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EXEGETICAL, PHILOLOGICAL, AND DOCTRINAL:
CAREFULLY COLLECTED AND CONDENSED, FROM THE BEST COMMENTATORS,
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AND THE FOREIGN MATTER TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH;
The whole accompanied with
A COPIOUS BODY OF ORIGINAL ANNOTATIONS.
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OF SIDNEY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, VICAR OF BISBROOKE IN RUTLAND, AND RESIDENT CURATE OF TUGBY, LEICESTERSHIRE.

Où σοφισταὶ ἰκεμέν, οὐδὲ ἀπιστεῖν ἔτοιμοι, θεαταὶ δὲ μόνον τῶν
γεγραμμένων, ἔτεκόμεν τῆν Γραφήν.

"Ὅπως οὖς ἐστι πίστις, ἀπαιτά τοιοῦτοι, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ μάχαι τίτονται
λόγων, τοῦ πιθανοτέρου τοῦ ἐπερον ἀναρέσειν δοκοῦντος: 'Ἡ πίστις
οφθαλμὸς ἐστιν' ὁ μὴ ἔχων ὀφθαλμοῦ οὐδὲν εὑρίσκει, ἀλλὰ μόνον
ζητεῖ.
Theophylact, from Chrysostom.
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ADVERTISEMENT.

In thus, at length, ushering into the world the Second Part of the arduous Work which he has been enabled to accomplish, the Author feels it is due to the Public to preface it with a brief statement of the causes which occasioned so long a delay in publication, and especially the reasons which induced him to adopt some alterations (and, as he trusts, improvements,) in his plan. These had partly occurred to him from experience and mature reflection, and partly had been suggested by some distinguished personages, who kindly took an interest in the Work, and to whose opinions much deference was, on various accounts, justly due. Both combined to point out that, in consequence of the immense mass of annotatory matter to be digested and reviewed in this second Part (comprehending nearly three-fourths of the difficulties of the New Testament), and of the marvellous diversities, nay, contrarieties, of interpretation perpetually to be encountered, it would be impossible to make the Work answer the chief purpose in view, or, indeed, to do any tolerable justice to the subject, within the prescribed limits; which, indeed, the Author had rather hoped than expected would suffice. That, moreover, in this portion of Scripture the nature of the subjects treated of rendered it necessary to in-
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roduce some alterations in his method of working up the materials, whether original, or otherwise; in fact, at once to enlarge, and yet contract his plan. Enlarge it by exploring the fountain heads of interpretation, as they are found in the Fathers of the first four centuries, and the Greek Commentators, Scholiasts, and Glossographers;* and especially by perpetually interweaving his own critical and explanatory remarks, and supplying, de suo, what seemed essential to complete the Corpus Annotationis; moulding, at the same time, the whole into a perpetual Commentary, in which every point of the least importance should be discussed, the true reading, in all doubtful and important cases, canvassed, the connexion traced, the course of reasoning indicated, all probable expositions detailed and reviewed, and the true interpretation, as far as possible, ascertained and determined. In consequence of such a material enlargement of the plan, it was necessary to devise every possible method of otherwise contracting it, especially by using the critical knife freely, by getting rid of heavy masses of unimportant or precarious matter, and bringing what

* The use, though limited, which the Author had made, in the former Part, of the antient Fathers and Commentators, had shown him their great importance to the interpretation of Scripture, and how unmerited was the neglect into which they had so long fallen among Protestant Commentators. In this judgment he was confirmed by the opinion of some distinguished Scholars, and eminent Churchmen, whose encouragement determined him to regularly examine at least Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret, Æcumenius, and the Greek Scholiasts, for the purpose of the present Work. By this course, as will be seen, the Editor has largely profited.
was essential into the most condensed form. Hence it became expedient to modify, and occasionally abandon his rule of ascribing each portion to its respective author; to blend together much various matter, partly original and partly compiled, * nay, sometimes to express the substance rather than detail the words of an annotation. But though the apportioning of minute and scattered remarks to their respective authors was often impracticable, yet he has been everywhere diligent in stating the chief authorities by which any interpretation has been supported. Considering, too, the Doctrinal nature of almost the whole of this second Part, and the unsoundness in doctrine, as well as inferiority in learning and judgment, of most† of the recent Foreign Commentators thereon, it was thought advisable to introduce far less matter from that quarter. The Author has, indeed, endeavoured not to introduce, from what-

* Hence the Editor has sometimes not been able sufficiently to distinguish his own original annotations from those of other Commentators; though, upon the whole, the discrimination is sufficiently marked. Conscious of being guided by a general spirit of literary honesty, the Author trusts that the praise, in this point, awarded to him by the Reviewers of the former Part, will not be found less merited in the present.

† For this is not meant to apply to all of the recent German, much less the Dutch, school. To use the words of a great orator, λέγω δὲ ταῦτα οὐ καρὰ πάντων, ἀλλὰ καρὰ τῶν ἐνδικῶν τοὺς εἰρημένους δινών. The names of Storr, Knapp, Staudlin, Tittmann, Winer, Borgers, Fritzche, Laurmann, Flatt, Schott, Wahl, and generally speaking, of Morus, Koppe, and Schleusner, are exceptions. To the erudition, acumen, and research of Kuin. Ros. Pott, Heinr. Dindorf. Jaspis, and others, the Author bears willing testimony; and, as his references will show, he has largely profited by their learned labours.
ever source, any objectionable interpretation, except for the purpose of pointed censure and direct refutation.

It is obvious that these material alterations (by which the Work became less of a Synopsis, or Corpus Annotationis, and more of a Recensio, or Critical Digest,) would considerably increase the Author's difficulties, and therefore will satisfactorily account for a delay of nine months in the publication. It is, indeed, scarcely possible for the most experienced writer to conceive the labor improbus which the adoption of these alterations in the plan occasioned the Author; under which, and a variety of difficulties he has had to struggle with, his chief support has been the very favourable reception which the First Part has met with from the Public in general, especially the friends to enlightened yet sound theology, amongst professing Christians of various denominations. Nay, even among some placed at the antipodes in respect of doctrine, and equally distant from the established Church, critiques have appeared, distinguished by a candour and courtesy as unusual towards the Church as it is honourable. But while the Author can, with truth, say that he has endeavoured to profit by every remark and suggestion thrown out by public criticism, from whatever quarter, he cannot dissemble his surprise at one or two mistakes respecting his opinions, and some misconceptions of the true features of his Work, even by some who must be considered alike intelligent and well affected to the undertaking. In the present Part, however, the perpetual discussions
into which the importance of the subjects and the alteration of plan led him, must have so completely unfolded his prevailing opinions and principles as to preclude all future misapprehensions. In reference to one source of error, the Author must be permitted to observe, that, consistently with those broad and impartial principles so essential to the exercise of right judgment and just decision, it was not for him too hypercritically to scan the merits of annotations by justly celebrated Commentators, or diminish the reader's means of judging for himself, by suppressing aught that might, by any possibility, be the true interpretation, or contribute to its discovery. Were it not for some mistakes that have arisen, it were hardly necessary for the Editor to say that he must not be considered as participating in every opinion by him introduced, unless with a formal disclaimer. The limits prescribed to this Work would not have permitted such perpetual animadversions; hence the Author has thought it sufficient to studiously suppress whatever he considered decidedly objectionable, or only to introduce it for the sake of censure* and refutation. In all other cases, he wished to afford his readers as much opportunity as possible of judging for themselves. In the exercise, indeed, of his Editorial and Critical functions, he cannot hope to have satisfied all; yet he trusts he shall not often fail of attaining it from those whose approbation it is his especial wish to gain; those, namely, who,

* Yet not a vestige, he trusts, will be found of that bitter, objur- gatory, calumnious spirit, which, to the injury of the Gospel, has made the Odium Theologicum " a bye-word among the Heathen."
while they hail every beam of real light, and readily embrace whatever can be considered as solid improvement in religious knowledge, yet strenuously oppose all needless changes of interpretation, all innovating refinements, and metaphysical subtleties—in other words, the supporters of sound, yet enlightened orthodoxy. Novelties of interpretation, indeed, the Author's experience has taught him habitually to distrust, since it has shown him that the truth usually lies somewhere amongst the antient and earlier modern Commentators; though it may, not unfrequently, have to be dragged forth piece-meal, and sometimes, according to the adage, may be said "to lie (overwhelmed with huge masses of useless erudition) at the bottom of a well." It has been the Author's fortune sometimes to justify and confirm, by the suffrage of antiquity, what had been unjustly distrusted and rejected as mere novelty; but far more frequently to show the solid grounds of interpretations which it had been too long the fashion to reject, merely because they were common; though from their antiquity and general reception, they might have been presumed to be true; for, to use the words of Cicero, "Opinionum commenta delet dies, Naturae ac veritatis judicia confirmat." Hence may we learn, in the words of the Oracle, ἀκίνητον μὴ κινεῖν.

To advert to some peculiar features of the present Part, the Author can, with truth, say that he has employed the same diligence in selecting all opposite illustrations of the phraseology or sentiment from the Classical writers, by a careful recensio of
the immense Collectanea of Pricæus, Grotius, Raphael, Elsner, Kypke, Wetstein, &c. The labour of this may easily be imagined, when it is considered that the quotations even in Wetstein's New Testament amount, it is said (see Dibd. Introd. vol. I. p. 165.), to a million! The Author was induced to especially attend to this branch of his plan, since the publications in question are rare and expensive, and the persons for whose use the present Work was especially intended, have seldom complete collections of the Greek Classics. The Author's own illustrations of this kind will, in the present Part, be found far more numerous and important. He has also, in this Second Part, used the same diligence in forming glossarial notes on every word and phrase which present the slightest difficulty. These, he trusts, will be found eminently serviceable to the Student: and though this kind of matter admits not of complete originality, yet a comparison of these glossarial notes with the matter found in Lexicographers or Commentators, will show that the Author has chiefly depended upon his own powers and resources.

A most important feature of the present Part is, the introduction of a new version and close paraphrase, by the Author, of most of the sentences of the original here annotated on. In the selection of Rabbinical illustrations the Editor confesses that he has been more sparing, partly because that kind of matter is here less valuable than on the Gospels, and since the nature of the subject-matter admits far less direct elucidation from that quarter; nay, on points which involve doctrine, are of very questionable
utility. No well informed Theologian can be ignorant of the abuse to which this mode of illustration is liable, and to which it has been applied by heterodox Commentators.

As a faithful and firmly attached son of the Church, an Ecclesiae Anglicanae Miles, the Author cannot dissemble his high satisfaction that the extensive researches prosecuted in the present Work do so decidedly tend to confirm the doctrines of his venerable nursing mother, as they are embodied in her articles and liturgy, and her discipline, as contained in her canons. Esto perpetua!

In conclusion, the Author cannot but entreat the Divine blessing on these his labours, that they may be made instrumental to that combination of knowledge with zeal, by which both are eventually purified, and by the union of which alone can Ministers be enabled "rightly to divide the world of truth," or "contend* for the truth once delivered to the Saints." With feelings of the deepest gratitude does he, in thus penning the concluding sentence of so arduous a Work, acknowledge the gracious aid, under various trials, anxieties, and sickness,† afforded

* Especially in times like our own, marked by innovating refinements, by restless insubordination, and by that mischievous spirit of dogmatism which draws its strength not even from perverted learning, or ingenious sophistry, but from hardiness of assertion, coarseness of language, and mysticism in doctrine.

† It may not be quite uninteresting to the reader to know that, hurried forward by a scarcely temperate ardour, the Author's exertions so far exceeded his strength that they had nearly cost him his life. For towards the conclusion he was so utterly exhausted, and was seized with such alarming symptoms, as left him but faint hopes of accomplishing the work.
him by that Almighty Being who, "when his heart was in heaviness, was the strength of his confidence; who hath brought his feet out of the mire and clay, and hath set them on a rock, and ordered his goings; and who hath thus put a new song into his mouth, even a thanksgiving unto his God!"

ΜΟΝΩ ΘΕΩ ΣΩΤΗΡΙ 'ΗΜΩΝ, ΔΙΑ 'ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ 'ΗΜΩΝ ΔΟΣΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΓΑΔΩΣΥΝΗ, ΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ, ΚΑΙ ΝΥΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΙΩΝΑΣ, ΑΜΗΝ.

*Vicarage, Tugby, Oct. 15, 1927.*
CORRECTIONS.*
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Page 6, fin. for a read 2—12, line 19, cancel alter—13, l. 8, read μετωπός—15, l. 14, for of read in—16, sub med. read Bergler—21, l. 4, read these—23, fin. read διεφθαρμα—23, l. 32, read has—29, sub in. read λεγόμενη—id. read writers—id. l. 35, insert or—30, l. 10, read Barkey's—32, sub med. read se in—38, l. 6, read Storr—51, l. 6, for to, read for—id. l. 26, read νῦν—61, sub fin. after their insert good—63, sub in. for who read the latter of whom—66, l. 11, for said read called—id. l. 25, for spirits read spirit—76, l. 32, read Scholia.—83, sub med. for με read βλ—92, med. read follow—97, l. 23, read Mary—109, l. 7, read προέκυψε—111, sub m. read παρέκτη—122, l. 25, after yet insert observes—128, sub in. for than read then—160, l. 7, read rediero—id. l. 8, read expects—164, mid. for had read have—166, l. 27, for from read of—170, l. 7, cancel Grotius—181, l. 23, read βουλέντω—190, l. 14, read νῦν—195, l. 34, for Sæc. read Sæc. read Pace—201, l. 24, add (Kuin.)—221, fin. for if read of—231, l. 37, read Kuin.—id. for dragon read serpent—235, sub med. for an read no—242, fin. read μαρτεία—346, l. 29, read Ἑρώτα—257, mid. for Thus read The—262, l. 10, for Dio read Div—263, l. 8, read Διονύσιος—294, fin. for ενα read ενα—297, l. 8, after wit add replied—305, sub mid. for ας read δε—id. for Eunuch read Apostle—304, l. 29, read suppose—305, l. 5, read οὐκ απειράρχησε—307, sub fin. after mind add and—315, l. 15, read amaroeis—316, l. 29, after which add will—330, mid. for not read now—343, l. 12, after to add feed—344, sub fin. after linen add in—348, l. 12, read φθέγψαται—348, l. 29, after preposition which—361, l. 12, read ἔτη—384, l. 31, for in read on—385, l. 26, after this read custom—id. fin. for in read is—389, l. 8, read ἀγάθος—391, l. 30, read positively—393, mid. for γεφος read γεφός—401, in. for by read with—401, l. 11, read ἐὰν—404, l. 28, read Menachem—is id. read Chalcis—413, in. for παρασιτον read μάρτεια—418, sub fin. read raised—420, l. 17, read letters—424, l. 16, read compounded—438, mid. for add read and—461, fin. for Aristoph. read Aristot.—482, l. 11, for version read

* For typographical errors (unavoidable in such a Work) the Author must throw himself on the indulgence of his considerate readers, when he informs them that his great distance from the press prevented him from correcting the proof sheets more than once, and his remoteness from a Post town, which rendered it necessary to employ special messengers, and exposed him to many disappointments, allowed him too short a time for correction. He has now, however, carefully examined the whole, and trusts that the following list (not perhaps longer than might be expected in a work of nearly 4000 closely printed pages of learned matter) includes nearly every error of the least consequence; and he cannot but intreat his readers to use it for the purpose of actual correction.
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verse—529, in. read The word occurs—543, l. 6; read προσκλη
rhoτθαι—557, mid. for opposite read opposite—561, fin. for esteem
to read esteems—571, in. after must add refer—573, in. for ἐφα read
ἐθα—574, l. 14, for uti read utri—683, fin. read χειροπηγημανι
—594, l. 41, after only cancel not—599, l. 7, for τοῦ read το
—608, sub mid. read Hecatei—620, fin. read σωκάφων—638, sub
in. cancel But—ισισ—653, fin. read καργηοριας—654, l. 8, read
χειροπηγητον—655, in. for dear read dear.
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Psa 13, line 11, read Bokker—35, s. f. read λαλούντες—39, l. 17,
read πηδα—41, l. 9, read fratrem—42, fin. read χρείας—46, mid.
for add read and—48, l. 11. for to read of—48, mid. read εἰόνυμνι
—52, fin. read διανέαντας—61, l. 33, after them add and—63, fin.
add Whitby—64, sub fin. read and as nothing—77, 10, read Κλιττ
—87, sub fin. read ἄρωη—96, l. 4, for assigned read consigned—97, mid.
for then read these—99, l. 31, for was read owns—103, mid. read τεκνον
—104, l. 33, after Priest place a bracket—112, l. 5, for is read of—127, l. 11, read citizen—130, l.
76, for day read days—136, mid. point σουτητιμος, σουτάνως—142,
mid. for and read in—143, in. after where add else—145, mid. for
σεος read θεος—id. for τάρμον read ταρτωμον—152, l. 9, after
Ernesti add Lex—154, l. 29, after than read by—160, fin. read nor
acquit and set—178, mid. read Varus—180, sub fin. for surrounding
read succeeding—182, sub fin. after once add elsewhere—183,
mid. read φοροντων—189, in. for a s read as b—198, mid. for to
read the—202, l. 29, for or read as—203, fin. for critics read cities
—207, l. 34, read χειμωνι—209, l. 25, read ειτων—214, l. 10, after
this add drifelling—217, in. read ἄρην—227, sub fin. for Rhes.
read Rhet—230, sub fin. read principle—243, mid. for πευξάνας
read μακαίας—243, l. 31, after of which read sense—243, l. 35,
read προφάσει—254, mid. read προσελαστας—256, mid. read ὅβεπρ
—id. fin. after they were add or many were—257, sub
fin. for σα Του read σα Φο—259, l. 7, read to take one to—272, l. 9,
read Clueri and Dorvelin—273, sub fin. read after, or perhaps before
—285, sub fin. read Apostolo—298, mid. after extends add it—300,
l. 29, cancel that—301, l. 14, read πηντα—308, l. 8, read τριαντα
id. l. 18, read μεπα—309, mid. read communication—312, sub
fin. after that add it—id. fin. read ἐκληθοτητη—313, l. 30, read but,
at the same time, with—314, l. 19, read Βαρβάρων—326, sub fin.
for it read that—337, mid. after for read in—331, l. 10, for now
read for—333, l. 29, for that religion, read that system—339, fin.
for Timant. read Timarch—343, l. 14, read δεκεμυ—343, l. 30, read
putantum—347, l. 2, read Agricola—id. sub fin. after apud insert
alium—350, l. 7, after stories add and—id. l. 15, read interpreters
—350, sub med. read διορύγην—351, l. 13, read προσεκοντιντας
—353, sub fin. read εἰσοδής—364, in. read Trypho—366, mid
for qui read quæ—368, l. 4, cancel of—383, l. 31, read the archetyp
—384, sub fin. after means add ill—388, fin. cancel which
—389, l. 6, read boastest—396, sub fin. cancel his—405, l. 25, read
CORRECTIONS.

regards—407, l. 14. read distichs—412, l. 36, for this read the—427, m. 428, sub fin. read ἔθθησαν—429, sub med. read κόροις and πυρομολογεῖν, and διάδρομοι, and ἔρωμεν—429, fin. for and answers read answering—433, sub. fin. read πάσης—434, sub fin. for therefrom read therefore—444, m. for affecting read effecting—447, mid. read δογματίζειν—id. fin. for uses read is used—449, l. 16, after before place a period—458, sub fin. read refero—468, l. 29, after put read out—471, fin. read Fesai—478, sub fin. signification, and Gloss Philoxen.—480, sub. fin. for casual read causal—482, l. 29, to be (acknowledged to be) by—484, m. read מְבָרְכָּה—485, l. 6, for compares read combines—489, l. 9. read ימינו—id. f. read κατενοθήκας and וּלְדָּו—498, l. 21, cancel that—501, l. 17, for this read them—505, l. 14, after apposite add and—507, l. 14, read ἄνωθεν ὅμωσι—516, l. 7, for best read better—517, s. f. after and add were—538, l. 5, read by hand—538, l. 6, read וּלְדָּו and—id. m. read ἐμπορέσατε—539, m. read κυρίου—540, l. 9, read συμφόρου—548, s. m. cancel not—552, l. 9, read concupiscencia—550, l. 8, read poetical—566, f. read and also those who—578, l. 6, for civrò read ἀνόητος—583, l. 2, cancel—591, f. read nutuque—592, cancel the stop after—594, l. 7, read ἰμεροβολός—603, s. m. read ἄνωθεν—639, m. for of read for—643, f. for με ὑπέρ ὑμῖν—663, s. f. after yet add since—671, f. for also read alas!—672, s. m. read ἤχων—695, l. 5, after Winterburg place a period—701, l. 13, cancel the ad—714, m. read acceptance—id. after εώς add (Koppe)—716, m. after even add thee—717, f. read ἀναστηλων—723, s. f. read forborne—743, m. cancel it—746, l. 9, for for read from whence—746, m. for ἐνθεοσαίαν read τιθεοσαίαν, and for ταττόμενον read ταχάθεν.

Vol. VI.

Page 19, for exoteric read esoteric—32, fin. read ὅν and ὧν—23, f. for suitable read salvable—26, line 8, read εἰσεύθην—27, l. 4, read ῥαβν—30, s. f. for or read i. e.—31, l. 6, for jest read gist—id. s. f. read καθελείν—32, l. 14, read γα—33, m. read ὡς—39, s. f. for greatness read goodness—45, l. 8, for et read at—id. m. for senate read sanato—46, m. for γεγονός read λέγεις—53, m. read στέλεχος—58, m. read ἑπιστῶτα—64, l. 11, read ὡτα—87, l. 5, for Chapter read Epistle—107, s. f. read ἡμί—117, s. f. read ἐμπορολόν—121, f. for Horatian read Virgilian, and ignora—123, for facile read facile 126, s. f. cancel usually—127, m. read προοῑ—132, m. for later read Latin—135, s. f. read προοῑ—136, m. ὡς ὧν—137, id. m. for divinitus—141, l. 14, read κατά—145, l. 6, for με ὑπέρ ὑμῖν—149, f. cancel the—151, l. 6. read λέγεις—165, s. f. after meats add of the Mosaic Law—177, m. read εὔθυνος—178, l. 4, read antanacasis—183, s. m. read advanced—186, m. after it add not—187, l. 1, read ὦ—189, s. f. read δυνάμενον—190, f. read Ἐκποθαίνει—208, m. read superstition—211, f. read πληρώματι—215, m. read καὶ—216, l. 11, read προφυς—236, f. read Ἀπεκδέχεται—237, m. read πῦλη and ἀνευθύνον—239, l. 6. read ομοί—240, s. f. read μαθητὴς—244, l. 10, read ἀστάξεμαι—246, l. 5, read ρήμα—247, l. 4. Read προσήγο-
CORRECTIONS.

πια—248, m. read σόφη—231, in. read ὡπ—235, m. read ἵθυμομενος—299, m. for Samuel read Shammi—302, m. read ἴμων—304, m. for avoid read award, and τῷβα—317, s. m. for ἔστεο read ἔστε—318, l. 13, for ill clothed read unclothed—327, l. 3, read prohisci—329, for their read its—335, f. read καρπονομον—339, l. 11, cancel late—340, f. r. suggests—341, s. m. for nation r. notion—342, s. f. for of r. to—343, in. r. Plato in Theaetet—357, s. m. r. ponitur—358, l. 9, r. δίον—365, f. after αἰσθήσεις add οίδε δρεχίν εἰδίδως—366, s. f. for ῥοφαὶ r. ῥοφα—368, l. 11, r. συμφώναι—id. f. after sinneth add against—372, s. f. for illustrata r. illustria—376, in. read ῥοπα—379, l. 17, after is the add same—398, f. r. writer—413, f. for more r. more—415, l. 6, r. δοσιαν—id. l. 11, cancel by—417, f. point Duxi uxorem, quam iberiam vidi! natī filii: αλλα curā—458, f. r. ἔλαμβανεν καί εκνοτον—459, m. r. διετάξατο—461, s. f. r. καυγώματι—id. s. m. after καυ μή—480, r. πνευματικῷ—486, s. f. for δι᾽ r. ol—491, l. 15, r. ἀλαθρεύω—504, m. r. heatheans—512, r. δὲ, and a little further on ὑπήλιον—525, 2, for are r. is, and for by r. in—526, l. 12, for sit r. ut—539, f. for δεινεῖν r. δει πονεῖν—554, m. r. hurried away—560, l. 16, for last r. past—567, f. r. ἔστε δει r. σῖτε δει—576, s. f. r. λεγόμενα—596, f. r. ἵστα—605, f. for the r. some—612, m. r. κρυσταλλα—614, l. 11, r. ἀληθείαι καί κοινωνία—624, m. r. acquiescence—627, m. r. ol—645, r. ἐξω λόγον—653, s. m. r. κοσμίας—656, l. 5, r. εὶν or ἐπειράμεθα—667, m. for 223, r. l. 21—664, l. 11, r. ἐκτρωσις—id. l. 13, for suit r. fruit—665, l. 8, r. reckling—666, s. m. r. pretend—667, l. 9, r. κεφαλαία—695, m. r. εὐκαίρια—701, for by r. as—709, s. f. r. habituri—711, s. m. r. ἐστι—720, m. after especially add at—720, f. r. πλεονεκρον πληκτον—721, m. r. αὐτῇ—id. f. for are r. were—725, m. r. ἴσω—739, m. r. χάρις—754, in. r. ἀναπαυθήκασιν.

VOL. VII.

Page 52, f. read σοφιστεῖν—537, r. κακυνεῖν—61, s. f. r. ἐπιχειρήσασθαι—75, m. for further r. formal—82, line 7, r. ἔλεειδοι—87, f. after dispatch add it—93, s. f. cancel an and r. agonistes—109, m. r. σκη—123, l. 2. for on r. in—125, m. for was r. were—126, r. Necyom—130, f. r. ἀπόλυσε—146, m. r. καὶ—153, in. for these r. there—163, for this r. his—167, s. f. r. βουκόλους καί συννυκτάζεις—169, f. r. taken—177, s. f. r. ἐσθεν—178, s. m. r. ἔγαρμεν—190, l. 11, r. affectu—201, s. f. r. ab and ex—212, s. f. r. περιφέρεσε—216, in. r. οἰκειχαθη—241, s. m. after stulti add sunt—245, m. for readily r. ready—250, l. 11, r. προσέχει—252, m. for connexion r. thought—268, l. 17, r. persecutions—279, s. f. r. clause—280, m. r. velum—281, m. for imitated by r. imitated from—282, s. f. r. expositions—283, l. 13, cancel of—287, place ἢ after ὡπ, and r. πτι—304, l. 6, r. τῇβα—309, s. m. for this r. they—320, s. m. r. ὄνωμι—341, l. 10, r. recognise—343, f. forms r. oaths—358, s. m. r. ἑτής—360, f. r. νῦν and ὄνοια—362, l. 4, r. ἀλλο—363, s. f. cancel always—365, m. r. δικαιωθήσεσαι—368, l. 10, r. γνώμης—id. s. in. cancel is—374, m. after they are of, add no
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Page 1, line 14, cancel καὶ Μυτιλήνη—10, fin. for Macknight r. Campbell—11, f. r. elékω—36, l. 7, r. γράμμα—42, l. 4, r. incidents—43, l. 15, r. elementari religioni—43, f. r. rιν—53, m. r. τόν—54, s. m. r. Σκιδῆν—64, l. 3, r. as far—id. s. m. r. and desires—66, s. f. r. ἀλλα—67, l. 14, for or r. and—70, s. f. r. oration, and ἀναγώνα—71, m. r. inconclusive—77, l. 11, for are done r. have been—id. m. r. effected—91, l. 13, r. μαρτύρεσθαι—92, f. for re-
CORRECTIONS.

puted r. refuted—95, l. 5. r. subaud—97, m. after rather add seem—104, l. 4, for it signifies r. they import—109, m. r. secios—124, f. for most r. some—125, s. f. r. ἑκάστη—135, l. 8, for had r. have—141, l. 4, after those add ordinary—144, l. 10, after trying add it—148, f. for is r. was—153, f. r. κατακυθήθαι—156, s. m. r. ultione—158, s. m. r. ἁμαρτά—179, s. m. r. ἀνδρότητα—193, l. 1, r. are both—204, s. m. r. ὠνάδα—205, l. 13, after another add world—207, s. m. for of the sense r. and the sense—206, l. 9, for predisposition r. predictions—213, m. for are r. were, and blessings—216, l. 12, r. thus offered, and that persons of any—221, l. 14, r. ἡμερία—id. s. f. r. cincinnati—id. f. for binding r. brading—223, for head r. hand—239, l. 13, for however r. therefore—231, s. f. r. ἐμφανίζεται—id. s. m. for guilty of r. enslaved to—id. s. f. r. sellulariam—232, s. m. r. marander—id. l. 15, for therefore r. for—234, m. r. objectors—id. l. 9, r. νεκροκτόνωσις—238, f. cancel r. 245, l. 11, r. more agreeable—247, m. r. ἀνάλωσιν—249, l. 2. r. παραιτ. and ἀποστέφθαι—id. m. cancel A, and for γίνεται r. γίνεται—id. s. f. r. ἀρνίοντο—254, s. m. for conjoin r. enjoins—id. s. f. r. ἀνάγκη—257, l. 12, r. νευτέρως—262, f. point Deaconesses. But—268, l. 15, after Schleusner add adduces—270, l. 13, r. προσωποληψια—275, f. r. λογιζομαι—276, m. for μεν r. μια—281, l. 6, cancel is certain—282, s. f. r. actions—id. f. r. strive to lay—286, s. f. r. ἔχω—288, f. r. εἰσόησι—304, l. 8, r. ἄνωθεν—309, m. for the same r. He—311, l. 5, after Rivington add to which, and for on which r. appointed—313, m. r. nequibunt—317, s. m. r. to awaken from deep sleep—320, l. 1, r. Juvénal and Horace. Nay Thucyd.—id. l. 5. cancel (I would r. ἀνάρα) —321, f. r. φυλογούσιν—322, s. f. r. cooperti—323, l. 4, r. προσωπομένων—326, l. 7, r. Platon. and ἔντυσιν—328, f. r. ἁρμόζει—331, s. f. r. of these and other—333, l. 3, r. ἐγκυκλούσσως and παρειμβάλοντας—id. s. m. cancel at least, and for an illustrious r. a striking—336, l. 7, r. creatures—337, f. r. Q. That—338, 7, for or r. on—345, s. f. for by r. at—351, m. r. ἀεί ζευγαρίαν and Bauer, and for swit r. swift—356, s. f. r. σεβάσμα—359, s. m. r. Menoch.—id. s. f. point παλαινομίουν αὐτόν—363, m. r. but, in some measure from its power, by supplying, &c.—id. f. r. προκαίρια—367, s. m. for have r. having—id. f. cancel done—369, l. 5, r. callings—379, m. r. observes—383, l. 4, cancel parenthesis—id. s. f. for one r. opinion—384, m. for τούτῳ ἔτη—389, m. r. ἐκατόντας—389, m. after subject add whether—403, m. r. turns—405, l. 9, r. all the best—id. s. m. for external r. eternal—406, l. 6, r. Graecism—407, l. 1, r. made—414, m. r. ὥρη—415, f. r. indignant—419, s. f. for of r. by—423, s. m. r. felicitas aeterna—426, l. 27, r. they will attain—427, l. 3, r. couched—id. l. 6, r. ἐκτίμητι—id. l. 16, r. vestrūm—id. s. m. r. ἐνεργῇς—id. s. f. r. ἄνδρι and ἄνδρων—428, for sanctification r. sacrifice—431, s. f. r. Priesthoods—433, m. r. περίκεισαι—435, f. r. Job. 35, 12, and ἔστη—438, s. f. r. teachers—444, l. 9. r. we will proceed—446, l. 7, r. ἔλη—448, l. 6, r. ἐνεργεῖ—453, m. r. ἔστη ἔχων—id. m. r. πρόδρομος—455, s. f. r. ἄνδρον—455, l. 4, for in r. on—467, l. 9, r. ἐκείνος—461, l. 8, r. ἀνεκέκρυφθαι—463, l. 31, r. asserts—id. m. r. include—485, l. 8, r.
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τελειόων—id. s. f. for consist r. subsist—488, l. 16, r. astriferum—
490, l. 14, r. Barnab. Epist.—506, l. 14, r. ἐκλέγει—509, s. f. r.
one—511, f. r. ἐκδόχαι—512, l. 4, for so r. as—519, l. 12, for then r.
thing—528, l. 10, r. to be so—549, r. αἰματεργεσίας—552, f. r.
ὁ—558, f. r. κείμενον—559, m. r. ἐκάθαρον—560, l. 25, cancel
and—564, m. r. ἔστω and—566, l. 29, r. united with—573, in. for
recapitulation r. commemoration—607, l. 15, r. εἰσεύρα—616, m.
τραπαγί—id. s. f. cancel two—627, l. 11, r. Poet and πένητρα—
629, l. 12, r. ἡμι—635, m. for house r. soul—638, l. 12, r. γερα-
τικόν—641, for supported r. cheers—652, s. f. for it r. them—
682, for Val. r. Vit.—691, l. 23, for frigidly r. briefly—696, l. 32, for
and r. but—704, l. 16, r. day-star—710, 4, r. ταρατάων, hurling
—710, f. r. Lenev—712, l. 9, r. αἰθάδεσις—732, m. r. ἐμπαίτα
cs—743, l. 22, for into r. according to—744, m. r. that excessive—746,
m. r. ἑπισήν μόνη ἐκεῖνα—751, l. 14. read quod attinet ad—758, for
Doctors r. Docetæ—766, f. r. magis, potentius—767, s. f. r. speak
of—789, f. r. Ἑλληνικόν—803, s. f. for single r. sinful—804, l. 20,
r. to denote—811, l. 10, for interprets r. intermits—814, m. r. that
originally centered in—813, f. r. οὔτερα.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Author avails himself of this opportunity to inform his
readers that, conformably with his promise in the Preface, he has
drawn up a copious Appendix (to be bound with Vol. I.) of sup-
plementary matter on that portion of the Gospel of St. Matthew,
which extends to ch. xii. This will be ready for delivery with
Part II.
THE

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Did καὶ ἐμαυτὸν μᾶλιστα εἰς ταύτην ἀναγκαίως καθήκα τὴν πραγματείαν, ὥστε ἐπισκόπουσθαι τὸν ἀγνοοῦντα, καὶ μὴ ἀφειναι τοιούτων λανθάνειν καὶ ἀποκρύπτεσθαι θησαυρὸν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐλαττονα τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἡμᾶς ὡφελῆσαι δυνάσθαι, τοιαύτης ἐμπέπλησται φιλοσοφίας καὶ δογμάτων ὀρθότητος, καὶ μᾶλιστα τῶν πνεύματος ἀρχηγῶν. (Chrysostom.)

Preliminary remarks on the style of St. Luke, as it is found in this book, collected from Kuinoel's Prolegomena.

As to the style of St. Luke, one may observe, generally, that it is far more accommodated to the genius of the Greek language than that of the other sacred writers. This Evangelist is especially studious of brevity (see 13, 1. seqq. 14, 10, 20. 16, 3. 19, 2 & 4, &c.), and often omits what may easily be supplied from the rest of the narration, or even other passages (see 8, 36. 10, 23. compared with 11, 12. 11, 3. 15, 5 & 34., &c.); not unfrequently passes from the indirect to the direct form of expression (see 1, 4. 17, 3. 28, 22, 23. 25, 8, &c.); often so uses the relative pronoun that it answers to the case of the preceding noun, and not the verb following (see 1, 1. 3, 25. 9, 13. 17, 3. 20, 38, &c.); frequently employs the word ἰμαθωμαῖον (see 1, 14. 2, 1 & 46. 4, 24. 5, 12. 7, 57. 8, 6, &c.), and the verb προσκατέργειν (Acts 1, 14. 2, 42 & 46. 6, 4. 8, 18, &c.). The words and formulas peculiar to Luke,
and which occur in no other writer, are the following: ἀνδρεῖς καὶ ἐξοχὴ τῆς πόλεως, 25, 23. ἀπελευθήσεται, 19, 27. ἀφελότης, 2, 46. ἐξαρτίζειν, used of time, 21, 5. ἐνατίζεσθαι, 2, 14. ἐπιβάλλειν τὰς χεῖρας, suscipere, 12, 1. μυσχαποιεῖν, 7, 41. περιαστράπτειν, 9, 3. προσοπολήπτης, 10, 34. πρόσπεινος, 10, 10. χρώανυτειν (a verb which very rarely occurs), 20, 16. ὁδίνες vincula, 2, 24.

The words and formulas not used by the other writers of the New Testament, are the following: ἀπέναντι, adversus, 17, 7. ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, 2, 1. διάλεκτος, 1, 19. 2, 6 & 8. 21, 20, 22. 2, 26, 14. διαστρέψειν ἄντος, 13, 8. διάδεκτον, 26, 7. ἐκ τείνειν τὴν χείρα, a Hebrew formula, used of the Deity, 4, 30. ἐπάναγκες, 15, 28. ἐπίκαιως, 8, 22. καταγγελεῖς, 17, 18. λυμαινεῖσθαι, 8, 3. μεταζεύζω, post, 13, 42. οἰκήμα, carcer, 12, 7. προσκλίνεσθαι, 5, 36. συμπεσθαι, 20, 4. τοινυ, 4, 29, 5, 38. 17, 30, 20, 32, 27, 22. τίθεναι παρὰ τούς πόδας, 4, 35, 5, 2, 7, 57. φάσις, 21, 31. See Michaelis apud Eichorn's Introduction.

To which I add ὅπολονομεν.

CHAP. 1.

VERSE 1. τῶν μὲν πρωτον λόγων ἐποιήσαμην π. π.—ὡς ἤρξατο ὁ Π. With the Commentaria which he formed on the sayings, doings, and fortunes of Christ, the Evangelist has connected this book on the Acts of the Apostles, repeating from ver. 1 to 14. the history of Christ's ascension unto Heaven, and offering a more copious detail of that event. (Kuin.) Thus Chrysostom, in his Proleg. calls this book the ἀναστάσεως ἀποδείγμα, and he adds that this may, in a rough and brief way, be called the whole scope of the book. Now there are some minute points concerning the phraseology of this Evangelist, which must be adverted to. The use of μὲν without the apodotic δὲ, an idiom which is found in the best Greek writers, and especially at the proeme of a book. Many examples of this are produced by commentators from Xenophon. It occurs, too, in
all the books of Herodian; as also in Sophocles, Philo, and Eurip. Hipp. See Kypke and Valckn. Πρατιν is for πρότερος; as is required by propriety of language, when there are but two things. This use of the comparative is not, however, unexamined. The commentators compare Cic. de Invent. 2, 3. Δόγων ἐπισημάτων. Δόγως is often used by the best Greek writers in the sense which it here bears, namely, of narration, history, or a book of history. For when any work, especially a history, is divided into several parts, those parts are called λόγοι; as in the histories of Herodotus and Herodian. Hence historians are, by Herodotus and others, called λογοστοι. Nor, indeed, is this without example in the Hebrew language; since נב ו sometimes denotes a book of history; as in 1 Chron. 29, 29. Jer. 29, 29. Thus λόγων ποιεῖν, or ποιεῖθαι, will have the sense of compose a history. Of the examples added by Wetstein, Kypke, and Valck., the most apposite are the following. Diog. Laert. 7, 1, 21. where he tells us that Zeno λόγων πεποιηκέναι περὶ τῶν καθήκων, de officio. Theophr. Char. πρατιν μὲν οὖν ποιησαίμη τῶν λόγων. Philo T. 2, 445. ὁ μὲν πρότερος λόγος ἦν ἡμῖν, ὁ δὲ δόσιν, περὶ τῶν πάντων δοῦλον φαύλων. Galen de Usu, Part 2. περὶ πρατέων τῶν δικτύων ἐπισημάτων τῶν λόγων.

Ων ἡρξατο ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν is for ἐποιήσε καὶ διδάξει. For the pronoun relative, by an Attic idiom, does not answer to the case of the noun preceding, but the verb which follows. The idiom is, indeed, familiar to Luke, and is found not only in the New, but the Old Testament; as Gen. 2, 3. Thus Markland observes that the antecedent being in the genitive case, causes the relative to be put in the same case; and the relative draws the following adjective after it; instead of περὶ πραγμάτων ἐποιήσε. He then compares a similar construction in Luke 3, 19. περὶ πάντων ἐποιήσε ποιημέν ὁ Ἡρώδης: & 19, 37. Acts 10, 39. 22, 10. Most commentators also suppose a pleonasm in ἡρξατο ποιεῖν.
for ἐποίησε; since ἀρχεσθαι, like the Heb. לְחַס, when joined to verbs is redundant; and, as Glass observes, ἀρχεσθαι is sometimes used of complete action. The words περὶ πάντων must not be pressed, but are to be regarded as a popular mode of speaking, in which rigid accuracy is not observed.

2. ἀρχαὶ ὡς ἡμέρας ἐνεπλάμενοι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὐς ἐξελέξατο. There has been much doubt on the construction, and consequently the interpretation of this passage. The ancient Fathers and Commentators join διὰ πνεύματος with ἐνεπλάμενος. And so the English Version. Some interpreters tell us that Jesus is here considered as a Divine Legate; and that διὰ πνεύματος signifies “by divine impulse and authority.” They render ἐνεπλάμενος promised the Apostles divine assistance, endowments, and faculties necessary for their work. Others, however, observe that οὐς ἐξελέξατο will then be pleonastic. But that may be doubted. Some modern commentators, as Beza, Sanctius, Elsner, Barrington, and Heinrich, join ἐξελέξατο and διὰ. But (as Kypke observes) οὐς ἐξελέξατο thus yields a very languid sense, and the trajectio is exceedingly harsh; since not only are these words separated, but also the words οὐς ἐξελέξατο and ἁποστόλοις. Utterly unauthorized, too, is the sense quod attinet ad, which some ascribe to διὰ. Kuinoel follows the mode of construction adopted by Beza, Heumann, Kypke, Michaelis, and Rosenmuller, who place a comma after ἁποστόλοις, thus uniting διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐξελέξατο, and transposing only οὐς. This trajectio is, he thinks, the easiest, and, (since in whatever way the words be taken, some trajectio must be admitted) is, upon the whole, preferable. This punctuation is found in some MSS., and is confirmed by the Syriac, Arabic, and Ἐθιοπικ versions, as also Cyrill. Nor is the transposition unusual. Examples of it are found in 3, 24. προφήται ἀπὸ Σαμουήλ, καὶ τῶν καθέξης, οὕτοι ἐλαχισταν, που προφήται οὕτοι κ. τ. ἁ. Joh. 9. 40. Cic. Verr. 3, 31. cum civitatibus frumentum, in cellam quod sumi oporteret, æstimavit.
Thus (continues Kuinoel) the words ἀποστόλοις ὁδὲ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐξελέβατο may be explained either 'whom he had chosen by Divine impulse' (see the note on Matth. 4, 1. Luke 4, 14), or 'according to the Divine virtue and power, with which he had been endued, in order to the fitting them for their Apostolic office.' ἑντειλάμενος, having given orders.' In ver. 3. (continues Kuinoel, from Bengel) Luke expresses generally what the Lord had said to the Apostles during those forty days: but at ver. 2. he adverts to what he had said on the day of ascension. Therefore ἑντειλάμενος must be referred to the things which are here mentioned, ver. 4. seqq.

After all, however, the first mentioned mode of interpretation seems the most satisfactory, and, as being supported by the weighty authority of the ancient Fathers, may deserve the preference. Nor do I see how ὁδὲ εξελέβατο can be thought superfluous. This mode of interpretation is adopted, too, by Wetstein, who renders, 'He issued his commands by the Holy Spirit (i.e. a prophet predicting future events), that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the effusion of the Holy Spirit. (See infr. 11, 28. 21, 4. Heb. 11, 22. Gen. 18, 19. 47, 33. 2 Sam. 17, 28. 2 Kings 20, 20.) Not as other men, who, at the approach of death, make their wills, wholly ignorant of the events which shall fall out.' This, however, though ingenious, is very precarious. Schoettgen observes that the whole will be clearer and less difficult, if the words διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου be understood of the Divinity of Christ (on which he refers to his note on Rom. 1, 3.); since those things which Christ commanded and ordained, respecting the Church, he commanded and ordained, not as a mere man, but as God, as King of the Church, who could, of his own proper authority, issue his commands with respect to it.

Certainly we are not authorized to limit the term ἑντειλάμενος having issued his orders to any one order, but must apply it generally to any order which respected the right discharge of their Apostolic office.
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8. ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις. Valckn. notices the difference between σημεία and τεκμηρία, the former having a physical, the latter a moral sense. Thus Antipp. ap. Ammon 127. says that past events obtain faith by σημεία, that future ones are conjectured by τεκμηρία. So Eurip. in Οἰνομ. 1. (cited by Wets.) Τεκμηρόμεθα τοῖς παρὼντι τῷ ἀφανῆ. Aristol. Rhet. (cited by Wets.) explains τεκμηρία by σημεία ἀναγκαῖα. And so Quint. Or. 5, 9. signa necessaria, i.e. important ones. The words are, however, frequently confounded. Τεκμήριον here signifies a clear, evident, certain sign. Thus Hesychius explains τεκμήριον by σημεῖόν ἀληθ. Of this sense Kuinoel cites examples; to which I add Thucyd. 1, 22. ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων τεκμηρίων. Many others also occur in that historian. Αἰσχ. Ag. 343. πιστὰ τεκμηρία.

The several appearances of Christ during these forty days are thus detailed by Bp. Pearce: "The first appearance of Christ was to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary. (Matth. 28, 1—9.) The second to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus. (Luke 24, 15.) The third to Simon Peter. (Luke 24, 34.) The fourth to ten of the Apostles (Thomas being absent) Luke 24, 36. & Joh. 20, 19. Note, that all these four appearances were on the day of his resurrection. The fifth was to the eleven Apostles, Thomas being then with them. (Joh. 20, 26.) The sixth to seven of the Apostles in Galilee, at the sea of Tiberias. (Joh. 21, 4.) The seventh to James (1 Cor. 15, 7.), most probably in Jerusalem, and when Jesus gave an order for all his Apostles to assemble themselves together, as in Acts 1, 4.*

3. ἰπτανόμενος. This is well explained by Hesychius ἐμφανιζόμενος. The word is almost confined to the sacred writers. It answers to the Heb. נָסָר in 1 Kings 8, 8. Tob. 12, 19., and is found in two

* The eighth, when they were assembled together, and when Jesus led them out as far as Bethany (Luke 24, 50), from whence he ascended into heaven: at which it seems to have been, that he was seen by above five hundred brethren at once. (1 Cor, 15, 6.)

3. δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα, "at intervals, during that period."* Wetstein observes that the number forty was a holy number; and he refers to Num. 14, 33 & 34., and Matth. 4, 2. "Christ (says he) lay forty hours in the sepulchre, and there were forty years to the destruction of Jerusalem." Kuinoel refers to a similar passage in 1 Sam. 17, 16.

3. Λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. The περὶ is almost pleonastic; as in 28, 15 & 23. See the note on Mark 4, 19. By βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is meant the Christian religion, or, as Schoettgen explains it, Ecclesia temporum Novi Testamenti, cujus Rex est ipse Christus, the Christian dispensation. "Our Lord (says Schoettgen) conversed with his disciples during these forty days, on all matters relating to the Constitution of the Church to be planted and established among the Gentiles. And first concerning doctrine, when he inculcated anew the instructions hitherto delivered to them, which, that they might not escape their memories, were afterwards confirmed at the effusion of the Holy Spirit. (See Joh. 14, 26.) He then also gave them injunctions concerning the rites and ceremonies to be observed in the Church, as, for instance, in what manner the Sacraments were to be celebrated, the manner and time of assembling together, &c. For I must ever maintain that those rites which were now instituted in the Apostolic age, or altered from the hitherto accustomed ones, were so constituted by the injunctions of Christ himself. This is especially applicable to the alteration of

* It is well remarked by Cæomenius that here we have δι' ἡμερῶν, not ἐν ἡμεραι: since the Lord did not abide with them continually, as he had done before the passion, but διασταλέων, ἡμα μὲν καὶ πολεμοντέραν αὐτοῖς τὴν δαυτοῦ ἐμφανεῖαν παρασκευά- zeων, ἡμα δὲ καὶ τὸ ὑψηλότερον καὶ θεοπρεπὲς αὐτοῦ ἐμφανίζων.
the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian Lord's day, a change on which the Apostles would never have ventured, had it not been in obedience to the order of our Lord himself." Schoettgen.

4. συναλίζομενος παρήγγειλεν αυτοῖς, &c. Some MSS. have συναλιζομενος, which Wetstein supports, but upon insufficient grounds. The common reading, as it is the more difficult, so it seems to be the truer one. The words are often confounded in the Classical writers. Almost all critics, indeed, unite in retaining the common reading, but in the explanation of the word they are not agreed. Bois and others, cited by Wolf, as also Bolten (who compares Mark 16, 14. ἀνακειμένοις αὐτοῖς) render it convescens, taking food with them; which is supported by the Syriac, Vulgate, and Arabic versions; as also by Chrysostom. They cite, too, Ps. 141, 4. where ὡθήν is rendered by Amonius μὴ συναλισθῶ, by Symmachus συμφάγομι. But this signification is unfrequent, and not suitable to the context. For Jesus spoke what we read in ver. 4. on the very day of his ascension, and not while they were at supper. Compare ver. 9., and see the note on Mark 16, 14 & 19. Elsner explains συναλιζομενος by 'conveniens cum illis;' and compares Herodot: 1, 62. οὗτοι μὲν δὲ συμμετάγοντο & 5, 15. On account of the words of ver. 6. οἱ μὲν οὐν συνελθόντες, I assent to those who give συναλιζομενος the sense of assembling: so that συναλιζομενος (with a middle form and an active sense) may be rendered 'and having gathered them together' (supplying αὐτοῖς). This sense of συναλιζομενος is frequent in the best Classical writers. See Alberti, Raphel, Kypke, Krebs., Wetstein, and the ancient Greek Lexicographers. (Kuin.)

4. μὴ χαρᾶσθαι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμων, not to depart. Examples of this signification are adduced from the Classical writers by Elsner, Kypke, and Munth. "From this it appears (observes Heinrichs) that Christ meant the rays of the new light to go to all parts of the world from hence, as from a centre."
Besides (as Rosenm. remarks) it was proper that these miracles should be exhibited at Jerusalem, in order that the same persons who had been spectators of the ignominious death of Jesus, might now be convinced, by the most certain arguments, of his glorious life and majesty, not to mention the great number of people who had repaired thither to celebrate the festival. Περιμένειν, wait for. So Thucyd. (cited by Wets.) 2, 8. ὁ περιμένας τὸ ἀπὸ Κορίνθου ναυτικῶν.

4. ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός. By this are to be understood the effects of Divine power, i.e. the faculties and strength necessary to perform their office, or the Divine power shewing its efficacy in them. See Joh. 14, 16 & 17. where see the note. (Kuin.) Ἡν ἡκούσατέ μου. Here is an idiom common to the best writers: a transition of direct into oblique; which is usually expressed by the insertion of inquit, said he. Examples are adduced by the Philologists. See Raphel, Wetstein, and Krebs. In the use of ἀκοῦειν there is, too, another idiom, equally sanctioned by Classical authority. Ἀκοῦειν not only signifies to hear any one, but, by the ellipsis of some preposition, as παρὰ, ἕξ, ἀπό, &c., to hear from any one.

5. Ἰωάννης ἐβαπτίσεν ὁ διάτι, &c. Our Lord has reference to a saying of John the Baptist, not unknown to the Apostles, many of whom had been John’s disciples. (See Joh. 1, 33. and Matth. 3, 11.) By the πνεῦμα must here be understood the efficacy, influence, or effects of Divine power, necessary for the discharge of their Apostolic functions; and is further explained by the words ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πατρός: and this very ἐπαγγελία is by Luke 24, 49. explained the δύναμις ἕξ ὄνων. Besides, at ver. 8. we have ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐξ ὃμας. Now this very formula ἐπελεύσεται ἐὰν σε πνεῦμα ἁγίου is in Luke 1, 35. explained by δύναμις ὅψιστον ἐπικλάσει τοῖς. Βαπτίζειν is figuratively used for plentifully imbue with, copiously supply. The sense of the passage may therefore be thus expressed. ‘John only
dipped men in water, in order to collect followers for the Messiah; but ye shall be imbued with the grace of the Holy Spirit, and thereby fitted for your Apostolic office.' (Kuin.) Here we may notice a change of construction, frequent in the best Greek writers, for οὕτως ὕμερας μετὰ ταῦτα, of which several examples are produced by Kypke.

6, 7. ἐπαρατὼν αὐτῶν, λέγωντες—'Ἰσραήλ. Εἰ (like the Heb. דָּנ) has here, as often, the sense of whether. Ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ, at this time. It is well observed by Οἰκομενιος, that by the expression 'Wilt thou at this time restore,' is indicated the anxiety with which they put the question. On Ἀποκάλυσταν Heinrichs observes that it is a term often used of restoring ruined states to their original form of government: and he cites Polyb. 9, 30. τῷ πάτριον ἀποκατέστησε πολιτεία: though, as the same commentator remarks, something more than this is implied, namely, to form a perfect one; which is confirmed by the gloss of Hesychius, τελείον. "The Apostles (observes Kuinoel) thought that the Jewish polity would by Christ be restored to its original state, nay, raised to a far more splendid one. This deeply rooted prejudice of the earthly kingdom of the Messiah, though shaken and weakened by the death of Christ, at his return to life received new strength, and greater confirmation. Hence when Jesus had directed them not to depart from Jerusalem, but there expect the promise of the Father, they immediately imagined that Jesus would forthwith establish that kingdom which they so anxiously expected." Kypke observes, that they not only thought that the kingdom of Judæa would be restored in the utmost extent which it had ever reached, but perhaps imagined that a spiritual kingdom of Christ would be therewith conjoined, in which the Jews would enjoy peculiar privileges, so that then, the Theocracy being restored, and the observance of the Levitical Law retained, the Ge-
tiles, who should submit themselves to the governance of King Messiah, would be compelled first to embrace Judaism.

The opinion of Lightfoot and others, who recognize in these words somewhat of indignation (q. d. ‘Wilt thou then restore the kingdom to those Jews who have crucified thee?’) is too improbable and ill founded to deserve any attention. The common interpretation is the more natural and agreeable to the context, and is supported by the authority of the ancient commentators. Of the modern ones it is adopted by Bp. Pearce.

7. οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνώσας ἡμῶν ἡ καιροῖς, non vestrum est, ‘it does not lie under your province, it is not for you,” &c. Between the words ἡμῶν and καιροῖς there is properly this distinction; namely, that the former denotes time in general, the latter a point of time, a fair occasion, opportunity for any purpose. Here, however, they seem to be synonymous*. See Koppe on 1 Thess. 5, 1. Dan. 2, 21. 7, 12. where Νύμφης οἰκίας is rendered by the Sept. καιροὺς καὶ ἡμῶν. And in the present passage ἡ seems to have the force of ἡμῖν. (Kuin.) This wears the air of a popular, and perhaps proverbial saying, applied properly to private soldiers, who, as they know not the seasons and opportunities for battle, of which their general alone can judge, ought not to pry into, but acquiesce in, his counsels and plans. Bulkley here compares Hom. II. L. 1. v. 545 seqq. Ἡμεῖς, μὴ δὴ πάντας ἐμοὶ ἐπιέλεγεν μόνους καὶ ἔθετο τοι ἐσοντ’, ἀλόχω πέρ ἐσόνη. Stat. Thebaid L. 8. Unde iste per orbem Primus venturi miseris animantibus æger Crevit amor? divum ne feras hoc munus an ipsi gens aliqua, et parto non unquam stare.

* H. Stephens and Valckyn., however, render the words ‘opportunos temporum articulos;’ and the latter observes that Luke might have written ἡμῶν καιροῦ, as Soph. El. 1306. Yet I remember no prose writer who has so written. It seems poetical, and may be numbered with those peculiar phrases in which Sophocles is so abundant.
quieti? Eruimus quæ prima dies; ubi terminus ævi; Quid bonus ille deum genitor; quid ferrea clotho Cogitet—Sylvas amor unus humumque edomuisse manu: quid crastina volveret ætas scire nefas homini. Nos pravum ac debile vulgus. Scrum-tamur penitus superos.

7. ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἱδίᾳ ἔξωσια. The E. V. has 'put into his power:' Doddridge renders 'reserved in his own power,' which sense, however, the Greek word will not admit, though it is certainly more intelligible than the version 'put into his own power.' It rather signifies to alter, plan, destine, determine, appoint: and then ἐν τῇ ἔξωσια will have the sense of 'according to his own authority.' So the words are explained by Kypke, whose interpretation has been adopted by most recent commentators. Our Lord does not return a direct answer to their question, since such an answer was not necessary to them: he rather tells them what is really of importance for them to know. For, as Chrysostom observes, διδασκάλου τούτο ἐστι μὴ ἄ βούλεται ὁ μαθητὴς, ἀλλ' ἄ συμφέρει μάθειν, διδάσκειν. He knew that their minds were not yet thoroughly prepared to understand the nature of the heavenly kingdom (see Joh. 16, 12. seqq.), and that nothing would remove their prejudices but the illumination of the Holy Spirit. He therefore, on bidding them farewell, was pleased not entirely to destroy their vain hopes, and yet not give them countenance. His words, however (as Bp. Pearce observes), seem to imply that, when the Holy Ghost was come upon them, they should then know the nature of his kingdom: and till that time they appear not to have known it.

8. ἀλλὰ. The particle ἀλλὰ has here a very elliptical use. Heinrichs renders it genug, enough, let this suffice, referring this to what was promised in ver. 5., namely, that they should be endued with the power of the Holy Spirit. Δύναμις here relates to those high spiritual endowments necessary to the discharge of their Apostolic office, including a per-
flect knowledge of Christianity, zeal, and perseverance in the propagation, and unshaken constancy in the profession of it. By the words ἐν πᾶσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ are meant every region of Judæa, including Galilee. Of λαμβάνειν δύναμιν Wetstein produces many examples.

8. ἐκ τῆς γῆς γῆς. Some commentators subaequal μέσος, which is sometimes supplied. (See the examples of Munthe and Wetstein; as Herodot. 3, 25. ὅτι ἐς τὰ ἐσχατὰ γῆς ἐμελλε στρατεύεσθαι.) They remark, too, on the omission of the article; in which, however, they seem not to have been aware that there is an Hellenistic idiom. It was a Hebrew formula, expressing the whole world; as in Ps. 19, 5. Is. 49, 6. The expression must not be too much pressed; since it may merely denote a considerable part of the civilized world.

9. βλεπώντων αυτῶν ἐπῆρθη. Ἐπῆρθη is equivalent to the ἀνελήφθη eis τὸν οὐρανὸν of Luke 24, 51. Βλεπώντων αυτῶν is rendered by Valckn. quum totā facie conversā spectarent recedentem.

9. καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν α. ἀ. τ. ὁ. α. Kuinoel takes καὶ in the sense of enim; and in the same light it seems to have been considered by Wetstein, who cites Herodot.1, 24. τὸν ἰδ 설치 δελφίνα λέγουσι ὑπολαβόντα ἐξενέκαί ἔπτα Ταῖνας, and Hesych. ὑπέλαβεν, ὑπεδέξατο. So Plutarch p. 985. (cited by Kypke) δελφίνων ὑπολαβόντων καὶ ἀνανεόμενων. Apollodor. Bibl. 2, 1-καίομένης ἐν τῆς πυρᾶς λέγεται νεφος ὑποστὰν μετὰ βροντῆς αὐτῶν [τὸν Ἰδρακλέα] εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀναπέμψαι. Thus Bp. Pearce renders, ' and a cloud supported him out of their sight.' De Dieu, too, takes it for ἀνελήφθη. Yet it seems better to render, with Beza, Piscator, Valckn., and Kuinoel, susceptorum abstulit, abduxit, or subduxit. Into the particular mode of the ascension it seems not advisable, with the German Theologians, too curiously to pry.

Valckn. observes that what is here truly said of Jesus, was by the ancients falsely attributed to many of their heroes; examples of which are adduced by Elsner.

11. τί ἐστήκατε ἐμβλέποντες εἰς οὐρανόν. The word ἔσταναι not unfrequently, as here, has a conjunct notion of amazement, &c.; which is, however, sometimes expressed by words added, κατ' ἐξήγησιν; as in Aristot. Polit. 3. (cited by Wets.) ἔστακέναι καὶ ἐμπλήκτων εἶναι. And Aristoph. cited by Valck. τι πάσχετ' ἀνδρεῖς; ἐστατ' ἐκ πεπλήγμενοι.

12. Ἐπαινῶν. On these forms in ὅν consult Bp. Blomfield on Ἀeschyl. Prom. 667, and Agam. 235. The learned Prelate, with great probability, conjectures that this form was derived from the genitive plural of the noun in the nominative. Valcknaer too remarks that this form has a collective force, and has a sense of plenty. The student may with advantage consult his note, in which he gives many examples of this.

12. σαββάτου ἔχων ὅδιν. Ἐχων is put for ἀπέχων, being distant. So the best Commentators, from Chrysostom downwards. This signification occurs not only in the best Classical writers, of which examples are given by Kypke and Alberti, (see also St. Thes.) but also in Luke 24, 13. This distance consisted of two hundred cubits, or paces, or seven stadia and a half. (See Luke 24, 13. Joh. 11, 18, and the note.) This space had been determined, not by any positive injunction of the Mosaic Law, but by
the decision of the Rabbis. (See Lightfoot in loc.) The distance of the Mount of Olives from Jerusalem is variously calculated; sometimes at only six, or even five stadia; but either of the distances might be correct, according to the particular point of Jerusalem, and of the mountain reckoned from.

13. ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον. The word ὑπερῷον, which often occurs in the Greek writers, (see Wetstein's examples,) is properly an adjective, signifying upper, elevated*, and requires the subaudition of οἰκήμα, which is supplied in Lucian, As. 45. (cited by Wets.) κορίζουσιν ἀνω τῷ κλίμακι εἰς οἰκήμα ὑπερῷον. The question however is, whether we are here to understand it of an upper apartment in the Temple, or of a private house. The former opinion is adopted by De Dieu, Hammond, Schoettgen, Vitringa, and Krebs, in support of which they appeal to Luke 20, 50. Acts 2, 46. Now that there were upper rooms in the Temple for various religious uses, there is no reason to doubt, (see Jos. Ant. 15, 5. Selden de Syn. 1279, and Vitringa de Synag. 1, 6.) but that any one was κατ' ἔξοχην called τὸ ὑπερῷον, is more than can be proved; and it is difficult to conceive how such comparatively private apartments should have been conceded by the Jewish magistracy, and for such a use, to a few poor Galileans. As to the passages of Luke 24, 58. and Acts 2, 46. I agree with Kuinoel, that they are not of such a nature as to compel us to think of any such apartment of the Temple. There seems therefore no reason to abandon the antient and commonly received opinion, that this was a large upper apartment of some pri-

* So Dionys. Hal. 659, 24. ἔτερων μὲν τὰ κατὰ γεῖα λαγχανοντων, ἔτεραι δὲ τὰ ὑπερῴα. This word had been considered by all Commentators as a compound, until L. Bos discovered that it was a simple. Valck. compares Hom. ii. β. 514. Παρθένος αλδοῖν ὑπερῴων εἰσαναβάσα, and observes that this form is frequent in the Odyssey. ὑπερῴων, (continues he,) contracted to ὑπερῴον, is an adjective signifying nothing more than superius. We have the full form ὑπερῴων, superius conclave, which is found in Pollux, L. i. s. 81, where by ὑπερῴα olchuma are meant conclavas superiores.
vate house, at which (as some think) there had been held a private synagogue of the Galileans. Be that, however, as it may, it is certain that upper apartments were, in the houses both of the Greek and Oriental nations, so constructed as to serve for the purposes of dining-rooms, parlours, apartments for taking exercise, &c. and from their stillness and privacy, were often appropriated, as oratories, to the purposes of united and family worship, or religious retirement and private prayer. Michaelis compares the Arabian Alegan. On the names see Matt. 10, 2, seqq. After ἰακωβου subaud ἀδελφός, which is a somewhat unfrequent ellipsis. See Luke 6, 16. Jud. 1. Alc. 2, 2. where see Bogler., and Eurip. Iph. A. 768. See also Wess. on Diodor. Sic. 1, 312. all referred to by Kuinoel.

14. προσκαρταρωντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ. Here are three things to be observed: first, the syntax and sense of προσκαρταρεῖν, which carries a dative, and is used both with a person, in the sense of to be by, to wait upon any one, (as in Acts 8, 13. 10, 7. Demosth. 386, 6.) and with a thing; but chiefly with the latter, and, from the adjunct, signifies to apply oneself closely to any thing. This use is common both to the Scriptures (as 2, 42. Rom. 17, 12. Col. 4, 2. Acts 6, 4.) and to the Classical writers; examples of which may be seen in Schl. Lex. Secondly, we may observe the use of the participle and auxiliary verb instead of the imperfect; a periphrasis very frequent, especially in the later Greek writers. Kuinoel refers to the numerous examples brought together by Fischer on Weller, T. 3. P. 2. p. 4. ὁμοθυμαδὸν is a word frequently used by St. Luke, and once by St. Paul, in Rom. 15, 6. It not unfrequently occurs in the Sept. simply in the sense of together; as in Num. 24, 24. καὶ αὐτὸ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀπολύονται, and Jos. Ant. 15, 8, 2. ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἔξηγον. It is explained by the Gloss. vett. simul, and by Suidas and Hesychius ὑμῶ or ὑμοψικῶς. It occurs not unfrequently in the Classical writers, of which

The word δέσποινα is nearly synonymous with the preceding προσευχή, but I cannot see on what principle it has been expunged from the text by Griesbach and Heinrichs. It carries every mark of genuineness, even in that pleonastic use which is so characteristic of the Oriental and Hellenistic style, and of which we have examples in Eph. 6, 18. Phil. 4, 6. By the γυναῖκες are not merely meant (as some have supposed) the wives of the Apostles and brethren of our Lord, (otherwise, as Wolf observes, αἱ γυναῖκες would have been added,) but the women generally, including those who had followed our Lord out of Galilee, “and ministered unto him of their substance,” (see Matt. 27, 55. Luke 8, 2, & 9, 24, 10.) and who (as Kuinoel observes) had joined themselves to the Apostles with so much the more decorous propriety, since the Mother of Jesus did herself form a part of their body, as having her abode with John. By Jesus’s brethren being mentioned, it is clear that they were now faithful believers, however they had formerly been induced to doubt of his Messiahship, and were swayed by worldly minded views. See the note on Joh. 7, 3.

15. From this verse to the end of the chapter, we have the exhortation of Peter to the Apostles to choose another in the room of Judas Iscariot, and the result of that choice. By μαθητῶν we are to understand, not the Apostles only, but the Disciples in general. By οὐόματα are meant persons, men; as in Apoc. 3, 4. ξεις ὀλίγα οὐόματα. Examples of this idiom are given by Glass, Phil. 896., Raphel in loc., Suic. Thes. 2, 492., and Wetzstein; as Polyb. 1426. μαρτυρίαις δὲ χάριν ὄμολογούμενα δύο οὐόματα. Nor is it unknown to the Latin writers; as in Ovid, A. 2, 1, 35. Heroum clara valetae nomina. Stat. Theb. 6, 373. Quinam iste duos, fidissima Phœbo. Nomina, commisit Deus in discrimina reges? I add, Hor.
Carm. 3, 1, 16. Omne capax movet urna nomen. See Gronov. on Liv. 1, 8. After ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς subaud χαρίν or σκήμα. It however simply denotes together, and is explained by Hesych. ἵμα, with which also it is interchanged in the various Greek versions of the Old Testament. This expression (which is often used by St. Luke) may indicate identity of time, or of place, or purposes and views; as in 2, 44. (where see the note,) and perhaps on the present occasion the latter may be associated with the former. By the ἡχλοι, &c. is merely meant the number of disciples then present, out of a far more considerable number, (upwards of six hundred,) most of whom had remained in Galilee after the Lord’s ascension: and as to the number assembled for public worship, it would vary according to circumstances.

16. ἄνδρες ἄδελφοι. See the note on ver. 11. ἰδει πληρωθήναι—τὴν Ἰησούν. Some Theologians, as Dr. Sykes, Eckerman, and others, join πληρωθήναι with περὶ Ἰουδα. But the sense thus elicited is neither permitted by the context nor by the usus loquendi; since the phrase πληρωθήναι περὶ τινός, for ἐκλ or ἐν τινα, is utterly unauthorized. Nor can I assent to Wolf and Eckerman, that Peter had reference to Ps. 41, 9 & 10. since there is no vestige of any such allusion in the context: whereas, from ver. 20 it is plain that the Apostle had in mind Ps. 49, 25. and 109, 8.; and though there are many parts of both those Psalms which are not to be confined to Judas, but are more applicable to David, yet it is plain, from the Apostle’s words, that some passages of these Psalms were meant to have reference to Judas primarily, though not to the exclusion of David. Kuinoel, and other commentators, have recourse to what is called accommodation. But, upon the whole, it seems safer to conclude, with Dr. Doddridge, that while David prophesied of the calamities which should befal his persecutors, it was revealed to him by the Holy Spirit, that the enemies and murderers
of the Messiah should inherit those curses in all their terror, and be yet more miserable than the persons on whom they were more immediately to fall. This fact (in itself exceeding probable) he takes to be asserted in these words, as what was revealed by the same Spirit to the Apostle Peter. After having, for their consolation, reminded them of this prophecy, Peter begins to disclose his intentions more clearly.

17. ὅτι κατάριθμημένος ἐν σοὶ ἡμῖν. Wetstein adds two examples of κατάριθμος, the one without the preposition, the other with μετὰ. Εὖ would have been more elegant; and indeed it is so written in the Cod. Cant. In all the manuscripts, however, in which it is found, it cannot but be considered as a gloss. Kuinoel renders ὅτι quamquam; as in Luke 11, 25., and refers to his note on Joh. 5, 25., and Glass, Phil. 5, 31. Markland renders it because: but the former signification, though somewhat rare, seems more agreeable to the context.

καὶ ἔλαχε τὸν κληρὸν τ. δ. τ. Δαγγάνεων properly: denotes to receive by lot; as in Luke 1, 9., and then to obtain, receive; as in Xen. Anab. 3, 1, 9. Thus κληρος, which properly signifies lot, or what happens by lot, is transferred to whatever in any way happens to any one, and is used of possession of wealth or property, especially in land, since such possessions were anciently divided among colonists by lot; as in Hesiod Opp. 341. where see Grævius, and Elsner on ver. 25. It is also used of labour enjoined on any one in Polyb. 837. See Raphel in loc. Here κληρος does not designate lot in the same sense with διακονία, apostolical ministry, and is therefore redundant. (Kuin.) It is however, (I conceive,) not so much redundant, as it denotes generally appointment. Hence the word Clericus. See Walchius in a learned dissertation De munere Apostolico. Wetstein illustrates this sense of διακονία by citing the following words of Æschines Ctesiph. ὅσα τις αἱρετῶς πράττει.
κατὰ ψήφισμα, οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἁρχή, ἀλλ’ ἐπιμέλεια καὶ διακονία.

18, 19. I assent to Kuinoel, Rosenm., and Heinrichs, that these verses are parenthetical, and come from St. Luke, not St. Peter. I cannot, however, but censure the rashness of Dr. Owen, who would entirely cancel them, as if there were any MS. authority for the omission, and the sacred writers were not accustomed to make such explanatory insertions. The words themselves πενήνις γενόμενος involve some difficulty, which has, however, been at large examined, and, as far as the case admits, adjusted in the note on Matth. 27. 5. Kypke compares a similar passage of Joseph. B. 7, 5, καὶ πταλασ πρὸς τινα πέτραν πενηνὶς ἐπ’ αὐτῆς μετὰ μεγίστου ψόφου κατέσεσεν. The word λακέω seems to be an onomatopoia, like crepo, crack, ψόφεω, &c., and denotes the sound emitted by the bursting of any vessel; and 2dly, the bursting itself (with which our leak and lack appear to be cognate). Of the numerous passages heaped together by Wetstein, the only apposite ones are the following. ΑElian H. A. 4, 52. ἢ δὲ καὶ ἱστοὶ πλευραῖς ἐμπνεύσοντες διέσχισαν, καὶ τὰ σφαιρακά ἠξέχων. Cholin, f. 56, 2. Aramæus quidam vidit hominem, qui de tecto in plateam decidit, et ruptus est ejus venter, et viscera ejus effluxerunt.

As to the difficulty involved in ἐκτῆσατο χωρίον, which seems at variance with what we learn in the Gospels, namely, of Judas's having thrown down the thirty pieces of silver to the priests, many commentators, as Whitby and Doddridge, remark, that an action is sometimes said in Scripture to be done by a person who was the occasion of doing it, and they compare Gen. 42, 38. Exod. 23, 8. 1 Kings 14, 16. Isa. 6, 10. Jer. 38, 28. Rom. 14, 15. 1 Cor. 7, 16. 1 Tim. 4, 16. But I should rather be inclined to prefer treating this as a figurative catchresis, by which Judas might be said to have bought the field with the wages of iniquity, by receiving such wages as would have bought the field. So 2 Kings,
5, 26. “Was this a time to receive money, and garments, and olive-yards, and vineyards, and sheep, and oxen, and men-servants, and maid-servants;” i.e. the money and vests wherewith this might be purchased. So in a passage of Achmet Oneirocrit. cited by Lampe on Joh. 2, 615. on the interpretation of dreams: “Si quis viderit, quod invenerit vel emerit plurimas oves fac praebentes: inveniet opes et gaudium et servos pro ipsarum ovium numero.” Heinsius, and many critics, would take it to mean possessed the field by being buried in it; and to this tend most of the passages adduced by Wetstein: but it seems too strained an interpretation to deserve any attention, not to say that the fact itself needs confirmation. On the μισθὼν τῆς ἁδικίας compare 2 Pet. 2, 15. Gen. 23, 4.

20. γέγασσαν γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ — αὐτῇ. The words are taken from Ps. 69, 26: but are slightly accommodated by Peter to the purpose of his discourse. In the Sept. it is rendered γενηθήτω ἡ ἑσπαυλὴ αὐτῶν ἁρμαζόμενη καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκηνάμασιν αὐτῶν μη ἔστω ὁ κατοικισμός. The last words of the verse are taken verbatim from Ps. 109, 8. where ἑσπαυλὴ answers to the Heb. פַּן, which properly signifies a shepherd’s hut, with the enclosed cattle-yard, and also generally a habitation of any kind. Thus Hesychius not only explains the word by μάνθρα βοῶν and ποιμενικὴ αὐλή, but οἰκία, αὐλή, and even στρατοπεδία, and the Scholiast on Apol. Rhod. 1, 800. οἰκία. Hence come the Latin aula and caula, which were originally the same sense: though, as Valcknaer well observes, “omnibus Linguis verba valent usu, ut numi.” “Therefore from the rustic hut (continues he) the word was transferred to other habitations: for all men were originally rustics and shepherds.”

The former words (says Kuin.) cannot well be applied to Judas, but rather seem to be a figurative way of expressing the general sense “may he utterly perish!” since a deserted house is a very lively image of complete destruction. The passage of

Rom. 11, 9: may be similarly interpreted. The latter words, from Ps. 109, 8., are referable to Judas [as well as to David—Edit.] in their literal sense. ἐπιστροφὴ in the Sept. answers to the Heb. רוח, which denotes any office committed to one's administration. (Kuin.)

21. At τῶν συνελθόντων ἀνδρῶν subaud ek. The word συνέρχεσθαι denotes union and society; and answers to the Heb. יבש in Symmachus's version of Gen. 14, 3. Besides the twelve Apostles, it must be remembered, Jesus had chosen the seventy Disciples (see Luke 10.), who are especially alluded to in these words.

In εἰσήλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθε we have an Hebrew formula, בְּנָשׁ אָבָב, which is used of those who sojourn or abide with any one. So Acts 9, 28. “versatus est cum nobis et inter nos. But it is also applied to the whole life, actions, and pursuits (as in Ps. 121, 8. Deut. 28, 19.), especially administration of office; as in Deut. 31, 2. 1 Par. 1, 10. See the note on Joh. 10, 9. Now since there follow the words ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ, &c. which seem to have reference to the commencement of Christ's ministry* (see Luke 3, 28.), both these senses may be united. The phrase, too, is obviously elliptical, for εἰσῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς; as in Eurip. Phoen. 586. ἐσ οἰκος εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθε. (Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and Valckcn.) On the phrase Wetstein refers to Deut. 28, 6, 31. 2. 2 Par. 1, 10. 29, 7. 1 Par. 27, 1. Num. 27, 17 & 21. 1 Sam. 18, 13 & 16. 1 Kings 8, 7. 15, 17. Zach. 8, 10. Ps. 121. 1 Joh. 10, 9.

22. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιστροφήματος Ἰωάννου, from the baptism of John: for at that time Jesus entered upon his office, and from thence began to collect disciples. See Matt. 4, 17. Joh. 1, 40. Ἡμέρας ἦς is for ἡ. Μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως, witness of his resurrection. To the resurrection of Jesus, as testifying himself

* There is a similar expression in Phil. V. Ap. 1. 24. οἱ δὲ ωτὶκοι ἀν Ἰωάννα καὶ Λαυδίας ἀρξάμενοι διεφθερησαν.
of it, the Apostles are accustomed to appeal. See 1 Cor. 15, 14. Hence the doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus is mentioned in the place of all the other heads of Christian doctrine; and therefore the words μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦς signify, in general, a fundamental point of Christian doctrine. "Ενα τῶν must be referred to the preceding τῶν συνελθοντῶν, &c. which sorts of hyperbaton are not unusual to the Classical writers. See Raphel. (Kuin.) It is observed by ΟEcumenius that they did not set up more than two, lest they might increase the chagrin consequent on rejection. But this seems doubtful. Doddridge has, with more judgment, remarked that "they might reasonably and modestly conclude that it was fit the number of Apostles which Christ first chose should be kept up, perhaps in allusion to the twelve tribes of Israel. But it is impossible, as well as quite unnecessary, that we should, at this distance of time, be able to assign a reason why the two that are afterwards mentioned, and no more, were proposed as candidates."

24. καρδιωγνωστα, a discerner of the heart. So the Heb. רות has answering to it in the Sept. ἐτάγον καρδιας, Jer. 17, 10. and Joh. 7, 20. See Philo ap. Præceæum. The same name is ascribed to God, infra 15, 18. and is especially applicable to Him, since any knowledge of the heart of others must to men be very imperfect. It is well remarked by Chrysostom, that they do not say ἐκλέξαι (chuse), but ἀναδείξων τὸν ἐκλεγέντα. "For every thing (adds he) has been known and determined by God before it had entered into the thoughts of men." So Joseph. A. 6, 5, 6. (cited by Wets.) ἐγὼ μὲν ἀναδείξα τῶν, ὅν αὐτὸς [ὁ θεὸς] ἐξελέξατο. Plin. Trajan. Paneg. 94. In consilio sis eligentis, monstresque aliquem, quem adoptari in Capitolo deceat.

25. τῶν κλήσεων τῆς διακονίας, the appointment to this ministry. Διακονία and ἀποστολὴ are by Gro- tius taken by an Hendiadis, for διακονία ἀποστολική. In παρέβη there is an Hellenistic idiom; for though

παράβαινειν means, by a subaudition of ἄδικος, to go out of the road, yet, when the substantive is expressed, it is always put in the accusative, not, as here, in the genitive, with the preposition κ. We have a similar use in Exod. 32. 8. and Deut. 9, 22. where παράβαινειν ἐκ τῆς ἄδικος answers to the Heb. נט. Here the expression figuratively denotes desertion of office.

25. Πορευθηκαί εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν Ἰδον. In determining the sense of these words, commentators are not a little divided in opinion. Some refer them to Judas, others to his successor in the Apostolic office. Those who maintain the latter opinion (as Knatchbull, Hammond, Homberg, Heumann, Kypke), urge, in the first place, that the words depend on the verb λαβεῖν, that the formula ἔξ ἔς παρέβη Ιωάσ is to be included in a parenthesis, and the word τόπος to be taken of office: and they determine the sense to be as follows: “Ut occupet locum Judæ antea proprium;” or, ut occupet locum ipsi (i. e. Judæ successor) a Deo destinatum. But this interpretation is liable to many objections. For, in the first place, the very term ἔξ ἔς παρέβη Ιωάσ clearly shows that the words πορευθηκαί, &c. more naturally refer to Judas himself than to his successor. 2. The former words of the verse contain the sense “another is to be invested with the Apostolic office, which Judas has deserted;” if, therefore, the latter words be referred to the successor of Judas, the same thing is repeated, but only in a more obscure manner. 3. It does not appear that any example can be produced of πορευθηκαί εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν Ἰδον in the sense of succession to place or office. 4. In order that the last words may cohere with λαβεῖν, propriety of language requires (as is well observed by Clericus, Wolf, and Ernesti πορευθηκαί. Hence it is clear that this interpretation is arbitrary and utterly unfounded, and that the words in question are, by other interpreters, rightly referred to Judas. Those, however, who maintain this latter opinion, are not quite agreed on the sense to be assigned. Keuchen,
Moldenhauer, Moschius, Krebs, and Bolten, by τόπον τῶν Ἰδιῶν understand the house of Judas, since in the Sept. τόπος is often so employed; as in Jud. 7, 7. 1 Kings 24, 25. Jud. 9, 55. 1 Macc. 4, 38. They also compare Acts 21, 6. εἰς τὰ ἱδία, and give the words this sense; "betook himself to his former habitation, after having deserted our society." “He departed home (say they), to pursue his own interest, but, stung with sudden remorse, hanged himself.” But how jejune and frigid is the sense thus elicited, every intelligent person will immediately perceive.

Others by τὸν τόπον understand the sepulchre, and think there is an allusion to the ignominious burial of a felo-de-se. To establish this signification of τόπος they appeal to Sir. 46, 49, 10. But this exposition is somewhat strained; nor are the passages of Sirach similar to the one now under our consideration. For there the context plainly points to burial; which cannot be said of the present passage, and no example has been adduced of πορευθεῖσας εἰς τὸν τόπον τῶν Ἰδιῶν being used for “to be buried.” Others, since τόπος is sometimes employed of condition, as in Sir. 12, 12. interpret it of the condition of Judas in the other world: q. d. “he has gone to the state awarded to him.” So Wolf, Klotz, Schleusner, and others. This does not materially differ from the opinion maintained by most commentators, ancient and modern, namely, that by τόπος is here to be understood the place of the damned, hell. This interpretation recommends itself by its simplicity, its suitableness to the context, and its agreeableness to the usus loquendi of both Jewish and Heathen writers; and is therefore, doubtless, to be preferred. So, too, it seems to have been understood by the most ancient Ecclesiastical writers. Τόπος Ἰδιός denotes the place that is suitable to, fit for, due to any one; which sense is well expressed by the gloss. δίκαιος, read in the Cod. Cant. This term is also used by Luke himself, in his
Gospel, 16, 28. τότος τῆς βασάνων. The same manner of speaking is likewise observable in the Jewish writers. So Baal Turim on Num. 24, 25. Balaam ivit in locum suum, i. e. in Gehennam. Targum, Eccles. 6, 6. Die mortis suae descendit anima ejus in Gehennam, in locum unum, quo omnes peccatores abeunt. See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in h. l. Nor are there wanting testimonies for the confirmation of this opinion deduced from the Greek writers; as Plato, Phaed. c. 57. εἰς ξῖδου πορευόμεθα, sc. τόπον: and c. 58, speaking of the souls of the good and bad: ὡς ἐκ τῶν αὐτῆς ἐκάστης τόπων προσήκοματα. Æschin. Socr. Alex. c. 5. τὴς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸν οἰκεῖον ἱδρυθεῖσης τόπον, τὸ ὑπολειφθὲν σώμα, γεώτρες ὁν καὶ ἀλογον, οὐκ ἐστιν ὁ ἀνθρωπος. This is strongly confirmed too by some passages of the most antient ecclesiastical writers; as Ignat. in his Ep. to Magnes. c. 5. ἐπεὶ οὖν τέλος τὰ πράγματα ἔχει, ἐπίκειται τὰ δύο, ὅμως ὁ τε βάναυσος, καὶ ἥ ἰώη καὶ ἐκατός εἰς τὸν ἱδιον τόπων μέλλει χαρεῖν. Clemens, Rom. Ep. 1. to Corinth. p. 24. edit. Wotton. πλείονας ὑπένεγκεν τόνως, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας, ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Polycarpus in Ep. to Philipp. c. 9. where, exhorting his readers to follow the example of Paul, and the rest of Christ’s Apostles, he uses this argument: δι’ ὧν ὁμοί τῆς σέλερος εἰς κενὸν ἐδραμον, ἀλλ’ ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ δι’ ὧν ὁμοίως τῶν ὀφειλόμενον αὐτοῖς τόπων εἰσὶ παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ κυνεπάθων. (Kuin.)

The above learned Collectanea form a summary of the most valuable matter derived from various quarters; in conjunction with which, the reader may with advantage consult the annotations of Drs. Whitby and Hammond. In this latter conclusion I entirely acquiesce: but may not the words τῶν τῶν ἱδιον be understood of death both temporal (i. e. the grave) and spiritual (i. e. the punishment of another world, the worm that never dieth). So they seem to have been understood by ÓEcumenius, who explains: τῆς ἀγχώνης ἢς ἀξίων ἐκατον παρεσκέυασεν ὁ Ἰωύδας διὰ τῆς προδοσίας. Mr. Bulkley cites Max.
Tyr. Diss. 25. where it is said that, upon the decease of the body, the soul is called to its own place, εἰς τὸν αὐτὸς τόπον. Plotinus, Ennead 4. l. 3. c. 24. where he says that the wicked man, upon quitting the present state, falls into the place accommodated to him, εἰς τὸν προσήκοντα αὐτῷ τόπον ἐνέπεσεν.

It is plain that at πορευόμασι we are to subaud εἰς τῷ, which is often omitted (as in Luke 9, 2.): yet, as Grotius well observes, it signifies event rather than purpose. So Rom. 1, 20., 2 Cor. 4, 4., and elsewhere.

26. καὶ ἐδὼκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν, &c. The mode in which they cast the lots cannot be determined, various being the methods by which the antients were wont so to do. (See Fabric. Bibliogr. 460., Selden de Syned. C. 11, 4., Le Clerc on Lev. 16, 8., and Wolf Bib. Heb. P. 2. p. 103.) They were accustomed, among other modes, to cast slips of parchment, or pieces of the tabulæ scriptoriiæ, with the names inscribed, into an urn. And this sort of sortitio most commentators here understand; and they render ἐπεσεν κλήρος, sors exiit; ἐδὼκαν κλήρους. So the Hebr. יָּתְּרָנָה in Levit. 16, 8. (Kuin.) It should rather, however, seem that there is an allusion to the custom of deciding the lots by casting dice (as is suggested by Beza).

26. κλήρους αὐτῶν. This kind of phrase, and that which immediately follows, is idiomatic and popular. The lots (we may observe) are said to be theirs on whom the lots are cast, and to fall upon him who comes off successful in the lot. Ἀνακτησάμενοι properly denotes to choose by common suffrages, and then to number with or unto, συγκαταριθμεῖν. That it must be so taken in the present passage is plain, since the persons chosen were chosen not by suffrage, but appointed at the pleasure of Jesus. (Kuin.) The sortilegium (it may be remarked) was understood to be a mode of showing the will of the Almighty, and was therefore, from the earliest times, resorted to in the creation of kings or

CHAP. II.

1. ἐν τῷ συμπληρώσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τ. Π. The verb συμπληρώσθαι, as also the simple πληρώσθαι, not only denotes the consummation, but also the approach of any time, and therefore here signifies advenisse, adesse. See the note on Mark 1, 15., Luke 1, 57. 9, 51. 2, 21., and so ver. 15. For τὴν ἡμέραν, many early Versions, and some antient MSS., read τὰς ἡμέρας, which is preferred by Scaliger, Drusius, Grotius, and others. Thus would be denoted the whole period of the fifty days from the Passover, of which the clausula, or last day, had then come. (See Grot.) No change, however, must be made, since the common reading, which is supported by all the MSS. gives the same sense: nay the antient Interpreters may be thought to have had regard rather to the sense than the expression. (See Wolf.) At πεντεκοστῆς we must subaud, not ἡμέρας, but ἔορτῆς. On which it has been well observed by Schmid, that it may seem one should say τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν πεντακόστην, when the fiftieth day, i. e. from the Passover, was completed: but it should be remembered, 1st,
that πεντεκοστῆς is here not to be taken adjectively, but substantively, and is, as it were, a proper name; so that there is no subaudition of ἡμέρας (for it would be absurd to say that the fiftieth day of the day was completed,) but rather of ἔορτῆς. This observation is confirmed by Tobet 2, 1. ἐν τῇ πεντεκοστῇ ἔορτῃ. Whence also in 2 Macc. 2, 32. we must, at the words μετὰ τὴν λεγόμενη πεντεκοστὴν, subaud ἔορτην. The same applies to 1 Cor. 16, 8. (Kuin.)

On this feast see Michaelis, in his Mosaic Law, p. 4. § 167, and the writer on Jewish Antiquities (including Horne's Introd. Edit.) By the words τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντεκοστῆς some have thought is to be understood the fiftieth day after Christ's resurrection, because on the Lord's day, on which the festival of the Pentecost is now celebrated, the Holy Spirit was poured out on the Apostles; as we learn from the dicta of the antient Church, &c. But if the fiftieth day from the resurrection of Christ, and not the Jewish festival, were to be understood, propriety of language would require ἐν τῷ συμπληρώθαι ἡμέραν πεντεκοστῆν, or ἐν τῷ συμπληρωθMSN τῆς ἡμέρας πεντεκοστῆς. Thus, however, the phraseology would be obscure and ambiguous. Many commentators too are of opinion that it cannot with certainty be affirmed that the Pentecost was, that year, celebrated by the Jews on the Sabbath day; nay that there are not wanting arguments by which it may be proved to have been celebrated on the Sunday. The Pentecost fell on the fiftieth day from the Passover; and this fiftieth day was numbered (as we learn by Lev. 23, 15.) from the last day of that Sabbath מִסְכָּן הַמִּסְכָּנִים, on which they brought the sheaf of the wave-offering. So that from that day seven whole weeks, forty-nine days might be numbered, and thus the fiftieth would be the feast day. But in the explanation of the word מִסְכָּן the Sadducees, i.e. the Karæi, or Scriptuarii (see the note on Matt. 26, 17.) and the Pharisees differed, the former understanding by it a Sabbath properly so called, which
was celebrated on the seventh day; but the latter, the first day of the Passover, which was celebrated as a Sabbath. (See Exod. 12, 16.) Hence the feast of the Pentecost, according to the decree of the Karæi, always fell upon the first day of the week, Sunday, but, according to that of the Pharisees, on the fiftieth day from the offering of the handful of barley in the Temple. See Ikenius's Dissertation on the time of the celebration of the last Supper, and Barker's Obs. Exeg. on Acts 2. in Bibliotheca Haggana, vol. 2. p. 373. Now if Jesus, as most of the Commentators maintain, ate the passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews, the Jewish commonalty indeed celebrated the Pentecost on the Sabbath day, but Christ's disciples, if they followed the maxims of the Karæi, celebrated that feast on Sunday. Extremely probable, however, (as has been shown at large in the note on Matt. 26, 17.) is the opinion of those Commentators who maintain that Jesus, with the Karæi, anticipated by one day the ordinary Passover of the Jews. If therefore Jesus and the Karæi had eaten the Passover on Thursday, but the rest of the Jews on Sunday after sun-set, (which first day of the Passover was a Sabbath one, since they numbered the day from the preceding evening, (as has been observed on Matt.) both of these, Sadducees and Pharisees, at that time celebrated the Pentecost on Sunday. (Kuinoel.)

1. ᾧςαν ἄπαντες ὁμοθυμάδων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ. It has been disputed whether by the word ἄπαντες is signified the twelve Apostles only, (and indeed οἱ ἀπόστολοι is added in some MSS. but by a gloss,) or the rest of the disciples of both sexes included. (Compare 1, 14, 11. Those who refer it solely to the Apostles, found their opinion on these arguments. I. In the preceding, 1, 26. (say they,) we read of the eleven Apostles, to whom was added Matthias. The context therefore clearly shows that ἄπαντες is referable to the Apostles only. II. Those who spoke in foreign tongues (ver. 7) are said to be Galilæans;
but it is not probable that all those one hundred and twenty, mentioned at 1, 15., were Galilæans. (See, however, the note on ver. 7.) 3. Peter, at ver. 14. is said to have stood up with the eleven: from which we are authorized to collect that only these were present."

Others, however, with better arguments, and sanctioned by the authority of Chrysostom, Augustin, Jerome, and other ancient Fathers, maintain that, beside the Apostles, there were present the rest of Christ’s followers, mentioned at 1, 15. “For, in the first place, it is clear, on an inspection of the context of Acts 1, 15. ult. that the subject there professedly treated of, is the assembly of the hundred and twenty believers which Peter addressed, and out of which Matthias was chosen and adopted into the Apostolic body: but the eleven Apostles are only mentioned en passant. Now to the predicate, which is destitute of a subject, the subject immediately antecedent, and not that of which mention was made en passant, but professedly ought to be called in and associated.

2. If St. Luke had meant the twelve Apostles only, it would have sufficed to say, not ἀπαρτές, but οὖν. 3. It is little probable that on a feast day, at an hour appropriated to prayer (see Schoettg. Hor. Heb. on Acts 3, 1. infra ad v. 15.), the rest of Christ’s followers were not with the Apostles. 4. Peter, at 2, 16. seqq. has quoted the passage of Joel 2, 28. “I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and our daughters shall prophecy;” for the purpose of shewing that the prophecy was now fulfilled. It is clear, therefore, that, besides the Apostles, there were many other Christians assembled, that on them, also, the Holy Spirit was poured out, and that they also spoke with foreign tongues. Peter and the eleven rose up (ver. 15.), since they were the leading persons, and by them the body was to be defended against the calumnies of the Jews.

Upon these grounds the latter opinion certainly
deserves the preference. (Kuin.) I entirely acquiesce in this view of the subject, which was also adopted by Grotius, Mercer, Lightfoot, Wolf, Rosenmuller, and Heinrichs, and, what is of more consequence, such seems to have been the tradition of the Church from the earliest ages. For (as observes Whitby) St. Jerome says, "When Paula came to Sion, they shewed her the place where the Holy Ghost fell upon the hundred and twenty to complete the prophecy of Joel: "And St. Chrysostom and Æcumenius on the place, say, He fell not only upon the Apostles, but also upon the hundred and twenty; and that St. Luke would not have said πάντες, all, when the Apostles only were present, εἰ μὴ καὶ ἄλλω μετέχον, if others, also, had not been made partakers of the Holy Ghost.

1. ὀμοθυμαδὼν ἐστὶ τὸ ἄυτό. See the note on 1, 14 & 15. Great has been the disagreement of Commentators respecting the place where the disciples were then assembled. Some maintain that by οἶκος is meant a mere chamber of the temple of Jerusalem, others, an apartment of some private house, and that 1st, οἶκος denotes not only a house, but an inner chamber, and that spacious. That there were in the temple of Jerusalem (says Krebs) thirty such halls, in which the Doctors of the Law held their theological schools, we learn from Joseph. Ant. 8, 3, 2. περιφοροδομήσε δὲ τὸν ναὸν ἐν κύκλῳ τριακοντα βραχεῖων οἴκων κ. τ. λ. & 7, 14, 10. τὴν διαγραψίαν καὶ τὴν διάταξιν τῆς οἰκοδομίας τοῦ ναοῦ, πάντων ὀφάντων, ἐδωκε Σολομών, θεμελίων καὶ οἰκῶν καὶ υπηρέτων.

Now οἶκος may signify aecus, i.e. the conclave, cenaeculum of a private house (as in Lev. 14, 28. Philo 1042 c. Joseph. Ant. 8, 5, 2. 10, 11, 2. 12, 4, 11. Athen. 130 λ. & 203 c. See Ernesti on Callimach. n. on Cer. 55. and Valckn. on Schol. ad h. l.) and that there were in the temple, also, such aecii, the passages of Joseph. testify. But had this been Luke's meaning, he would have unfolded it more clearly, since neither in the preceding nor following
words is there any mention made of this. Besides, no passages have yet been produced to prove that the common people, and especially strangers, were permitted to resort, for the purposes of prayer, to those apartments of the temple.

2. It is urged by Capellus, Spic. Obs. in h. l., that the circumstances narrated happened at the third hour of the morning, when the more religious Jews used to resort to the temple for prayer, and that since the Apostles and the rest of Christ's followers were accustomed every day to repair to the temple (see ver. 46.), and were not excluded thence by the Priests, undoubtedly on the day of Pentecost also, on which it was a religious duty to attend temple worship, they were met together there. Now we do not deny that the Christians might, without molestation, resort to the temple and mingle with the Jews engaged in religious worship, but it is here said that they were ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ (see the note on 1, 14 & 15.), and it is not probable that the Priests would have permitted these hated disciples of Christ the use of a private apartment in the temple. (See 4, 1.) There were, it must be remarked, three regular hours of prayer, the third (ver. 15.), the sixth (see 10, 9.), and the ninth (see 3, 1.): but the Jews did not appear at the temple at each of these hours. It was lawful to offer up prayers in a synagogue also, or indeed in any place where ten persons should be gathered together for that purpose. See Trigland de Karæis, Vitringa de Synag. Vet. L. 1. c. 5. p. 45., the commentators on 1 Tim. 2, 8., and Lightfoot Hor. Heb. on Matt. 6, 3. The Apostles had therefore met together at that hour for the sake of prayer, in a house, wherein was held an oratory of Christ's followers, or, as it were, a private synagogue. (Compare 1, 13.) Besides, the Apostles seem to have hoped that on the very day on which the memory of the promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai was celebrated, the promise of Christ respecting the Holy Spirit to be sent from
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Heaven, would have its completion (see Luke 24; 49. Joh. 15, 26. Acts 1, 5 & 8.), and that God would, by a sign striking to the senses, declare that the religion of Christ was now to be more widely propagated by them; and thus they were met together ἵνα τοῦτο πάντες ἰδού. See 4, 29 seqq. Virg. Æn. 3, 385.

3. It is urged by Krebs, that we read, in 41, of there having been, on that day, added to the Christians three thousand persons. “Now surely (continues he) such a multitude no upper apartment of any private house could contain. Besides, it is not easy to conceive how such a multitude, of so many nations, could have collected together at the hearing of the sound, unless they had previously been congregated in some neighbouring place.” But that these apartments of private houses were so large as to contain a great number of persons, is plain from Mark 2, 3. Acts 20, 7. And, granting that this apartment hired by the Christians could not contain three thousand, yet it does not follow that we are to fix on the temple. For, as is well observed by Rosenmuller at ver. 41., those who think it incredible that one house could contain three hundred persons, take it for granted that all were admitted at one time to hear Peter and the Apostles; which is neither asserted by Luke, nor is in itself probable. Besides, if it be supposed that the house in which they were collected was in the vicinity of the temple, one may the more easily account for so great a multitude having been so quickly collected together, especially since it was then the usual hour of prayer.

4. It is urged by Schoettgen and Heinrichs, that God might possibly choose to make this promulgation of the Gospel in a place the most illustrious; and that if, by the providence of God, these events took place in the temple, they would be rendered the more august, and be calculated to produce a more powerful effect on the minds of men. But that this reason is not sufficiently certain and cogent, will easily
appear. Besides other obvious answers, it may be replied, that God did not chuse to make a promulgation of the Gospel in the temple, since the constitution of the Mosaic Law, and the mode of Divine worship, hitherto confined to the Temple of Jerusalem, was now to be abrogated, and another and far more spiritual and perfect worship to be instituted; nay, the very destruction of the temple was at hand. (See Joh. 4, 22. seqq. Matt. 24, 1 seqq.) All which reasons justify us in assigning the preference to the opinion of those interpreters who maintain that the ἐπεραῖον here mentioned was an apartment of a private house, not of the temple. (Kuin.) In this opinion, which was also adopted by Doctors Doddridge and Benson, I must acquiesce.

2. ἔγενετο ἄφνο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἑχος. Wetstein remarks, that ἄφνο is often used in commemorandia prodigii, and he adduces several examples, from which it appears to be associated with words expressive of what is unexpected, and anticipates thought and reflection. Some, as Sanctius, by ἑχος understand thunder, and thus it is remarked by T. Mag. that the word is used ἐκλ μέλους καὶ βροντῆς. This opinion is supported by Heinrichs, in his Excurs. 2, p. 819. But I rather assent to the common one, (confirmed by the ancient Greek commentators,) that it denotes the stridor venti. For, as Elsner observes, it is not said to have been conjoined with a status procellus, but to have been ἀκτήρ φερομένης πνεύματος βιαίας, such as are usually produced by the luctantes venti, tempestatessque sonoræ, of which we read in Virg. AEtn. 1, 57. Examples of πνεύμα,* with the epithet βιαία, are adduced by Wetstein from Philo and Artemidorus, to which I add Pausan. 9, 32. ἄνεμοι βιαίοι κατέπνευσαν. Joseph. 1181, 9. ἄνεμοι βιαίοι.

* The word πνεύμα is synonymous with πνεῦμα, and, in the Sept., answers to πνοῦ and πνῶν. It was (as Elsner observes) accounted a symbol of Divine presence. See Ps. 18, 11. 104, 3 & 4. Gen. 3, 8. Ex. 40, 36. Ex. 43, 2, 4, 5. 1 Kings 19, 11 & 12. 2 Chron. 5, 14. Joseph. Ant. 3, 4. makes mention of the ἄνεμοι σφόδροι, as being among the other signs of the presence of God on Mount Sinai.
Pythagoras in his Symbol. has the expression ἀκραυγμένος ἀκεφαλίς τῶν ἀκριβῶν. As to the sound being said to have come ἐκ τοῦ φαινον, this was agreeable to the notions entertained by the Heathen theologians. So Philo T. 2, 442, 42. (cited by Wetstein) τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ἵνα ἐκεῖθεν κατακαίουσθεν εἰσωθήσατο τῇ ὑπερήφανῳ, περιτιθέντος τῷ μὲν σώματι κάλλος εἴσασθαι, τοῖς δὲ λόγοις πειθαρχείς, τοῖς δὲ ἀκούοντι σύνεσιν. Jamblichus de Myster. 3, 2. καὶ τότε μὲν ἀφανῆς καὶ ἀσώματος πνεύμα περιέχει κύκλω τοῦς κατακειμένους, ὥς ὅρασιν μὲν αὐτῶν μὴ παρεῖναι, τὴν δὲ ἀλλην συναίσθησιν καὶ παρακαλούσθησιν υπάρχειν, ροιδομένου τε ἐν τῷ εἰσινεῖ, καὶ περικυκλοέου πανταχύθεν ἄνευ τινος ἐκφήσεως. Also, in the same work, C. 6, 3. (cited by Bulkley) “the philosopher observes that a person, favoured with the inhabitation of deity, sometimes perceives a spirit descending and insinuating itself into him, and of what rank and quality it is; and that by it he is secretly taught and governed; and that such a person, before the divine suspicion, perceives, too, a certain form or species of fire, which is sometimes sensible even to those who are present with him.” Kuinoel, too, observes (partly from Elsner and others) that the Christians then met together accounted the wind, which filled the room where they were sitting, as a sign of the presence and approach of the Holy Spirit promised by Christ, and therefore seemed to themselves to hear something greater than usually happens on a common tempest. Hence it appears (continues Kuin.) that Luke used ἤχος ἀσπερφομένης, πῦὸς βιαίας, for want of a more determinate expression.

Φέρσται, it must be observed, is, like ruere (Virg. Æn. 1, 86. ac venti—ruunt), frequently used of winds and their violent impestus. So Ælian H. A. 7, 24. ἐπείδαι τὸ πνεύμα βίαιον ἐκφέρσαι. Diodor. Sic. p. 619. πολλού καὶ βιαίου πνεύματος φερομένου. Diog. Laert. L. 10. c. 25. § 104. διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος πολλοῦ φερομένου. Kypke well observes that καθᾶσθαι with its cognate καθίζειν and καθίζεσθαι, is often (as
hère) put for commorari, esse, versari in aliquo loco: as also in Luke 21, 35. See the examples produced by that Commentator.

3. αὕτην αὐτῶν. There have been not a few difficulties raised on the construction and sense of this whole passage. Many early Commentators, as Piscator, take αὐτῶς for in them, on them, upon them. But it has been, upon good grounds, maintained by Schoettgen, Maius, (Obs. P. 4. p. 71.) Heumann, Wolf, Rosenm. Heinsius, and others, that the sense of the words is, "were seen by them," appeared unto them; which interpretation is supported by the Vulgate, and was judiciously followed by the authors of our English Version. The construction is frequent in the New Testament, examples of which may be seen in Schl. Lex.

The words διαιμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὤσεὶ πῦρ ὦν are variously explained. Some have thought that the natural tongues of the Apostles appeared to each other divided or cloven, considering αὐτῶς as put for αὐτῶν. But this would have required the article αἱ γλῶσσαι. Besides, as Kuinoel observes, there were not spectators immediately at hand. The ὤσεὶ must be construed after γλῶσσαι, as it were tongues of fire. Nor are the γλῶσσαι διαιμεριζόμεναι cloven tongues (which, as Markland observes, would have required διαιχιζόμεναι), but distributed (as in 45). So the Vulg. dispersit. Or it may be rendered, with Valck., dividentes semet ipsae (in the middle voice). Rosenm. and others explain discursantes. As to the mode in which this most remarkable phenomenon took place, commentators are not agreed. Michælis attributes it to electricity, Moschius and Heinrichs to lightning. Heumann thinks that their seeing these fingers of fire dispersed through the apartment was in ἐκστάσει; and Kuinoel refers to his note on Matt. 4, p. 102. But this is a very precarious shift to remove the difficulty; nor does it at all satisfactorily effect that purpose. Eichhorn seems to have resolved all into an Oriental and metaphorical
phrase, denoting high mental excitement and enthusiasm, and ascribes it all to Jewish notions, appealing to several passages which had been produced by Schoettgen, in his Hor. Heb.* But this mode of considering the subject is liable to strong objections, some of which are well stated by Storn, Op. 3, 174., who there proves that the phraseology of those passages cannot be entirely resolved into metaphor; or that, supposing those Jewish writers had meant nothing more than mental ardour, yet it will not follow that what we read in writings so much more recent than this work of St. Luke’s can properly be compared with what is therein found. Besides, Luke does not make mention of the promulgation

of the Mosaic Law by fire (to which the passages of those Jewish writers advert), nor does he use the phrase so often employed by him, πλησθήνα τοιούτως άγνω, or else adds an equivalent description, as it were, of flames of fire, but in this one passage records, among the other phenomena falling under the senses, this of the tongues of fire. For my own part, I see not how we are concerned to account for the actions of those recent Jews. But supposing them to have been entertained even by the earlier Jews, yet it is not unreasonable to suppose that God would vouchsafe to use a symbol accordant with the notions of that age, and therefore intelligible to all.

As to the mode in which the phenomenon was effected, we are not enabled to come to any certain conclusion. The opinion of Michaelis, Rosenmuller, Hezel, and Paulus, is approved by Kuinoel; namely, that it was effected by the power of electric fluid, which (say they) is observed in a similar way to settle on objects animate and inanimate, as men, ships, masts, yards, &c., and yet not burn them. The conjecture is not in itself improbable, but I know not whether it be not presumptuous to investigate too minutely where Scripture affords not the means for obtaining certainty. Wetstein observes that the ancients believed the presence of the Deity to be indicated by fire, and that a flame burning from the head was accounted a sign or symbol of Divine favour; and that a little tongue of fire, or a radiated head, indicated the sanctity of those on whom it was found.*
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might aptly represent the variety of languages with which each person was endowed; "and some (says he) have thought that the form of the mitres worn by bishops (according to the Roman ritual) bears some allusion to the supposed form of these cloven tongues." But this proceeds on a false interpretation of διαμεριζόμεναι. It has been, with more probability, thought by Grotius and others, that this wonderful appearance in the form of fire might be intended to signify the quickening and purifying influences of the Spirit, as well as to illustrate John the Baptist's prediction, that Christ should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. (Matt. 3, 11., and Luke 3, 16.).

So Philo ad Decalogueum (cited by Grotius.) Ἐπειδὴ τὸ πῦρ τὸ μὲν ψωτήριον, τὸ δὲ καὶ ἐφευρέκει, οἱ μὲν τοῖς χρίσμασις ἐξουσίας εἶναι κατατεθέναι αἰς ἐν ἄσκεσιν φαβί τὸν ἄνεμον ἔκλειται, τοὺς ἀντίθετας ἐχοντες ἐν ψυχῇ φωσφοροῦνται. ὡσπί ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ κατακαίμενοι διατελεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνδον ἑκτύμησιν, ὁ δὲ φόρος τρόπου πορθήσονται τῶν σύμφωνα τῶν ἐχόντων βίων. By Lightfoot and Grotius it has been thought that as the division of tongues at Babel once introduced confusion, and was the means of casting off the Gentiles from the knowledge of the true God, so now there was a remedy provided by the gift of tongues at Zion, to bring the Gentiles out of darkness into light, and to destroy the veil which had been spread over all nations.

3. ἐφ' ἑνά ἐκαστον αὐτῶν, settled upon each of them: as many Commentators suppose, with a tremulous motion. At έκάθισε some Interpreters subauda τινίμα, which occurs in the following verse, since an ellipsis of a word is not unfrequently to be sought out of a subsequent member of a sentence. (See Glass Phil. 688.) Here however the following words are not a member of the same sentence, but commence a new one. Besides, as Kuinoel observes, the phrase τινίμα ἅγιον ἐκάθισε is utterly unexampled; neither is there any reason to resort to such an irre-
gularity; since, as is observed by Beza, Schoettgen, and Kuinoel, we may refer the verb to the immediately preceding noun πᾶρ, or, (as is the opinion of Ernesti, Storr, Schnur, and Schroeder,) being put by enallage (as an index distinctionis) it may be construed with γλώσσαις ποράς. So Valckn. who remarks: έκάθισε non pertinet ad γλώσσαι, sed ad subaudium έκάστη, id vero evolventum ex eo, quod adest έκαστων. Hoc ergo modo loquentio supplenda est contracta: έκάθισέ τε (sc. έκάστη τῶν γλώσσων) ἐφ’ ἑαυτ’ έκαστων αὐτῶν.

4. καὶ ἤρξαυτό λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις. The interpretation of these words has not a little exercised the learning and diligence of the Commentators, who in the explanation of them have pursued two different courses. Whole treatises on this one passage have been published by Barkey, Vieroth, Moschius, Ernesti (de dono linguarum, Opus. Theol. p. 412), Less, in his Answer to Ernesti, Rabast, Bardile, on the signification of προφητεύς, Eichhorn, Storr, Opusc. 2, 290. Herder, Paulus, Becker, Kursman, Hanscinius, Meyer, on the gift of tongues mentioned in Acts 2. and 1 Cor. 1, 14. Ammonius de linguis novis 1808. and Klein de formulâ γλώσσαις λαλεῖν.

I. The opinion of most of the earlier, and not a few of the later Theologians, is, that the Apostles, or generally the hundred and twenty disciples then collected together, by divine inspiration, began to speak in the words of foreign tongues utterly unknown to them, as if in their vernacular and accustomed languages; and that this was a gift granted them from Heaven, and perpetual. The arguments on which this opinion is supported, are the following:

1. "According to the command of Christ, his doctrine was to be delivered by the Apostles to all nations. In order, therefore, to the right, proper, and immediate discharge of their office, without the toil of learning foreign tongues, there was to be conferred on the Apostles and other Christians the divine power and faculty of preaching the Christian doctrine to foreign nations, each in their own tongue." To this, however, it may be answered, that not the Apostles only, but also the rest of the Christians collected on the day of Pentecost, spoke with tongues (see the note on ver. 1.); as also Cornelius and his family (Acts 10, 44), and the disciples of John (Acts 19, 6); yet there is no reason for supposing that all were made teachers; and the Corinthians used this faculty of speaking in foreign tongues in the church at Corinth, where there was no need
of them to the teaching of men who only understood the Greek language. It is indeed replied by those who use the foregoing arguments, that although it be granted that not all those who were divinely endowed with this faculty propagated the Christian doctrine by teaching, yet there must have existed a competent number of persons in all respects fitted to teach the Christian doctrine to foreign nations, and, according as the opportunity should offer itself, they might be sent out for the instruction of foreign nations. But to this it may be answered, that neither to the Apostles, nor to other teachers of the Christian Religion, was there need of any other language, for such a purpose, than the vernacular tongue of Palestine (namely, the Syrochaleeze), or the Greek, either of which they knew sufficiently well for that purpose. For the Greek language was then in universal use, and was prevalent even in the regions of Palestine. (See Ernesti Opus. 421. seq., our Proleg. on John, p. 34. seq., Hug. Introd. p. 80. seq., and Cic. pro Archis, c. 93.) Therefore it was not necessary, for the purpose of teaching, that other tongues should be infused into them. Nor was St. Paul, who undertook so many journeys for the sake of preaching the Christian Religion, acquainted with all tongues. See Acts 14, 11.

2. It is urged, that our Lord had predicted to his disciples (the future teachers of his religion), that they should speak γλώσσαι καινάς (Mark 16, 17), i.e. in tongues which they had never learned; and that of this prediction we have the fulfilment on the day of Pentecost. But to this it may be answered, that the term there employed is καινάς, new tongues, by which is meant a new mode of speech, an usual eloquence, never before found in the disciples: and what Jesus has there said is not to be referred to what we here read. (See my note on Mark 1, 1.)

3. It is urged by the above Commentators, that on the day of Pentecost there were (as we learn from v. 41.) about three thousand persons who embraced the Christian faith. "Such an increase (say they) must have been occasioned by this gift of tongues, whose power, and the cause of it, the auditors had, with admiration, perceived from the discourses τῶν λαλοῦντων τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ, and from the very discourse of Peter itself. Compare ver. 33." But that the auditors knew from the discourses of Christ’s followers that the tongues which they used were previously unknown to them, is rather taken for granted than proved; it does not appear from the narrative of Luke; and on the words of Peter at ver. 33. there is by those interpreters obtruded a sense which is not contained in them. The religious Jews had heard, with admiration, the congregated Christians celebrating in foreign tongues the wonderful works of God (ver. 11): some in derision had said that these men were inebriated with new wine. But why did not Peter plainly declare to those who wondered and caviled at the novelty of the thing, and these, that the very words of the foreign tongues were themselves inspired into the speakers? Now, in answer to those who contend that the foreign tongues were not before known to the speakers, we may be permitted to make the following observations: — a] If the faculty of speaking foreign tongues had, by the pro-
vidence of God, been granted to the Apostles, one does not see how it should happen that they should not, spontaneously and voluntarily, have come to the knowledge, that they were invested by God with this faculty, in order that they might deliver the doctrine of the Gospel to the Gentiles also. Now Peter had yet to be taught by vision that, besides the Jews, the Gentiles also were to be received into the assembly of Christians (see 10, 10 & 15); nor does he, when reprebended by the Jewish Christians (see 11, 1. seq.) for having announced the divine doctrine to the Gentiles, in his apology, appeal to the gift of foreign tongues, granted to him and the rest of his colleagues on the day of Pentecost.—b] Among the Corinthians there were many γλώσσαι (scil. γλώσσαι) λαλούντες (which formulas are equivalent to the γλώσσαι ετέραις λαλούντες now under our consideration). John’s disciples, when they had come over to Christianity, and Cornelius, with his family, are related to have used foreign tongues. See Acts 10, 44 & 46. 19, 6. If we refer this to a miracle, it would indeed deserve to be ranked with the most illustrious, but that so remarkable a miracle should have been so often repeated, and should have been conferred on so many Christian converts, is little probable.—c] St. Paul, 1 Cor. 12, 28. in reckoning the χαρίσματα, mentions the γένη γλώσσων, last. He at 1 Cor. 12, 31. 14. 1. seqq. refers it to χαρίσματα, of lesser estimation, and declares that from it redounds no benefit to the Church, unless the things so brought forward by the speaker be interpreted. —d] By many of the Corinthians this gift was ambitiously sought after, and applied to the purpose of ostentation, since it excited greater admiration than the other gifts, which St. Paul sharply censures. (See 1 Cor. 14, 12. 28. 33.) But how is it possible that God should grant so admirable a gift to the Corinthians, that they might abuse it? This cannot be thought of, whether it be maintained, with some, that the faculty granted them, of understanding each language, was such that they might use it when they pleased, instead of their vernacular tongue, or (with others) that the gift was temporary, and only now and then granted by God.

II. There have been those (as Ernesti and Moschius) who have thought that the gift of tongues was temporary and sudden, and only now and then exerted, during public assemblies, for the end of being a testimony to the truth of the Gospel, in order that the Apostles, who should believe in Christ, and the rest of his followers, who should afterwards believe in the Apostles, might be confirmed in the faith, and have this pledge of its truth; and moreover that they also who should not yet have believed, might be excited to attain a knowledge of the truth. But to this it is replied by Eichhorn, that thus the gift granted by miracle would have required a miracle to take it away. "Now (continues he) for the preservation to them of that gift a new miracle were surely unnecessary. If once the faculty of speaking in foreign tongues had been granted to the Apostles, why did not God suffer it to be perpetual? Although not necessary to them, it might yet be useful. Neither does one see why it should be necessary for this faculty to have been granted to the other Christians, that they might account it a pledge
of the truth of Christianity." Storr, Opusc. 3, 177. asserts that
the knowledge indeed of foreign tongues was not granted to the
Apostles and other Christians, but only mental faculties made equal
to and fit for the speaking of those tongues whenever there should
be need, and that the faculty of pouring forth prayer and praise to
God was divinely inspired into them at that time, and was there-
fore conceived in the words of a language unknown to the persons
praying, in order that the Apostles might be excited to admiration,
(see ver. 6—12.) and the presence and support of the Divine as-
sistance, which had been promised to them, be confirmed. But, as
Eichhorn observes, neither can this conjecture be proved by any
certain arguments.

III. Finally, there have not been wanting those (as some Antients,
and Wolf) who have transferred the miracle, and, as it were, its
seat, from the Apostles, and the other Christians, to the hearers;
and have maintained that the Disciples spoke in their vernacular
tongue, but that these words were received by the auditors of dif-
ferent nations each in their vernacular tongue. But this opinion is
plainly repugnant to the context (compare ver. 4 & 11.); and thus
things of themselves difficult enough to be understood are unneces-
sarily rendered more marvellous and strange.

IV. Others maintain that all is to be explained on natural prin-
ciples. But these interpreters are not quite agreed on the mode.—
a] Eichhorn is of opinion that the present formula, γλώσσαι ἐκε-
ραίς λαλεῖν, is to be taken no otherwise than γλώσσῃ and γλώσσαις
λαλεῖν in 1 Cor. 12, 14. and Acts 10, 46, 19, 6. These phrases,
he thinks, mean no more than "speak with the tongue," move the
tongue to the expression of sounds inarticulate and indistinct,
which others cannot understand: and as to the passage of Acts 10,
46. he remarks that it may be so explained as to signify that some
uttered inarticulate sounds, but others praised God in plain and
perspicuous words. The same views have been adopted by Bardili,
Ziegler, and Boehm. Eichhorn thinks that those who, on other
occasions, spoke in foreign languages, were foreign Jews, of the
number of those who had come to Jerusalem to celebrate the Pass-
over and Pentecost, and had been by the Apostles brought over to
the religion of Christ. Those foreign Jews (says he), seized furoré
divino, expressed the thoughts and feelings of their minds in their
own vernacular tongues. Now the Jews, who entertained some-
what rigid notions on religious worship and instruction, were averse
to the use of any other language in sacred worship than the antient
Hebrew, or the Syro-Chaldee. (See Noesselt, Diss. on the Holy
Ghost communicated by the Apostles to the first Christians by the
imposition of hands, inserted in his Exercit. p. 67 & 73, where he
remarks that the cause why the Samaritans (Acts 8, 17.) are said
none of them to have spoken ἐκείναις γλώσσαις in this, that the Sa-
maritans' native language was Aramean, a certain dialect of the
sacred language, and therefore could not be spoken in a profane
tongue.) The Jews therefore, who had collected together, when
they heard men of their own nation holding sacred discourses in
profane languages, were greatly offended at witnessing such an in-
novation, and exclaimed, "Are not all those which speak Galileans? Jews of a sect arising from Galilee? How is it then that we hear them speak thus in profane languages? What just of innovation is it that hurries them so far?" Others answered, "It is no innovation, the men are inebriated."—β] Herder tells us that γλώσσα was sometimes used of words obsolete, foreign, unusual, and poetical; and that in the Rabbinical writings מַשָּׁבָּה, denotes the language of a certain nation. But the former signification of γλώσσα rarely occurs in the Classical writers, and never in the New Testament; and that poetical words are so denominated can scarcely be proved by any examples. See Storr, Opusc. 3. 277. Γλώσσα λαλεῖν Herder interprets animo concitato loqui, γλώσσας λαλεῖν, ἀποφθέγγειν, and εὐρέως καὶ κακοὶ γλώσσας λαλεῖν to bring forward new interpretations of divine oracles. (But this and the rest of his hypothesis is too absurd and improbable to need refutation, and is completely overturned by Storr, Opusc. 3, 277, and Kuin, in h. l. Edit.)—γ] Paulus is of opinion that the Christians praying and singing in foreign languages, (i. e. the Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Persian,) were foreign Jews, but that the auditors falsely and hastily took them for Galileans, and he maintains that even the Corinthians spoke in foreign tongues, with which they were acquainted.—δ] Meyer renders the words, "they began to speak in tongues different from those used for this purpose. He thinks that the formulas γλώσσα, γλώσσας λαλεῖν, in Acts 10, 46. in Acts 10, 46. 19, 6. and Ep. to Corinth. are to be understood of an enthusiastic discourse and phraseology filled with foreign names, so that, according to his opinion, those, for instance, who spoke Greek, mingled in their discourse certain Hebrew and Latin phrases and formulas; which conjecture, destitute of proof and improbable in itself, has been refuted by Klein and others.—ε] According to the opinion of Heinrichs, the Jews in their festivals did not use the vernacular language of Palestine, but an older and sacred Hebrew, and that this the Apostles and Disciples had used before the phenomenon had appeared to them, but afterwards, when they perceived themselves seized with the sacred fury, they cared no longer for the lingua sacra, but pronounced the words in the language accustomed and natural to each; and that therefore the Palestinians used that dialect, the Cretes the Cretan. He therefore ascribes to the phrase γλώσσας ἐτέρας ἐχάντω λαλεῖν this sense: "The benefits of God and the Divine Majesty, which they had hitherto celebrated in the holy language, they now extolled in a poetical and figurative phraseology (but see supra β), and in sublimer language, and moreover each in their native tongue, and vernacular dialect." But that the ancient Hebrew was then unknown has been proved by Vitringa de Syn. Vet. p. 1015.—ν] Klein maintains that, on the feast day, very many had met together in the Temple, in order to pour forth their prayers in the accustomed and in the holy language prescribed by the rites of the Law, and being after a time moved by a certain extraordinary event, gave vent to their highly-excited feelings in the vernacular, and therefore to them easier tongue, and seized with enthusiasm verba
græcilia fœcisse, ἠδεντο λαλεῖν ἐτέρας γλῶσσας. The formula γλῶσσας λαλεῖν at Acts 10 & 19, he takes, not in a proper but in a proverbial sense: and thus in Acts 2, 4, he thinks that ἐτέρας γλῶσσας λαλεῖν was a proverbial expression. [For the remainder of these most absurd and far-fetched hypotheses I must refer the reader to Kuin. Edit.]

After bringing forward the principal interpretations of this passage, I must subjoin what appears to me the most probable one; for nothing beyond probability ought to be required, since we live too far removed from the times in which the things here mentioned took place; and nothing beyond the fact itself has been narrated by the sacred writer. The simplest interpretation, and the most suitable to each of the passages, and therefore probably the truest, is that which assigns to the formulas γλῶσση, γλῶσσας λαλεῖν, at Acts 10 & 12, and 1 Cor. 14, the same sense with that of γλῶσσας ἐτέρας λαλεῖν, at Acts 2, 4, and renders thus: to speak a foreign tongue, or foreign tongues. That they are synonymous and equivalent appears from Acts 11, 15, where Peter professes that in the Pagans (i. e. Cornelius and other Romans, compare 10, 30, & 44.) the divine power had worked in the same manner as formerly, on the day of Pentecost, it had done in the Apostles. But at C. 10, 14, we read that, seized with ardour and enthusiasm, they had spoken also in foreign tongues. Hither also must be referred the passage of 1 Cor. 14, 21, where there preceded the phrases γλῶσσαι, γλῶσση λαλεῖν, and where there are adduced by St. Paul, and transferred to his purpose, the words of Is. 28, 11. The prophet there threatens to his countrymen that God would employ enemies barbarian in language, and thus chastise them. In the Sept. we have διὰ γλῶσσας ἐτέρας, but the Apostle has employed the terms χειλεα ἐτέρα and ἐτέρας γλῶσσας, in foreign languages. (Compare Storr, Oupsc. 2, 295, and see what was before remarked in β). Now as to our present passage, the following considerations are to be borne in mind. To the Jews of Palestine, and especially the more rigid ones, the study of foreign languages was held in hatred, and they felt averse to the use of any other language, for religious offices and instructions, than the old Hebrew, or the Syro-Chaldean. Those indeed who entertained milder opinions conceded the use of the Greek language. In the Palestinian synagogues the Law and the Prophets were publicly read in the Hebrew language. Since, however, it had, at that time, ceased to be known to the common people, some selections were read in the vernacular, i. e. the Syro-Chaldee tongue, and in this, as well as in the older Hebrew, the forms of prayer were recited: ex. gr. Menachoth, fol. 64, 2. maledictus sit qui alit porcos, et qui docet filium suum sapientiam Graecum. Hier. Sota, fol. 21, 2. R. Levi ben Chaiathah adit Cassaream, atque audivit eos recitantes precatiorem υπὲρ Graecè; voluit eos prohibere. R. Jose id animadvertens, iratus dicebat: qui non potest Hebraice, num omnino non recitabit? Imo recitet eâ lingua, quam intelliget, et sic officio suo satisfaciat. Berachoth. fol. 3, 1. Sunt, qui dicant precatiunculam istam, cujus initium ψηφι recitare post concionem; adfuit autem ibi vulgus, qui linguam He-
brean non intelligebat, ideo in linguâ Targumisticâ emam institue-runt, ut intelligeretur ab omnibus, nam hæc eorum linguâ, &c. See also the note on Joh. 7, 36. Also in the synagogues of the Hellenists (see Acts 6, 1, 9.) the sacred books were publicly read in the Hebrew language (for that the Alexandrian version was so read cannot be proved), but the portions recited were explained in the Greek language: moreover the prayers in the Syro-Chaldee tongue, and what had been composed from places of the Old Testament, were named in the Old Hebrew. The common people indeed did not understand those forms of prayer, but, according to the decisions of the Jewish Doctors, it was sufficient for them to pronounce Amen. So Schabbath, fol. 119, 2. Dixit R. Josua Ben Levi: Quicunque respondet Amen, illius nomen magnum erit et benedictum, et decretum damnationis ejus omnibus viribus annihilatur. Imo si ipsi aliquid idolatrâe adhereat, id deletur. R. Chija fil. Abba dixit, docuisse R. Johanem: Quicunque respondet Amen, illi omnibus viribus apertum portas Paradisi, &c. Berachoth, fol. 53, 2. & Sohar Chadasch, fol. 74, 4. R. Jose dixit: major est, qui respondet Amen, quam qui preces recitat. Compare also 1 Cor. 14, 16. where see Beza. There have indeed been those who have contended that not only in the Synagogues of the Palestinian Jews, but also in those of the foreign Jews, the Syro-Chaldee was in use, and that all the more religious Jews abstained from the use of any other language, while engaged in religious teaching or divine worship. But this cannot be proved by any certain and cogent arguments, nor, if the opinion were admitted, can one see how the Gentile proselytes, ignorant as they were of the Syro-Chaldee, could frequent the Synagogues. Admitting, however, the opinion which we have just proposed, not only is this difficulty removed, but it plainly appears what is the force of the words ἐρχαίτο λαλεῖν γλώσσαις εἴρησι, and why the more rigid Jews were filled with astonishment when every one heard the Christians speaking in their vernacular tongue. For amongst the Christians collected on the day of Pentecost were also certain foreign Jews. (See Joh. 12, 20.) On hearing the sound (ver. 2), and viewing the flames (ver. 3), all with a sacred enthusiasm and holy fervor, prayed with a loud voice, and made known ῥά μεγαλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 11), every one using his own vernacular tongue. Now the Jews, and, among them, ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς, repairing for religious worship to the Temple (situated perhaps in the vicinity), on hearing the sound and the voices of those who were praying with minds highly excited, entered the Synagogue of the Galileans, heard the Galileans praying in foreign languages, and praising God for the event which had just taken place. Those who heard the Christians praying were Jews both of foreign countries and distant parts of Palestine. Now they, as being religious Jews, were offended at hearing prayer uttered, not only in the Syro-Chaldee, or the Greek, but also in other languages, by the Jewish Christians on this feast-day, and that at the customary hour of prayer in the Holy City, publicly and in the synagogues. See the note on ver. 7 & 12. But that the Apostles, and especially their companions, offered up prayers, and repeated hymns derived from
the sacred books, and accommodated to those times, and not sacred orations, may also be confirmed by a passage of 1 Cor. 14, 13—17. There were, indeed, among the Corinthians those who imitated the event mentioned at Acts 2, using in their sacred meetings foreign tongues, (often many at once: see 1 Cor. 14, 27.) not enflamed and excited with pious ardour of mind, as were the Christians assembled on the day of Pentecost, but drawn by vanity, and for the sake of boasting of their skill in foreign languages. What they uttered were prayers, and not hymns. For in the passage in question of 1 Cor. ὁ λαλεῖν γλώσσαν, or γλώσσαις, is more accurately defined by the words προσεύχεσθαι, βάλλειν, εὐλογεῖν, for which in this place (ver. 11) we have ἐλάλουν τὰ μεγαλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Compare also 10, 46. (Kuin.)

The last-mentioned opinion is far more probable than the preceding ones, and seems to remove some difficulties by which the common hypothesis is embarrassed; but it is liable, though in a less degree, to the same objection as that which destroys the first detailed hypothesis, namely, that it is contorted, far-fetched, and seems to do violence to the sense of the whole passage, being such as no person of sober understanding and competent learning, who had no knowledge but of the passage before him, would ever have thought of. Surely so magnificent and august a preparation as the preternatural appearance of the tongues of fire and the ἀφθονίας ἀφονίας διαμερίζομενα γλώσσαι δει χρόνος, suggests the idea of something miraculous, and not that they only prayed and preached with unusual flow of language and fervour. Such a magnificent portal, I say, requires a correspondent edifice. Besides, the conversion of the three thousand seems to suppose something miraculous had taken place. So that, after all, the common hypothesis, as it is the most natural, and is confirmed by the earliest authorities, so upon the whole, it perhaps involves the least difficulty. I certainly have met with nothing even in the Greek Lyric Poets that at all comes up to the highly figurative sense assigned to the plain prose expression, τέρατος γλώσσας, by the above learned Commentators.

4. καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδω ἀποφθέγγεσθαι. Most recent Commentators unite in giving καθὼς the sense of postquam, quoniam, or nam; as in Joh. 17, 2. Rom. 1, 6, and elsewhere. But that signification is of doubtful authority, and the passages cited are of a different complexion. Besides, the interpretation is evidently adopted for the purpose of supporting the hypotheses propounded on the former passage. It seems safer, therefore, to retain the common interpretation prout, which, indeed, is required by the words preceding, (if any sense be assigned to them which at all involves a notion of Divine assistance,) and by the ἐδίδω, unless its force be entirely explained away.
Besides, something extraordinary seems indicated by the term ἀποφθέγματα. For, as Valck. observes, it signifies graviter et magnificè loqui, scil. elocui dicta profunda, sensus plena. So Hor. L. 4. Ode 2. ver. 5. Monte decurrents velut amnis, imbres quem super notas aluere ripas fervet, immensusque ruit profundo Pindarus ore. So the sayings of the seven wise men were called ἀποφθέγματα, and such were those of our Lord in Matt. 5, 6 & 7. Grotius, too, and Beza, as also Camerarius and Vatablus, agree that the word is commonly used of prophetic, divinely inspired, and profoundly sententious language, and answers to the Heb. קִרְיָב and הַר, all of which signify “to utter prophetic and divinely inspired words.” And this interpretation is confirmed by the authority of Chrysostom and ÒEcumenius, and seems to have been adopted by Wetstein, since his Classical examples all tend to the illustration of it.* To these may be added the following, cited by Kypke. Plutarch de Pythia orac. p. 405. speaking of the Delphic priests, he says: πρῶτον μὲν ὠφεξε ἑρρηταί, τα πλείονα κακοίναι καταλογάδην ἀποφθέγματο. & p. 268. ἀποφθέγματα λόγια καὶ χρησμοῦν τῶν ἐρωτῶν. Strabo L. 14. p. 945. relates that the king of the Egyptians, μαντικός ποὺς ἀποφθέγμαται. See also Joseph. Ant. L. 17. C. 8. p. 597. Philo de Josepho, p. 543. relates that, on his having interpreted dreams to Pharaoh, the king said to him: οὗ γὰρ ἰδεῖ οὗτος ταύτ' ἀποφθέγματα μοι δοκεῖς. To his examples Wetstein subjoins the following observation, namely, that as the gift of tongues, so also that of prophecy was not so far in their power that they could use it as often as they pleased, to whom, and on what business, they chose, but in conformity to the will of the Almighty.

* These are chiefly derived from Elaner, though he has unwarily omitted the most important of those illustrations, namely, Jamblich. de Myster. sect. 3. c. 17. p. 82. ἐν τοῖς εὐθυκίον τινα ἀνθρώπων ποιεὶ (ἐς Θεός) μετὰ σοφίας λογίον ἀποφθέγματα.
6. ἢ γὰρ ὅ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ κατοικοῦντες. These words are, by Paulus and Heinrichs, referred to the proceeding ones, but by other commentators to the following: and this Kuinoel acknowledges to be the truer mode of taking them. For the reasons which he assigns to this preference I must refer the reader to his note; the thing being too obvious to need any explication. Κατοικοῦντες is, by Wolf, Michaelis, Rosenm. and others, explained dwelling, and not, as it is usually rendered, sojournings, "since that (say they) would require παρακούντες and παρε-κινηματον. They remark, too, that many religious persons of the foreign Jews had fixed their residence at Jerusalem for the purpose of having greater facilities for the performance of religious duties, and because the advent of the Messiah was then expected.

They explain οἱ κατοικοῦντες at ver. 9. by qui olim habitavimus. But this seems harsh, and there is no reason to suppose the sacred writers so very exact in the use of terms nearly synonymous. I agree with Kuinoel in maintaining the common interpretation. For (as he observes) κατοικεῖν is not only used of those who dwell permanently, but of those who οἰκονομίζω any where, like ἐπικύρωσεν; as in the Sept. Gen. 27, 44. where it answers to בְּשֹּׁם, and in 1 Kings 17, 23. to יָנָה peregrinare.

These foreign Jews had come to Jerusalem in order to celebrate the Passover, and many of them, we may suppose, had remained there from the last Passover.

The sense of the whole passage is thus laid down by Markland: "It happened that there were at that time at Jerusalem Jews from almost all parts of the known world, on account of the feast of Pentecost. These men were greatly surprised and astonished when they heard the Apostles speaking in the languages of their several countries. But others (viz. the natives of Judea and Jerusalem), not understanding the languages which were spoken, said
that they were poor inconsiderable fellows, who had got drunk that morning, and spake, like drunken men, what came uppermost. But Peter, at the head of the other Apostles, applied himself in a speech to both the parties, and proved to the natives, first, that they were mistaken in thinking them drunk: and then he told them both, that that was the thing which had been foretold by the prophet Joel," &c.

5. ἀνδρεῖς εὐλαβεῖς. By these are not meant proselytes (as some have supposed); in which signification the word does not occur in the New Testament; neither does the particle καὶ distinguish them from the Jews before-mentioned. For at Acts 8, 2. by the εὐλαβεῖς are denoted persons of integrity and piety; as Simeon in Luke 2, 25.

5. ἀπὸ παρθῶν ἦνος, τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. Here we have an hyperbole, for "in a manner all, from many or various nations of the globe." * Wolf subauds

* Of this hyperbolical way of speaking we have several instances in Scripture. Thus in Deut. 1, 28. 9, 1. we read of cities walled up to heaven. And in Deut. 2, 25. of the dread of the Jews falling upon every nation under the whole heaven. See also Gen. 11, 4. Judg. 20, 16. and Ps. 107, 26. (Doddridge). So Joseph. Ant. 4, 7, 2. says that Lucullus came to Cyrene to quell an insurrection of the Jews there, ὅν ἡ οἰκουμένη πεπλήρωσε, of which (Jews) the world is full: and in Bell. Jud. 2, 16, 4. he makes King Agrippa the younger say to the Jews, οὗ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐθνῶν, ὃ μὴ μοῖραν ὑμετέραν ἐχώ, there is no nation in the world where a part of you is not to be found. But Philo, in his account of the Jewish embassy to Caligula, makes King Agrippa the elder speak more largely on this subject in the following words (vol. 2. p. 587. ed. Mang.): Ἀντὶ ἑκά τῆς πατρίσις μητρόπολις δὲ οὐ μίας χώρας Ἰουδαίας, ἄλλα καὶ τῶν πλείστων, &c. Hæc quidem (scil. Hierosolyma) est patria mea; est vero metropolis non unius regionis Judææ, sed et multarum, propter colonias inde variis temporibus emissas in regiones finitimas: in Egyptam, Phœnicam-Syriam, tum reliquam, tum eam, quam Coelo-Syriam vocant; tum in longius distas, Pamphyliam, Ciliciam, pleraque Asieæ partes usque ad Bithyniam et Ponti sinum internos. Fari modo in Europâ Thessaliam, Boetiam, Macedoniam, Αἰtoliam, Atticam, Argos, Corinthum, Peleponnesi partes plurimas et praecipuas. Nec tantum continenti pro vincis plene sunt coloniis Judaicis, sed et insularum celeberrimæ, Euboæa, Cyprus, et Creta. Taceo de provinciis Trans-Euphratensis: omnes enim istæ, exceptâ parvâ parte (Babylone reliquisque prefecturœ quæ agro feraci gaudent) à Judæis incolluntur. See also what Philo says
χαρῶν, Erasmus, Beza, and Heumann, ἐθνῶν. But we may simply supply ἄντων. Ἡ πόλις τοῦ ὤρανον, on the earth. In the same sense have we elsewhere ὅπο τοῦ ἡλίου. So in the Heb. שֵׁם הַר in Eccl. 1, 9. In Diodor. Sic. 599 c. Persepolis is said to be πλούσιον-tάτη πόλις τῶν ὅπο τοῦ ἡλίου. And in Plut. Tim. 46 c. Athens is pronounced to be the most beautiful city τῶν ὅπο ὄρανον. See also Plut. Lyc. 46 c. (Kuin.) Τὰ ἡλίων or ὅπο τοῦ ἡλίου are of frequent occurrence; as Phil. 972 a. 979 d. 982 e. (Loesner.)

6. γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς. Φωνή has been by most Commentators, as Wolf, Rosenmuller, and Heinrichs considered as synonymous with ἤχος at ver. 2., i.e. a sound produced by a commotion of the air. (See the note on that passage.) But ἤχος is too remote, nor does one see how a very violent wind, diffused through all parts of the city, could cause Jerusalemites to meet together at that house. Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Wolf, and Heumann, take φωνή to have the sense of φώμη. So Gen. 45, 16. καὶ διεθοῖτί ἡ φωνή. Jer. 4, 15. φωνὴ ἀναγγέλωντος ἡξε, and 59, 46. Φωνή ἀλώσεως. See Gatak. de Styl. Nov. Test. C. 14, p. 144.); and φωνῆς ταύτης they explain by φωνῆς περὶ τούτων. But there is not sufficient reason for receding from the common signification of φωνή, and taking it for φώμη, since it is often used in that sense, and conjoined with the verbs ἔρχεσθαι and ἔξερχεσθαι (Matt. 9, 26.), not with χένεσθαι. Besides, the ταύτης plainly shews that φωνὴ is to be referred to what immediately preceded, namely, the noise produced by those who, full of vehement commotion, in a loud voice uttered prayers in foreign languages. Thus, just after, in ver. 14., φωνή is used of a human voice.

Συνεχίσθη " was confounded, struck with astonishment at the novelty of the thing. Συγχέονταi, like the Latin confundo, denotes great perturbation of

mind; as in 1 Macc. 4, 27. 2 Macc. 10, 30. Thus Hesychius explains συγκέχυται by συμτετάρακται. Of this sense many examples are produced by Wetstein and Loesner. Διάλεκτος is for γλώσσα in 1, 19. 2, 4. (Kuin.)

7, 8. εξίστανται*—εγενήθησεν. Most Commentators suppose that the auditors wondered that men, by nation Galileans, without the advantages of literature, or intercourse with foreign nations, should speak foreign languages. (See Storr. Op. 3, 174.) But the Galileans, it must be observed, were of a mixed race, composed of many nations; and the country was inhabited by Egyptians, Arabs, Phœnicians, and Syrians. The province flourished in commerce, and was not unpolished in manners. (See the note on Matt. 4, 12. and the Proleg. to Joh. p. 34.) Wherefore a knowledge of foreign languages might be acquired by the Galilæans. And thus there might also be present at the Christian assembly, on the day of Pentecost, Galilæans ακ—

* On the words εξίστηναι and θαυμάζειν Valcknaer has the following learned remarks:

I. Εξίστημι is used both as an active and a neuter verb. Thus εκτημαίνω, τίς παλέως signifies to drive any one out of town; and εκτημαίνω, to depart from town, as τις ἐδώκει εκτημάναι. (See Herodot. i. 3. c. 77.) In the same sense εξίστασαι is used by Nymphodor. in Schol. ad Sophoet. Æd. in Col. 124.

II. The opposite to εν εαυτῷ είναι, or εν τοίς εαυτοῦ γίνεσθαι, to be composed and sedate, is εξίστασαι, or εκτημάναι τού νοῦ, and frequently, by ellipsis, εξίστασαι, to be beside oneself. Moreover, εξίστασαι, εκτημέναι, and εκτημάναι, were used of prophets De 23, under a divine inspiration, and transported by a sacred furor. Hence may be illustrated a passage of 2 Cor. 5, 13. where εκτημάναι and σωϕρονίναι are opposed; as σωϕρονίναι and μαίνεσθαι in Lucian. See Alberti on Mark, c. 3. p. 177.

III. It is most frequently used of wonder, by which any one is struck, and, as it were, put beside himself. In this sense it is employed in the present passage, as also in Acts 8, 13. 19, 21. Matt. 13, 23. We have the active εκτημαίνω, to astonish, in Luke 24, 24. Acts 8, 9. The state of a mind transported is in Scripture expressed by εκτασίας.

Θαυμάζειν properly signifies spectare cum admiratione, from θαίμα πρεστίγει, a show. Θαύμα comes from the perfect, θέθαυμα, of the old form θαὶω, which was derived from θαω. (Valcknaer.)
quainted with foreign languages, and Jews living out of Palestine. How then, it may be asked, could it seem wonderful to the Jews, assembling together, that the Galilæans were speaking in foreign languages? Why did it not occur to them that among the number of speakers there might be Jews living out of Palestine, who might have learned foreign languages? Now the cause of this wonder Luke has himself plainly declared, since he introduces the religious Jews as thus speaking: ἀκοῦμεν λαλούμενον αὐτῶν τῶν ἑμετέρων γлагόλας τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ. These wondered, therefore, that the Galilæans were celebrating the praises of God in foreign languages. (Kuin.) But see the note supra ver. 4. Kuinoel agrees with Eichhorn and some commentators mentioned by Wolf in regarding Γαλιλαίοι here as the name of a sect rather than of a country. "The followers of Christ (says he), before they were called Christians, bore the name of Galilæans, because the author of the sect and his first followers derived their origin from that district. See Reland's Palest. 184. Matt. 26, 69 & 71. Joh. 7, 50. Acts 11, 26. But it may be doubted whether the name had, at so early a period, ever been given them: at least of this we may justly require some proof.

9—11. Πάσχαοι—Ἀραβῖς. To shew that the foreign Jews heard the Christians speaking in the language of their countries, Luke reckons up these countries from the East, (i.e. Parthia and Media,) to the West, (i.e. Lyibia and Cyrene); from the North, (i.e. Cappadocia and Pontus, &c.), to the South, (i.e. Egypt,) in which the Jews then dwelt, and from whence sojourners might, at the time of the feast, be expected to arrive. This catalogue, however, or list, is rather ad ornatum, by way of ornament, and is not to be too much pressed; nor need we maintain that there were auditors present from each and every of the above-named countries, and that the Christians spoke in so many different languages,
since in many of the above named provinces the same language was in use; as in Phrygia, the Pamphylian, i.e. the Greek tongue; in Judæa and Mesopotamia, the Syrochaldée; in Parthia, Media, and Elynas, the Persian. (Kuin.)

To this interpretation, however, I cannot accede, since it supposes such a perfect knowledge of those countries as we do not, in reality, possess; and seems, therefore, an unwarrantable liberty. Besides, this paring down of the sense is evidently done to serve a purpose; namely, to countenance and support the hypothesis brought forward at ver. 4. And admitting that the same language was in use in many of those provinces, we may be allowed to suppose that it would vary considerably according to the different dialects, of which there would, probably, be several.*

Wetstein observes that as the Passover was celebrated early in the Spring, there was not sufficient time for any one to come from a great distance; and that the feast of Pentecost, to which both Jews and religious persons of all nations resorted, was far more convenient. He then cites Philo de Monarch. 2, p. 223, 14. καὶ τοῦτο σαφεστάτη πίστις ἐστι τὰ γενόμενα. Μῦριοι γὰρ ἄνευ μυρίαν ὅσων πόλεων, οἱ μὲν διὰ γῆς, οἱ δὲ διὰ βαλάττης ἐξ ἀνατολῆς, καὶ δύσεως, καὶ ἀρκτῶν, καὶ μεσημβρίας, καὶ ἔορτὴν εἰς τὸ ιερὸν καταρρέουσιν, οὐ τινὰ κοίνων ἰππόδρομον, καὶ καταγωγήν ἀσφαλῆ πολυπράγμων καὶ παραχωδεστάτω βιοῦ.

9. Πάρθοι, i.e. Jews born and resident in Parthia. Of these Justin says, L. 41. Proœm. Parthi, Scytharum exules fuerunt. Hoc etiam ipsorum vocabulo manifestatur; nam Scythico sermone Parthi (exules) dicuntur. See Cellar. Geog. 8, 18. Ἑλαμῖται, inha-

* Of this variation, according to the different dialects, the Italian language affords a notable instance. Of the most remarkable varying of its dialects may be reckoned those of Venice, Friuli, Mantua, Genoa, Naples, Padua, Istria, and Bergamo, a specimen of which is given in a translated fragment of a celebrated Italian author, published by the Chevalier Salvioni, and inserted in the introduction to Montucci's very useful "Italian Extracts."
bitants of Elymais, a province on the Persian gulph, and which formed part of Persia. Hence it is put for that country; as in Is. 21, 2. where the Sept. Version has ἐν ἐμοὶ οἱ Ἔλαμῖται, καὶ οἱ πρεσβεῖς τῶν Περσῶν ἐν ἐμὲ ἔρχονται. So also 1 Macc. 6, 1. Jos: Ant. 1, 6, 4. On Μεσοποτάμια see Cellar and Schl. Lex.

9. Ἰουδαίαν. This word has, by some ancient and modern interpreters, been thought spurious, because they did not see how Luke could reckon the Jews among foreign nations. Hence Tertullian and Augustin read Armenia, and Theophylact omits Ἰουδαίαν. Schmid. conjectures Ἰνδίαν, Barth Ἰδον-μαίαν, Markland and Bryant Λυδίαν, and Hemsterhuysius (with the approbation of Valcknaer) Βιονίαν. Most Commentators have, however, (more rightly,) judged that the common reading, as being supported by the authority of all the MSS. and Versions is to be retained, and have remarked that Judæa might properly be mentioned, since the Galilæan dialect was somewhat different from that of Jerusalem and the rest of Judæa; and that the word διάλεκτος not only signifies language, but also dialect, i.e. a different species of the same language. For Luke, who, at ver. 5., had made mention only of the foreign Jews, meant also to signify that the Jerusalemites too, and Jews who (as we have before observed) were very averse to communicating religious instruction, or offering religious worship in any other language than the old Hebrew or Syro-Chaldee, had heard the Christians praying in foreign languages. (Kuin.) On the other names see Wetstein, Cellarius, and Schleusner, as also Horne's Introduction.

10, 11. οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ρώμαιοι, i.e. "Jews who had settled and had their dwellings at Rome." So Ἀντιοχεῖς occurs in Joseph. C. Ap. 2, 11. After ἐπιδημοῦντες subaud οἵ, i.e. at Jerusalem. (Compare 17, 21.) Those are said ἐπιθημεῖν, who sojourn and fix their temporary residence at some place
different from their proper country and home. So Diodor. Sic. 32. 1. (cited by Munth) οἱ παρευδημοῦντες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. (Kuin.) Among the many examples produced by Wetstein, the following are the most opposite. Plotin. Enn. 6, 8, 1. ὥσπερ ἐν ἐνίς θουλώμενοι τοὺς πολίτας συνάξαι πίλες τίνος, οἶνον κατὰ τιμῆσες ἤ τέχνας, τοὺς εἰπεμοῦντας ἕνους παραλίποι καθόλου. Athenæus 8. p. 361 f. οἱ Ρώμην κατοικοῦντες, καὶ οἱ εἰπεμοῦντες τῇ πόλει, & κ. p. 188 f. τοὺς εἰπεμοῦντας τῶν ἑών. Simplic. in Epictet. p. 210. ἐστὶ δὲ τὰς σχέσεις καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἑώνους εἰπεμοῦντας ὑμῖν. Xenoph. Hell. 2. οἱ εἰπεμοῦντες ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ἥδιοι. Lucian V. H. 2, 46. τους εἰπεμοῦντας ἑώνους.


10. Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ προσήλυτοι, i. e. both Jews born and proselytes, those who had been made so; οἱ ἔξω ένδικηλήμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ, as Suidas explains. Some refer these words to the Romans before mentioned; others, more properly, to all the nations of which mention was made in the preceding; nay, even the Cretans and Arabs just afterwards named. (Kuin.)

11. τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ. We must here subaud praemumata or ἔργα, which signify, 1st, deeds worthy of admiration; 2dly, mighty benefits. (See the note on Luke 1, 49.) They celebrated the praises of God either in the Psalm usually recited on those days, or in their own words, and in prayers; declaring the benefits bestowed by God through Jesus Christ.

12, 13. εἰσταυτο ἡ καὶ διηνόρουν. The word διαπερεύ (which occurs in no other sacred writer but St. Luke) is a somewhat stronger term than ἀποτεύ, and denotes “knowing not what to do, what course to take,” and is generally expressive of hesitation, doubt, and uncertainty; as in Luke 9, 7. καὶ διηνό- ρες, and Acts 10, 17. διηνόρουν περὶ αὐτῶν, and 10,
17. αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ πνεύμα. So also in the middle voice, Luke 24, 4. And so Dan. 2, 8. (Symen.) καὶ δηηηρει τῷ πνεύμα. It is sometimes used by the later Greek writers, both in the active and middle voice: Τί ἐνεβη τοῦτο εἶναι; “what this should mean?” what this portended, to what event it would lead. Θέλειν and βουλεύειν, it must be observed, are not unfrequently used, like μελέων, to denote no more than our shall, will, should, and would. Of this some examples are adduced from Philo by Loesner, and from other authors by Palairot. Loesner refers to Reisk Animad. 4, 694. Wetstein, too, produces some examples; as Aπακε. 44, 6. τι βέλειν ὁπερ τὸδ εἶναι; Herodot. 1, 78. τι θέλειν σπαίνειν τὸ τέρας. On ver. 18. Wetstein refers to 2 Petal. 30, 10. 36, 36. Judg. 10.

19. ἐπειδὲ δὲ χελεάζωντες. Kuinoél remarks that χελεάζειν has the sense of γελάν, and Munth and Loesner have given examples of this idiom, which is recognized by Hesychius. But it signifies, in a general way, to mock, jeer, turn into derision. Its proper signification is, to turn up the lip; (as Ps. 26, 7. “they shoot out the lip, they shake the head;”) from χέλως synonymous with χέλας the lip; as was long ago seen by the author of the Etym. Mag. See a learned annotation of Vanderlinden on the different sorts of derision and mockery, whether by words or by gestures inserted in the Critici Sacri, in loc.

For χελεάζωντες Griesbäch has received into the text διαχελεάζωντες, from some MSS. and Fathers, as also the Syriac Version; and Kuinoél approves of this, observing that compounds are, by the Scribes, often changed into simples. True; but sometimes simples are, by Scribes of superficial learning, who have taken upon themselves to correct, changed into compounds. Διαχελεάζωντες is, I grant, a somewhat more forcible and elegant expression; yet the simple occurs not only further on, in 17, 2., but very frequently in the Septuagint; whereas διαχελεάζειν
occurs neither in the New Testament nor the Septuagint. Besides, the διὰ may have arisen from δὲ, preceding, and the testimony of the Fathers has, in such a case, but a slight weight; and that of any Version very indefinite. On these accounts I would restore the old reading.

Γλεύκως μεμεσταμένοι. By γλεύκως we are to understand, not new wine, i.e. new made wine (for such there could not have been at the Pentecost), but, as Cæcumenius and others explain, sweet wine, which is (as the above commentator observes) very intoxicating. So the Sept. in Job. 32, 19. ἀπέρ ἄκυδος γλεύκως (ἡ) ἰέων. It appears from Plut. 2. 928. and Columella 12, 29. that some sorts of wine, if kept in a cool situation, retained their primitive sweetness a long time. Such, we find from Pliny, was called ἀειγλεύκως. The word is also cited by Elsner and Wetstein from Dioscor. 1, 105. 2, 30., Lucian Philop. 39., and Polyæn. 358. So Athenæus 176 d. (cited by Vanderlinder) ἥλιει γλεύκως μεμεθυμένα παῖγμα Μουσέων. See Harmer’s Obs. in loc., and especially Walch’s Dissertation on this very subject, in his Dissertations on Acts, Vol. 1. Barth, Adv. 211. and the very learned Dissertation before mentioned by Vanderlinden.

Markland observes that he sees no γλεύκω or drollery in saying, “These men are drunk,” and would read γλεύκως, the wine personified, formed like Θάλασ, Αὐξώ in Pollux 8, 9. § 10., and Αειεστω and Εἴδεστω.* But I am surprised that this celebrated critic should not have seen how inconsistent this would be with the plain style of the New Testament. It would be more suitable to that of Lucian. Good taste of itself might surely have suggested that this was inadmissible. Besides, the expression μεμεσταμένοι (a term, as Valcknaer observes, always used in a bad sense, and πλῆρης in a middle one,) is suited

* This reminds one of the absurd conjecture hazarded by some antient and modern critics on Acts 17, 18., namely Ἀνάστασιν, i.e. the goddess of resurrection. See the note in loc.
only to the natural, not to the metaphorical acceptation. And as to Markland's observation, that there was no drollery or wit in this, I answer that none was intended, but only a derision of their pretensions to religion. There is somewhat more of solidity in the following remark of the same commentator, namely, that the word γλεῦκος was also intended to convey a sneer on the meanness of their condition, since no person of respectability tapped the last year's γλεῦκος so early as June, unless compelled by necessity.

14. Now follows Peter's address, which produced such an effect on the minds both of the wonderers and the deriders, that they embraced the Christian faith, and others, admonished and taught by them, followed their example; so that three thousand persons were, on that day, added to the assembly of Christians. It is plain, however, from ver. 40., that only the sum of Peter's discourse is recorded, and that many things are omitted which were said by the Apostle. The purport of the words from ver. 14. is this: "We, who are here collected together, are not drunken, but excited by a Divine emotion. The times of the Messiah are come, in which, as sang the prophet Joel, the Divine power will shew its efficacy on men of every kind, and all will be fired with zeal for religion and piety, when the enemies of the Messiah will be consigned to punishment, but his faithful worshippers attain unto happiness. Now the promised Messiah is Jesus, who was crucified, and was recalled to life by God." The plan of this discourse of Peter is thus laid down by Schoettgen.

DISCOURSE OF PETER.
Consisting of three parts, Exordium, Proposition, and Confirmation.

Exordium, containing an address and an attempt to secure their will. (ver. 14.)

Proposition two-fold, 1st, negative, i.e. remotive: The men are not drunk. (ver. 15.) 2dly, positive or
affirmative: *This is done, that the Scripture should be fulfilled.* (ver. 16—21.)

Confirmation of the former proposition: *because it is the third hour of the day.* (ver. 15.) The Jews, it must be observed, were not accustomed to eat and drink early in the morning. Now if these had been intoxicated, they could not have received the gift of tongues, of which they were not before possessed.

Confirmation of the latter proposition: "because Christ, by his merits and ascension, obtained this gift for us." (ver. 29, 33.) For this cause was to be demonstrated, 1st, the divinity of Jesus; which was done by signs and prodigies. 2dly, his resurrection after death (which death is described in ver. 23.), ver 24 & 32., according to the prophecy of David, which was not fulfilled in David's own case. (ver. 25—31.) 3dly, his ascension (ver. 33.), which was also according to the prophecy of David. (ver. 34 & 35.) The conclusion which follows from the argument is: "Christ is the true God, who had power to obtain for, and send to, us what you see.

14. σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνδεκά. These courageously rose up with Peter, that the multitude collected might behold in them the chiefs of Christ's followers. (Kuin.) The τῶν (by a force often found in the article) denotes the other eleven. It is well observed by Cæcumenius, that the circumstance of the other eleven also standing up is related in order to show ὅτι κοινῇ γνώμῃ καὶ φωνῇ πάντων αὐτῶν ἦν, μάρτυρες δὲ παρεστήκεισαι οἱ ἐνδεκά τῶν λεγομένων. By σταθεὶς is meant *set up to speak*; as in Ἀποκ. 11, 11.; a term, as Heinrichs observes, used *de concionabundis*; and he adds that it especially behoved Peter, as being their head, to be their spokesman, and refute this accusation of drunkenness.

14. γνωστόν ἔστω, καὶ ἐνοτίσασθε τ. ὑπ. Ἐνοτισία signifies to receive into the ears, or (to use an expression of Lactantius) inaurire. Ἐνοτισθαι in the middle voice is an Hellenistic word, used in the
Sept. and the later Greek authors, and answers to the Hebrew דֵּשַּׁר in Gen. 4, 23. Job, 33, 1. וֹדַּר in Job, 32, 11. בֵּשֵׁם in Jer. 8, 6., and יָשָׁר in Is. 44, 8. See Vorstius and Fischer de Proclus. 694. who has copiously treated on this, and thinks it was introduced by the Greek interpreters of the Old Testament from the idiomatic style and common use.

15. οὐ γὰρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς ὄπλαμβάνετε, &c. By the οὕτως are meant the speakers.* Peter, we may observe, spoke in the third person, and thought he sufficiently refuted that calumny by saying that it was now only the third hour of the day (nine o'clock in the morning), the time of morning prayers, before which none who had any regard for religion ever took any food or drink. So Berachoth, fol. 28, 2. (ap. Lightfoot and Wetstein.) "Non licet homini gustare quidquam, antequam oravit orationem suam. And Josephus, in Vit., relates that the assembly which, on the Sabbath day, met in the synagogues or proseuche, were not usually dismissed for breakfast till the sixth hour, i.e. after the

* The great question, whether the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost was conferred upon the Apostles only, or upon all the hundred and twenty mentioned chap. 1, 15. seems determined to the Apostles only, because the promise of our Saviour was made to them particularly, chap. 1, 8. and Luke 24, 49. just before his ascension. It seems equally clear from the language of this place; for, ver. 14, Peter and the other eleven appear on this account before the Jews, to whom Peter in his harangue says here, THESE MEN (pointing to the eleven) are not drunken, as ye suppose. Now, if the gift were conferred upon the other hundred and eight, they likewise would and ought to have been there, as well as the twelve, that Peter might say the same of them too; otherwise his argument will be very defective: for the objection of being drunk was made to all the spectators. This seems decisive. See too ver. 33. 37. Many afterwards, without doubt, had this gift; but on the day of Pentecost, I think it does not appear to have been conferred on any but the twelve Apostles. There is another way of solving this question. Among the hundred and twenty-three were some women, Acts 1, 14. Now I think it does not appear that the gift of tongues was ever conferred upon a woman; and St. Paul does not suffer a woman to speak in the assemblies, 1 Cor. 14, 34, 35. 1 Tim. 2, 11, 12. But if this gift was bestowed upon women, they could not have been hindered from speaking in the assemblies. See 1 Cor. 14, 39. (Markland.)
prayers appropriate to the sixth hour. Even among the Gentiles it was accounted disgraceful for any to be seen drunken at any time of the day; [See 1 Thess. 5, 7. and the note on that passage. Edit.] as appears from Plaut. Pseud. 5, 26. Senec. Ep. 122. So AElian, V. H. 12, 30. Ταραξτίνοις ἐν ἔθει ἢν πίνειν μὲν ἐξ ἐνοικίῳ, μεθύειν δὲ περὶ πλήθουσαν ἄγοφαν. Cic. Philipp. 2, 41. At quàm multos dies in ea villâ turpissimè est perbacchatus! ab horâ tertiâ bibebatur, ludebatur, vomebatur.

16—18. Joel 3, 1—5. is here cited, but (as it seems) from memory; for the words can have respect neither to the Hebrew nor the Septuagint. In the Hebrew we have נַחַר הַיּוֹם, which is rendered by the Septuagint καὶ ἐσται μετὰ ταῦτα, but Peter uses καὶ ἐσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. In the Sept. we have καὶ οἱ προσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνιασθήσονται καὶ οἱ νεκροί ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὑψονται, and the same order is pursued in the Hebrew: but Peter uses an inversion. The Hebrew מִשְׂרָאֵל some Greek interpreters render δούλους μου, which version Peter follows: but the Hebrew and Septuagint have simply δούλους. The words καὶ προφητεύουσι are added by Luke. Finally, ver. 19. the Septuagint render more closely by καὶ δόξα τέρατα ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, αἰμα, &c. (See Tychsen's Illustration of Joel, C. 3. and Rosenmuller's Scholia in loc.) The passage contains a poetical description of the Messiah's kingdom. (See the Commentators just mentioned.) Peter, who applied this passage to the present purpose, quoted it in order to show the Jews that all they had seen and heard (compare ver. 33.) arose from the most pious feelings, nay, were the happy auguries of future events, and all to be ascribed to the efficacy of the Holy Spirit.

17. Καὶ ἐσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, "in the last ages, in the times of the Messiah." Ἐσται is, by a Hebraism, redundant. See Glass Phil. 356. and Vorstius de Hebr. 603. seqq. The phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in the Sept. answers to בָּאָרָי הָדּוֹם, and by these words are properly signified times
future. See Gen. 49, 1. Is. 2, 2. But here, as the subject is of the times of the Messiah, ἐσχάται ἡμέραι are the last times. For the Jews, who hoped that the Messiah would introduce a totally different face of affairs in the world, and would put an end to all the calamities and afflictions of the Jewish people, named the times of the Messiah the last times. See the notes on Matt. 24. This manner of speaking is also found in other passages of the books of the New Testament, and in the writings of the Rabbins. See Heb. 1, 1. 1 Pet. 1, 20. [and the notes on those passages. Edit.] So R. Nachman on Gen. 49, 1. Extremum tempus omnium doctorum consensu sunt dies Messiae. (Kuin.)

17. ἐκήρω ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου. Ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος is, by a Hebraism, for τὸ πνεῦμα. Compare ver. 38. [There is an ellipsis of τὸ μέρος. Edit.] See Nold. Conc. p. 470. seq. By this phrase is meant, “I will work spiritual effects on all men (Luke 4, 18.); the Divine force will shew its efficacy in them.” What kind of efficacy is to be understood the following words indicate. Others however assign to ἐκήρω, &c. another, and (I think) too confined sense, by interpreting them either of a full and accurate knowledge of God, and a mode of thinking correspondent to that knowledge, or of a most ardent zeal for piety. Ἐκήρειν, it may be observed, is, like the Heb. יְבָשֵׁם, in Joel 1, 1., Hos. 5, 10., Zeph. 3, 8., used figuratively, (by a metaphor derived from liquids,) of all things which are largely and abundantly afforded. See Tit. 3, 16., Sir. 15, 11. ἐξέχεις ἐκ' αὐτοῦς τὸ εἴλεος αὐτοῦ. As also 16, 11., 18, 11., and Virg. Georg. 2, 46. fundet humo facilem victum justissima tellus. By πάντες are meant all the citizens of the Messiah’s kingdom, without exception. (Kuin.)

17. καὶ προφητεύοντος οἱ υἱοὶ θύμων, &c. Το προφητεύοντος some assign the sense “celebrate in verse the Divine praises” (on which see the note on Luke 1, 67.) Others, “predict future events.” Others again (more properly) take it in an extended sense.
and render, "speak by Divine inspiration, and after the manner of the Prophets. See Schl. Lex. in v. § 5. and Koppe, in his Exc. 3. on the Epist. to the Ephes. p. 151, and 2, 11. p. 100.

17. ὃπατεὶς ὑπανται, καὶ — ἐνυπνιασθήσονται. By these words are meant the visions and dreams by which God revealed his will to the Prophets, namely by teaching, admonition, &c. The Hebrew Prophets were remarkable for their zeal for piety and virtue, and were supposed to be the familiar ministers of Jehovah. In this sense Abraham is said שִׁלָּחְנָב in Gen. 20, 7. And in various parts of the Old Testament it is mentioned as a singular mark of Divine favour, that, at various times, God has raised up prophets as interpreters of his will. Hence the sense of the present passage appears to be as follows: "In that golden age there will exist, not merely some prophets, and persons endued with a knowledge of God, but all, as the Prophets, will be intimately acquainted with Divine truths, and, in a zeal for piety and holiness, will be most closely conjoined with God." By ὃπατεὶς are meant waking, or day visions, by ἐνυπνια night dreams*. The Prophet proceeds to say: "Nay even upon my servants and handmaids I will pour out my spirits." He descends to each: the old, the young, servants, and handmaids form a positive distribution, not denoting worshippers of both sexes, but the race of bond servants: q. d. "But my servants, &c. are those who are true worshippers, and are dear to me." Καὶ γε is to be rendered quinetiam. So in Ael. V. H. 1, 14. and elsewhere. (Kuin.)

The force of the word ᾧμὼν is to be observed here: it signifies that these favours shall be conferred first upon the Jews. Afterwards the Prophet

* In confirmation of Schwartz’s observation, that this word is properly not a substantive, but an adjective taken substantively, we may cite Eurip. Hec. 702. ἔριον ἐνυπνιον ὑμᾶτων ἀμων ὁμεν, where, though the Editors treat ἐνυπνιον as a substantive, yet the Scholiast directs it to be taken with ὁμεν.
goes on, and says, καὶ γε ἐκεῖ τῶι δούλους μου, &c. by which are signified other nations in general, who, (says God,) shall have the same gifts bestowed upon them: and that it was so, we learn from this history. Καὶ γε is imi, yea further. See Viger. Idiotism. cap. 8. § 4, p. 287. This shews that the most inconsiderable things in the Scriptures are not to be neglected. Ἐκεῖ πάσαν σάρκα, upon persons of all conditions, sons, daughters, young men, old men. (Markland.)


19, 20. In these words it is indicated that periods of sorrow shall, however, precede that golden age. The prodigies of which we here read (and which serve for ornament) are mentioned, because by the day of the Lord is signified a time the most calamitous. For it was an opinion common both to the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, that by prodigies of the kind here mentioned were portended public calamities and the ruin of states. Hence also earthquakes and solar and lunar eclipses were, with the poets of the Hebrews and other nations, usual images of times the most calamitous. (See Amos 8, 9. Is. 13, 10, seq. 34, 4.) So Lucian, Phars. 1, 524. enumerating the portents which presaged the civil war, sings: Superique minores Prodigiiis terras implerunt; æthera, pontum. Ignota obscuræ viderunt sidera

19. ἄρμιδα καπνοῦ, i. e. a smoke the densest, * [by a sort of hendiadis. Edit.] The words αἵμα, πυρ, and ἄρμις καπνοῦ, are by Limborch, Bengel, Morus, Rosenm. Heinrichs, Stolz, and others, referred to wars, murders, and burnings. But in Joel and the present passage the subject is, the prodigies which should presage a calamitous period, a time of Divine vengeance. By fire, therefore, may more correctly be understood ignited meteors, sulphureous and inflammable bodies which burn and shine; and by smoke, thick and black vapours which ascend from the earth, and offuscate the light of the sun and moon, so that those luminaries receive that rubicund colour (αἷμα) which is usually observed to precede earthquakes. See the note on Matt. 24. and Harmer’s Observations. Moreover, from what has been said it is manifest that the words of Joel, brought forward at ver. 19 & 20, are not (as some interpreters tell us) to be referred to what is narrated at 2 and 3. (Kuin.)

20. πρὶν ἢ ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν—ἐπιφανῆ, “before that great and awful day of the Lord come.” By τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ κυρίου is commonly understood the period at which God should pour out his spirit. But this interpretation is liable to many objections. Ἐπιφανῆς, in the Sept., answers to the Heb. נורא, terrible, horrible, which Aquila, on Deut. 10, 21., 2 Sam. 7, 28.,

* The Jews, as may be seen in Tanchuma (which passage is produced in the note on Rev. 16, 1), reckoned that this would be fulfilled in the time of the New Testament. These things (as every one knows) were fulfilled partly at the time of Christ’s passion and the destruction of Jerusalem, and partly afterwards, since in the Revelations we have a description of the punishments to be inflicted on the enemies of the Church. (Schoettgen.)
and Ps. 88, 8., expresses by ἐπιφάνης. But the Sept. render this word ἡμέρα, in very many passages (as Judg. 13, 6., 1 Par. 17, 21., Joel 2, 11., Hebr. 1, 7., Mal. 1, 14.) by ἐπιφανῆς, illustrious, remarkable; since they thought the participle ἡμέρα to be derived from ἡμέρα. Now in Joel the subject relates to the time when God would take vengeance on his enemies. (Compare 4, 2 seqq.) Therefore in the Sept. ἡμέρα ἐπιφάνης means a day remarkable for Divine punishment, in which God should display to the enemies of the Jews both his majesty and his wrath. So that ἐπιφάνης comes to much the same meaning with φοβερός.

Now since ἡμέρα κυρίου, in the Old and New Testament, often denotes time of vengeance and judgment (see the note on Hebr. 10, 25.); since ἐπιφάνης answers to the Heb. יָמָה; since, in the passage of Joel in question, the subject is a period of calamity; since, at ver. 19, were mentioned the prodigies which should precede a period of calamity; and since at ver. 21. there follows πᾶς δὲ ἀν ἐπικαλέσθηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται, we must undoubtedly understand a calamitous time, in which God would exercise condign punishment on the perverse Jews who opposed the Christian Religion, and would punish their impiety and contumacy by the destruction of their city and Temple. (Kuin.)


21. καὶ ἐσται, πᾶς — σωθήσεται. Ὅνομα, when joined to persons, is (by a Hebraism) redundant; as in Acts 3, 16, 9, 14. 1 Tim. 6, 1. 1 Cor. 1, 2. Compare Rom. 10, 12. 2 Tim. 2, 22. Ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν κυρίου denotes to worship God. (See Ps. 79, 6. Zach. 13, 9. Is. 65, 1.) Here, however, (according to the intent of Peter,) it signifies to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, and to embrace his doctrine; as in 1 Cor. 1, 2. By σωθήσεται is meant "shall be
preserved from the persecutions and calamities which will befall the Jews." (See the note on Luke 21, 28.) and Matt. 24, 18. (Kuin.)

22. The passage may be thus paraphrased: "What God may work in us, and thus the prophecy of Joel be effectually fulfilled, we owe to Jesus the Messiah, whom ye crucified, but whom God hath recalled to life, and by whose aid the Holy Spirit hath been thus poured forth." See Luke 24, 49. Joh. 14, 16. 26, 15 & 26. Compare infra ver. 33. This is the subject of the remainder of Peter's oration, and it is thus treated: "Jesus, whom ye crucified, God has recalled to life; for it was not possible that he should be held obnoxious to death (see 22—24.), since in God he reposed his hope and trust, and was the Messiah." This sentiment Peter has dressed up by citing the words of David, Ps. 16, 8. seqq. and has referred them to Jesus. (See 25 seqq.) Then at 33. he goes on to say: "That Jesus, then, whom God hath recalled to life, and invested with supreme dignity, hath imparted to us the Holy Spirit. Of him the words of Ps. 110. are meant, which you yourselves are accustomed to refer to the Messiah. (See ver. 34 & 35.) You must therefore be persuaded that Jesus, who was crucified, is the Messiah." (ver. 36.) (Kuin.)

22. Ἰσραήλιται. An appellation of which the Jews were proud (See 2 Cor. 11, 22.) since the name Israel was bestowed by God himself upon Jacob, (Gen. 32, 28.) to be a symbol of Divine grace. (See Koppe on Rom. 9. 4.) Beza, Heumann, Wetstein, Heinrichs, and others, contend that Peter called Jesus Ἰησοῦς Ναζαρηνός, because the Jews had been accustomed, out of contempt, to so call him. See Matt. 27, 71. compared with Joh. 1, 46. Acts 24, 5. I, however, accede to the opinion of those who think that Jesus was so called by Peter, because this had become his usual appellative, as in Mark 16, 6. Joh. 15, 5. Acts 3, 6. 10, 38. See the note on Joh. 1, 45. 19, 19.
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22. ἀνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεικνυμένου—οἶδατε. After Θεοῦ, Kypke, Heinrichs, and others, place a stop, and supply ἤντα; with which subaudition we may, however, dispense. Nay, the following words, οἷς ἐποίησαν δὲ αυτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς clearly show that the words, ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεικνυμένος are to be united. Now ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ is for ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, since the two prepositions are often interchanged; as in Jam. 1. 13. Joseph. Ant. 7, 14, 5. See the note on Matt. 11, 19., Dorvill on Chariton, 548. Reiz. on Lucian Gym. 20. and Loesner in loc. [This idiom is often found in Thucydides. Edit.] The verb ἀποδεικνύμη, (on whose various senses see Krebs and Loesner in loc.) denotes “to prove, demonstrate, evince;” as in 27, 7. Xenoph. de Rep. Ath. 1, 1. So Susanna, § 15. (cited by Valckn.) ἀπεδείχθην δὲ πρεσβύτεροι ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ κηταί. This signification is very suitable to the present passage; and therefore by the words ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεικνυμένος εἰς υἱὸς, &c. is signified a man approved of God by many and great miracles, a Divine teacher, the Messiah. So Heb. 2, 4. ἐπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Now Jesus himself appealed to his works, i. e. remarkable deeds, from which it might be inferred that he was a Divine Legate, the Messiah. (See Joh. 10, 37. Joh. 5, 36. where consult the note.) Διανέμεις, τέρατα, and σημεία are words nearly synonymous, and are here conjoined by way of indicating the number and variety of these remarkable deeds; as in Joh. 4, 48. and elsewhere. Οἷς ἐποίησε is for ἤ ἐποίησε. See the note on Mark 7, 13. and Joh. 4, 35. By ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν is meant simply among you. See the note on Luke 2, 46. (Kuin.) Wetstein has illustrated the sense of ἀποδεικνύμη by numerous examples, for which I must refer the reader to his note.

23. τούτων τῇ ἀριστουργή—λαβόντες. Ὁρίζειν signifies to define, limit, appoint, decree. See Elsner in loc. Therefore τῇ ἀριστουργή θυγατή means, “by the definite, certain, immutable decree of God.” See Luke 22, 22. θυγάτη and πρόγνωσις are synonymous,
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"Πρόγνωσις is, indeed, by some explained prescience; but (as Krebs well remarks) the context requires it to be rendered decree, counsel; as in 1 Pet. 1, 2. For that the Jews and Romans should have exercised, with impunity, violence and cruelty against Christ, did not depend so much on any prescience, as on the Divine decrees. This signification of πρόγνωσις is not only confirmed by the usage of the Hebrew, but the Greek. For the Hebrews use יִת (as the Greeks do γνῶναι) in the sense of (by a metonymy of cause for effect) decree, appoint. So Herodot. 7, 5, 4. εὕτυχος μᾶλλον γνώντες, scil. τούτο. Philo. 966 B. ἐγνωκας ἀρουρας κατηγορειν, & 636 E. μετὰ τὴν μάχην ταύτην ἐγνω δεῖν τὴν χαρὰν κατασκεψαθαι. See Elsner and Loesner. By the words τούτου τὴν ἀφισμένη βούλη, &c. Peter tacitly replies to the objection of the Jews, who stumbled at the crucifixion of Jesus, q. d. "The Jews could not have so treated him, unless God had permitted it so to be; and therefore he underwent death by the will of God." Now it must be observed that any one is said to be ἐκδοτος, who is delivered up to an enemy seeking him for punishment. Thus, in the history of Bel, ver. 26., the King is said to have given up Bel to Daniel, i.e. to do as he would with him: where ἐκδοτος δούναι is equivalent to ἐκδιδόναι in Herodot. 9, 86. Philo, 97 a. In Palæph. fab. 41. Admetus is unwilling to deliver up Alcestes ἐκδοτος ἐξαιτιωμένῳ. So also Joseph. Ant. 6, 15, 9. λάβαν αὐτῶν ἐκδοτον, & Bell. 3, 7, 31. Θέας τῶν τῆς πολεος λαῶν — πρὸς ἀπαλείαν ἐκδοτον φονεσθεν ἐχθροῖς παρέστησεν. Many other examples, too, are adduced by Raphel, Elsner, Kypke. Krebs, Munth, Loesner, and Valcknaer.

In the construction and interpretation of ἐκδοτον λαβόντες διὰ χειρῶν the Commentators are much divided in opinion. Limborch and Wolf refer ἐκδοτον λαβόντες to God, by whose counsel (they observe) it may be said to have been done, and who, as it were, delivered Christ to the Jews. But this seems harsh and far-fetched. The words rather refer to
the traitor Judas, from whom the Jews received Jesus, as it were delivered up and betrayed, ἐκδοτοῦν. Others, and indeed most interpreters, as Grotius, Limborch, Wolf, Heumann, and Rosenmuller, refer διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων to Pilate and the Roman soldiers, and, I think, rightly, since the Gentiles are κατ’ ἐξοχὴν said to be ἀνόμωι, not being under the Mosaic Law. So Rom. 2, 12 & 14. 1 Cor. 9, 21. 1 Macc. 2, 44. But χειρὸς, which is found in many MSS., seems the truer reading, and is correspondent to the Heb. וּלָּ. At προσπηγνυμένος must be supplied σταυρόν; and the passage may be thus translated: “whom having received delivered up to you, by the sure counsel and decree of God, ye have destroyed through the medium of the Gentiles, who crucified him.” Peter’s auditors, indeed, had not laid hands on Jesus, and delivered him up to the Gentiles, since most of them were foreign Jews; but, as the Commentators rightly remark, the stain of that transaction adhered to the whole of the Jewish nation; and thus Peter’s expression may very well be justified. (Kuin.)

Markland enquires whether the word προσπηγνυμένος is elsewhere to be found in the sense of fasten to the cross. I answer, perhaps not; but that will not prove that it is not so used here, the usage of the Hellenistic differing much from that of the Classical writers. At all events, there can be no occasion for the conjecture of Markland, προσπαίξαντος or προσπαίξαντες.

24. δὺ ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησε, λύσας τὰς αὐθίνας τοῦ βασάτου. For βασάτου many MSS. have ἰδιοῦ; which reading is preferred by Mill, Deyling, Valcknaer, and Griesbach, who treat the former as an interpretation. The sense, however, remains the same, since by ἰδιοῦ the Greeks often designated death itself. But since the common reading is supported by the authority of the best, and, indeed, the greater part of the MSS. it is undoubtedly to be retained. [It seems, too, more agreeable to the simple style of the sacred
writers. The other proceeded from some such learned corrector as the person who emended the style of the New Testament in the Cod. Cantab. Edit.] The other reading seems to have been introduced from ver. 27. and Ps. 18, 6. where ἀβίνιες τοῦ ἀδου are mentioned. The word ἀβίνι, which in the Sept. answers to the Heb. דלבוע is properly used of the pains of parturition (1 Thess. 5, 3.), and then of any violent agonies or dire calamities. See the note on Matt. 24, 8. The terms here employed, λοίειν and κρατεῖσθαι, like all verbs expressive of constraint, are, by the Greeks and Hebrews, frequently used of grief. So Job 39, 2. ἀβίνιες δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσε. Lycothron, 1198. κεφ ἀβίνιας ἔξελυσε. Aelian, H. A. 12, 5. τοὺς τῶν ἀβίνιαν λύσαι δεσμούς. Mich. 4, 9. κατεκβάτησαν σοῦ ἀβίνιες αὐτῷ τικτώσης. See also Luke 13, 16. Hence not a few Commentators render ἀβίνιες θανάτου mortis dolores. But since death put an end to the sufferings of Christ, it has been inquired, how he could be said to have risen again, the pains of death being loosed? To remove this difficulty, the Commentators have devised various methods. Beza thinks the ἀβίνιες τοῦ θανάτου are to be explained from the Hebrew idiom, so that by it may be signified a tormenting and painful death, θανάτος ἀδυνηρὸς; as in Matt. 24, 15. τῷ βδελυγμα ἐρμαίσεως is equivalent to ἐρμαισις βδελυγμη, and in Rom. 7, 24. σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου is for θνητῶν. But Deyling and others rightly remark, that there was no longer any pain in death, from which Christ was resuscitated, since, after having undergone the sufferings of the cross, death was the end of all his misery. Kypke would understand the agonies which preceded death, those most exquisite tortures, both mental and corporeal, which he had endured. But the subject of the present passage is the state and time intermediate between the death of Christ crucified, and his resuscitation. To omit other far-fetched and contort explications, which may be seen in Wolf and Deyling, the preference is undoubtedly
due to the opinion of Hackspan, in his Not. Phil. on Matt. 13, 32. Deyling, Heumann, Fischer, Storr, Schlesner, Bolten and others, who by ἀδέσποτες τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ understand the vincula mortis, since λέει and κατείχασι are properly used of bonds, and this interpretation is quite agreeable to the context. In this sense, indeed, the word ἀδιν does not occur in the Classical writers, but must be referred to the number of those Greek words to which new and unusual significations, formed on the Hebrew usage, were attributed by the Alexandrian interpreters. For the Hebrew בֵּית הָעָלָה denotes pains; as in Is. 18, 8. Jer. 49, 24. where the Sept. has ἀδέσποτες. But this very Hebrew noun also signifies ropes, bonds; and this is the original and proper use of the word. Those interpreters, in the places where it has this signification, have expressed it sometimes by σχον-νία, often by ἀδέσποτες. See Ps. 119, 61. compared with Ps. 18, 5. also 116, 3. and 2 Sam. 22, 6. Now the Hebrews were accustomed to compare death with a hunter stretching out his net, and catching men. (See Ps. 91, 3.) This is the very image which seems to have place in the passages just cited, and in the present one. Peter, therefore, having reference to those passages of the Old Testament, had used the words צְרָה וּבַּעֲרֵב: but Luke, following the Sept. wrote ἀδέσποτες ἑαυτοῦ, at the same time, however, himself understanding vincula mortis. So also the Syriac translators took the word. Therefore, the terms κοράς, &c. ought to be rendered; "the bonds by which death held him bound being loosed," and are to be understood of the state of death, in which Christ remained for three days, as it were, held by bonds. (Kuin.)

In this interpretation, which is nearly that of the ancient Greek Commentators, I must acquiesce: and such seems to have been the one held by Wetstein, who illustrates the phrase by many examples from the Classical writers, of which the most important are the following: Liban. Or. 106 θ. θυμ-
mēn ἡμῖν ἡμίτωσιν ὁμός, & ὅρασιν θάνατον. Ælian. 
H. A., 12, 5. τοὺς τῶν ἁμίτων ἀνάσας δεσμῶν, & 7, 12. 
τὴν ἁμίτων ἀπολύσας. See Anthol. 3, 118. Oppian 
Pisc, 699. where the Scholiast explains: λέει τὴν 
αἰώνα. With the former part of the sentence I would 
compare Æschyl. Agam. 1830. ἐπελέασεν πλατάναι 
καθεύδαν ἡμῖν ὁμός, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρα 
καθαύδαν ἡμῖν ὁμός, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρα 
καθαύδαν ἡμῖν ὁμός, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρασιν θά

24. καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνάτον, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρα 
καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνάτον, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρα 
καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνάτον, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρα 
καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνάτον, & ὅρασιν θάνατον, & ὅρα

The words may be thus paraphrased: "Such a worshipper of God (τὸν ὅσιόν σου, ver. 27.) as was Jesus and the Messiah, 
also (ver. 31.), his hope reposed in God (who should 
recall him to life) could not deceive (ver. 27); so 
that the words of David, Ps. 16, 8. are applicable," 
προσωρώμεν, &c. (ver. 25.) Others explain the words 
thus: "for the prophecies of the Old Testament 
concerning the recall of Christ to life must have 
their fulfilment." See Ps. 16, 8. seqq. It must be 
observed that those who gain the victory in a con 
quest, are said, by the Greeks, κρατεῖν. See Perizon. 
on Ælian. V. A. 2, 4, 3. (Kuin.) Either, or indeed 
both these interpretations may be admitted.

25. The sentiments of Commentators on the sub 
ject of Ps. 16. are very various. Most are of opinion 
that the Messiah is there introduced as speaking, 
and as declaring his faith in God amidst the afflic 
tions with which he is oppressed; then at 4 & 5 
professing himself to be a Priest of Jehovah, and 
finally trusting that he shall be by God recalled to 
life, and his body be preserved from corruption. 
Others, however, contend that the fortunes of David 
are described in that Psalm; as Rosenmuller, in his 
Schol. in loc., and Ruperti. Those who adopt the 
former mode of interpretation, maintain that Peter, 
here, and Paul, at 13, 16., quote the words as a 
prophecy properly so called. But that the Psalm 
does not treat of the Messiah has been pretty plainly 
shown by the Commentators just mentioned. For 
this interpretation does not correspond to the notion 
of the Messiah entertained by the more ancient 
Jews, who thought he was to be a powerful King,
who should subdue all the enemies of the Jewish nation: and this very notion of Messiah was, undoubtedly, entertained after the time of David. In a much later age the Jews finally took up the notion that the Messiah was to be also a Prophet and a High Priest. (See the note on Joh. 1, 29.) And there were then among the wiser Jews some who thought that the Messiah, in order to expiate the sins of men, would die, yet would return to life. (See the note on Matt. 20, 28. Luke 23, 42.) Besides, many things occur in the Psalms which cannot, without resorting to strained interpretations, be understood of the Messiah. It should seem, then, that Peter and Paul accommodated the passage of Psalms, and applied it, in a sublimer sense, to Christ. It has been, moreover, enquired whether the Jews, in the time of Peter, referred the words of the Psalm to the Messiah? Those who espouse the affirmative, maintain that Peter wished to shew that what the Jews themselves supposed to be said of the Messiah had now attained its fulfilment. But to this it may be replied, that “if the Jews themselves had explained the Psalm of the Messiah, there would have been no occasion for Peter to show at large that these words were to be taken, in a sublimer sense, of the Messiah. Nor did the common people of that age believe that the Messiah would die. (See the note on Matt. 20, 28. Peter, therefore, who transferred the words of the Psalm to the Messiah (whom he declared to be Jesus, ver. 32.), did not follow the common mode of interpretation. Such, too, was the opinion of Schoettgen, Hor. Hebraicæ. “No one of the Jews (says he), as far as I know, has ever explained the 16th Psalm of the Messiah.” (Kuin.) True; but the learned Commentator ought not to have dissembled what Schoettgen adds: “But certainly of greater authority than all the Rabbins put together, is the inspired Apostle who, in ver. 29 seqq. plainly shows that David died, and saw corruption. And from
thence he draws the conclusion that these words are to be understood of another, namely, of Christ, since his auditors knew that he had risen again from the report of the guards, which had been spread throughout the city, and was still fresh in every one's memory, and now was added the testimony of the Holy Spirit, which hitherto they, who had the eyes of their understanding blinded by the veil of Moses, had not distinguished." It is plain, therefore, that Schoettgen adopted the opinion held by some great Theologians of the seventeenth century, as Grotius, and of the eighteenth, as Le Clerc, Lowth, Dath, Horsely, and others (and which is undoubtedly the true one); namely, that the Psalm has a double sense, one historical (of David), and the other mystical and allegorical (of Christ).

25. Δα βιὸ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτὸν, i. e. "for David says respecting him." The εἰς here, as often, is used for περὶ; of which signification many examples are adduced by Elsner and Kypke; as Diodor. Sic. 11, 50. εἰς υδάταν ἔτερον ὕ το παρὼν λέγειν. Pausan. 5, 22. τοιαύτῃ δὲ ἄερα ἤτε Πίνδαρος εἰς Θήβην τε καὶ εἰς Δία. So the Heb. 7Ν; as in Job. 42, 8. and Ez. 21, 33. That the formula λέγειν εἰς τινα is, in the New Testament, also employed to denote using words which may not properly refer to any thing, but admit of being accommodated to it is clear from Eph. 5, 32. where we have ἔγω δὲ λέγω εἰς χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and where it is manifest from the context that such is the sense. Peter, therefore, means to say that what, in the Psalm, was said of David, held good, in a sublimier sense, of Christ. (Kuin.) Dr. Doddridge supposes the Psalm to partly treat of David, and partly of Christ; and that the transition is at ver. 8. But this seems too hypothetical and artificial a mode of exposition.

25. προσωφαίμην τὸν κύριον ἐναπτὸν μου διὰ παντός. Most of the recent interpreters, as Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, render the προσωφαίμην by a present tense: but this seems too arbitrary an interpretation. I prefer
the rendering of our common version, in the Psalm, "I have set." It may, however, be best considered as an Aorist expressive of habit: "I have set, and do habitually set," &c. And in this light it has been considered by Heinrichs. The words may be thus paraphrased: "I do habitually keep in my memory, and bear in my mind, the benignant kindness of the Lord, who hath been my help." Compare the verse preceding.

25. ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν, for he is on my right hand (as my helper). It must be observed that this phrase is a forensic one, and alludes to the friends, παρακλήτω (see the note on Joh. 14, 16.) who stood at the right hand of any one when he was called to judgment. (See Ps. 109, 31.) For ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ, the Hebrew is, "I shall not trip." Now ἵνα is, in the Old Testament, often used of those who are brought into any peril; and it is not unfrequently synonymous with ἔπτω, to fall; so that the antecedent is put for the consequent, and it tropically denotes "to come to an end, succumb under calamity, be conquered by enemies; as in Ps. 13, 5. 38, 17. compared with 13. Ps. 46, 6. & 16, 8. In nearly the same manner is σαλευθῶ used, which is, indeed, properly employed of ships tossed about by winds or waves (from σαλὼς, which signifies the sea in motion); as in Moschopulus and Pollux, 1, 114: but it is from thence transferred to any motion or agitation, and is often used of earthquakes; (see Ps. 17, 9. Sept.), and Acts 4, 31. as Bos and Kypke in loc., Carpzov. on Heb. 12, 27., and Elsner on Acts 17, 13.) It is likewise applied to minds perturbed by fear, solicitude, &c.; as in 2 Thess. 2, 2. (where see Elsner), Judith 12, 15. ἐσαλεύθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, and 1 Macc. 6, 8. And in this sense, also, some Commentators think the present passage is to be taken. But the former interpretation seems more suitable both to the Psalm and to the context of the present passage. (Kuin.)

26. διὰ τοῦτο ἐφησάκην ἡ καρδία μου, &c. For ἡ καρδία the Hebrew has רבי, my glory, ἡ δόξα μου, in
the Septuagint. The Vulgate and Arabic Versions have יִּכְבוֹר μου, and the authors of those Versions seem to have read לֹׁשָׂנִי; for I cannot assent to Bucer and Michaelis, that the tongue is called כְּבוֹר, as being the noblest part of the body, and that in which man is especially superior to the brutes. In the passage they adduce in support of that signification (namely Ps. 30, 13. 118, 2.) the word כְּבוֹר may very well be rendered animus*, as in many places. So Gen. 49, 6. Ps. 4, 3. 7, 6. 57, 9. This signification may therefore be assigned to כְּבוֹר in the present passage. See Michaelis, Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. 1199 & 1200. But in Ps. 16, 9. the words לֵבר, my heart, לִבְּנֵר, my mind, and לֹּפַי, my body, (so Phil. 1, 20. σώμα), have, as often, the force of a pronoun, and are to be expressed by, I rejoice, I exult, I shall dwell or rest secure. Now כּּוָר properly denotes rest, especially nocturnal, namely sleep; also resting, staying, and sojourning: wherefore the last words of the Psalm may be rendered either, “I shall dwell safe from all evil,” or, “I shall sleep securely, safe from all peril,” like the Heb. נֹשָׂזֶל in Ps. 4, 9. The last words, however, “my body shall rest securely,” must here be otherwise interpreted. For since Peter has accommodated them to Jesus the Messiah, the recalled to life, we

* Schoettgen illustrates this sense of כְּבוֹר from the following parallelism of Gen. 49, 6 :


In consilium eorum | ne veniat | anima mea.
In conventu eorum | ne sola sit | gloria mea.

Here Schoettgen observes that the two members of this sentence are synonymous, and therefore that gloria and anima mean the same thing. He then cites an eminent Jewish Commentator, who, remarking on the synonymy of כְּבוֹר and נבשת, observes that one thing is, after the manner of the Prophets, made two of (which exactly corresponds to our term parallelism; so that it plainly appears the learned Commentator was well aware of that principle, which has been, though on insufficient grounds, claimed as a discovery of modern times); and then proceeds to illustrate this by several other passages of Scripture.
must, in his discourse, lay a stress on σῶμα, body, as opposed to mind. Compare ver. 27 & 31.

κατασκευασμένον, like the Heb. נַשׁ [from which it is derived. Edit.] signifies to dwell, abide; also rest: whence the Sept. at Ex. 17, 23., render it by ἀναπάυεσθαι, and Symmachus, on Ex. 24, 6., by ἐπαναπάυετον. Therefore the words καὶ ἡ σῶμα, &c. are to be rendered, “My body shall rest safe and uninjured, free from putrefaction.” (Compare 27 & 31.) The phrase ἐπ’ ἐλπίδα answers to the Heb. ללמוד, and denotes securely; as in Prov. 1, 33. ὁ δὲ ἐμὸν ἀκών κατασκευάσει ἐπ’ ἐλπίδα, and Ps. 4, 10., Judg. 18, 7., Is. 32, 9. (Kuin.) Schoettgen explains ἐπ’ ἐλπίδα, by secure, or sub conditione spei, quam habeo de resurrectione; and refers to Rom. 8, 21. One may here compare a beautiful passage of Pindar, Frag. incert. 3. γλυκεία οἱ καρδίαν ἀτιτάλλοισα γηροτρόφοι ἑυαρεί ἐλπίς, ἡ μάλιστα θνατῶν πολύστροφοι γνωμαν κυβερνά.

27. ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ἄνω. Ἡδς answers to the Hebr. לֵאכָשׁ, Orcus, the subterranean seat of the impious spirits. See the note on Matt. 16, 18., Luke 16, 23. Ἐν is here, as often, for ἐν. See the note on Matt. 1, 9. & 35, 21., Joh. 1, 18. 9, 7. 20, 7. Moreover εἰς ἄνω is put for εἰς ἄνω ὅκου, or τίσιν. The same ellipsis is found in Xenoph. Οἰκον. s. fin. and Diodor. Sic. 162 ο. καταβηχαί εἰς ἄνω. Many more examples may be seen in Raphel’s Obs. Xen. and Munthe on this passage.

27. Οὐδὲ δῶσεις, permit. Αἰδοναί, like the Hebr. שָׂנָא, denotes not only a physical, but moral giving. See Krebs, and the note on Mark 10, 26. Τὸν ὅσιον σου, thy worshipper, the body of thy worshipper. (See ver. 31.) Ἡδόν, like the Heb. הָנָא, signifies to feel, experience. (See Ps. 34, 13. 19, 49. 116, 5. and the Sept. there.) And ἡδόν διαφθοράς signifies to be corrupted, putrefied; as ἡδόν τὸν βάγατον is equivalent to experience death. (On this manner of speaking see the note on Luke 2, 26.) The Hebr. לָאכָשׁ, in Ps. 16, 10. is rendered by the Sept. διαφθορά, and that Peter also (who was speaking in Syro-Chaldee) ap-
plied this notion to the word, is clear from the argument pursued by him; which notion, however, was only assigned to the word in a later age; for it nowhere occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures. The sense therefore of the words is: “Thou shalt recall me to life.” There is, however, in the words of Ps. 16, 10. which Peter referred to Christ, another sense. For the Heb. נְזָעַי, which corresponds to ἐγκαταλίθεν, has united with it a ה, and denotes to commit, deliver; as in Ps. 49, 11: and thus the words נְזָעַי יִשָּׁכֵל signify, “Thou shalt not deliver me to the grave.” (Compare 118, 18.) For יִשָּׁכֵל and יִשָּׁכֵל are very frequently put in the place of a pronoun.

Instead of יִשָּׁכֵל, thy worshipper, Fischer (Prol. 184 seqq.), Rupert, Rosenmuller, and others, would read the plural יִשָּׁכוֹל, by which the words would obtain a plural force, and signify, “Thy worshippers, such as myself.” But the singular is supported by the Masorites, and all the antient Versions and best MSS. For this and other reasons it is better to retain, with most Critics, the common reading. The word יֶשֶׁךְ, (from יָשֶׁךְ or יָשָׁכֵל, to descend, to be immersed,) which occurs in the other member, and is by the Sept. expressed by διαθόρα, properly denotes a low place, hence a ditch; then, like the Heb. רָע, a grave; and finally orcus, or the shades below; as in Ps. 30, 4 & 49, 10. Hence it also signifies death and destruction; as in Ps. 55, 24. 108, 4., Job 33, 18. Now, it must be observed, at Ps. 16, 10. there is (after the Hebrew manner) the same sentiment expressed twice. In the former member mention is made of יִשָּׁכֵל. The parallelism of members therefore requires that in the other member יֶשֶׁךְ be explained of the sepulchre, orcus, shades below. The sense therefore is this: “Thou shalt grant me a longer use of life; I shall not succumb to my enemies. (Kuin.) See the long and excellent annotation of Whitby on these two verses.

28. ἐγκαταλίθεσας μοι ἐδόθης ᾿άνω — σου. The Hebr. is נְזָעַי יִשָּׁכֵל נְזָעַי יִשָּׁכֵל, “thou teachest the way of life,”
i.e. "thou showest me the way by which I may escape the perils of life;" "thou bringest me back from the gate of the grave." See Ps. 38, 4. 71, 20. Thus in Prov. 7, 27. the \textit{via inferni} are those which lead to the shades below. But וֹדֵי or וֹדֵי often denotes felicity (see Ps. 36, 10. 42, 9., Hos. 6, 2., Prov. 15, 24.) in imitation of which the writers of the New Testament so use זָרִי (see Luke 12, 15., 1 Pet. 3, 18.): and this interpretation, on account of the parallelism of members, is to be preferred to the former. The sense of the passage seems to be this: I shall carry off the victory from my enemies, freed from the calamities with which I am now oppressed. I shall reign in happiness." Now, in conformity to the purpose of Peter, the words must be thus explained: "Thou restorest life to me; thou raisest me from the dead."

28. πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου. The Hebrew is, סְלַשָּׁהְקָה יַעַנְתִּי, a saturation of joy, i.e. joy the most exalted before thy face. Then follows, "in thy right-hand is joy perpetual." The words יַעַנְתִּי are explained: "In thy worship, thy religion (since pious men are said to walk before God,) or in thy temple. But since there follows יְהֵסֶכְלִי, joy is on thy right-hand, the former יַעַנְתִּי is simply to be rendered \textit{apud te}; so that this formula and that which follows, יְהֵסֶכְלִי, signify the same thing, and the sense is: "Thou art the author and giver of joy, and of felicity supreme and perpetual." Peter, however, mindful of the words of Jesus (Joh. 17, 5. compare inf. ver. 34.) meant the words to be understood thus: "Recalled to life, I shall with thee enjoy happiness supreme." (Kuin.)

29. Peter now proceeds to comment upon the Psalm, and shows that a sublimer sense is inherent in the words; which being admitted, they are by no means to be referred to David, but to Christ. The passage may be thus paraphrased: "Permit me freely to address you on the Patriarch David. Although David was a man of eminent piety (δοξα), and whom
you highly admire, yet I can freely maintain, what you will not deny, that he is dead and buried, and his body has experienced putrefaction." Compare 27, 31. 13, 37. These words, therefore, of the Psalm, which may also very well be understood of the hope of a resurrection after a short abode in the sepulchre, are to be referred, if this be admitted, not to David, but to Jesus, who by his resurrection has evinced himself to be the Messiah. (See 13, 35.) Ἐξω is for ἔστω. So Virg. Ἀν. 2, 157. Fas mihi Grajorum sacra resolvere jura. Joseph. Ant. 11, 5, 5. de Esdrâ, ὃ συνέβη μετὰ τὴν παρὰ τῷ λαῷ δόξαν γηραιώδες τελευτάσαι τὸν βίον, καὶ ταφάναι μετὰ πολλῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. Hieros. Chaggiga, fol. 78, 1, R. Jose, f. R. Ben. dixit: David mortuus est Pentecoste; et omnis Israel illum planxerunt, et sacrificia sua obtulerunt postero die. 1 Reg. 2, 10. Cūm alia sepulcra extra urbem essent, monumentum Davidis et familiae ejus in ipsâ urbe est, et hodiernum monstratur, teste Maundrello, p. 75, 76. Ruth R. 1, 17. David mortuus est die Pentecostes, quæ incidebat in Sabbatum.

29. Μετὰ παραθησίας, freely. So Diodor. Sic. 345 b. τὴν συμβουλιαν ἐκτίθεσθαι μετὰ τῆς παραθησίας and Joh. 7, 13. David, it must be observed, is called patriarch, as being founder of the royal family of the Jews. Thus Tertullian calls Saturn the Patriarch of the Gods. Ἐσάφη, died and was buried, and his flesh is corrupted, all which is included in the word. [This is a sort of popular synecdoche. Edit.] Τὸ μνῆμα ἐν ἡμῖν, with us; i. e. in the city. It was a privilege granted solely to the royal family to be buried, not like other people, without, but within the city. (Kuin.)

30—32. That Peter only applied, or accommodated the Psalm, in a sublimier sense, to Christ, and thus argued according to the mode then pursued among the Jewish doctors, is apparent from this, namely, that the promise which he here represents David as having received (i. e. that the Messiah...
should be his successor) David had not received. (See the note on ver. 25.) But the Jews referred to the Messiah those passages of the Old Testament, to which Peter alludes; as 2 Sam. 7, 12. Ps. 89, 5. 192, 11.

30. Προφήτης οὐν ἐστόχαιον, &c. Προφήτης here evidently signifies, in its proper sense, one who predicts future events; and it is applied to David, since in that age the Jews were wont to explain many of the Psalms of David as having reference to what should befall the Messiah. This interpretation is confirmed by the words following, καὶ εἰδὼς, &c. which plainly show why he is called a prophet. Προφήταις is to be joined with ἐκάλυπτε, and simply signifies predicted, προφήτευσε. But it must be observed that this is a popular mode of expression for, “he might be supposed to have predicted of the resurrection of the Messiah” (namely, in Ps. 16). For words which signify to be, or to do, are sometimes used for an opinion of the act, and are to be understood φανομεναι. See Glass Phil. 229. and the note on Joh. 11, 50. Matth. 26, 12. So Matth. 15, 7. καὶ εἰδὼς προφήτευσε ἐπὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαίας, where see the note. The words ἕτε κατελείψῃ are to be joined with the preceding: q. d. “He prophesied of the resurrection of the Messiah, that his soul was not left in the shades below, nor did his body suffer putrefaction.” The sense, therefore, of the words may be thus expressed: “You will readily grant that the words of Ps. 16. are rightly referred to the Messiah, are to be explained, in a sublimer sense, of him. For David did not return to life, and you yourselves maintain that he, having received the promise that from his posterity the Messiah should arise (see 2 Sam. 7, 12.), did, in the Psalms also, prophecy of the Messiah and his fortunes.” But to proceed to an examination of the rest of the words; καὶ εἰδὼς signifies, “and had known,” namely, taught of God by Nathan. See 2 Sam. 7, 12—16. compared with Ps. 182—11.

30. “Ωτί ὁρκὸν ὁμοσέν αὐτῷ Ἰσραὴλ. When God is said,
in Scripture, to have sworn, it is thereby declared that God is fixed in purpose and unchangeable. (See Hebr. 2, 11. 6, 15 & 17.) Therefore the sense of the word is, "sanctissimè promisit." Ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς οὐράνου αὐτοῦ. In Ps. 132, 11., to which Peter has especial reference, we have κατὰ σάρκα τῆς καθισματος σου., which is rendered by the Sept. ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς καθισματος σου. But ὤφις in the Sept. answers to the Hebr. אָ֫בִ֖ד at Job. 38, 8. and אָ֫בִ֖ד in Exod. 12, 11., so that καρποῦ τῆς οὐράνου may probably signify the fruit of the loins. These words, however, when used of the procreation of children, are interchanged, and the present phrase, according to the Hebrew idiom, signifies "from his posterity."

Κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν, &c. is usually rendered, "that the Messiah, according to his human nature, should be born, and should possess his kingdom." It is urged that ἀναστήσειν, like ἐγεῖσαι, is frequently used of nativity. See Matt. 22, 24. 2 Sam. 7, 12. But these very words are omitted in A. C. D. **Barb. 1. Ed. Syr. Erp. Copt. Æth. Arm. Vulg. Æth. Cyr. Iren. Victorin. Fulg. and in other books, we have, after θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χριστοῦ κατὰ σάρκα. The common reading is defended by De Dieu, Wolf, Heuman, and others: but has been, with reason, rejected by Bengel, Mill, Schott, Griesbach, and others; since the very variety of reading betrays a gloss. The words are not to be found in Ps. 139, nor in the parallel passage of 2 Sam. 7, 12. and Ps. 89, 5. and by omitting the words the reading is rendered more difficult; which points to the real origin of the common reading. On omitting the words we must subjoin τίνα at καθίσαι, i.e. a successor to the kingdom, namely, Christ. Compare ver. 31. The words γ' ψυχῆ αὐτοῦ are also omitted in many good MSS., with the approbation of Bengel, Mill, and Griesbach, and seem to have been brought in from ver. 27. by the scribes, who also for κατελείφθη wrote ἐγκατελείφθη; since that very verb is found in ver. 27. (Kuin.)
Of ἐρρίδων Wetstein adduces several examples; as Aristid. in Rom. 227. Plut. 2, 586 b. Anthol. 4, 18 seq. & 23, 5. and he adds, “David indeed spoke of himself, but he spoke just as if he had foreseen what had now happened.” (See the note on Matth. 1, 21.)

32. τοῦτον τῷ Ἰσχώρῳ. Heinrichs, who has rightly seen that after τοῦτον must be supplied Χριστὸν ἐνα, remarks, that τοῦτον may be taken for the predicate, and Ἰσχώρῳ the subject, and be emphatically.

33. τῇ δὲ εἰσί Ὄν τῷ Θεῷ ὑπαθηλείς, therefore raised to the right hand of God, i.e. to the height of dignity and majesty, declared and constituted Lord and Messiah (namely, by his resurrection and return to Heaven). See ver. 36. Phil. 2, 9. seq. On ὑπαθηλείς see the note on Joh. 8, 28. Matt. 11, 23. It must be observed, that the expression right hand of God was by the Hebrews used to denote the divine power. See Glass. Phil. 987.

Τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν λαβών—τοῦτο. At τοῦτο subaud πρεμύμα. Compare Joh. 14, 16 & 26, 15, 26. It was moreover a persuasion of the Jews, that by the will and providence of the Messiah, watching over the welfare of his people, great things had already been worked, and that by his inspirations the prophets had uttered their oracles. See Knapp’s Opusc. p. 26.

34. λέγει αυτός. Those interpreters who refer Ps. 110 to David, and suppose that Peter only accommodated the words, acknowledge that David was not the author of the Psalm, but maintain that Christ and Peter followed the common opinion of their countrymen. Of the same sentiment are also many of those who interpret the Psalm of the Messiah, since this notion of Messiah was introduced after the death of David. To this latter opinion I do not hesitate to accede. (Kuin.) For my own part, I can approve of neither, since both are equally founded on a dangerous principle, namely, of our Lord and the Apostle knowingly tolerating error, and availing themselves of it, to strengthen their cause, a principle so highly objectionable as to be calculated to
destroy all reliance on the truth of any hypothesis which involves it.

Kuinocel remarks that ὄποιοδιον is a word used by the Alexandrian Interpreters, and some later Greek writer; as Athen. 192 ε. and he refers to Sturz de Dialecto Macedonicâ, 199. and his note on Matth. 5, 35.*

36, 37. The construction is this: ὅτι τοῦτον τῶν Ἰησοῦν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν κύριον καὶ Χριστόν. The pronoun αὐτὸν is redundant, by a Hebraism [or rather an idiom extending to the idiomatic or popular use in most languages. Edit.] ἐποίησεν, appointed him, declared him appointed, by his resurrection and return to Heaven. On this sense of τοιείν see the note on Mark 8, 14. Joh. 6, 15. (Kuin.) On κύριον ἐποίησε Wetstein cites Justin. 10, 1. Darium pater regem vivus fecit. Plin. Traj. 5. Herodot. 4, 4, 1. ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας ἢ ἀρχαντας ἔδει τοιείν. And on the phrase ἀσφαλῶς γινοσκέτω he cites Eu- nap. Proor. εἶδοτε ἀσφαλῶς.

37. ἀκούσαντες, scil. τοῦτο (on which ellipsis see Bos. 490. Sch.), namely, that not only an innocent person, but even the Messiah himself, had been put to death. Κατενώγησαν τῇ κακίᾳ, “were stung with sorrow and remorse.” Now κατανόησανθαι, which properly signifies to be pricked down, or through, figuratively denotes extreme grief (as in Gen. 34, 7 where the Hebrew is בַּעַרְרָה), and is especially used of speeches which violently affect the mind, or strike

it with sorrow. So Sir. 14, 1. καὶ οὐ κατενύγη ἐν λύπῃ ἀμαρτίων. It also denotes the stupor and dejection which attends grief, and accompanies, or succeeds, other violent emotions. So Sir. 12, 12. 20, 21. καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει αὐτοῦ οὐ κατενυγήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει αὐτοῦ οὐ κατενυγήσεται. Ὁ 47, 21. κατενύγην ἐπὶ τῇ ἁφοςύνῃ σου. Susanna. 11. καὶ ἦσαν ἀμφότεροι κατανευγμένοι περὶ αὐτῆς in all which passages it denotes stupefaction; but, by another and yet more vehement effect of grief, it signifies to be dumb or silent; as in Ps. 4, 5. ἐπὶ ταῖς κοίταις υμῶν κατανύγητε and Levit. 10, 3. κατανύχη Ἄαρῶν, where the Hebr. is בָּלָה [whence our dumb, which comes immediately from the Ang.-Sax. ðæman, to obstruct, to dam. Edit.] and in Dan. 10, 15. it answers to the Hebr. בָּלָה, obmutescere. So Suidas and Hesychius. (Kuin.) See more examples in Kypke. Wetstein, among other passages, produces Plaut. Cor pungit meum. Themist. 2. p. 38. ἐνεξε τὴν διάνοιαν. Simpl. Præf. ad Epitext. αἰς τοὺς μὴ πάντας νενεκραμένους νύκτεβαι ἐκ τῶν λόγων. I add Liban. ap. Wolf. Bell. Gr. 7, 202. τούτως κεντούμαι τὴν ψυχήν.

The following words, τί ποιήσομεν, are a popular formula expressive of great concern at something which cannot be undone, but of which the sin needs to be expiated.

38. μετανοήσατε καὶ βαπτίσθητω, &c. The verb μετανοεῖν includes both repentance and reformation, especially by an abandonment of the prejudices which had hitherto hindered them from acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah. Βαπτίζονται οἱ τῶν ὀνόματι Ι. Χ. is equivalent to βαπτίζονται εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in Acts 19, 5. which may be explained, “to solemnly profess to be a follower of Jesus, and to bind oneself to embrace his doctrine.” See the note on Matth. 28, 19.) By the δῶρα τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος (since Peter manifestly has reference to the before-mentioned passage of Joel, ver. 17) are signified the effects of divine grace, a full and accurate knowledge of divine things, a fervent and constant striving
after holiness, a most ardent desire to profess and propagate the doctrine of Christ. See the note on 1, 8. 2, 4 & 14. (Kuin.)

39. ὕμων γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελλία, to you belongs the promise. ὕμων is for ὕμων; an idiom illustrated from Classical authors by Kypke. See the note on Mark 2, 18. By ἡ ἐπαγγελλία some Commentators understand the promise of sending the Messiah. But since there just before preceded λήφθη τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἅγιου πνεύματος, and since there is here a reference to Joel 3, 1. we must undoubtedly understand, "the promise of sending the spirit."

39. Καὶ πάσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, and to all, even the most remote. The majority of Commentators, following the authority of Theophylact, maintain that by these words are meant the Gentiles, and they subaud χάραν ὁδόν, (see Bos Ell. Schaff. 563.) taking εἰς μακρὰν χάραν for μακρὰ χάρης. They observe that the Gentiles were by the Hebrews termed remote, ὄρη, as removed from the Jewish religion, and therefore withdrawn from the Divine benefits (compare (Acts 6, 15, 10, 9.); and they maintain that Peter here, and Paul in Eph. 2, 18. and Rom. 9, 24. followed this mode of speaking. To this however it has been objected by others, that Peter was then ignorant that the benefits of the Messiah belonged to the Gentiles also (see Acts 10.); and that when Peter afterwards, being better instructed, had preached to the Gentiles the doctrines of Christ, the Jerusalemite Christians were greatly offended thereat. (Compare 11, 2.) They therefore think the words τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν are to be interpreted of late posterity, since μακρὰν is also used of time; as in Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 21. and in numerous passages cited by Wetstein. [But these are all only examples of εἰς εἰς μακρὰν; which is quite another idiom. Edit.] Others refer the words to the dispersed Jews; and in support of this opinion quote Eph. 9, 20. For my own part, I must accede to the opinion that the Gentiles are meant [this mode of interpretation, which seems
the true one, is supported by the authority of Cæcumenius. Edit.]: though, at the same time, I think by them must be understood Gentiles who should pass over to the Jewish religion. For the Jews held the opinion that those of the Gentiles who should embrace the Jewish religion would be citizens of the Messiah’s kingdom. See the note on Matt. 3, 2. 8, 11. 20, 18. To these proselytes then, who should pass over to the Jewish religion, Peter, at that time, thought would extend the benefits of Christ. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by Acts 3, 25. where Peter says, ὑμεῖς ἐστε νῦν τῆς διαθήκης, “to you belong the promise of the covenant given to Abraham; by your posterity shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. For your benefit especially hath God caused the Messiah to appear. (Kuin.)

39. ὁσοις ἂν—ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, whomsoever the Lord our God, by the doctrine imparted for the profession of the religion of Christ, and the felicity conjoined with that profession, shall call upon, cause to be brought over, (see Joh. 6, 44.) προσκαλέστηκαί. See Koppe on Gal. 1, 6., Rom. 9, 24., and Pott’s Exc. 2. on Epist. Petr. p. 279 seqq.

40. ἐτέρως τε λόγοις—ταύτης. By σώθητε is meant, “suffer them to be liberated, or snatched from perdition.” See Raphael’s Obs. Herodo., Gataker’s Ado. Posth. 761., and Suicer’s Thesaurus in voce. [Perhaps σωθεναι may here denote, to be put into the way of salvation. See the luminous statement of the various senses of this word, quoted from Dr. Maltby in vol. I. p. 9. of this work. Edit.] Γένοι, race, the men then living. See the note on Matt. 11, 16, 23, 36. Σκολίων properly denotes what is crooked, oblique (so Sap. 13, 13. ξύλων σκολίων, and 16, 15. where the word is used of serpents), whence the τὰ σκολιὰ and εὐθεῖα are opposed in Luke 9, 5., and σκολιὸς is especially used of a curved and winding path; as in Prov. 2, 15. though there figuratively. Hence it is metaphorically applied to what is perverse, sinful, wicked, &c.; as in Sap. 1, 3, σκολιοί
γὰρ λογισμὸι χρημάτων ἀπὸ Θεοῦ. Γενεὰ σκολιὰ is a term here used in imitation of Deut. 32, 5. γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη, where the Hebrew is υψη. (Kuin.) With the expression διαμαρτύρετο I would compare that of Thucyd. 6, 80, 6. δειμένα καὶ μαρτυρομέθα.

41. Ὡς, it must be observed, is a particle of transition. Ἀσμένοις is omitted by some antient MSS. and Versions, and is supposed by Mill to have crept into the text from a marginal scholium. But it has been rightly observed by Wolf, Krebs, Loesner, and others, that it is more probable that the scribes should have omitted the word, either through carelessness, or purposely, as being not very necessary. But indeed it often accompanies δέχεσθαι and ἀποδέχεσθαι, as is evident from the numerous examples adduced by Wetstein, Kypke, Krebs, Munthe, and Loesner. Ἄποδέχεσθαι, as applied to things, denotes to receive, assent to, approve, admit, following the authority of &c. So Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 8. οἱ ἀποδέχεσθαι ἀπερ αὐτῶ ἔδοκεν. Eurip. Helen. 888. ἢν δὲ δὴ νῦν μὴ ἀποδέχηται λόγους. See Kypke in loc., Taylor on Lys. 423. and Irmisch on Herodian 1, 766.

41. Ἐβαπτίσθησαν. In the early ages of Christianity, those who acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah were received, by this solemn rite, into the Christian Church; so that a fuller instruction did not precede, but follow baptism. Προσετέθησαν, scil. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. (Compare ver. 46.) Raphael, Elsner, and Bos, render this adjunxerat sese; and thus, as (observes Kypke) προσετέθησαν would have reference to ἀφίστασθαι in 1 Tim. 6, 5.: and the words are found opposed in Plut. 2, 855., and Joseph. Ant. 7, 1., and Vit. p. 1005. But, as Kuinoel remarks, the word almost always occurs in the middle voice. He would therefore render it adjunxerunt.

41. ὅμοι, by a mode of speaking common to almost all languages, signifies man. So the Hebrew וָאָדָם, in Gen. 46, 27., and וָאָדָם infra ver. 48. 8, 23. 7, 15. 27, 37. Rom. 2, 9. Lev. 17, 9., where the He-
brew is ὁμίλος. In this sense it is also found in the best Classical writers, both Greek and Latin, of which examples are produced by Raphel, Kypke, and Wetstein; as Eurip. Hel. 52. and Andr. 611. Aristoph. Nub. 49. Soph. Aj. 154. Æschyl. &c. 972. Virg. Æn. 11, 24 and 371. See Cuper's Obs. 1, 20. and Gataker on Anton. 5, 37. With respect to the fact, Elsner compares a similar one related of Pythagoras by Porphyry, Vit. P. p. 25. οὕτως δὲ πάντας εἰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπέτρεψεν, ὡστε μιᾷ μόνῳ ἀκρόασε, ὡς φησὶ Νυκίμαχος, ἣν ἐτιθᾶς τῆς Ἰταλίας πεποίησεν, πλέον ὁ δισχίλιος ἐλεύθερον τὸν λόγον. There seems reason to think that such like accounts in Jamblichus, Philostratus, and others, were expressly intended to injure Christianity by invidious comparisons. See Doddr.

42. Having related that the number of Disciples had increased to three thousand, Luke takes occasion to give some information on the institutes of the primitive Church. (See 4, 32 seqq.) On προσκεκτερόντες see the note on 1, 14. The rest of the words of this verse have been variously interpreted by Commentators. Κοινωνία is by some explained societas, consuetudo; and Heuman and Barkey translate, "adhærebant societati." But Wolf, Rosenmuller, Thaleman, Reichard, and Schott refer koinonia to the Apostles, and render: "They followed the society of the Apostles, and were familiarly conversant with them." Mosheim, in his Com. de rebus Christianor., Hansen, Heinrichs, and others, by koinonia understand a communication of goods, beneficence, alms: a signification frequent in the New Testament; as Rom. 15, 26. Hebr. 13, 16. 2 Cor. 8, 4, 9, 13. 1 Tim. 6, 18. Others, taking the kal for ἱγουν, sive (see Græv. on Hesiod, Opusc. 328. and Dorville, Misc. Obs. 9, 108.), assign to the words the following sense: "They persevered in hearing the doctrine of the Apostles, and in communion, namely, by breaking of bread and prayers." Others, following the Vulgate, join koinonia with the following words, καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἀγίου, by an hendiadis (as
in Acts 23, 6. Eph. 2, 3. Hom. II. γ. 101. δάνατος καὶ μοίρα. And Od. i. 61. Acts 14, 14. ταύρος καὶ ατρέμματα; and they take καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσει του ἄρτου, for καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ κλάσεως του ἄρτου, meaning a common meal. But, as Wolf ably remarks, the figure hendiadis cannot here have place, because καὶ must be repeated four times; whereas it elsewhere only occurs once, when there is an hendiadis. Indeed I would accede to the opinion of those who explain κοινωνία of the communication of goods and liberality towards the poor. Nor is it any hindrance to this interpretation that ver. 44 & seqq. treat of beneficence, nay it is rather a confirmation of it; for Luke there means to more fully explain what he had expressed in few and obscure words at ver. 42. Hence also, in 46., he again makes mention of the ἄρτοκλασία, and distinctly describes it. But the words καὶ τῇ κλάσει του ἄρτου have also been variously interpreted. The phrase κλάσει του ἄρτου, and κλάσεις του ἄρτου, in the New Testament, are not only used to denote breaking of bread, breaking it to pieces, and giving it to others, (see Is. 58, 7. Jer. 16, 6. Luke 24, 30 & 86. Matt. 14, 19.,) but are likewise so used as to denote the meal itself, and the common partaking of the food. Hence also κλάσει του ἄρτου is used of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor. 10, 16. Now here by κλάσει του ἄρτου not a few Commentators, as Er. Schmid, Beza, and others cited by Heuman, understand a common meal; which interpretation may be proved to be false from this, namely, that we find δίδαξεν and προσευχαὶ associated, and thus are enumerated rather the parts of Divine worship in the assembly of Jerusalem. The Syriac translator took the phrase κλάσεις του ἄρτου of the Lord’s Supper, and ἄρτος, which he has elsewhere rendered Λάμα, (as in Acts 20, 7.,) he has here expressed by Eucharist. This mode of interpretation had been adopted by some Fathers (see Suic. Obs. Sacr. 130. and Thes. T, 2. p. 105), and many recent interpreters, as Heuman, Lightfoot, Suicer, Schoett-
gen, and Wolf. But in ver. 46. the subject treated of is plainly common meals, nor is there any sufficient reason why the words κλαύντες ἄρτοι should there be taken in any other sense than the κλαύσις τοῦ ἄρτου in this passage. I therefore do not hesitate to assent to Limborch, Mosheim, Barkey, Hansen, and others, who take the expression here, and at Acts 20, 7. to denote common sacred meals, called ἀγαρε, to which the richer Christians contributed, for the use and relief of the poorer brethren, and which used to precede the celebration of the Lord's Supper. See 1 Cor. 11, 16 seqq. (Kuin.) In this last view of the subject I must acquiesce. Doddridge embraces the opinion of Casaubon, Grotius, and Wolf, that a common meal is meant.

48. ἐγένετο δὲ πάσης ψυχῆς φόβος. By the πάσης ψυχῆς is meant the body of believers, the ἰδίς καὶς (compare ver. 47.); and by the fear here mentioned must be understood a religious fear, partaking much of reverence and admiration, which indeed are kindred feelings: "They no longer (says Ὅcumenius) despised the Apostles, as vulgar persons, but, by the power of their eloquence in describing the great and precious promises of which those of the Jewish nation who should embrace Christianity might be made partakers, their feelings were interested; not to mention the signs and wonders which these persons had witnessed." Examples of this sense of φόβος are adduced by Kuinoel from Luke 1, 65. 7, 16. (See the note on Mark 4, 41.) The construction of the sentence is, as Wetstein observes, Hebrew, and the sense is nearly the same with that of Acts 3, 10. ἐπλήθησαν θάμβους καὶ ἐκπάθειας. Kuinoel thinks that the following τε denotes for, because. But this seems improbable.

44. πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεοῦντες ἴσσαν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. There has been some difference of opinion as to the sense of ἴσσαν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, which Lightfoot, Wolf, and some others, render, "were collected together (namely, for prayer) in the same place:" and since it is not
likely that 3120 persons could meet in the same house, and since in ver. 47. we have καὶ ὁμονομαζόμενοι, they think that the Church at Jerusalem was divided into many lesser bodies, or families, each of which had its religious meetings, and that this is what is here meant. Kuinoel, however, accounts this mode of exposition harsh. Dr. Whitby would understand it of communion of action, and refers to Ezr. 4, 3. Ps. 49, 2. Is. 66, 17. Jer. 6, 12. Most recent Commentators, as Pearce, Heumann, and Kuinoel, adopt the interpretation of Theophylact, who takes ἐν τῷ ἀμφότερον perfect unanimity and concord. This (say they) is confirmed by a similar passage of 4, 32. and by the usage of the Alexandrian interpreters; as in Ps. 34, 4. And so Thucyd., 1, 79. But, after all, perhaps the first mentioned mode of explanation may deserve the preference, especially on account of the very same expression, with the verb, having occurred at ver 1. of this Chapter, which determines it to mean meeting for religious worship. Whether these meetings were confined to one place is not said; though we may conceive that they kept as much together as possible. As to the objection of Whitby and others, that they could not all meet at one place, it seems of little force, since one cannot suppose that it would be possible or necessary for all to meet together at the same place. Even if the same day were adhered to, yet, in the course of it, so many successive meetings might be held as would embrace all who had it in their power to attend public worship. This passage seems to have been had in view by Porphyry de Vit. Pyth. p. 25. (cited by Wolf) μηκέτι οίκα δ' ἀποστήματοι, ἀλλ' ὁμοίως σὺν παισι καὶ γυναιξιν ὄμοιοι τι παμέγειδες ἵδρυσαμένους πολίσας τὴν πρὸς πᾶντων ἐπικλήθειται μεγάλην Ἑλλάδα ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ.

44. καὶ εἶχεν ἀπαντᾶ τοιῶν, subauda κτήματα. "All (says Tertullian) except wives. A foolish observation, enough, for a Father of the Church, since wives are not κτήματα, and could not be supposed to
be included. It is of more consequence, however, to determine how far this community of goods extended; and here, upon the whole, I am inclined to accede to the opinion of Whitby, Wolf, Heuman, Kuinoel, and Heinrichs (and, as it seems, Wetstein), that the words are not to be too much pressed, not to be interpreted of an absolute community of goods, since it does not follow because the richer Christians, for the purpose of relieving the necessities of their poorer brethren, sold part of their goods, that they gave up all, and had no property in their own hands, and could not afterwards sell it. That this power of sale was left them, and was voluntary, is clear from the story of Ananias and Sapphira, Acts 5, 4. Thus, also, when we read in Acts 4, 32. "nor did any one say that aught of his goods was his own, but all things were common to them," the words plainly indicate that only the use of the possessions was common, not the possessions themselves. "It clearly appears (says Kuinoel) that there were those among the Christians who had property, and kept it. Thus in 12, 12. mention is made of one Maria, who had houses of her own at Jerusalem. Nor do we find in the Epistles any vestige of there having been a community of property in the rest of the Christian societies. Nay, we find that there were rich and poor. By the admonition of the Apostles, money, indeed, was collected for the use of the poor (see 1 Cor. 16, 1.), and contributed on the Lord's day. They therefore had retained their possessions. Moreover, in 1 Thess. 4, 11., the Apostle exhorts the Christians to provide for their support by the labour of their hands; and in 2 Thess. 3, 7 & 12. he urges this admonition by proposing his own example. See also 1 Ep. 4, 28. Acts 9, 36. 11, 29. Thus the words καὶ εἶχων ἄπαντα κοινὰ are to be taken in a popular sense, and in nearly the same manner as the old adage, πάντα κοινὰ τῶν φίλων. See Cic. de Off. 1, 16. Senec. de benefici. 7, 12. Quidquid habet amicus commune nobis, sed
illius proprium est qui tenet, uti illo nolente, non possum. (See the note on 4, 32.) By these words, then, is designated great beneficence and liberality. (Kuin.)

This interpretation, however, seems to somewhat lower the sense, which must, at least, amount to this, that they regarded their property as if not their own, but held in trust for the advantage of their fellow Christians. So Val. Max. 6, 8. (cited by Wets.) Quod Gillias possidebat, omnium quasi commune patrimonium erat. It is very sensibly remarked by Doddridge, that "peculiar reasons made this community of goods eligible at this time; not only as so many sojourners, who had come from other parts, would justly be desirous to continue at Jerusalem much longer than they intended when they came up to the feast, that they might get a thorough knowledge of the gospel, but as the prospect likewise of the Roman conquests, which, according to Christ's known prediction, were soon to swallow up all Jewish property, would, of course, dispose many more readily to sell their lands.

The same judicious and pious Commentator insists on this circumstance, as arguing the incontestible evidence of the Gospel, from its prevailing on the possessors of wealth to part with their property for the relief of persons who, excepting community of faith, had no peculiar claim to their regards.

Some Commentators tell us that these κτήματα denote the immobilia as property in land or houses. But that was not always the sense of κτήμα, as appears from Polyæn. 2, 1, 10. τοῦ θείου άνθρώπων καὶ βοσκημάτων καὶ τῶν άλλων κτημάτων λαφυραγωγείσα. Wolf, Elsner, and other Commentators observe that both the Pythagoreans and the Essenes had a community of goods. Thus Jambl. de Vit. Pyth. 6, 17. p. 59. ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ τὰ μὲν ἐκατέργαστα, τούτῳ τινι οὐκ οὐδεμισθείσα, ἐκατέργασεν, διδόμεθα τοῖς ἀποδεδειγμένοις εἰς τούτο γνωρίμως, οἴκαν ἐκατοντα πολιτικοῖ καὶ οἰκονομικοῖ τινες καὶ νομιθετικοί ὄντες. Jo-
seph. Bell. 1, 2, 12. καταφρονηταὶ δὲ πλούτῳ, καὶ θαυμάσιαι λαβόμενοι κατὰ πάντας τοὺς ἀρετῶν μεταποιημένους τὸ δίκαιον, μεροικὸς ὑπάρξει Ἑλλήνων ἡ βασιλείας τειχων, ἀλλὰ μηδὲν ἀντὶ τῶν ἐκείνων, ἐκεῖνος δὲ καὶ παλαιοῦ συνελθὼν, ἐν τῷ εὐτυχείσης μὴ κεκοιλοῦντα τὰ χρήματα κοινὰ πάντως ἐνοχιαζόμενος, ἀπολαμβάνει δὲ οὐδὲν ὁ πλοῦς τῶν οἰκείων μειοῦντος, καὶ μὴν ὄντος κεκεχρυμένοις καὶ τάδε πράσσοντα ἄνδρες ὑπὲρ τεσσαρακοσιὰς τὸ γίγνεται ἄνετες. I can, however, by no means assent to the opinion of Grotius, Heinrichs, and others; that this was an imitation of the Essenes; since circumstances were widely different: for among the Essenes there was an absolute community of goods, and no property whatever. But it is plain, from what has been said, that this was by no means the case among these Jerusalemite Christians. In contributing their ready money, and even selling some of their property to relieve the necessities of their brethren, they can scarcely be thought to have adverted to the custom of a contemptible Jewish sect, but were rather influenced by those frequent admonitions to mutual love and beneficence so often and so strongly inculcated by our blessed Lord (see Luke 12, 38.), and enforced, doubtless, very warmly by the Apostles. They were the more readily, too, induced to do this, both from the natural wish to keep together their sect, and still more from the near prospect presented of the total ruin of their country.
and even (as they then supposed) of the end of the world. Still I am ready to admit that the tenets of the Essenes had afterwards their effects (and those unfavourable) on the opinions and practice of the early Christians. This we may especially recognize in the conduct of those who preached up unnatural self-denial, and excessive austerities. Thus I Tim. 4, 8. καλώντων γαμείν, ἀπεχέσθαι βρασμάτων, &c. from which, and other passages, we know that there were those who systematically degraded matrimony: and that this was done by the Essenes I find from Joseph. 793, 42. οὕτε γαμετάς εἰσάνων, οὕτε δούλων ἐπιτηδεύοντος κτήσεως, τὸ μὴ εἰς ἄδικαν φέρειν ὑπεληφότες, τὸ δὲ στάσεως ἐνδιδώναι τινῶν, namely, to avoid quarrels.

On the words ἐλχόν ἄπαντα κοινά, Bulkley cites Porphyry, who tells us that the disciples of Pythagoras had goods in common: Οὐσίας κοινάς ἐδείχτο. Justin, the historian, L. 43, C. 1. speaking of the original inhabitants of Italy: Omnia communia et indivisa omnibus fuerint, veluti unum cunctis patrimonium esset. Justin Martyr, Ari. p. 20. edit. Thirlbl. speaking of the Christians of his own day: "We, that once admired nothing so much as the prosecution of riches, now transfer even what we already have to common use, admitting all that want to a participation of it."

45. καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἐκτραπάσκων. By κτήματα are meant, generally, possessions. Thus Hesychius explains it πάντα τὰ ὑπάρξοντα. But it denotes specially the bona mobilia, as lands and houses. (See Eustathius on Hom. II. ἡ. p. 685 Rom.) Hence the Sept. use it to express γεωργίαν, vineyard, in Prov. 31, 16., and Hos. 2, 15., and ἡμέρ, field, in Prov. 29, 10. In Herodian 7, 12 & 13., houses, with their gardens, are called κτήματα in 2, 6, 5, & 3. 10. farms: and in Acts 5, 1, 8. the word is interchanged with γεωργίαν. See also Sir. 28, 27. & 36, 25. But ὑπάρξεις denotes wealth in general (see Ps. 78, 48. Prov. 18, 11. Heb. 10, 34.).
and is explained by Hesychius ὀσία: and since it is here opposed to κτήμα it denotes the bona mobilis, moveable property. (Kuin.)

45. καὶ διεμέρισθον αὐτὰ πᾶσι, κ. ἄ. τ. χ. ἐ. Heusen and others think that, at first, the Christians themselves distributed the money; that soon afterwards this was done by the Apostles (compare 4, 34.), and lastly by the Deacons. (Compare 6, 1 & 8.) This is not improbable; though, as Kuinoel observes, the word may very well admit of being explained, provided for its distribution, namely, by the hands of the Apostles. Grotius thinks that these words have especial reference to the sick, the aged, and the infant children, since the people of both sexes were clothed at the common expense, and took their food at the public table, κατὰ φρατρίας. But this is supposing such a knowledge of the circumstances of the primitive Church as, I think, we do not possess. Ἐκumenius, to the words καθὼς χρεῖαν εἶχε judiciously subjoins ὅ兮 ἀπλῶς, ἄλλο ὀἰκονομικῶς, from which it is evident that he adopted the above opinion.

46, 47, καθ' ἑμέραν—ἐν τῷ ιερῷ, they every day mingled with the Jews in the temple worship. Ἰσσοκαρπεῖν signifies to assiduously attend on; as in Susan. ver. 7. κλωνίζει τε κατ' ὀλκν ἀρτον. Ἐκumenius and Hammond take κατ' ὀλκν for ἐν ὀλκν, and understand it of an apartment in the temple. But, as Kuinoel remarks, who can believe that the Jews would have permitted the Christians to have the use of an apartment for any acts of worship, or even to take their meals in. De Dieu, Bengel, Heinrichs, and others, mentioned in Wolf, explain the phrase at home, privately. But this is (as Kuinoel remarks) frigid, and not to the purpose. Indeed, there is no reason to desert the common interpretation. It seems that, as no apartment was now able to contain them all, they preserved, as much as possible, their former community of meals by participating of them in common,
from house to house, in various groups.* Thus we must subaud ἐκκατον; an ellipsis very frequent in adverbial phrases formed of a noun with κατὰ, as κατὰ τοῖς in Matt. 24, 7., and κατὰ τὸλιν, which often occur both in the Scriptures and in the Classical writers. The opinion, however, of these Commentators, who (as Kuinoel) take the words of the ἀγαπᾶκ, deserves attention, since there is nothing said of the poor, and κλώντες τὸν ἄρτον, &c. may be referred to all Christ’s followers, both rich and poor, all of whom, it was said, assiduously attended temple worship.

46. μεταλάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει, i.e. the rich rejoicing that they could exercise their liberality towards the poor; and the poor rejoicing in the liberality of the rich. And this joy was unfeigned, arising out of their mutual love and unanimity. The rich were removed from all pride and ostentation, and the poor from all envy and ill will." On μεταλάμβανεν τροφῆς, take food, see Kypke on Acts 27, 38., and Munth in loc. *Ἀφελότης denotes undissembled simplicity and sincerity, otherwise termed ἀπλότης. Cæcumenius, Wetstein, and Barkey take it of that simplicity of heart which rejects pride; and this sense they endeavour to establish by examples. But though I grant it may sometimes have that sense, yet here, as it is applied both to the rich and the poor, we must adopt the general one above laid down. Of all the English translators, Tindal alone correctly renders the passage, thus: “And eate theyr meate together, wyth gladness and synngle-nes of harte praying God, and had favour with all the people.”

47. ἔχουτες χάριν πρὸς ἄλλων τῶν άνω. It seems as if this were a brachylogia. The words may be rendered, “And by so doing they stood in high favour

* Indeed, so it seems to have been taken in the age of Philostratus, since (if I am not mistaken) he imitates (as he usually does other passages of the Gospel history) this circumstance.
with all the people.” And thus it should seem to have been taken by the early Commentators, since Ecumenius says: οὕτω καὶ τὸν βίον ἄντω τῆς πίστεως μετερράμησον, καὶ φιλαλληλοῦσι εἶχον. By the ὅλος ὁ λαὸς is meant the people at large, as distinguished from the Rulers and Priests, and the Pharisaical faction. On the expression χάριν ἔχειν Wetstein compares Ex. 33, 12. χάριν ἔχεις παρ' ἐμοὶ. Plut. 1, 849 Λ. πάντων φιλοποιήτατος οὐ τῶν λεγόντων—χάριν οὐκ ἔχει πρὸς τὸν δῆμον. So also Herodian, cited by Schmid.

47. ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει—σωζόμενος. By the σωζόμενοι (wrongly rendered “such as should be saved,” instead of the saved) are meant those who are being saved, those who are placed in a state of salvation, by having rejected the Jewish superstitions, and embracing the Christian religion. See Dr. Maltby in the note on Matt. 1, 21. Thus Markland observes that it is a title of those who were in a state of salvation; as οἱ ἀπολύτρωμενοι are the opposite, 1 Cor. 1, 18., and 2 Cor. 2, 15. οἱ σωζόμενοι in Rev. 21, 24. So Whitby, who renders it the saved, and treats it as a general term for Christians: and it is certainly so used elsewhere. This seems preferable to the mode of interpretation adopted by Bp. Pearce, “such as had been saved.” For though he urges that the Christians, who, upon their repentance towards God, and faith in Jesus Christ, were baptized, are often spoken of in the New Testament as persons already saved, i. e. rescued from that eternal misery to which they stood exposed till they were baptized (as in Ephes. 2, 8., where St. Paul says, “By grace ye are saved,” or rather, “ye are those who have been saved:” and Tit. 3, 5., “according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration,”) yet that can only refer to their being put in a state of salvation. I am surprised that the learned Prelate did not see this, since the truth almost stared him in the face when he wrote the following words: “But it should be remem-
bered that this description of the Christian converts only considers the state which baptism put them into, and does not here (though it does elsewhere) point out to them that, when they were added to the Church, eternal life was not to be obtained without the practice of all manner of good works." *

By κύριος is meant, not God (as some Commentators tell us), but Christ, who is said to bring men unto God. Compare ver. 36.

CHAP. III.

The narration now returns to what was broken off at ver. 42, and the merits of Peter preaching the Gospel are brought forward. (Heinrichs.)

1. Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ Πέτρος — ἐνάτην. The formula ἔπι τὸ αὐτὸ, whose various significations are discussed in 1, 15., cannot be rendered "to the same place;" for the place is expressly mentioned to which Peter and John then repaired, namely, the Temple: nor (with Abresch.) to the same end; for the words subjoined, ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδόν τῆς προσευχῆς ἐνάτην, plainly show with what intent they repaired thither: but "supped together." † And this signification the context requires. The following words ἔπι τὴν ὁδόν τῆς προσευχῆς — ἐνάτην are [by a sort of popular Synchysis. Edit.] put for ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδόν τῆς προσευχῆς, ἣτις ἦν ἡ ἐνάτη τῆς ἡμέρας. Now ἐπὶ often, in the Classical writers, denotes at, about; as in Arrian

* This passage has, as my readers know, been pressed into the service of Calvinism: with how little reason, we have seen. In fact, this was no place for inculcating any such mysterious doctrine, supposing it true, as that of election; for, as Wetstein observes, "St. Luke speaks as an historian, of a thing which fell under his view, of a fact relating to the Jews, not to the hidden counsels of God."

† So also the word is interpreted by Krebs, who quotes a similar passage from Joseph. Ant. 16. 8, 6. speaking of Herod and Archelaus: ἐνοικήσατο δὲ καὶ συνήθειας, τοὺς Ῥώμην ἐλθεῖν, ἐπιτιθεὶς περὶ τούτων ἐγέραπτο Καίσαρ, καὶ μέχρις Ἀντιοχείας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ παρῆλθον.
Epict. 3, 18. ἐν τῷ ἡλιοσκόπῳ, about day break. Polyb. 3, 83. ἐν τῷ ἐναπέδευσθε, scil. ἁπαν. See Alberti and Wolf. The hours of prayer, it must be observed, were three. 1st, the morning, called ἐν ἐναπέδευσθε and ἐν ἡρακλή, which was at the third hour. 2d, noon, called ἐν ἁλμάλει, the prayer of oblation, at the sixth hour. (See Acts 10, 9.) 3d, the evening, called ἡ ἀνασκόπη, at the ninth hour. So Acts 10, 3 & 30. and this place. This the Jews derived from the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. See Lightfoot and Schoettgen; as also Buxtorf’s Lex. Talm. 964, 1361, 2370. Suicer’s Thesaur. 1, 1278. on the word εὐχα, and the authors cited by Wolf. (Kuin.) On this passage the reader may, with advantage, consult the note of Dr. Whitby. Οὐκεμενιος thus remarks on the friendship of these two Apostles; as, for instance, where we read Peter made a sign to John that he should ask a question of the Master: and when, at another time, they both ran together to the sepulchre. And again, too, we may observe, Peter says to Christ concerning the same companion (περὶ αὐτῶν, I conjecture αὐτῶν): αὐτὸς δὲ τι; and what shall he do? Now on the present occasion they went together to the Temple, not as judaizing, but for a good purpose, and in condescension to the weakness of their countrymen. With respect to the miracle of which we here read, we may remark, that it is related on account of the time and place. For though many more were worked by the Apostles (as we are told above), yet of these Luke has made no mention, either because they seemed inconsiderable, or because the purpose of his history was not boasting.” (Οὐκεμενιος.)

2. χαλίς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ. The same expression occurs in Acts 14, 8. So τυφλῶν ἐκ γενετήσεως in John 9, 1. and ἐκ γαστρὸς in Theogn. v. 307. Now it must be observed that the adjective χαλίς is in the New Testament used of lame persons, but had once a more extended sense, χαλώμα, being employed by Hippocrates also of a mutilated hand, and
other mutilated limbs; as is observed by Erotianus in Lex. Hippocr. and Eustathius on Il. β. p. 156. And this may well be the case, since χαλός originally denotes nothing more than defective. (Valck.)

2. οὐ εἰτίθεν καὶ ημέραν πρὸς τὴν βύραν. Θύρα signifies gate, or portal. T. Mag. indeed distinguishes between πυλαι, ἐπὶ τείχους, gates, as of a fortress, and βύραι ἐπὶ οἰκίαις. But this distinction is not always observed. That the poor among the Gentiles were accustomed to place themselves at the gates of the Temple, and ask charity of those who were entering them, we find from Martial 1, 12.; and that this custom continued in the primitive Christian Church we learn from Chrys., in his second Homily on 2 Tim. διὰ τούτου ἑστίκασιν οἱ πέντετες πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν, ἵνα μηδείς εἰσί, ἵνα μετὰ ἐλεημοσύνης εἰσί, and thus, he observes, their prayers would be more efficacious. The Commentators, however, have debated what gate of the Temple was that called the οἰραία? Most of them, as Wetstein, fix upon the Eastern gate (called Nicanor's), by which there was an entrance from the court of the women to that of the Israelites. This gate was (as they conjecture) κατ’ ἐξοχίαν, called οἰραία, beautiful; since (as we learn from Joseph. Bell. 5, 5, 3. & 6, 5, 3. it was formed of Corinthian brass, a material even more valuable than gold, and was wrought with consummate art. Others, as Wagenseil ad Sota 40., Lund, Bengel, and Walch, in his Dissertation on this subject, contend that the gate here mentioned was the same with that elsewhere called Susan; and this position they endeavour to establish by various arguments [for which I must refer my readers to Kuinoel. Edit.] Others (as Lightfoot and Bolten) think it was a gate of the court of the Gentiles, called Chalda, from the Hebr. טַמֵּא, time; so that οἰραία means tempestiva. One thing seems certain, that by η θύρα η λεγομένη Ωραία is not to be understood a gate which led from the court of the women into that of the Israelites; for the context compels us to fix on a space inside of
Mount Moriah, which was separated by a wall from the gate of the Gentiles. Besides, it is improbable that the Jews should have given a name of Greek origin to a gate of their Temple. But whether the gate ὀραία was called Susan, or Chalda, cannot with certainty be determined; though the latter conjecture seems the more simple and probable. On the word ἱερών see the note on Mat. 21, 12. where we have shown that it generally denotes that area in Mount Moriah in which the sacred edifice, with its porticos, halls, and apartments, was erected; but it is especially used of the exterior buildings of the temple. (Kuin.) Wetstein adduces many Rabbinical passages on the Gates of the Temple, especially Nicanor's.

2. Τοῦ αἰτείν ἔλεημοσύνην. Ἑλεημοσύνην, it may be observed, not only denotes the act of compassionate relief, but also the stipis, or sum of money given, (corresponding to our word charity,) as in Sir. 29, 12. σύγκλεισον ἔλεημοσύνην ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις. See the note on Matt. 6, 2. Valcknaer remarks that it is never so used by the antient Greek writers; but seems to have been first employed by Callim. H. in Del. 152. 'Ἀντ' ἔλεημοσύνης.*

3—5. ήραία ἐλεημοσύνην λαβεῖν. Some early editions omit λαβεῖν; and Priceeus. thinks the word is not genuine. But this position has been justly disputed by Bos and Alberti, who (and especially Valcknaer) have shown that λαβεῖν, (and sometimes εὑρεῖν and τυχεῖν,) is elegantly pleonastic. Valcknaer produces the following examples, Hermæs Pastor,

* Of all the ancient Poets, Callimachus alone seems to have read the Holy Scriptures. Some ancient Christian writers, indeed, of great learning, as Clemens Alex. and Athenagoras, have maintained that Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, and others, derived all that is excellent in them from Moses and the Prophets; which opinion seems not only false, but absurd. For, in the first place, none of them who lived before Callimachus had the opportunity of reading a Greek version of the Books of Moses. Secondly, if that wisdom, which is too often what the Scripture terms foolishness, had even enabled them to read those sacred writings, they would not have read them, as being books of the Jews, those whom they so despised.

(Valcknaer.)

4. ἀτενίσας δὲ Πέτρος — εἰς ἡμᾶς. On ἀτενίζειν, a word frequently used by St. Luke, see the note on Luke 22, 56. and also Elsner on this place. Peter and John, we may observe, fixed their eyes on the lame man, that they might know whether he only pretended debility, and desired him to look at them, that they might judge by his countenance whether he were an impostor, and also that they might excite the attention of the man. (Kuin.) This however seems very hypothetical and precarious.

5. Ὅ δὲ ἐπείχεν αὐτοῖς. At ἐπείχε Wolf, Elsner, and Morus subaudic. τὸν νοῦν. But since βλέψων immediately preceded, Bos, (in his Ellip. 366. Sch.), Rosenmuller, Heinrichs, and others, more judiciously supply ἄφαλμος. And so also Dr. Owen. See the note on Luke 14, 7.

6, 7. ἀγῶνιον καὶ χρυσίον. Doddridge remarks that this was after the estates were sold, (chap. 2, 45.), and plainly shows how far the Apostles were from enriching themselves by the treasures which passed through their hands. The following observation however of this Commentator is very frivolous; namely, that by his mentioning gold as well as silver, (which a beggar like this could not expect to receive,) he probably meant to speak of himself as continuing still a poor man, and not merely to say that he had no gold about him. The fact is, that these words are a popular formula denoting riches.
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See Herodot. 3, 140. and other examples in Wetstein. "O ὅ ἔχω, such as I have will I give, namely, "I will exert my power to heal." The sentence has the air of a proverb; to which there is something similar in the following passages. Soph. El. 450. σμικρὰ μὲν τὰδ’, ἄλλ’ ὅμοιος ἀ’ χω, δὸς αὐτῷ. Aristoph. Lys. 671. ἄπερ οὐν ἔχω, δίδωμι σοι. On τίσις τῆς δεξιᾶς see ÒEcumenius; and on Ναῷραίον see the note on 2, 22.


8. ἐξαλλόμενος, leaping, i.e. (as ÒEcumenius thinks) to try whether he were really healed, or as not knowing how to walk. Schmid, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, think it was not only for joy, but in order to show that he was perfectly healed. To me it seems that by the ἐξαλλόμενος is described his first trial at walking, which would be at first rather leap- ing. It appears, too, to indicate joy. Of the verb ἐξάλλεσθαι, Wetstein cites examples from Joseph.
Bell. 6, 4, 2. Dionys. Hal. Antiq. 2. It signifies *subsilire*, and answers to the Heb. דְּּּ with Joel 2, 5. See Hebr. 1, 8. 1 Macc. 13, 44.

9—11. Now is narrated the *effect* which the healing of the blind man had on the minds of the auditors. Κρατούντος δὲ τοῦ ἰαθέντος χαλῶ τὸν Πέτρου καὶ Ἰακώβου. Κρατεῖν denotes, "to keep close to, not to stir from the side of any one;" as in 2 Sam. 3, 6. Ἀβεβηρ ἡν κρατῶν τοῦ ὀλκου τοῦ Σαωβ. So also Col. 2, 19. The action may here be traced to love and gratitude, (Kuin.) and not, as Beza and Doddridge think, to fear, lest his lameness might return when out of their sight. On the στολ τοῦ Σολομῶντος see the note on Joh. 10, 23. The noun collective λαὸς has a *plural*; on which see Kypke in loc. and Glass Phil. 326.

12. Ἀπεκρίνατο τὸν λαὸν, “addressed the people.” For ἀποκρίνεσθαι, like the Heb. דְּּּ, not only denotes *to answer*, but *to address*. Of this signification the New Testament is full of examples. The summary of the contents of Peter’s address is thus laid down by Schoettgen.

The address consists of three parts: *Proposition, Explication, and Application*. I. **Proposition remote**: It is not we that have done this. *Positive*: It is by the power of Christ that this was done, ver. 13, 16. II. **Explication**, showing the manner of Christ’s passion, by virtue of which such miracles might be wrought, ver. 13—15. III. **Application**, that the Jews ought to receive Jesus as the promised Messiah: the *reason* why all the Prophets testified of him, ver. 17. to the end.

12. τὴν βασιλαγήτερ εἰπ τούτῳ, scil. πράγματι. For ἐστεβίεια the Syriac, Arabic, and Vulgate Translators read ἐκστοσία; which is, however, a mere gloss. *Estebia*, it must be observed, is for δι’ εστεβίειας, ob pietatem et sanctitatem; or, by an Hendiadis, “by virtue of our piety.” Πετοιμάσειν τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτῶν; as if having made him to walk. One should rather have expected τὸ περιπατεῖν: but this is an Alex-
andrian idiom often found in the Greek Translators of the Old Testament, who thus express the Hebrew Infinitive with the preposition ἐ. (See Fischer's Pro-lus. Nov. Test. 330 & 742. and Leusd. de Hebr. Nov. Test. p. 168. Compare 27, 1.) Grotius thinks there is an ellipsis of περάγμα, and Schmid. of ἐνεκα. Markland, however, resolves πεποιηκόςιν into ποιηταῖς ὁσι, i.e. ἀντίοις ὁσι; by which, he observes, τοῦ περιπατεῖν will be right. He then compares Acts 27, 1. Ὅς δὲ ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποκλαίνῃ ἡμᾶς, i.e. ὃς ἐγένετο κρίμα τοῦ ἀποκλαίνῃ, which may, he says, be explained by that in 20, 3. ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν. With this Markland also compares the Latin, illum participavit sui consiliis, i.e. illum fecit particem sui consiliis. The same mode, too, is adopted by Heinrichs.

13. ὁ Θεὸς — πατέρον ἡμῶν, the God whom our fathers worshipped, and by whom they were defended, the Deus tutelaris. See the note on Acts 5, 30. Luke 1, 68. Matt. 22, 92. (Kuin.) It is judiciously observed by Doddridge, that this was wisely introduced here in the beginning of the discourse, that it might appear they taught no new religion inconsistent with the Mosaic, and were far from having the least design to divert their regards from the God of Israel.

13. ἐδόξασε τοῦ παιδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, i.e. made his Messiahsip and his glory evident. Παίς is for ὁδος; as in ver. 26, 4, 27 & 30. Matt. 17, 18. (Raphel.) Ἀτ παρεδωκατε subaud eis τον πατατον. See Rom. 4, 25. compared with Matt. 10, 21. 26, 2. 2 Cor. 4, 11. "This they did (says Ὄεκumenius) when they said, "It is not lawful for us to put any one to death." Ὡντος αὐτοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον Πιλάτου. Here it is well observed by ᾿Οργκ, that ἀπείπεις τινα denotes to deny, reject, repudiate, and profess to hold no communion with any one, ἀπειπεῖς; and that it is used both of things and persons; as in Callim. in H. in Del. 100. ἀλλ' ἐτ' Ἀρχιερέας μὲν ἀπερημόσαντο πόλης ἐφερέμενυ. Here, however, something more special seems intended, namely, "denied to be King Mes-
siah." (See Acts 7, 35.) In the same light, too, the expression is viewed by Œcumenius, who truly remarks, that they denied Jesus, when they exclaimed, "We have no king but Cæsar."

13. κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἄπολύειν. Bos Wolf and Munth subaud δεῖν. But Krebs has shown (as, indeed, had been before done by Grotius, De Dieu, and Bois) that κρίναντος has here (as often) the sense of determine, will: and he cites Joseph. Ant. 1, 4. ἀφανίσατε ἐκ πάντων οὐκ ἐκρίνετε. 7, 1, 5. κρίναν Ἀβδηγίων ἀπεκτείνατε. & 2, 2. Ταῦτα τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίναντος περὶ τῶν Σοδωμίτων. Other examples are adduced by Loesner: and, indeed, this signification is frequent in the later Greek writers. ἄπολύειν properly denotes to untie, then to liberate, let go, and, by metonymy, to acquit, as here, and in Matt. 27, 15. &c. indeed frequently in the New Testament and Septuagint, especially the Apocrypha. See Schl. Lex.

14. ὠμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἡγνήσατε, "denied the holy one and the just." This is a cognomen of the Messiah; as in Apoc. 3, 7. Joh. 10, 36. Acts 4, 27 & 30. See Wolf and Koppe’s Opusc. p. 34. Peter, we may observe, has used the very names strongly opposed to the qualities of the φωνεύσ * Barabbas.

14. ἡγνήσαντε ἀνδρα φονεά χαρισθήναι υἱῶν. In this sense, which is found in Acts 25, 11. Phil. 22., the word χαρισθήναι is also used by the Classical writers: and examples are produced by Krebs. Kuinoel remarks, that the Latins expressed this sense by the phrase, “donare aliquem alicui.”

15. τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε, "ye slew the author of life." So the Vulgate. Now Jesus had himself professed to be "the way, the truth, and the life." See Joh. 14, 6. and the note on that passage. Examples in abundance are produced by Raphel, Kypke, and Munth, of ἀρχηγὸς being joined

* This word may signify, not positively a murderer, but improbis-simus. So Casaubon on Athen. Col. 398. ἀνδροφόνοις Graeci vocab omiss insigniter improbos: of which signification he subjoins several examples.
with nouns having both a bad sense and also a middle one: but seldom is it found in a good sense, as here, and in Hebr. 2, 10. ἀρχηγός τῆς σωτηρίας. So, however, it occurs Isocrat. p. 476. (cited by Kypke), τῶν παρόντων ἐγαθών ἀπάντων αὐτοῖς ἀρχηγοῖ. Valcknaer takes occasion, from this phrase, to observe, that in these speeches of Peter, though not such pieces of finished composition as those of Demosthenes, or the other Greek writers, there is a dignity in the historical, and a grandeur in the didactic parts, to which it were impossible to add aught.

16. ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὄνοματος, “through faith in him.” For ὄνοματος is, by a Hebraism, redundant. Thus πίστει ἐκ αὐτῶ is equivalent to ἡ πίστις ἐν αὐτῷ in Col. 1, 4. these prepositions being frequently interchanged.

16. ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὀλοκληρίαν. The word ὀλοκληρία denotes the condition of being perfect in all members, none being wanting; as in Antonin. 5, 8. Thus ὀλοκληρος and integer (the latter of which corresponds to ἄδιγμα, as being the opposite of attager), often signify, like our word whole (from ὅλος,* which properly signifies complete, solid; as Corinth. de Dial. οὐλεῖν ὑγιαινείν) healthy: and so it is here rendered by the Syriac. Thus in Is. 1, 6. we have, ἀπὸ πόδαν ἐκσ θείας ὑπὸ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ ὀλοκληρία: where Symmachus renders υγιέως.

17. οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, ὁ. κ. ε. α. ν. Many Commentators have exceedingly stumbled at Peter’s here adducting ignorance as the cause of the atrocity committed by the Sanhedrim and people. Hence Wolf is inclined to think that the words ἀπερ καί οἱ ἄγνοιαι ὑπόν are not to be referred to the remote antecedent ἄγνοιαν, but to the proximate one, ἐπράξατε, so that the comparison of the people with their rulers may only respect their works, but not the origin of those works, as the excuse for them: and he assigns to the words the following sense: “I know

* So οὐλε, salve, in Homer; with which may be compared our hail.
that through ignorance you have been induced to do as your rulers did." So also Reichard and others. But the sense thus elicited is by no means inherent in the Greek words, and is at variance with Acts 13, 27. 1 Cor. 2, 8. Hence Barkey, to remove this difficulty, has endeavoured to show that the Jewish rulers, in fact, were ignorant that Jesus was the Messiah, although they might have known it. But, as Dendord and Heinrichs observe, the words of Peter are not to be too much pressed. The Apostle, in order, by softening the atrocity of their guilt, to make his speech more acceptable to his bearers, and to raise and console them, has brought forward this only, the rest not being excluded, but put aside for the present. (See Matth. 21, 33. seqq. and the note on that passage.) He does not, however, by this mean to entirely absolve them of guilt. (Kuin.)

The mode of taking the words above proposed has the support of the Syriac Version, and is adopted by Bishop Barrington, who observes, that otherwise this text would be inconsistent with the manifest intention of the parable (Matt. 21, 38—39. Joh. 15, 22—24). But this seems pushing the matter too far. The Apostle does not mean to say that their ignorance, so far as it might exist, was blameless, since that would be at variance with what is elsewhere said in Scripture, and, as Doddridge observes, it is plain that their ignorance, being in itself highly criminal amidst such means of information, did not excuse them from great guilt. Yet the Apostle does hint that this ignorance might seem in some degree to extenuate their guilt: for, as observes Eurip. Hippol. 1884. (cited by Wetstein), τὴν ἐντὸς τῆς ἁμαρτίας τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι μὲν πρῶτον ἐκλώει κάκησι. So also Thucyd. 3, 1, 88. οὐ γὰρ κακῶς τινὰ τούτο ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτία ὑπόστασις ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτία ἄνθρωπον ἐξισοδομηθείσα, ἀλλὰ ἀνθρώπου· τὰ ἄνθρωπον τοῖς ἄνθρωπον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. There are similar passages in Thucydides, 8, 40. and 4, 98. on which I shall have occasion to produce a great variety of parallel passages from authors of every age, which I therefore forbear
to do on the present occasion. See also Lev. 21, 14. Luke 23, 34. Examples of καὶ ἀγνοεῖν are produced by Wetstein from Sextus Empir. and Polybius. Thus St. Paul, in 1 Tim. 1, 13. urges ignorance in extenuation of his guilt. Nor must too great stress be laid on the words αἰτε ἵνα, since they are frequently, as they seem to be here, merely parenthetical, and to have the sense of scilicet. Examples of this abound in all the Greek Classical writers. And indeed I agree with Kuinoel and Heinrichs, that the sense of the passage altogether is not to be too much pressed, nor any recourse to be had to refined dialectical reasonings, or ethical disquisitions; but it must be solely considered as said populariter. I cannot, however, assent to the position that this was done by the Apostle solely ad captandum, but rather, as Camerarius suggests, in order by this excuse to throw open to them the doors of repentance.

18. ἐὰν Θεὸς—ἐπιθυμεῖν ὑµῖν, q. d. “God hath used that ignorance for good, by permitting that you should commit this crime, and moreover, since thus would be fulfilled the declarations of the Prophets, concerning the calamities with which the Messiah should be oppressed.” See Acts 13, 27 & 29. Luke 24, 26 seq. Acts 8, 32. By all is meant, as Sanctius and Kuinoel tell us, in a popular way, very many. I must, however, maintain that it cannot but signify, at least, a considerable part, or, indeed, nearly all. Besides, we are to bear in mind that the Rabbis themselves acknowledged that all the Prophets prophesied of the Messiah. See Sanhedrin, cited by Wetstein.

19. μετανοήσατε ὡν καὶ ἐκπαίδευσατε. Now follows the application of the discourse, in which Peter exhorts his hearers to repent of their obstinate rejection of Jesus, to embrace his doctrine, and live in conformity to its precepts: for all this is included in μετανοήσατε, (see the note supra, 2, 38.) of which ἐκπαίδευσατε is considered by the Commentators to be a mere synonyme. But it must be observed, that
the former denotes a change of mind and purpose; the latter, a change of conduct.

19. Ἐσι τὸ ἐξαλείφθηναι ύμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, “that your sins may be blotted out, and especially that of rejecting Christ added to your other sins.” The word ἐξαλείφω, it may be observed, properly denotes to obliterate, erase any writing by scratching it out, &c. Now the antients wrote (or rather marked) on waxed tablets; and when any thing was to be erased, they turned the style or pen, and with its blunt end closed up the marks on the wax, and thus made alterations in what they had written. See Xen. Hist. 2, 3, 20. Athen. 403 f. Thus the word denotes in general delere; as in Ἀeschyl. Cœph. 500. Sir. 46, 20. ἐξαλείψατε ἁμαρτίαν λατω. It also signifies to destroy, deliver to oblivion; as in Plat. Theat. 187. ο. πάντα τὰ πρόσθεν ἐξαλείψατε. It here signifies to remit sins; as in Is. 43, 23. ἐγὼ εἰμί ὁ ἐξαλείφων τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου and 2 Max. 12, 42. ἀξιώσασθε τὸ γεγονὸς ἁμαρτήμα τελείως ἐξαλείφθηναι, a metaphor derived from creditors, who cross out the accounts of their debtors when discharged; (see Col. 2. seq.) and an image frequent in the Rabbinical writings. (Valcknaer and Kuinoel.)

Every student will feel thankful for the above erudite and instructive illustrations of the sense of ἐξαλείφω; but I must observe that the learned Commentator seems to have mistaken the primary sense of that word, which is, to wipe away: for as ἀλείφω signifies to anoint or besmear with oil, &c. so ἐξαλείφω denotes the contrary, namely, to wipe off the oil, or other liquid. There is the same metaphor in the Latin delere (from leo, lino) and the Hebr. יַעֲשֵׂ, which is used to denote wipe, wipe off, both physically and morally. Of the sense expiate Wetstein adduces an example from Lysias: δεινὸν ἂν εἴπῃ, εἰ πειρὸν Ἀνδοκίδου—ἐπεμελήθημεν, ὡς ἐξαλείφθη εἰς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἄλλα.

20. seqq. In their endeavours to explain this passage, the Commentators have pursued different
courses. For my own part I shall first shew what interpretation seems the truest, and then briefly detail such others as have any probability, or have been brought forward by eminent Commentators.

The words ὃπως ἂν ἔλθωσι καὶ ἡ ἀναψύχεις ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου, which perfectly cohere with the preceding, may be thus translated: "Cum, Deo auctore, lætissima temporae venerint." For ὃπως here denotes when, after that; as in Herod. 1, 47. (edit. Basil.) ὃπως ἔλθῃ ὁ ποταμὸς ἐκ ὁκτὼ πηχέας. Eurip. Phœn. 1155. Soph. Cæd. Tyr. 1241 & 1250. Hom. Od. ḍ. 109. & γ. 22. II. μ. 208. Aristoph. Nub. 60. See also Beza, Schmid, Glass, in his Phil. Sacr. 375., and Devar. de partic. Gr. p. 252. Ἄναψυχή, which properly denotes respiration, or cooling after being heated, metaphorically signifies refreshment, rest, delivery from evil, &c.; as in the Septuagint version of Ex. 8, 15. where we have in the Hebrew והם, which Symmachus renders ἄνεσις, the Vulg. reqúies. So Philo 371. ἡ ὦψ ἐν ταῖς ἀναψυχῆς καὶ ἄνεσις: συνανείται καὶ χαλάται, and Xen. Hist. 1, 5, 6. ἀναψύχειν. And so also 2 Kings 16, 14. Sept. [I add Eurip. Ion. 1604. ἐκ τῆς ἀναψυχῆς τῶν, and Suppl. 615. κακῶν ἐκ ἀναψυχῆς Philostr. Icon. 2. ἀναψυχήν ἔλειν. Hence, too, may be emended a passage of Chrys. 5, 783, 80. Edit.] Now resit is, in Scripture, a perpetual image of felicity [as might be expected in Oriental writers. Edit.] See Sap. 4, 7. Sir 51, 27. and the Commentators on Heb. 3, 11. Apoc. 14, 13. Thus, by καὶ ἡ ἀναψύχεις are meant times the most felicitous, and specially those of the Messiah, as being the author of all felicity, in which will be collected the assembly of worshippers to be blessed by him. For we have just after, in ver. 24., προκατήγγειλαν οἱ προφήται τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας. And then is added, by way of explication, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἰησοῦν. As, therefore, John the Baptist, in Matt. 3, 2., and Jesus himself, in Matt. 4, 27., had exhorted the Jews to repentance, and reformation by the words μετανοεῖτε, ἥγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.
also Peter exhorts his hearers to repent when the refreshing and happy times of the Messiah shall have come: and thus the formula is nearly equivalent to ἐνσωστῷ κυρίου δεκτός in Luke 4, 19. compared with ver. 18. and καὶ ὁ εὐφρίαστος, ἡμέρα σοτηρίας in 2 Cor. 6, 2. Finally ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου signifies from the presence, and at the will, direction, and providence of God. For ἀπὸ often denotes cause, or origin.

Instead of προκεκαθημένων, some of the most ancient, and not a few other MSS. read προκεκαθιστημένον, which is approved by Hammond, Mill, Valcknaer, Vitringa, and most Commentators; and is received into the text by Bengel, Griesbach, and Matthiae. The common reading does, indeed, savour of a gloss. Προκεκαθιστημένον, it must be observed, signifies primarily to lay hands first upon any one, to chuse him for any office, destine, &c. ; as in Acts 22, 14. 26, 16. Numerous Classical examples are adduced by Raphael, Wetstein, and Kypke. (Kuin.)

21. ἰν ἰδι οὐρανον μεν δέξασθαι, &c. Now the Jews maintained that the Messiah would perpetually reign on earth. (Compare Joh. 12, 34. and see the note on that passage.) Hence Peter anticipates the possible objection of his auditors, namely, that if Jesus had been the Messiah he would have continued on earth, and founded a perpetual kingdom; and withal replies to it, by saying that it had pleased God that Jesus should be in Heaven, and there remain until the times of the restoration. Αἱ is well explained by Οὐκεμενιος ἱδι. As to δέξασθαι, which is used by enallage for δέχεσθαι, the Commentators have debated whether it is to be taken for occupaverit or accipserit, retinet coelum. The former opinion is maintained by Schmid, Wolf, Dresig, Morus, Rosenmuller, Schott, and others; the latter by Beza, Castellio, Le Clerc, Heumann, Erneati, and others. The sense, in fact, comes to much the same thing, unless any one chuse to make dogmatical distinctions on the sense of the words: but the latter,
which had been formerly brought forward by Justin Martyr, in his Apol. 1, § 6., Didymus, Theophylact, and ÕEcumenius, seems, on more than one account, to deserve the preference, namely, occupare (which interpretation is adopted by Wetstein, who adduces many examples. For δέχεσθαι, when it is joined with a place as its attribute, signifies capere, excipere, exceptum retinere, and is equivalent to ἀναλαμβάνειν, κατέχειν; as in Acts 21, 27. Luke 9, 11. So Lysias, καὶ τῶν ἄνδρα—οὐ τόλις ἔβηλε δέχεσθαι διὰ τέλους. Philo 1023 B. ὅπερ οὐκ ἔδέχατο—μιᾶς χώρας περίβολος. Aristoph. Plut. 773. χώραν δὲ πάνων Κέκροσος, ὡς ἔδέχατο. See Palairet and Loesner. Sometimes, indeed, but very rarely, it signifies occupare; as in a passage of Demosth. cited by Schmid: οὐς δὲ τῶν ἔχετε, οὐδὲ διδόντων ὑμῖν τῶν καιρῶν, Ἀμφίπολιν δέξασθαι δύναμιθ' ἀν, ἀπερημένοι καὶ ταῖς παρακατασκευαῖς, καὶ ταῖς γνώμαις, where, however, δέξασθαι is used of violent occupation and seizure. As to the passage of Eurip. Alc. 807. to which those who assign the sense occupare, appeal, it is nothing to the purpose, since the words οὐκ ἔδεις ἐν δεόντε δέξασθαι δύναμις have rather the following sense, "non opportunē in has sēdes venisti, ut te exciperemus;" there being an ellipsis of ὅστε (as in 637.) and of the pronoun as in 637. and other passages. It is well observed by Ernesti, that the true principles of interpretation do not permit us to recede from the proper and common signification of words, and follow the authority of a few examples (especially in the writings of the Apostles, who were ignorant of those rare senses), unless an evident necessity should compel us; which here does not exist. Besides, the very intent of the Apostle absolutely requires that the common signification of δέχεσθαι be retained; which is, indeed, far more suitable to the context. The words ὅν δὲ τῶν ἔρωτιν δέχεσθαι seem to convey the following sentiment: "removed from the sight of men, he is conversant with God, has been raised to supreme majesty and beatitude." See 1 Pet. 3, 22.

21. "\(\alpha\chi\rho\iota\) \(\chi\rho\omega\nu\) \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\) \(\pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\). This formula \(\alpha\chi\rho\iota\) \(\chi\rho\omega\nu\) is explained by Ernesti, Krebs, and Loesner, \textit{interea dum, quoad, quamdiu}; as in Acts 20, 6. Heb. 3, 13. Joseph. Ant. 12, 7, 6. "The reason why \(\alpha\chi\rho\iota\) admits of this sense is (say they), that \(\chi\rho\omega\nu\) does not, like \textit{kairos}, express \textit{temporis terminus}; but \textit{continuation of time, space}." But the words are not unfrequently interchanged, and \(\chi\rho\omega\nu\) is often used of the \textit{terminus temporis}; as in Jer. 38, 28, (Sept.) Job 6, 11. Esth. 2, 15. Luke 1, 57, & 2, 21. where \(\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\) is put for \(\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\), as here \(\chi\rho\omega\nu\) for \(\chi\rho\omega\nu\), by an enallage of number, and dignitatis gratia. Hence there is no need to recede from the common signification of \(\alpha\chi\rho\iota\): nay, indeed, the context absolutely requires that it should be retained. By \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\) is meant the restoration, restitution to a former state, reformation, or change for the better; as in Joseph. Ant. 11. 3, 8. \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\) τῶν Ἰουδαίων, & 4, 6. τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\). Philo 767 B. τῶν κληρονόμων \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\) εἰς τοὺς ἐκ \(\alpha\chi\varphi\iota\) λαχώντας ὀίκους. This notion, however, is little suitable to the present passage, the subject of which is the \textit{event of prophesies}. Now it also denotes \textit{perfection}, accomplishment of any thing, consummation; a signification very suitable to the context, and which is found in Philo 522 c. \textit{τελεία, \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\) ἄρετής}. Thus Hesychius and Phavorinus explain it \textit{τελείωσις}, and the Schol. Mosq. here interprets it \(\epsilon\kappa\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma\). And thus the verb \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\) signifies to perfect, bring to an end, in Job 8, 6. (Sept.) Now Peter, by the words \(\alpha\chi\rho\iota\) \(\chi\rho\omega\nu\) \(\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\) \(\pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\) \(\delta\varepsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\rho\sigma\varepsilon\) \(\Theta\iota\varepsilon\varsigma\) ("by the time in which all things shall be perfected, completed, and have their event, which the Prophets have predicted") meant the inauguration of the Messiah's kingdom, and the events which shall precede it, a fuller propagation of the doctrine of Christ,
a resuscitation of the dead, the final judgment, &c. See Acts 1, 6. Matt. 17, 11. The general sense intended is therefore this: "unto the very end of the world." (Kuin.)

In the foregoing interpretation, which was also adopted by Valcknaer, I must, upon the whole, acquiesce. For a summary of the various opinions of Commentators on the words themselves, I must refer such of my readers as may be dissatisfied with the present interpretation, to Kuinoel. Dr. Doddridge renders ἀποκαταστάσις "the regulation of all things," and thinks it may very well be explained of regulating the present disorders in the world, and the seeming inequalities of providential dispensations. From which the sense assigned to the words by Bp. Pearce does not materially differ. He observes that καθιστάνειν or καθιστάναι signifies to establish and settle any thing in a good state: and when ἀπό is added to it, then this preposition implies, that this good state, in which it is settled, was preceded by a bad one, from which the change is made to a good one. This, he thinks, is the sense of ἀποκατάστασις here, and in 2 Ephes. 3, 13. where we have the expression a new heaven, and a new earth; wherein dwelleth righteousness.

22. Ἡσυχίας μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας εἰπεν. What we read in this verse seems to have no connection with the preceding. For whether by χρόνος ἀποκαταστάσεως be meant times of reformation, or the inauguration of the Messiah's kingdom, &c. Peter, if he had had reference to those words, and the prophecies to be referred to that ἀποκατάστασις, would have adduced quite different prophecies; as Ps. 110, 1. Dan. 2, 44. 7, 13. 9, 24 & 26., or Mal. 3, 4. But here there is a reference to what preceded in ver. 19 & 20., and Peter is endeavouring to show that Jesus is the Messiah announced by Moses and the Prophets. The connexion of the words from ver. 22 to 26. is this: "Moses announced the Messiah, and all the Prophets of our times, to whom he appeared,
have predicted of those times ἐπεφέρεις. To you belong these prophecies, and the promise given to Abraham that in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed. To you God hath sent his Son Jesus, and on you He would confer felicity, if ye would lay aside your prejudices and forsake your sins. Repent therefore and reform; acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, and admit his doctrine, lest ye suffer worse consequences of your obstinacy." Here, it must be observed, γὰρ (as often) is a mere particle of transition. The passage of Deut. 18, 15. 18 & 19. is quoted from memory.* (Kuin.) The learned Commentator then attempts to shew, at large, that the common opinion, which supposes that the above passage refers to the Messiah, and that Moses himself so meant it, is void of foundation.† He and his coadjutors, Rosenm. and Dath, make out a strong case, which however falls short of conviction. In preference to the ingenious and learned speculations of these Commentators, I would recommend to the student that prompt submission of the understanding of which we have here an example in Schoettgen, who, though he admits that he has met with no Jewish Commentator who has interpreted the words of the Messiah, yet that the authority of the Apostle places this beyond all possibility of doubt. And this may (he continues) be proved from Moses's saying that a Prophet must be raised up similar to himself, i.e. such as should be the author and minis-

* This seems, however, too unqualified an assertion, since nothing certain can be determined until the text of the Sept. has been reformed on critical principles, by the diligent use of that magnificent work for which we are indebted to the munificence of a most illustrious University.

† Of the same opinion too is Wetstein, who observes: Non necessum est per Prophetam hic et comm. 23. intelligere ipsum Jesum, Cüm enim Lucas illum nusquam Prophetam appellat, et porro Prophetae omnes propius abscessent a Moes, quam Moses a Christo, possumus Prophetarum interpreteri de tota serie prophetarum a Moses temporibus in Republica Judaica sibi succidentium, et uno ore de adventu Messiae, qui prophetarum Dominus est, vaticinantium.
ter of a new covenant, as was Moses of the old, the
future abolition of which is so clearly shewn in
the impressive words of Jeremiah. Since therefore
the new æconomy was to be established, it was ne-
necessary that the promised Prophet should, like Mo-
ses, confer much with God; and this our Messiah,
who was emphatically "in the bosom of his Father,"
did. This Prophet then was very similar to Moses.
Now to the same degree of holy familiarity, if we
may be allowed the expression, none of the other
Prophets ever attained. Kuinoel observes that ἄνωσ-
την, like the Hebr. יבש, signifies "to cause or
order to come forth," and is often used of prophets
and teachers, as Deut. 13, 1. 34, 10. Sir. 47, 1.

23. ἐσται δὲ, for καὶ ἐσται. A Hebrew pleonasm.
See the note on 2, 17. On πᾶσα ψυχή see the note
on 2, 41. Ἐξολοθρευθῆσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ, "shall be
extirpated from the people." The Hebr. (of Deut.
19, 19.) is ἣν ἀνὴρ ἀνέβαλεν ἐν αὐτῷ, which is rendered by the Vulgate
ulter existam. Surenhusius, on the Quotations 399,
conjectures that Peter changed the points, and for
Ῥαμφα read Ῥαμφα. But examples of this form have
not yet been produced. Peter rather seems to have
quoted from memory; and the sense seems to be
this: "He who shall reject the Messiah will be de-
prived of the blessings reserved for his worshippers,
and be excluded from the eternal felicity destined
for them. Ἐξολοθρεῖν is nowhere met with in the
Attic writers, but often occurs in the Sept. (as in
Sap. 12, 8. 1 Macc. 2, 40. Joseph. Ant. 8, 11, 1. 11,
6, 6. Philo 1, 78, 2.) and is therefore to be reckoned
among the number of the words appropriate to the
Alexandrian dialect: on which see Sturz, p. 166.
(Kuinoel.)

24. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφήται. It is proper to ob-
serve the sense of καὶ δὲ (but also), as in Joh. 6, 51.,
many examples of which are produced by Kyplke on
this passage, and Raphael here and on Luke 10, 8.
Kuinoel thinks πάντες is not to be too much pressed, but denotes "there are many prophecies in Scripture concerning these times." This, however, is paring down the sense; for though it be admitted that it does not always mean strictly all, yet it must surely denote in a manner all, nearly all, a very considerable portion. Σαμωήλ. See 2 Sam. 7, 16. Now Samuel was first in the series of Jewish Prophets. So Hieros. Chagiga, f. 77, 1. Midrasch Schemuel 24. (cited by Wets.) Ait ei Saul: Reduc mihi Samuelem, magistrum omnium Prophetae. —Si eximius omnium prophetarum judicium timuit, quanto magis cæteri omnes. The construction of the sentence is this: καὶ δόσοι τῶν καθεξῆς ἐλάλησαν.* Λαλῶν, it may be observed, is used very frequently of the oracles of the Prophets. See Acts 26, 22. Heb. 1, 1. 2 Pet. 1, 21.

25. ὑμεῖς ἔστε νῦν τῶν προφητῶν, "ye are the children of the Prophets." Now Prophets and teachers were, by the Jews, styled fathers, and their disciples sons. See the note on Matt. 12, 27. The sense therefore intended is this: "The Prophets taught you:" and since mention had just been made of the times of the Messiah, the passage may be thus rendered. "To you they announced these times. Hear ye, therefore, and strive after the promised felicity." Some Commentators interpret: "To you the prophecies pertain."

25. καὶ τῆς διαθήκης, "and to you, the posterity of Abraham, the promise (i.e. the promised felicity) pertains." Here, too, there is a sort of Hebraism; since in the Hebrew language מ (son) is often joined to names of things, to denote any one to whom the

* Cassaubon conjectured, that the reading should be, καὶ δόσοι τῶν καθεξῆς; but I think that there is no need of this change of order in the words. They produce the same sense, as they now stand in the printed copies: δόσοι will admit of a genitive case, and that case is often placed before it in the order of the words; as in Aristoph. Plut. Act 4. sc. 5. v. 1052. we read, Ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ τῶν φωτιῶν δόσαι ἔχει. And in Eurip. Med 8, 476. ὡς ἰσαι, Ἑλλήνων δόσοι Ταυτῶν συνεισέβησαν Αργών σκαφὰς.
thing in any way belongs.* See the note on Matt. 8, 12. Joh. 17, 12. By διαθήκη is here meant the promise; like the Heb. בְּרִית in Gen. 9, 9 & 11. Ps. 25, 14. 89, 29. 1 Macc. 2, 54. 2 Macc. 8, 15. Sir. 44, 18. Gal. 3, 15. Ephes. 2, 12. See the note on Luke 22, 29. Matt. 26, 28. Markland (less properly, I think) explains the passage thus: "Ye are the sons of the prophecies and of the covenant; i.e. ye are heirs (as St. Paul argues, Rom. 8, 17.) ye have a right to all the advantages of the prophecies and of the covenant."

25. λέγειν πρὸς Ἀβραάμ, &c. On this promise, often given to Abraham, as in Gen. 22, 15. (which passage Peter quotes from memory) compare the Hebrew and the Sept. So Gen. 12, 3. Ἐνευλογηθησονται ἐν σοι πάσαι αἱ φυλαι τῆς γῆς. Now Peter (as Paul to Gal. 3, 16.) has here applied the words of Gen. 22, 18. to the Messiah, the descendant of Abraham. (Compare ver. 26.) The sense of the passage may be thus expressed: "By the Messiah and his doctrine will all nations be blessed. How much more, then, will he bless you his countrymen, if you acknowledge him as the Messiah, and admit his doctrine." By τὰ οἴνου, however, Peter then undoubtedly meant all Gentiles who should pass over to Judaism. (See the note on 2, 39.) Ἡ διέθεσις is for ἧν διέθετο (as in 1, 1.) and τῷ σπέρματι ἐνευλογηθῆσονται for ἐν τῷ σπέρματι εὐλογηθῆσονται. See Glass. Phil. Sacr. 462. Αἱ πατριαὶ, tribes, nations. See Kypke on Luke 2, 4. So Tob. 1, 9. Ἐλαβον ἁναν γυναῖκα ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῆς πατρίας ημῶν. & 5, 15. Πατριά, like the corresponding Hebrew term נֶפֶשׁ.

in Am. 8, 1. Jer, 8, 14. Mich. 2, 3, and Neh. 3, 5 denotes a nation or people. (Kuin.)

26. ὑμῖν προτὸν ὁ Θεὸς, ἀναστήσας — εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς. Ἀναστήσας is (as was observed in the note on ver. 22.) often used of the appearance of Prophets and teachers. The sense seems to be this: "God hath sent forth his Son as teacher and Messiah." ὑμῖν, as being a Dative of profit, signifies "for your benefit." By προτὸν is meant especially; as in Matt. 6, 35. Joseph. Ant. 10, 10, 5. and in other passages. Ἐυλογεῖν is omitted in many excellent MSS. and is rejected by Mill, Bengel, and Griesbach. Ἐυλογεῖν denotes "to confer blessings upon, render any one happy;" as in Matt. 25, 34. See Suicer's Thes. 1, 1246.

26. ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἐκκατον ἀλλὰ τῶν πνευμάτων υμῶν. Our Version renders "In turning every one of you away," &c. This mode of translating the words is supported by the authority of the Ital. and Piscator. Others, however, as Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, and Tindal, render: "So that every one should turn, &c." De Dieu, Pearce, and others: "If every one shall turn." Hammond, Morus, Heinrichs, &c. take ἀποστρέφειν entirely of Christ reforming and blessing the Jewish people; as in Rom. 11, 26. & Tim. 4, 4. But this lies open to the objection of Orobio, as stated in his conference with Limborch (referred to by Doddridge); namely, that Christ did not, in fact, turn every one of them from their iniquities, though it must be allowed that he took such steps as were very proper for that purpose. Doddridge, therefore, adopts the version, "Every one of you turning from your iniquities," which he thinks farther preferable, "as the Apostle knew that the Jews would, in fact, reject the Gospel, and bring destruction on themselves as a nation, by that means." It may, I am aware, be said that the action only reaches so far as Christ's wishes and best exertions to effect it extends; yet this is not quite satisfactory. So that, upon the whole, I am inclined to accede to
the interpretation of Beza, Piscator, Bp. Pearce, Doddridge, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel: "On each one turning himself from his iniquities:" and this (as Kuinoel observes) is most suitable to Peter's words at ver. 19. μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε. Finally, this interpretation was probably adopted by the ancient Greek Fathers; since it is brought forward by Oecumenius: εἰ ἀφεῖ καὶ αὐτοί ἐλοισθε ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ τῶν κακίων υμῶν.

CHAP. IV.

1. ἐνεστὼσαν αὐτῶις. This is a formula often used of those who come upon any one suddenly and unexpectedly. See the note on Luke 20, 1. and Krebs and Loesner on this passage. By στρατηγὸς τοῦ Ιησοῦ is not meant (as Schmid and Hammond have thought) the commander of the citadel Antonia, but the Prefect of those Priests and Levites who kept guard in the Temple. See the note on Matt. 26, 47. Luke 22, 4. Deyling, Obs. T. 3, 236. and Schleusner's Lex. It was the duty of this officer to take care that there should be no tumult in the Temple. Under the pretext that the Apostles had excited disturbances there, and acted without the knowledge or consent of the Sanhedrim, to whom belonged the privilege of granting permissions to teach, (see Deut. 17, 18 & 19, 7. Ez. 44, 15 & 24. Acts 4, 2. Matt. 21, 23,) the Priests (we are told) apprehended them, and committed them to custody. (Kuin.) The Sadducees here mentioned seem to have been private persons. One may observe, by the way, that from the Acts of the Apostles it appears the Sadducees were more intolerant than the Pharisees, and evinced towards the Apostles a yet more persecuting spirit; which peculiar bitterness may be ascribed to the doctrine of the resurrection, that fundamental one of Christianity, so firmly (and fatally for their dogmas) established by the resurrection of Jesus. On
the other hand, the Pharisees were better affected to the Apostles. See 5, 34. 23, 6 seqq.

2. διαπνοούμενοι διὰ τὸ δ. α. τ. λ. The word διαπνοοῦμαι signifies properly to be wearied out, than to be exceedingly vexed, take much to heart, bear with impatience, &c. This signification, however, is not found in the Classical writers, but is purely Hellenistic, and occurs in Gen. 6, 6. Eccl. 10, 9. (Sept.) It answers to the Heb. נתי. Wetstein illustrates this sense of the word from Plut. Lycurg. p. 47 f. τὰ δὲ σώματα τῶν παρθένων δρόμων καὶ πάλαις — διεκλήσει. Versio. Vulg. dolentes. Cod. d. dolore percussi e. indignantes. Hesych. διαπνοήσεις, λυπηθές. Other examples are adduced by Wesseling on Diodor. Sic. 2, 7. 'Ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ may be explained, "by the example of Jesus;" as in 1 Cor. 4, 5. Ἰνα μᾶθετε ἐν ἐμοί.

3. 4. ἔδειτο εἰς τὴρησιν. On the various senses of τὴρησις, see Fischer on Vorst de Heb., Dindorf in loc., and Schleusner's Lexicon. Among its other significations is the present one, φυλακή hold, prisoner: and in this it occurs in Thucyd. 7, 80. κατεβίβασαν εἰς τὰς λιβωτομιὰς ἀσφαλεστάτην εἶναι νομίζοντες τὴν τῆρησιν, where the Schol. explains φυλακὴν.

4. Ἐσπέρα, afternoon: for they had entered the Temple at our three o'clock in the afternoon. Now Ἐσπέρα, like the Heb. עָשָׁה is used of all the afternoon hours; and there were among the Hebrews two Ἐσπέραi, the first commencing at our three o'clock; the second at our six o'clock. See the note on Matt. 8, 15. (Kuin.) Πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκουσάντων τὸν λόγον ἐκίστευσαν, &c. Ἐκίστευσαν must be taken in a Pluperfect sense. Many Commentators, as most of the ancients, and, of the moderns, Lightfoot and Benson, think that this number was exclusive of the three thousand converted on a former day; and Lightfoot argues that propriety of speech would require this sense. But our author is sometimes little attentive to this, and here the sentence is a somewhat inaccurate one. To me it appears clear, as it has done to
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Camierius, Piscator, Doddridge, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, that this number includes the three thousand. For, among other reasons, it is not probable that the portico would hold more than five thousand men; and yet many of the preceding three thousand would be present; not to mention those auditors who might not yet be believers. Besides, as Doddridge and others observe, the Apostle does not here say (as before) προσετέθησαν. 'Εγένετο is for fuctus est, was made. At άνδρων we must subaud τῶν πιστῶν σώσων, taken from the context, namely, from the preceding εὐσεβῶν. 'Ανδρῶν may have the sense either of viorum, or hominum.

5, 6. συναρτήσαι αὐτῶν τοῖς ἀρχιούσις, &c. i.e. the members of the Sanhedrim. So Joh. 3. 1. 1 Macc. 1, 14, & 29. By Josephus Ant. 20, 1, 2. they are called ἀρχιούσίς Ἰερουσαλημίτων, and sometimes simply, as here, and in Luke 23, 15. ἀρχιούσις. It is therefore a general expression, usually defined more exactly by some added words. By αὐτῶν is meant 'Ιουδαίων. For pronouns often belong to a noun not expressely mentioned, but to be taken out of the context, or known from the subject treated of. See Glass. Phil. Sacr. 158 seqq. and the note on Joh. 8, 44: 9, 23. 17, 5.

5. εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ is put for εν Ἰερουσαλήμ (these prepositions being often interchanged); and the words might perhaps be dispensed with, did we not find in other parts of this book some phrases which would seem superfluous; as in 8, 38. Indeed Beza, Lightfoot, Heuman, and Michaelis, suspect that many members of the Sanhedrim were at their country-seats for the summer; and thus they account for the clause in question. (Kuin.) But this seems very hypothetical, and precarious.

6. καὶ Ἀναν τὸν ἄρχιερα καὶ Καίαφαν. At Καίαφαν we must subaud ἀρχιερέα; for Caiaphas was then discharging the pontificial office. See Joseph. Ant. 13, 2. 18, 4, 8. Joh. 11, 49. 18, 19. and Krebs in loc. Hence it has been debated by Commentators
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how Hanas could be called ἀρχιερεύς. Petavius, in doctr. temp. 10, 58., and most others (following the opinion of Augustin) maintain that there were then two high priests discharging the pontifical office by turns, just as the two Roman consuls used the fasces. Others, however, with more probability, suppose that Hanas was the vicar, or deputy, of Caiaphas the Hight Priest, and was also, by courtesy, styled High Priest.

6. Ἰωάννης, καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος. Who these persons were, cannot be determined. This only is certain, that they were men of authority, and senators. Alexander is thought by Bishop Pearson, in his Lect. on Acts, Krebs, in his Obs., and Dr. Mangey, to have been the brother of the celebrated Philo Judæus, and of whom frequent mention is made in Josephus, as in Ant. 18, 8. 79, 5. and elsewhere.

6. καὶ δεινὸν ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ. By these words Hammond thinks are meant the chiefs of the twenty-four Sacerdotal classes. And so Schleusner, in his Lex. in v. γένος. But no passages have yet been produced to prove this signification of the word. Grotius supposes that it relates to the Synedri who had gone through the office of High Priest. And so Wetstein, who cites Joseph. Ant. 15, 3, 1. 20, 10. ult. Bell. 4, 8. 6, 7, & 8. Others, with more probability, understand those Synedri who were relations of Hanas and Caiaphas. “Luke makes mention of these, (says Rosenmuller) in order to show his readers what powerful enemies were opposed to the Apostles. (Kuinoel.)

7. εὐ ποίη δυνάμει η ἐν ποίῳ ὑπόματι ε. τ. ὑ. The Synedri proposed this question to the Apostles (who, they fancied, would defend themselves very feebly and timidly) in order to elicit from them some answer by which they should find an occasion of ruining them. Most Commentators refer the words εὐ ποίη δυνάμει, &c. to the discourse delivered by Peter in the Temple, (see Morus and Rosenmuller,) or to the discourse of Peter and the miracle wrought by
him, as Ravius and Heinrichs. But that the interrogation of the Sanhedrim only regarded the mode of the cure is plain from the very answer of Peter, ver. 9. Others, as Erasmus, Limborch, Le Clerc, Bolten, and Eckerman, interpret thus; "By what virtue, natural, or medical, or by what magic power?" (Kuin.) And so Wetstein: "Quâ potestate, an nomine Raphaelis, aut angelorum alicujus, aut nomine Dei ipsius pronunciato hoc fecistis." On the sense of the words ἐν ποιω όνόματι, in reliance on whose help and authority, (as in 8, 6, 16, 18. Joh. 10, 25. compared with Acts 3, 16. ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ όνόματος αὐτοῦ,) see Lightfoot. "The Sanhedrim (says Kuinoel) used this formula, since the Jewish exorcists of those times cast out devils and healed very dangerous disorders, not merely by the use of medicaments, but by employing various formulas of incantation, as, for instance, the name of Solomon, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or God. See the note on Matt. 12, 27. Joseph. Ant. 8, 2, 9. Just. c. Tryph. p. 311. Orig. c. Cels. L. 4, p. 183 seqq. Iren. adv. Hær. 2, 6, 2. Fabr. Cod. Pseud. V. T. p. 1084 seqq. and Van Dalen, Diss. de divinitate Idol. V. T. p. 520.

8, 9. πλησθεὶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου, "filled with sacred enthusiasm, and without fear." (Kuin.) Or rather: "filled with the sacred and preternatural aids and inspiration of the Holy Spirit." See Doddridge. Of this discourse of Peter the following plan is laid down by Schoettgen.

The speech consists of two parts: I. Proposition, namely: This miracle was worked by the authority of Jesus of Nazareth, ver. 9 & 10. II. Explication of the Proposition, by what is said in Ps. 118, 22, and a general maxim, ver. 12.

9. εἰ τίμεις σώμερον. Peter glances at the Judges, because they had called him to trial, not for an evil deed, but for a benevolent act. Ei signifies cum quandoquidem; as in Joh. 13, 32. 7, 4. See Glass, Phil. 521. (Kuin.) So also 11, 7. and 18, 15. Clas.
sical examples may be seen in Schl. Lex.; to which I add Herodot. 2, 24, 1. εἰ δὲ δεῖ μερισθένην γνωμάς. Eurip. Phæn. 84. χρή δ', εἰ σάφος πέφυκας, where the Scholiast explains εἶπεῖδη. 'Anakrίνεσθαι, it may be observed, is a judicial and forensic term (used here and in 12, 19, 24, 8.), which properly regards the interrogation and examination. Thus Valcknaer cites Αesch. Socr. where there is a saying, that, among the shades below, Minos and Rhadamanthus sit ἀνακρίνοντες, examining such as come. See the note on Luke 13, 14. So the Latin interrogare, of which Grotius adduces examples.

9. ἐφεργεσία ἀνθρώπου ἀσθενοῦ, for εἰς ἀνθρώπων ἀσθενῆ, ἀνθρώπω. Ἀσθενοῦς being a genitive of object. So Diodor. Sic. p. 8 d. κοινὴ ἀνθρώπων ἐφεργεσία for εἰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. And p. 9 οὗ ἐφεργεσία τοῦ καίνου βίου for εἰς τῶν κουν βίων. Philo, 125 ά. ἐκ ἐφεργεσία τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν. See also Glass, Phil. Sacr. 78. έν τίνι οὕτως σετάσσεται; Erasmus and Beza render: "Qua ratione, quo modo," with the subaudition of τρόπῳ; as in Matt. 5, 13. But it is better rendered by whom. (See Luke 11, 19. Hebr. 8, 12.) For Peter, in his answer, has especial reference to the other part of the interrogation, εἰ ποιήσῃ ἵνα μαται; and in ver. 10. declares that the lame man was healed, εἰ τῷ ὄψῃ ἰησοῦν, by Jesus. Σώζεσθαι here signifies to be healed; as in Matt. 9, 21 & 22. Mark 5, 23, 6; 56. Luke 7, 50. Acts 14, 9. Compare also 11 & 14. (Kuin.) This indeed appears to be the primitive sense of the word, whose different significations are luminously detailed by Dr. Maltby quoted in the note on Matt. 1, 21. The whole passage is thus paraphrased by Heinrichs: "Quandoquidem non de malefacto, ut solet, sed de beneficis inquirimus, et id potissimum in quaestionem venit, cujus ope restitutus sit claudus, respondemus, Jesu Christi ope eum sanatum esse." The ἐν here signifies by; which is not (as some suppose) a Hebraism; as appears from the numerous examples adduced by Wetstein from the Classical writers; ex. gr. Soph. Aj. 519.
Dio Cocc. exc. p. 698. ἐν σοὶ τε καὶ ἡμεῖς σωζόμεθα, καὶ ὑπὲρ σου πάντες ἀποδανοῦμεθα.

10. They had, it seems, sent for the lame person, that they might interrogate him concerning the mode of cure; and perhaps (as Heuman suspects) doubted whether the man healed by Peter were the same with him who had sat at the Temple gate begging. (Kuin.)

11. The passage of Ps. 118, 22. which refers to David, Peter applies to Christ; and the sense of his words is: "This Jesus, whom ye rejected, is the true Messiah. See the note on Matt. 21, 42. (Kuin.) Heinrichs observes that the sentiment contained in these words seems to have become proverbial, indicating that what has been formerly held in contempt, sometimes attains great estimation.

12. καὶ οὐκ ἦστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδεὶς ἡ σωτηρία, "and (infeeb) this salvation is not by any other." Ἡ σωτηρία signifies the salvation by the Messiah. Kypke excellently illustrates this from Joseph. Ant. 3, 1. where Moses says, ἐν αὐτῷ (i. e. in God) γὰρ εἶναι τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἄλλῳ. Aristoph. in Lys. ἐν ταῖς γυναικίοις ἦστιν ἡ σωτηρία. In interpreting the words σωτηρία and σωθήναι the Commentators differ widely in opinion. Most understand them of the salvation of the Messiah's kingdom, and the felicity obtained by men through Jesus Christ. See 1 Pet. 1, 5, 9, 10. 2 Tim. 2, 10. 3, 15. But others, as Whitby, Pearce, Teller, Michaelis, and Bolten, understand σωτηρία and σωθήναι of the healing of the lame man. This, however, involves a considerable harshness, since thus σωθήναι must be explained otherwise than the preceding σωτηρία; or an entailage must be supposed in ἡμᾶς, by the admission of a figure called the κοινοτοῦ. But, as Kuinoel observes, such a κοινοτοῦ, except in a hortatory and objurgatory discourse, is very rare, and can only be admitted, when without it there would exist some very absurd contradiction: which is not the case here. Besides (as Doddridge remarks) if the most determinate
word for healing had been here used, (as ἱατρεύοναι or ἱατρεῖα,) it must have signified spiritual and eternal salvation, since it is plain that when Peter says, νῦν δὲ σωθήσονται ἡμᾶς, he takes it for granted that all who heard him needed to apply to Christ for this healing. Now there is no reason to believe they were all afflicted with bodily maladies, nor could he have any imaginable warrant to promise them all supernatural recovery in that case. Others, as Moldenhauer, Kypke, and Heinrichs, maintain that both the preceding senses may be conjoined; and although some exceptions are taken to this method by Ravius and Kuinoel, yet it seems, not improbably, the true one. At the same time there is no necessity to abandon the common interpretation, which is confirmed by the words of the verse following, thus rendered by Kuinoel: "Est salutis auctor, per eum contigit felicitas quam Deus promisit; est Messias a Deo constitutus." By ὄνομα ἐτερον is meant any other person, since ὄνομα has often this sense; as in 1, 15. Peter, too, had reference to the interrogation of the Sanhedrim, ἐν τῷ ὄνομα. Δεδομένον is for διδότω, namely, by God (see 2 Tim. 1, 9.) destined, appointed, constituted. See Eph. 1, 22. 4, 11. The ἐν seems pleonastic; of which idiom Kuinoel adduces examples from Sir. 3, 7. 47, 10. Jer. 25, 11. (Sept.) Col. 3, 10. Acts 13, 15. 1 Cor. 8, 7. 13, 14. θεωροῦντες δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου παράσιαν, &c. By παράσια is meant liberty of speaking, intrepidity in speaking one’s mind: of which see a learned Dissertation of Walchius. Καταλαβέων, having understood, learnt; as in 10, 34. and 25, 25. For καταλαβεῖν properly signifies to lay hold of, to apprehend, both in a physical, and a moral sense. Ἀγράφαματος properly denotes one who does not even know his letters, generally, an illiterate person, or one who possesses not the art of literary composition, or one devoid of knowledge or sense in general. Now since among the Jews science consisted chiefly in the knowledge of sacred literature, so here we may suppose that ignorance of
the Rabbinical interpreters was chiefly had in view. Valcknaer in loc. quotes Athen. 176 ε. ἰδιώτης καὶ ἀναλφαβητὸς.

13. ἰδιώτης. This word has various significations; and in order to accurately determine which of those senses is to be attributed to it in any particular passage, attention must be paid to the context. Thus it denotes private persons, as opposed to those who hold any office civil or military; or low and mean persons, as opposed to persons of rank; and when reference is made to learned and skilful persons, it will denote the contrary, namely, the illiterate. Of all these significations examples have been adduced by Commentators. See Ruperti on Longin. 258. also Irmsch on Herodot. vol. 1. p. 259 seqq. and Krebs on Acts. 7, 22. One remarkable passage seems to have escaped them all; namely, Thucyd. 2, 48. καὶ λάτρης καὶ ἰδιώτης. Now since ἰδιώτης is here referred to persons in authority or power, and magistrates, the whole context leads us to suppose that it must be taken in the sense of private and plebeian persons.

18. ἑπειγωνικοῦ. By this is meant not merely knew, but recognised; as in Matt. 14, 35. Xen. Hist. 5, 4, 12. oi σὺν τῷ Θεῷ are denoted companions of Jesus; a periphrasis frequent in the best Classical writers, of which Kuinoel collects the following examples from those produced by the Philologists. Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 15. τοὺς συνε, ἐπεὶ σὺν ἡμῖν εἰσὶ. And 3, 3, 14. οἱ Ἀσσύριοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῶν. Eurip. Hippolit. 85. σοὶ ἐμείμη. Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 15. Ἑνοφοίν καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῶ. Xen. Rep. Laced. 18, 1. Kuinoel adds, that it here means the perpetual companions, disciples interiorioris admissions. It is well observed by Grotius, that the Sanhedrim might well recognise Peter and John as Jesus’s disciples, since many of them had occasionally attended on his teaching. See Matt. 21, 23. Luke 18, 18. Joh. 12, 42. The words οὐδὲν εἶχον ἀντειπεῖν form a popular phrase, of which Wetstein cites the following exam-
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, CHAP. IV.

15. καὶ εἶπον τοῖς ἁγιοῖς τούτοις ἀπελθεῖν, when they had commanded them to go aside out of the council: in order to have opportunity for private discussion. Similar expressions often occur in Thucydides, and the other ancient historians. Ἀτ συνεβαλὼν subaud boulȧs or bouleȗmatȧ, which is supplied be Eurip. Phoen. 700. θέλω πρὸς αὐτοὺς συμβάλειν bouleȗmatȧ, or γνῶμην. So Plut. 2, 592. καὶ ὁ συμβάλειται γνῶμην; & 154. Similar passages are cited by Bos and Kypke.

16—18. τί ποιήσωμεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις; i. e. "shall we punish them, or let them go." Ἰσωτῶν σημείων. Markland suspects γνωστῶν to be not genuine, as being nowhere else so used in the New Testament. But the MSS. give no countenance to this suspicion, which is, indeed, a very groundless one.

17. ἀλλὰ ἣν αἱ ἐπὶ πλεῖον διανέμηθη e. t. l. Ἁλλὰ may be rendered however. See Devarius de Particulns. At διανεμηθῇ subaud σημείων, or διδαχῇ, as some think, who quote 2 Tim. 2, 17. But the former seems the preferable method. Διανέµων, which corresponds to the Heb. פָּרָע (see Deut. 29, 26.), properly denotes to distribute among several; as in Xen. Mem. 8, 14, 1, and figuratively to divulge, spread a report. By the λάος: are here meant the Jews in general, except the Jerusalemites. Ἀπειληφθῇ ἀπειληφθεῖσα. A common Hebrew idiom, by which the signification of any verb is strengthened by the addition of its cognate noun. See the note on Luke 22, 15. Μηκέτι λαλῶν, i. e. speak, teach. Ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνώματι τούτῳ, in the name of this person (Jesus). Παραγγέλων here signifies to order, and is a term appropriate to kings, magistrates, generals, &c. In this sense it perpetually occurs in the Greek historians. Φθέγγεσθαι, which occurs just after, must be taken in the same sense as the preceding λαλῶν.
Examples of this signification are given by Kuinoel from Theophr. Char. 6, 5. 7, 1. Xen. Cyr. 2, 7. 4, 58. Herodian 4, 6, 2.

19, 20. eι δικαίων ἐστὶν — λαλεῖν.* The words ἀ εἴθωμεν καὶ ἤκουσαμεν are to be referred to all the actions and fortunes of Christ, and all the discourses in which he expounded his doctrines. 'Ενώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ is equivalent to παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, "Deo judice, num vere fas sit." See the note on Luke 1, 6. and compare Acts 8, 21. So Rom. 3, 20. δικαιώσεται τάσσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. There is a similar passage in Eurip. Med. 221. δικῇ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστων ὀφθαλμοῖς βροτῶν ὄσις κ. τ. λ.


* So Xen. Anab. 7, 6, 14. ει τι οὖν ἔγω ἐνταῦθα ἡδίκησα; ἄγαγῶν ἤμας, ἐνθα πάσιν ἤμιν ἐθοκεῖ, εἰπατε.

20. οὐ δῦνασθα γὰρ ἡμεῖς, &c., i.e. "we cannot bring ourselves to do it; it is neither right nor just; it is contrary to the Spirit which impels us to act." Thus δούσαι has here, not a physical, but a moral sense; as in 2, 24. Of this idiom an example is adduced by Wetstein from Papinian: nam quæ facta laedunt pietatem, existimationem, verecundiam nostram, et, ut generaliter dixerim, contra bonos mores sunt, nec facere nos posse credendum est. See also Glass. Phil. Sacr. p. 209 seqq. The passage is thus paraphrased by Kuinoel. "We cannot do otherwise. We, by the providence of God, became the disciples of Jesus (see Joh. 6, 44 seqq.), whom God hath chosen to be witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 10, 41.), whom the Holy Spirit directs and actuates, and to whom Jesus commanded to propagate the Divine doctrine. We cannot but speak what we have heard and seen."

21. προσαπείλησαμεν, and withal threatening them. Πρὰς, in comparison, often denotes addition. Μὴ δὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὰ πῶς, &c. Pricæus, Schoettgen, Wolf, and others, subaud autem (comparing Luke 23, 14.), and give the words this sense: "They found no handle or pretext." Πρὰς Pricæus and Glass take for ἐπως, of which, however, examples are wanting. I would accede to the opinion of Beza, who maintains that μὴ δὲν is equivalent to μὴ (see

Xen. (Econ. 11, 9. and Æsch. Socr. 2, 29.), since the article ὁ follows, which is usually so prefixed as to indicate the following sentence; as in Luke 12, 2. See the note on Mark 9. 23. Πάντες may be rendered on what pretence, or pretext. The Sanhedrin, we may observe, knew not how they could decree any punishment against the Apostles, or how they could so put it in execution as that the people might not break out into a tumult. Πάντες denotes, by hyperbole, the bulk of the people; as in Joh. 12, 14. (Kuin.)

23. 24. ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς ἴδιους. Schmid, Heumann, Morus, and others, explain the words: “They returned home:” and the τοὺς ἴδιους, they take to mean the other Apostles, or the Christians who occupied the same lodging with Peter and John. I would rather understand by it the apartment, or private oratory, in which the Christians had met to offer up prayers for the release of the Apostles. (Compare 12, 5, 2, 1.) By ἴδιοι are often meant any one’s partisans; as in Philo 630 a. Μωσῆς ἔθαρσε τοὺς ἴδιους.

24. ὡμοθυμάδων ἦσαν φανήν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. By ὡμοθυ- 

μαδῶν is meant together. See the note on 1, 1, 14. To the examples there adduced, I add Athen. 623 d. κράτου πε γενομένου, καὶ πάντων ὡμοθυμάδων αὐτῶν καλε-

σάντων. The Hebrews prefix the formula נָא יִלַּי to verbs of speaking; so that it is almost redundant. This idiom has been adopted by the writers of the New Testament, who prefix ἐπαίρειν τὴν φανήν to the verbs εἴπειν, λέγειν, ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, which give them a sort of intensive force. It is well observed by Limborch, that all did not at once break out into this prayer, since, without divine inspiration, [which, however, it is not absurd to suppose, and is adopted by Doddridge,] how can it be imagined? The sense of the words is this: “All, on hearing of the threatenings, addressed themselves to prayer. Some of the Apostles pronounced, with a loud voice, the following precatory address, and the rest, in a
low voice, pronounced the same words, or adopted them mentally, adding their own earnest wishes to the prayer, which, as being pronounced on so memorable an occasion, was afterwards committed to writing." That this precatory address was (as some conjecture) not pronounced extempore, but a pre-composed form of prayer, we cannot rationally suppose, since the words advert to circumstances not known until that very time; as, for instance, the threatenings of the Sanhedrim, (ver. 29.) of which they had been but just then informed: and the words ἀκούσαντες ὀμοθυμαδίως ἦραν φανή, will not allow us to imagine any interval between the report of Peter and John, and this prayer.


25. ὃ διδ στόματος Δαβιδ τ. π. σ. ε. Almost all Commentators, both ancient and modern, even Dath, (who is sceptical enough upon such points,) agree that the Psalm has reference to the Messiah. But from this opinion Kuinoel dissent; whose reasons, however, do not seem entitled to much attention when opposed to the united authority of the sacred

* It is generally thought that εἰς or εἰ, art, is wanting after σοὶ. This has been partly owing to the construction's being suspended through several verses, and not coming out before ver. 29; and this difficulty was increased by the words καὶ τὰ νῦν, which were very proper; τὰ νῦν (or τὰ νῦν; being opposed to πορε, which may, or may not, be understood before εἰς) θεόν, who formerly saidst by David, Why do the Heathen rage, &c. now also look upon their threats," &c. If formerly be omitted, the mention of David is sufficient to show the opposition to now. 'O Θεός is put for & Θεός. (Markland )
writer, and the most eminent Theologians, including Rabbi Solomon Jaschi, who confesses that all the ancient Rabbis did so interpret it. I shall therefore omit the empty speculations of that Commentator, and rather turn to his solid philological illustrations of the passages in question, which being, as usual, derived from the best sources, are deserving of great attention. ἵνα, why. So the ᾧ, which Symmachus renders εἰς τί, for what. Hesychius explains the word by διατί. Φυώσεις (like the Heb. שָׁהָר) and its derivatives are used of the whinneying, or neighing of horses; as in Xen. de re Eq. 12, 12. Diod. Sic. 687 v. Callim. Lav. Pall. 2. See Gataker on Anton. 9. p. 364, and the Commentators on T. Mag. 901. It is, however, used metaphorically of men. Hence Φυώγμα and τίφος are joined by Ἐλιαν V. H. 2, 10. Aristēn. 2, 12., and we have Φυώγμα and μεγαλαυ-χία in Plut. de Ed. 2, 6. So Φυώσεις in Diodor. Sic. 191 v. 3 Macc. 2, 2. Other examples may be seen in Valcknaer. The sense, therefore, is this: "Why do they rebel against the Messiah, why endeavour to shake off his rule."

25. Λαοὶ ἐμελετήσαν κενὰ; Μελετῶ, like the Heb. הנה, signifies to meditate on, think of; as in Mark 13, 11. Xen. Cyr. 5, 5, 14. κενά (as Bengel well observes) has the force of an adverb; as in Job. 21, 34., where the Sept. renders παρακαλεῖτε κενά; but by Aquila the Heb. הנה is expressed by κενῶ. (Kuin.) Wetstein illustrates the sentiment by a proverb found in Suidas and Apostolius: κενά κενοὶ λογίζονται vel. θουλεύονται.

26. παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, i.e. stood up (for opposition). The Heb. is בִּרְצִירוּ, which with לל signifies to minister unto, help; as in Job. 1, 6, 2. Zach. 6, 5., and is, by the Alexandrian Jews, and the writers of the New Testament, expressed by παραστηκέναι. But לל is also, like παραστή-κέναι, used in a bad sense of those who oppose, stand as adversaries against; like ἀνθρωπίκεναι and συνῆ-θαι. The words ἄρα ὑπο cohere with ἁρκάριον, as
here κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου with παραστηκέναι: κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, "against God, and the King anointed and appointed by him." For those kings rebelled against God, by resisting the King whom God had appointed. (Kuin.)

27. συνήχθησαν γὰρ ἐκ ἁληθείας. Ἡ ὁ παρὰ has here the sense of uitique, surely. See the note on Joh. 9, 30. Many MSS. of different recensions, and several Fathers and Versions add ἐν τῇ πόλει ταυτῇ, which was approved by Lightfoot and Hammond, and has been received into the text by Beza, Bengel, and Griesbach, with the approbation of Rosenmuller and Kuinoel. The words are thought to be supported by Ps. 2, 6. to which they seem to have reference. But how then are we to account for their omission? To me, I confess, they appear to be derived from the margin; and such, I suspect, was the opinion of Wetstein. The plural λαοί; it may be observed, is put for the singular λαὸς, which Kuinoel thinks is for the sake of more exact correspondence. I have, however, noticed many such instances of plurals for singulars in the later Greek, the Alexandrian, and the Hellenistic writers. Such a use also had place in the Latin populus, of which Wetstein adduces examples from Livy, Justin. Mala, Pliny, and Virgil. It is remarkable, that in all of them the plural is associated with another noun in the plural, which seems to confirm the observation of Kuinoel.

28. τοιῆσαι ἀσα ἡ χελρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλῆ σου προάψεισε γένεσθαι. Some Commentators are of opinion that τοιῆσαι connects with ἐχρίσαι at ver. 27, not the intermediate words Ἡρωδῆς and λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ with συνήχθησαν. But this trajectio is harsh, and, as far as I know, unexampled. Ποιῆσαι may more rightly be referred to συνήχθησαν. Compare 3, 17 & 18. Ἡ χελρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλῆ are an endiadis for "thy all-powerful will." (Kuin.) And so Ecumenius. This, however, appears harsh and unauthorized. I prefer, with most Greek and Latin Fathers, as Vatablus, Camerarius, &c. taking it to denote the providential
ordering of God. For, as Whitby justly observes, the hand of God, in the Old Testament, relates not so much to his power, as to his wisdom and providential dispensations. So Job 27, 11. “I will teach you by the hand of God. (See more in Whitby.) The sentiment conveyed in these words is this: “They persecuted and slew Jesus the Messiah; but this was done by the will, providence, permission of God, who could, if he had pleased, have frustrated all their efforts.*

29. kal τὰ νῦν, Κύριε, ἔπρεξε ἐξὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς αὐτῶν. Τὰ νῦν is an elliptical expression for κατὰ τὰ νῦν ἐντα πράγματα, in praesentid, for the present. The expression occurs in the best Classical writers; of which examples are given by Raphel, Elsner, and Wetstein. Grotius observes that in Hebrew the correspondent particle πρῶς has a hortatory force. It is rightly remarked by the Latin Fathers, and, of the modern Commentators, Menochius and Kuinoel, that ἔπρεξε signifies, “So look upon their threats as to frustrate

* The same view of the subject is taken by Wetstein, in the following elegant annotation:

“Herodes et Pilatus sine dubio volebant suum consilium perficiere, subique potestate abutiri. Putabant non posse aliter fieri, quæm ut hunc Evangelii extingueretur: se vel minis vel ultimo certe supplicio Apostolos ad silentium redacturos; omnem, per quem elaborentur Apostoli, rimam esse obstructam; se aut callido isto consilio, quo silentium ipsius indixerant, aut vi apertâ victuros: Apostoli vero ipsi, dum haec aguntur, ad Deum confugiant; hominem consilis opponunt consilium Dei, cujus sapientiae comparata omnium hominum caliditas stultitiae est; hominem potentiae opponunt divinam potentiam. Scimus causam Evangelii, quæ et nostra est, tibi curæ cordique esse: scimus hostes nostros tecum bello gerere; scimus te omnia ipsorum consilia et molimina uno spiritu diffiare posse; credimus, eos ne capillum quidem capi ti nostro eripere posses, nisi tu permittas; te autem ne permissurum, nisi quod nobis salutare, et doctrinae Filii tui promovendum idoneum erit. Si decretiisti ut hostium vexationibus porro exponamur, habes nos paratos veritatis testes: si nos decretiisti é præsens periculo eripere, cujus potentiae hoc est facillimum, agemus tibi gratias. Confidimus autem, quomodocunque res cadat, causam Evangelii sub te rectore detrimentum non esse passurum, et illis, qui te diligunt, omnia etiam quæ pessimo consilio et summâ vi ab inimiciis ipsorum agitantur, in bonum cessura.”
the execution of them." Of this use, however, they give no examples; nor do any occur to me, except I may be allowed to compare the very same use of a not dissimilar word, namely, the Hebr. יַעֲדָה, *to visit,* which is used both in a good and bad sense. The Commentators remark, that δίσ, and the Latin da, are frequent in prayers. See Rom. 15, 5. Hom. II. γ. 351. Virg. Æn. 2, 789. and consult Elsner, Wolf, and Raphel, on Mark 10, 37.

30. ἐν τῷ τῇ χείρᾳ σου ἐκτείνειν σε εἰς ἱασιν, "while thou extendest thine hand to heal the sick." A Hebrew phrase, declarative of *power.* See Glass. 934.

31. καὶ δειπνευτὶν αὐτῶν ἐσελεύθη ὁ τότος. This unexpected earthquake was to the congregation a sign that God *had heard their prayers,* and would help them. For even the Gentiles believed that earthquakes were sometimes marks of divine approbation and favour; of which many examples are adduced by Priceus, Doughty, and Wetstein. *Kal ἐπιληπτηκαν ἄπαντες Πνεύματος ἁγίου, "filled with sacred ardour," as some recent Commentators render; but which is a mode of interpretation that exceedingly lowers

ING THE SENSE. THERE SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN A SENSIBLE ILLAPSE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT; THOUGH I AM NOT PREPARED TO SAY, WITH DR. DODDRIDGE, THAT THIS WAS ACCOMPANIED WITH ANY VISIBLE SYMBOL OF ITS DESCENT; STILL LESS, WITH DR. BENSON, THAT THE CLOVEN TONGUES AGAIN FELL ON THEM. THIS, INDEED, IS BEING WISE ABOVE WHAT IS WRITTEN, AND SUCH TEMERITY IS CAREFULLY TO BE AVOIDED, SINCE IT MAY LEAD, ACCORDING TO THE TEMPER OF MIND IT MEETS WITH, AS WELL TO SUPERSTITION, AS TO SCEPTICISM.

32. SEE THE NOTE ON 2, 44. ΤΟΥ ΔΕ ΠΛΗΘΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΨΥΧΗ ΜΙΑ. THE EXPRESSION ΚΑΙ ΨΥΧΗ ΜΙΑ, IT MUST BE OBSERVED, WAS A PROVERBIAL DESCRIPTION OF THE MOST TENDER AFFECTION AND CLOSE UNITY.* ON THE WORDS οὐδὲ εἰς τι τῶν, &c. SEE THE NOTE ON 2, 44.

33. ΚΑΙ ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΔΥΝΑΜΗ ΑΣΧΕΣΙΟΝ Τ. Μ. Ο. Α. THERE SEEMS NO REASON, WITH PRICESUS, TO INTERPRET THE EXPRESSION ΕΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙ OF MIRACLES. IT SEEMS ONLY TO HAVE REFERENCE TO THE FORCE AND EFFICACY OF THEIR ELOQUENCE AND POWER TO PERSUADE AND MOVE THE HEARTS OF THEIR HEARERS. SEE THE NOTE ON LUKE 4, 32. 24, 19. (KUIN.) THE SAME VIEW OF THE SUBJECT IS TAKEN BY HEINRICH AND WOLF. FOR MY PART, I WOULD NOT EXCLUDE THE FORCE OF THAT INARTIFICIAL, BUT IMPRESSIVE ELOQUENCE, WHICH, FOUNDED IN CONVICTION, AND SUPPORTED BY THE VISIBLE EFFECTS OF DIVINE FAVOUR, WOULD GIVE THEIR WORDS AN EFFECT RARELY TO BE FOUND IN THE MOST POLISHED ORATORY: BUT I MUST MAINTAIN, THAT THERE IS COMPREHENDED IN THE EXPRESSION WHAT WOULD, ABOVE EVERY THING ELSE, ENABLE THEM TO SPEAK WITH SUCH POWER, NAMELY, THE MIRACLES WHICH THEY WERE OCCASIONALLY ENABLED TO WORK.

* OF THE EXAMPLES ADDUCED BY THE COMMENTATORS, GROTIANUS, PRICESUS, ELANDER, AND KYPKE, THE FOLLOWING ARE THE MOST APPROPRIATE. PLUT. IN CAT. WHO CITES THE FOLLOWING ANTIQUAN VERSE: ΔΘΟ, ΦΙΛΟΙ, ΨΥΧΗ ΜΙΑ. DIOG. LAERT. L. 5. C. 1. § 2. ΕΡΩΤΗΘΕΙΣ ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙ ΦΙΛΟΣ; ΕΦΙ ΜΙΑ ΨΥΧΗ ΔΥΝΑΜΑΙΝΕΝΕΝΩΣΥΑ. EURIP. OREST. 1047. ARISTOT. ETH. 9, 8. OVID, FAST. 4, 72. MINUILLUS FELIX: CREDERE UNAM MENTEM IN DUOBUS DIVISAM ESSE.
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38. χάρις τε μεγάλη ἵν ἐνὶ πάντας αὐτούς, "and they were all in great favour with the people." By χάρις Beza, Priceus, Heuman, Whitby, and Doddridge, understand the favour of God (as in Luke 2, 40. Ephes. 6, 21. Bengel renders, "in favour both with God and man." But to these interpretations I cannot assent. For the very connexion (compare ver. 37), and the parallel passage of ver. 47, clearly shew that the words are to be here understood of the favour of the people, which the Apostles and the rest of the Christians gained by their mutual love and harmony (ver. 32), and by their liberality towards the poor. See ver. 34. (Kuin.) To this mode of interpretation, which was also adopted by Grotius, Caesanbon, Pearce, and Rosenmuller, I entirely accede.

34. ὅσοι γὰρ κτίτορες χαρίας ἢ οἰκίων ὑπήχων, &c. Calvin and Heuman rightly remark, that it cannot be hence inferred that all and every one of those who had farms or houses, sold part of the possessions. For here we have not πάντες ὅσοι, as in 5, 36. Matt. 7, 12, 13 & 44., and ὅσοι is elsewhere put indefinitely; as in 9, 39. This view of the subject is strongly confirmed by the words addressed by Peter to Ananias. (See 5, 4. and the note on 2, 44.) The phrase ἐδέναι παρὰ τοῖς πιστάς τινος, which occurs also in 5, 2, 7, 57. denotes to commit to the care and disposal of; for in the Hebrew, parts of the body are often used for the person himself. Of this Wetstein adduces several examples. (Kuin.) We may observe, moreover, that this action was intended as the most reverential mode of making the deposit; as is remarked by Œcumenius, whose words are these: Ἔτι τὸ πρὸς τοὺς πιστάς, καὶ σέβιασ αὐτοῖς περπολαὶ, καὶ ὑπείχοις ἀφῆγε τῶν ἐνδυσάν τῶν τρεφόμενων. *


"R. Eliéser, R. Jesus, and R. Akiba, came to Antioch, where lived Aba Jodan, who used to give liberally to the Rabbins. His wife said to him, why hast thou not gone down to the market-place for these last two days? He answered: The Rabbins have come, and I have no money to give them; so I am ashamed to go down to
Of τιμή, value, the following examples are adduced by Wetstein: Appian. B. c. 5. p. 1088. τιμᾶς τῶν ἔτι πιπρακομένων. Demosth. C. Aphob. 1. τῶν ἀνδροπέδων τῶν πιπρακομένων — τὰς τιμᾶς ἐλάμβανεν. Doddridge has well refuted the insinuation of Oratio, that it was no small advantage to poor fishermen to be treasurers of so considerable a bank. "Nothing (says he) can be more unjust and unnatural than to suspect that men who were so ready to sacrifice their lives to the cause of truth and the happiness of mankind, should be capable of falsifying such a trust as this for the sake of a little money. Their miraculous powers were joined with a thousand marks of probity in their daily conduct to warrant such a confidence, which was but a natural token of due respect. We see in chap. 6, 2, 3, 4. how ready they were soon to transfer the management of this affair to other hands; and the following story furnishes us with an additional answer to this cavil, which is beyond all exception."

36. Of the number of those who sold their possessions for charitable purposes, was Barnabas, afterwards a celebrated Christian teacher. On the meaning of this name see Schleusner's Lexicon. This indeed is a point on which the Commentators are not agreed. It is usually thought to denote, son of consolation; but Kuinoel, after summing up the various opinions with his usual diligence and accuracy, determines it to mean, "son of doctrine," i.e. doctor. The question seems one of no easy determination; but, like most such, is of little importance.

37. ἵππος αὐτῶ ἀγωγός. He could not have sold that which was his paternal inheritance as a Levite; but this might perhaps be some legacy, or purchase of land in Judea, to which he might have a title till the next jubilee, or perhaps some land in the market-place. His wife, who was fond of the precepts of the Rabbins, said to him: Have we not a piece of land remaining? Sell half, and give to them. And he went and did so; sold the half for five coins, and gave them to the Rabbins, saying: Pray for me. And they prayed for him, saying: God supply thy want, &c.
Cyprus. (Doddridge.) That it was lawful for the Levites to buy land, we learn from the example of Jeremiah himself, who was of the tribe of Levi. (See Jer. 32, 17.) It is observed by Bp. Pearce, that those Commentators who contend that this land must have belonged to his wife, because according to the law mentioned in Numb. 18, 20, 23 & 24. a Levite could have no inheritance in Israel, seem to have mistaken the sense of that law, “which (says he) means only that the Levites, as a tribe, were not to have a share in the division of Canaan among the other tribes. This did not hinder any Levite from possessing lands in Judea either by purchase or by gift, as well as in right of his wife. Josephus was a Levite, and a priest too, and yet in his Life, ch. 76. he speaks of lands which he had lying about Jerusalem, and in exchange of which Vespasian gave him others for his greater benefit and advantage. After all, I see no reason why we may not suppose that this land, which Barnabas had and sold, was not land in Judea; and if so, the words of the law, no inheritance in Israel, did not (however understood) affect their case. His land might have been in his own country, Cyprus, an island of no great distance from Judea: and he might have sold it at Jerusalem to some purchaser there, perhaps to one of his own countrymen.”

Χρυσά is equivalent to τρυψ, at ver. 34. It is rarely found (as here) in the singular, to denote money; yet it does so occur in Herodot. 3, 98. Diodor. Sic. 10, 106. where see Wass. (Kuin.) I add Diod. Sic. 6, 479. in cod. Coislian.

CHAP. V.

After commending the undissembled liberality of Barnabas, Luke adduces a memorable example of the contrary (hinted at by the adversative δε) in Ananias and Sapphira, who, on having sold some land, deposited part only with the Apostle, pretending to have brought the whole. And both of
these, he relates, perished by sudden death. (See 1, 12.) That Ananias had brought his gift publicly, and in presence of the assembled congregation, is plain from the whole narration: for at ver. 11. it is said that the Apostles were gathered together, and that a great fear seized the whole congregation. The crime committed by Ananias and his wife was, indeed, no slight one. They had pretended piety, had endeavoured to deceive the Apostles, had deliberately committed the fraud, and had thereby incurred the guilt of sacrilege, inasmuch as the money was destined to the use of the sacred society, and might therefore itself be accounted sacred. So Cic. Offic. 1, 13., totius injustitiae nulla capitalior est, quam eorum, qui cum maximè fallunt, id agunt, ut viri boni esse videantur. Many Commentators contend that the atrocity of the crime was increased, inasmuch as those who had sold their goods, and delivered them to the Christian society, had a right to support from the common treasury. But that Ananias had no possessions or property but that in question, we are not told; nor (as was remarked at 2, 44. and 4, 33.) can it be proved that the richer Christians divested themselves of all their property. It is not necessary for me to notice the conjectures in which Michaelis, Rosenmuller, and Heinrichs indulge, since they are both destitute of proof, and little probable in themselves. As to those who endeavour to account for all upon natural principles, their hypothesis (which is, indeed, no novelty, but was formerly broached by Origen) involves more difficulties than it removes; so that, if we had not so many proofs of the credulous incredulity of sceptics, or at least latitudinarians, we should be surprised at seeing them seriously maintain such a position. Though instances of death, brought on by fright, are on record; yet that any two given persons dwelling together shall both die of fright, is too improbable even to think of. And as to what those Commentators urge, namely, that Peter did not, by divine
inspiration, foresee, much less threaten, the death of Ananias, because he makes no mention of death, this is a false conclusion, since whatever previous knowledge Peter might have, to threaten the death of Ananias would have been, in the present circumstances of the Church, highly imprudent, since it would have given the magistracy that handle against the Apostles which they desired; and hence there is no cause for the wonder expressed by some Commentators (as Kuinoel) that the Sanhedrim took no cognizance of the matter, since from the prudent course which Peter pursued, it was impossible for them to have any hold upon him. Indeed, the words καὶ ἐξήσωσι σε contain not a threatening, much less (as Porphyry said) an imprecation, but a prediction. Doubtless, the same Holy Spirit which revealed to Peter the fraud, revealed also the punishment which would follow it. Here Οὐκουμενίου judiciously observes: Τρία δὲ κατὰ ταυτὶ τημακάτα σημεῖα: λαθραίων γνωσίς, μελέτης διανοιῶν ἐκφύβησις, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀναφέρεσι ἐκ προσταγμάτων.

1. ἐκάλησε κτήμα. See the note on 2, 45. Here κτήμα denotes a piece of landed property; for at ver. 3. it is interchanged with γάριον.

2. ἐνσωπήσατο. Νοσφίζομαι signifies to separate, and νοσφίζεσθαι (from νόσφι, apart) denotes to put aside, convert to one's own use. It is chiefly used of peculation and embezzlement of public money.* At τῆς τιμῆς subaud μέρος τί; an ellipsis common both to the Greek and Latin writers, and such a one is found in the modern languages. Kuinoel

* Of the examples adduced by Raphel, Kypke, Munthe, and Loesner, the following are the most apposite. Xen. Cyr. 4, 2, 42. ήτι δὲ καὶ χρήματα ἐγὼ οἶδα διὶ τοιά ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἐστιν, ἄν νῦν ἄγνω διὶ δυνατόν ἢμῖν, γοινών αὐτῶν ἀπόκειται τοῖς συγκατεληφός, νοσφιζέσθαι ὑπόσα αὐτὶ βουλώμεθα. Diodor. Sic. 450 B, οἱ νοσφιζόμενοι τὰ χρήματα τά σωζόμεθα. Phil. 563 D. ἄπνυσι τῶν ἀργυρῶν καὶ χρυσῶν θοὺν ἐκ τῆς τιμῆς ἥροσο τοῦ σιτοῦ ἐν τοῖς βασιλείως ἐνθαυμαστῶς ταμείοις, οὐδεμιᾶν ἄρχων γοσφιζόμενοι. & Macc. 4, 89. χρυσώματα τίνα τῶν τοῦ ιεροῦ νοσφιζόμενοι ἐχαρίσατο τῷ Ἀνδρόνικῳ.
here brings forward an observation (partly from Bp. Pearce), obvious, indeed, to any one, namely, that when Ananias deposited the money with Peter, he intimated that it was the whole price of the land. Such minute circumstances as may themselves be easily supposed, the sacred writers (and indeed the best Classical ones) are accustomed to omit. See Pearce. At συνείδησις we must supply τοῦτο. So Thucyd. Vol. 2, 92, 7. edit. Becker. €ινειδως τοίς εσεροις τῷ επιβούλευμα. The ancient Commentators agree that this was sacrilege, the punishment of which (says Cæcumenius) was death. One must here (observes Mede, in his Diss. 26, p. 151.) distinguish between the species facti, which was sacrilege, and the circumstances of the deed, namely, hypocrisy, desire of vain glory, avarice, &c.

S. διατελήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου. The best Commentators seem agreed that πληρῶν τῆς καρδίαν τινος is a Hebrew form of expression, signifying to impel, incite, embolden, persuade any one. See Hammond and De Dieu. “It answers (observes Fischer) to the Heb. בְּלָשָׁנָה, which is equivalent to the formula קָרַתְךָ, which the Greek Translators render ἔπιεσεν, ἀφαρείεν, άπο- πείλε&nu= 600. Thus the formula ἐπιλαμβάνειν καρδίαν with an infinitive declaring the action, is used of any one who is induced, who dares to do any thing: as in Esth. 7, 8., and Eccl. 8, 11., where בְּלָשָׁנָה is rendered by the Sept. εἰπεροφορήθη καρδία νων τοῦ ἄνθρω- που ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῦ ποιήσαι τὸ κακόν. Now πληροφορεί- θαι is used metaphorically of men who are hurried away by excess of eagerness to do any thing. The expression is to be taken figuratively. For as, in Scripture, those who obey the Divine will are said to be guided by the Holy Spirit, so are those who commit iniquity said to be filled with the evil spirit; Satan. Besides, at ver. 4. Ananias is said to have formed this plan in his mind. The expression is therefore equivalent to “How is it that thou hast...
dared to form and execute such a flagitious plan." See Doddridge's paraphrase.

At ἑφύσασθαι subaud eis τὰ. The verb takes both a dative, as in ver. 4., or an accusative, as here, and denotes to lie; and since a lie is a species of fraud accomplished, or attempted, by words, it also signifies to deceive, act dissemblingly towards. (Kuin.) Examples of these significations are given by Bos, Schmid, Kypke, and Wetstein. Thus Joseph. Ant. 18, 1. ἑυτέκνοιν αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῶν βασιλέων. Antonin. Lib. fab. 17. ἑφύσαστο τὸν Λάμπρον, ἄρρεν λέγουσα τέκεν. Deut. 33, 29. (Sept.) καὶ ἑφύσασται σε οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου. Ps. 77, 36. καὶ τῇ γυλάσσῃ αὐτῶν ἑφύσαστο αὐτῷ. Θεοῦ. 17, 49. ἑφύσαστο. But it is more frequently used with the accusative in the sense of deceiving; as in Diodor. Sic. 199 d. ὡς κρόνων ἑφύσαστο. Herod. 2, 11, 12, 10, 8. Is. 57, 11. (Sept.) τίνα εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβῆθης, καὶ ἑφύσασα. Hos. 11, 2. ὡς ἑφύσαστα αὐτῶς. I add Jos. 388, 38. ὡς ἑφύσαστα αὐτῷ καταπεινασθεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ Φήγας. & 1147, 4. εἰ κατασχεδιάζω Θεόν.

For a detail of the nature and extent of the crime I must refer my readers to the very judicious observations of Dr. Whitby. Kuinoel observes that ἑφύσασθαι must here be understood of attempt, not performance: an idiom not unfrequent; as Eurip. Ion. 1326. ἥκουσαν ὡς μὴ ἔκτενεν. See Glass Phil. 202. He remarks, too, that by πνεύμα ἁγιον is here meant "us who are filled with the Holy Spirit." (6, 3, 7, 51.)

4. οὐχὶ μένον σοι ἔμενε, "as long as it remained (thine), did it not continue at thy disposal." Hence it appears that none were compelled to sell estates by any law or institution of the Church.

4. τί ὅτι ἔθουν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου τὸ πράγμα τοῦτο; The phraseology is abrupt and elliptical. Γέγονεν is to be supplied; and τί ὅτι is put for διατι. The complete phrase occurs in Joh. 14, 22. Τιθέναι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, or εἰς τὴν καρδίαν (21, 14.) answers to the Heb. בָּשַׁם in Hagg. 2, 19. Dan. 1, 8., and is used
of those who *aliquid altă mente repositum tenent*, consider of, plan, and determine to do any thing. So Mal. 2, 2. ἐὰν μὴ ἔσῃς εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν τῶν δόναι δόξαν τῷ ὑματίᾳ μου. Very similar is that form, which so often occurs in the Greek Poets, ἐν θυμῷ βάλλεσθαι.

4. Οὐκ ἐξεύσω ἀνθρώποις, ἄλλα τῷ Θεῷ. Οὐκ answers to ἄλλα, and the sense is, not so much—as. This signification of οὐκ is frequent in Scripture. See the note on Matt. 10, 20. (Kuin.) When Θεός is used with the article, it always means God the Father. Now Ananias and his wife did not deceive ordinary men, but the Apostles who were filled with the Spirit of God and Christ, and therefore they insulted both the Spirit, Christ, and God the Father. Of the Holy Spirit we have express mention in this verse, as also in the third and ninth; of Christ in the ninth verse; of the Father in this and the thirty-second verse. 1 Cor. 6, 19. 3, 16. 1 Thess. 4, 8. Ex. 16, 8. Esaj. 7, 13. (Wetstein.)

5. πεσάν ἐξεύσετε, expired. Here we must supply βίων. There is a similar ellipsis in ἐκπνεῖν, ἀποψύχειν, &c. The complete phrase occurs in Eurip. Or. 496. ἀποψύχειν τὴν βίων. Soph. Aj. 1656. and Virg. Æn. 2, 262. vitam exhalare. (Valckn. & Kuin.) Porphyry, and some Jewish detractors, accuse Peter of cruelty. But the visitation was not Peter's, but God's. That the severity (as Doddridge observes) was not only righteous, considering that complication of vain-glory and covetousness, of fraud and impiety, which, as Limborch and Mr. Biscoe (p. 659—661.) have well proved the action contained; but also, on the whole, was wise and gracious, both as it served to vindicate the honour of the blessed Spirit, so notoriously affronted by this attempt to impose on those who had been so lately and eminently anointed by his extraordinary effusion, and farther, as it tended more effectually to deter any dishonest persons from joining the Christians merely for the sake of present alms, to which, by a fraud like this,
many might, on easy terms, have purchased a pretence, who would also, no doubt, have proved a great scandal to a profession taken up on such infamous motives. Moreover, such exemplary punishment of so heinous a crime was the more expedient, as Christianity was now in its first rise. So, just at the opening of the Mosaic institution, Nadab and Abihu were struck dead with lightning for a fault (as it seems) of much less aggravated guilt (Lev. 10, 1, 2.): and the wisest human governments generally act on the like principle.*

*“The sin of Ananias and Sapphira (observes Wetstein) admitted of no excuse. The Disciples had entered into a society consisting of the rich, the poor, and the middle classes, on condition that the rich should contribute much, those of the middle class according to their means, and that from the fund so formed, all should derive their common support. (See supra 2, 46.) Ananias, therefore, who pretended to be poorer than he was, thirsted for gain, hoping to receive more from the common treasury than he had contributed. Had this evil example been followed by others, the Church would soon have been severely burthened (see 1 Tim. 5, 16.); nay the funds would shortly have been exhausted by the expenses incurred through such fraudulent persons (see 2 Pet. 2, 13. Judg. 12.) who, under pretence of poverty and piety, would reap the fruit of others’ labour. This would have opened a wide door to hypocrisy and idleness, and have utterly extinguished the benevolence of the wealthier classes, whose charitable dispositions would have given way before their wealth should have been exhausted; for who would have supported persons of property, who pretended poverty in order to become a burthen on the bounty of others. This abuse would not only have injured the reputation of the nascent Church, but have cut the very nerves of all its prosperity. Yet this sin Ananias and Sapphira, regardless of law divine and human, had not hesitated to commit, knowingly, voluntarily, and deliberately, without the plea of imminent peril or urgent necessity. Just, therefore, seasonable, and even necessary, was their punishment, that the fraud might not turn to the benefit of its authors, and that all might see that this new society was an assemblage of honest and good men. Ananias sought the praise of liberality: the event, however, was, that the turpitude of his crime was thereby manifested to all, and the memory of it transmitted to every future generation. Ananias and Sapphira sought to live on the labour of others, and lost life itself. By their dissimulation they, as far as in them lay, deprived the really poor of their support, and converted it to their own use, than which what could be more cruel? Just therefore it was that they should not experience the
5. καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐν πάνεσ. I agree with Whitby, Hammond, and Bolten, that this may mean all those who heard the words, and witnessed the event which followed them. It seems to be a popular, though not strictly accurate mode of expressing that sentiment. At all events, I see no reason to suspect (with Kuinoel) that the words are a later addition, since they are found in all the MSS. and Versions; and though it may be true (as he says) that there are interpolations more ancient than any of the MSS. (as an instance of which he cites Mark 1, 27. 15, 23. Luke 2, 2. Joh. 13, 21.); yet these are very rare, and hence there is no cause for suspicion, since, the sense above detailed being adopted, the words cannot seem out of place.

6. ἀνάστασες δὲ οἱ νεκτερεῖς, namely, those who, in ver. 10., are called οἱ νεκτάρικοι. Who these νεκτερεῖς were, the Commentators are not quite agreed. It is the opinion of many recent ones, as Heinrichs and Kuinoel (derived from Mosheim, or rather Dr. Hammond) that by οἱ νεκτερεῖς we are to understand some servants, or officers (sextons), appointed to perform various inferior duties in the Church. Kuinoel cites a long passage in support of this opinion from Mosheim de Rebus Christ. ante Const. who remarks, that unless the young men were such, one does not see why they alone should have, without delay, risen up, removed and buried the corpse: but
that if we suppose they were persons discharging a public employ in the Church, we may discern the reason why, without orders, they should have performed the sad office. "That there were (continues he) public servants or officers in the first society of the Christians, no one can doubt who considers its nature, and the circumstances under which it originated, and the manner in which their sacred assemblies were conducted. The offices of sweeping and cleaning the Church, of placing the seats and tables, and of making proper preparations for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, and the Agape, required certain persons appointed for that purpose. "This, too (adds Kuinoel), is confirmed by the use of the Alexandrian Jews, who employed \textit{οἰδεωσκος} (which corresponds to the Heb. הַסֹּד) sometimes in the sense of servant, at others of soldier."

In this opinion, I cannot, however, acquiesce; for though it may be probable that there were such officers in the early Churches, yet Mosheim adduces no authorities; and that they should have been called by \textit{that name} is not probable, since the duties in question would not absolutely demand young men; nay, propriety would rather require middle aged or elderly ones. Besides, even admitting all that he says of \textit{οἰδεωσκος}, yet that will not hold good of \textit{οἱ δεμποι}, which, as it occurs first, may be supposed most correctly to designate the persons in question. Now, on the common hypothesis, the comparison will have much propriety; on the new one, \textit{none at all}. I would therefore retain the usual interpretation, and understand by \textit{οἱ δεμποι} some of the younger and stronger, and therefore best able to perform the office of removal. It may, indeed, be objected (as it is by Mosheim), that one does not see why they should have \textit{buried him}. I answer, that this \textit{burial} was probably no more than \textit{laying him out for burial}, depositing him in the family vault, probably prepared for the purpose (as appears from ver. 10. where it is said that they bu-
ried her by her husband); just as our Saviour was only *deposited in the sepulchre* by Joseph, preparatory to the rites of embalming, and the funeral properly so called.

6. *συστέλλω αὐτῶν.* The Vulgate renders *amo-\*verunt*, and others *subtraxerunt*, or *corripuerunt*. But (as Kuinoel observes) no good reason can be given for deviating from the common signification of *συστέλλω*, especially since there follows, just after the funeral term *ἐκφέρειν*. Fuller, Casaubon, De Dieu, Grotius, our English Translators, Doddridge, and most recent Commentators, assign to *συστέλλω* the same sense as that of *περιστέλλω*, which signifies "to roll up in a winding-sheet, or shroud," &c. This sense of *συστέλλω* is indeed very rare; but Grotius and others adduce examples of it from Eurip. Troad. 376. ὦ Ἅρκης ἔλι: ὦ παῖδες εἶδον, ὦ δάμαρτος ἐν χερόιν Πέπλους συνεστάλησαν.* Although *συστέλλω* has the same sense as *περιστέλλω*, which extends to all the offices preparatory to burial, yet the circumstances of the present case compel us to understand it only of wrapping in *cloaks*. Of *ἐκφέρειν*, in the sense of *efferre*, to carry forth for burial, the Commentators and Critics produce examples in abundance; none of which is it necessary to bring forward; and I shall only observe, that though *ἐκφέρειν* is usually a term appropriate to funeral rites, yet here it seems to simply denote *removal for burial*. Ἠθαψαν may be understood in the manner I have above suggested; though *burial* on the same day was not uncommon among the Jews. I must add (what, I believe, is little known), that the *Greeks occasionally removed dead bodies for burial on the day of decause*. So Eurip. Alcest. 345. where almost

* Thus, (I must here observe,) may be settled the meaning of a much-disputed passage of the same Drama, 108. Ἡ πόλισι ἄγακον συστέλλομεν προσέχων: i.e. "O the mighty splendour of my *departed* ancestors." Literally, shrouded, buried. By which interpretation we are furnished with another example of this very rare signification.
immediately after Alcestes has expired, Alcestes the tender husband, for whom she died, after having indulged in some short bewailings, abruptly exclaims: ἀλλὰ ἐκφοραν γὰρ τοῦτο θήσωμαι νεκρῶν, "but I must forbear, and go and give orders for the removal of this corpse."

7. ἐγένετο δὲ ὡς ἀφὰν τριάν. I am inclined to think, from the circumstances which attended this, that the death of Ananias happened at some one of the hours of prayer, and that the coming of Sapphira was at the next following prayer time. It is judiciously observed by Οἰκεμενίας, that Peter did not call for her, but waited for the time of her coming; (perhaps the usual one), thus giving her an opportunity for repentance. She enters (continues he), not knowing what had befallen her husband, since no one had dared to tell it to her, through fear, and reverence for the master; and yet a space of three hours was sufficient to communicate the information to very many. But fear, it seems, kept them silent, and thus St. Luke was induced to record, as something extraordinary, the space of time that intervened, and the ignorance of the woman." Hence we may know what to think of the opinion of Lightfoot and some others, that the three hours were spent by the young men in the progress to and from the sepulchre, which, as usual, would be situated out of town. Nothing can be determined, since we know neither the distance they would have to go, nor exactly what they had to do. The copula καί, we may observe, is for δὲ, as often in the New Testament. There is the same use in the Hebr. 1. Nor is the idiom unknown in the Greek and Latin Classics.

8. αὐτῇ, (thus) addressed her. See the note on 8, 12.) ἐπει δὲ, εἰ τοσοῦτον τὸ χαρίων ἀπεδοθε; By τοσοῦτον, so much, is meant the sum which Ananias had offered to Peter; and we must subjoin διὰ and τιμήματος. Ἀποδίδωμι, especially in the middle voice, has, among other significations, that of sell.*

* The Latin vendo, it must be observed, is properly venem do;
9—11. τι είτε, how (is it) that. Subauda γεγονεν, as in ver. 4. Wetstein here compares Terent. Eun. 9, 5, 11. Quid est, quod laetus sis? Συνεφαινηθη υμιν πρεσβευτι το πνευμα Κυριου; Here one may compare Joseph. 787, 10. θεασάμενος ουν συμπνευσμεν ἐπὶ ψευδολογίας and Polyæn. 28, 5, 6. where συνεδριασάττειν has the same sense as the present expression συνεφαινηθη. Limborch here well observes that they tempted the Spirit of God, which spoke and worked in and by the Apostles, since by this deed they had made trial whether the Spirit would detect their fraud and hypocrisy or not. Not (continues he) that they directly intended this: they hoped that their fraud might escape detection. Yet they might, in a certain sense, be said to tempt the spirit of God. The same view of the subject is taken by Bp. Pearce, who renders: "to try whether the Holy Ghost, with which we are filled, knows the truth of things, or not." Beza and Rosenmüller adopt a more general definition. "To tempt God (say they) is so to act as to seem to doubt of the omnipotence, veracity, or any other of the attributes of God." Heinrichs, Pott, and Kuinoel recognize in the formula merely the sense of offending God by sin; and they refer to Hebr. 3, 8 & 9. and 1 Cor. 10, 9. But this is cutting matters short indeed, and manifestly explaining away the sense!

9. οἱ σὺν ὧν θαυμάζεις, &c. This is clearly a HEBRAISM for οἱ θαυμάζεις, since the Hebrews often express a man by some member of his body, which is principally used in accomplishing the action in ques-
tion. See Ernesti, in his Prolusio de Vestigiis Linguæ Ebraeæ in Linguâ Graeca, and the note on 4, 37. Wetstein here cites Isaj. 52, 7. Nahum 1, 15. Il. 1. 519. μήτε πῶδας. Schol. τὴν εὐθαése αὑτίσεν. But he might more appositely have compared Eurip. Hipp. 657. σὺν πάτρος μολὼν ποῖλ, quando cum patre reverso re dieire: where Dr. Monk produces a similar passage from the Orest. 1215. παρθένου δέχου πῶδα, expecta virginis reditum. So also Eurip. Suppl. 90. μη μω τε μήτηρ, ἵνα μεταστείχω ποῖλ, where Markland rightly observes, that ποῖλ has no reference to the manner in which Theseus came, whether on horseback, in a chariot, or on foot, but simply to his coming and going. He then compares Eurip. Herc. Fur. v. 336. Ω τέκνω φωρφεὶς ἀδίξω μητρὸς ποῖλ. Hence it is clear that in the present passage the expression merely denotes παρουσία, return.

10. εἰσελθώντες δὲ, coming in: as they would, at the next hour of prayer. See supra, ver. 7.
12. διὰ δὲ τῶν χείρων τῶν ἀποστόλων, i.e. by the Apostles. So the Hebr. פֶּן רָב in Exod. 9, 35.
12. Καὶ Ἰσαὰκ ὄμοθύμαδον—καὶ γυναικῶν. These words are usually supposed to be parenthetical, because ver. 12 connects with ver. 15. But this seems little satisfactory; for (as Zeigler and Beck have seen) in a parenthesis, according to psychological laws, the discourse proceeds in one tenor, and does not, as here, consist of short sentences connected by very slight bonds, and not cohering with the discourse which it interrupts.

The above Commentators, and Kuinoel, are of opinion that vv. 13 & 14. at least are spurious, and patched up from 2, 1 & 46. and 5, 42. Kuinoel, however, regards ver. 15. as genuine, since the words cohere with those both of 12 and 16. For my own part, I am inclined to consider all the verses as genuine, being supported by the united authority of the MSS. Versions, and Fathers; and I consider them as presenting a remarkable example of synchysis (though scarcely more so than some to be met with
in Thucydides), which in one comparatively unskilled in the proprieties of the Greek language, as our author, cannot seem surprising. Bp. Sherlock indeed (ap. Bowyer) proposes the following transposition: "And great fear came upon the church, and as many as heard these things: And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women: (12) And they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch. (13) And of the rest durst no man join himself to them: but the people magnified them. (12) And by the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought. (15) Insomuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets." But there is, perhaps, as little faith to be placed in these violent transpositions as in alterations from mere conjecture; and on the present occasion the transposition merits the less attention, since it is liable to some difficulties, which are thus ably stated by Markland:

I. "It may be asked, who are the ἀπαντεῖς, ver. 12; whether the Apostles only, or the believers? If these latter, the number of them by this time must be near, if not above, ten thousand: too many, one would think, on several accounts, to be together in one place. But if the Apostles only, why should the οἱ λοιποὶ, which may include the rest of the Christians, be afraid to join them? Secondly, who are these οἱ λοιποὶ, ver. 18, who seem to be distinguished from the ὅ λαὸς in the same verse? If Bp. Sherlock's transposition be admitted, the ἀπαντεῖς perhaps were only all these new converts, ver. 14, not the whole number of the Christians; and then οἱ λοιποὶ (ver. 18) must be the same with ὅ λαὸς, viz. those who were not converts, who did not associate with those in Solomon's porch, but nevertheless thought and spoke well of them. In some editions (as in that of Bp. Fell, Oxon. 1675,) a parenthesis is put before καὶ Ἰσαάκ, ver. 12. and continued to καὶ γυναικῶν, ver. 14, so as to connect the beginning of the 12th verse with the 15th. This makes the narrative hang together better than it does in those editions
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where this parenthesis is wanting; and then ἀπαντεῖν ver. 12, must be the Apostles only, τῶν λοιπῶν still uncertain: but see Grotius and Le Clerc. For my own part, I would publish with Dr. Fell, but would read with Dr. Sherlock, because an editor of the New Testament ought not to depart from the written copies: but a private person, who reads for his own improvement, though he is, and ought to be, under great restrictions, yet I suppose he has greater liberty than the other.

I need not say how entirely I accede to the justice of the last remark, which is perfectly accordant with the critical canons of the greatest critics, as Hemsterhusius, Valcknaer, Bentley, and Porson.

13. τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν. Who are here meant the Commentators are not agreed. Some think they are the adversaries of the Apostles. But, as Kuinoel observes, κολλᾶσθαι is no where else found in this sense. Pricæus, Morus, and Rosenmuller, understand the rich, and those of the higher classes, with dispositions similar to that of Ananias. But this would require the following transposition: καὶ ἐμεγάλυνε ὁ λαὸς, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἑταλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς. Kuinoel is of opinion, that as οἱ λοίποι are opposed to the Apostles in Solomon’s porch, we may understand the rest of those present, whether Christians or Jews. Nearly the same view of the subject is taken by Bp. Pearce. But this mode of exposition seems somewhat harsh.

15. ἐπὶ κληρῶν καὶ κράββατῶν. On these words see the note on Mark 2, 4, where κράββατος is distinguished from κληρι, as denoting a mean and low couch, (see also the note on Joh. 5, 8. Append. p. 807.) and κληρι, the couch of richer persons. By

* (See Doddridge.) Indeed I am not satisfied with any mode of interpretation I have yet seen; and, to use the words of Porson, 'Ego quod fugiam habeo, quod sequar non habeo; omnibusque fere in rebus, et maxime in Criticis, citius quid non sit, quam quid sit, dicturus.' 'Εμεγάλυνε, extolled, thought highly of them. Wetzstein cites similar examples of magistriicare from Plautus and Terence.
these words therefore it seems to be indicated, that both the high and low resorted to and implored the assistance of the Apostles.

15. Ἰνα ἐγέρσυνεν. Lightfoot observes, that it is not clear whether they were healed; and he thinks it probable that the laying of the sick there was not an act of Christian believers, but of the superstitious Jews. Rosenmuller, too, remarks, that this is to be referred to the superstitious notions of men, only mentioned, not approved, by St. Luke or the Apostles. But the complexion of the sentence taken with the context clearly suggests that they were healed. Nay, Kuinoel admits it to be extremely probable, considering the circumstance which follows, namely, the healing of the sick by handkerchiefs: the reason why this is not directly asserted perhaps is, that only some of those were healed, although, as we are told, all of them. “It is clear (continues Kuinoel) that the power of healing was not in the shadow of Peter, any more than in the vestments of Jesus (see the note on Matt. 9, 20 & 21), but in their faith. Nor did Peter and the other Apostles sanction any such notions; nay, they professed that they did not show forth these mighty deeds by any power of their own, but solely through the aid of the Divine power of Jesus.”

16. τῶν πέρις τῶν, i.e. the circumjacent towns (supply κειμένων or οἰνων). This, like some other prepositions and adverbs, is often used as an adjective or participle. The following examples are collected from Philologists by Kuinoel. Xen. Cyr. 1, 40. τῶν οὖν ἐθνῶν τῶν πέρις. Xen. Anab. 4, 4, 7. καὶ ἀφίκων εἰς βασίλεια καὶ καίμας πέρις πολλὰς & 2, 5, 14. where the ellipsis is filled up: οἱ πέρις εἰκούστε & 7, 8, 12. τὰ μὲν πέρις ὄντα ἀνθραπότα τῆς τύραννος. Anton. Lib. c. 30. ἐκ τῶν πέρις τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

17. ἄναστας is a Hebrew pleonasm, and not expressed in the Syriac and Arabic Versions. Casaubon and Heumann think it equivalent to ird commoveatur: but proofs are wanting of this sense, espe-
cially as the words ἐκ αὐτῶς are not added; which alone could justify Beza’s version insurgens.

The formula σὺν τινὶ εἰναι is, like μετὰ τινὸς εἰναι, used of being any one’s partizan [or it may mean here and infra 21. those discharging official duties, in conjunction with the High Priest, as assessors, the οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς. See Schl. Lex. Edit.]; as in Acts 4, 13. where see the note. Here it designates those who took part with the High Priest, as being of the same religious sect; and since there follows ἡ οὐσία αἱρεσίς τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, it is manifest that the High Priest was himself a Sadducee. Commentators, however, are not agreed whether Hanan (4, 6.), or Caiaphas was attached to the sect of the Sadducees, or whether both the sons of Hanan are said to have been Sadducees by Joseph. Ant. 20, 15. p. 698. Hanan himself was the High Priest’s vicar, and as such might, by courtesy, have the name of High Priest (see the note on 4, 6. Luke 3, 3.), and had power to convene the Sanhedrin. (ver. 21 & 27.) But since here and in ver. 21. ἀρχιερεῖς is taken by itself, it is obvious that Caiaphas must be understood, who was the Pont. Max. And that he was a Sadducee his very austerity seems to confirm (see Joh. 11, 49.); for the Sadducees were, beyond all other Jews, severe and harsh. See Krebs in loc.

17. ἀἱρεσίς denotes properly a chusing, election; òdly, a taking up an opinion, and the opinions themselves; and lastly the persons, or party, who maintain them. So Diodor. Sic. p. 82. καὶ ἐν ἀἱρεσίς κτίζειν, and Acts 15, 5. 26, 5. Examples may be seen in the Philologists or Schl. Lex.; to which I add the following: Athen. 190 ε. οἶκοι ἔχουσα τὴν τοιαύτην ἀἱρεσίν. Diog. Laert. 10, 2. (speaking of Epicurus): ἔτειται ἕνα πᾶς τῆς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ οἱ τῆς Στοίκης ἀἱρεσίας ἤγεμόνες. Dionys. Hal. p. 12. οἱ τῆς Στοίκης ἀἱρεσίας ἤγεμόνες.

17. ἐπιλησθησαν ἐν θλοῖν. Ζῆλος here denotes anger; as in Joh. 2, 17. The cause of the especial bitterness
evinced by the Sadducees towards the Apostles has been shown in the note on 4, 2.

. 18. ἑλθόντοι αὐτῶν ἐν τῃσεὶ δημοσίᾳ. On τῇρησίᾳ see the note on 4, 8. Wetstein has collected many examples of this phrase, and the corresponding Latin ones cujusmodi publica, publicum carcer, &c.

19. ἄγγελος ἢ Κυρίου διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἤρθε τὰς δύος τῆς φυλακῆς. I shall pass by the vain conjectures of Thiess, Eckerman, Heinrichs, Eichhorn, and others, on the mode in which this liberation was brought about. By endeavouring to account for it independently of Divine agency, they (as usual) create more difficulties than they remove. Their speculations (into which it is unnecessary for me to enter) have been over turned by Storr, in his Opusc. 3, 186 seqq.

20. σταθέντες λαλεῖτε. Beza and Kuinoel regard σταθέντες as a Hebrew pleonasm, and Grotius thinks it has reference to constancy. (See Schl. Lex. in v. § 19.) But (as I have on a former occasion observed) it is a forensic expression used of those who are set up to speak, either as orators and advocates, or as prisoners in defence of their own cause. So Acts 17, 22. 25, 18.

20. λαλεῖτε—τὰ ἰματα τῆς ἱωῆς ταύτης. By ἰματα τῆς ἱωῆς we are to understand, as in Joh. 6, 68. (ἱματα ἱωῆς αἰωνίου) the doctrine which confers and imparts eternal felicity, and shows the way to attain it. See infra 7, 38. This same doctrine is called λόγια ἱωῆτα, i.e. ἱῳοτοιοῦντα. So also Sir. 45, 5. νόμος τῆς ἱωῆς. Again, the words ἰματα τῆς ἱωῆς ταύτης are used by hypallage for ἰματα ταύτα τῆς ἱωῆς; as in Acts 13, 26. ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἀπεστάλη, where also the pronoun demonstrative is added to the latter noun, with which it agrees in each case, though it belongs to the former noun, and ought to correspond to it also in case; the words being put for ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος ὁ ὁτὸς τῆς σωτηρίας ἀπεστάλη. So also Rom. 7, 24. τις με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ βανάτου τούτου, which is for ἐκ τούτου ταῦ
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σάματος τοῦ θανάτου. In the same manner, too, the present passage is taken by the Syriac and Arabic Translators. That such hypallages are not unfrequent in the profane writers, both Greek and Latin, has been shown by Munth in loc. (Kuin.)

21. ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρθρῶν, at day-break. See the note on Luke 24, 1. Παραγενόμενος is treated by recent Commentators as a Hebrew pleonasm. But it seems a characteristic of the simple and popular style in all languages. By the οἱ σὺν αἷτῳ I would understand the ἀρχόντες, &c. See the note supra 17.

21. Συνεκάλεσαν τὸ συνέδριον, καὶ πάσαν τὴν γερουσίαν
The word γερουσία seems added by way of explanation. Pausanias tells us that the Lacedemonians called their senate by that name. And Dionys. Hal. A. 2, 12. (cited by Wets.) says: τοῦτο τὸ συνέδριον Ἐλληνιστὶ ἐρμηνευόμενον Γερουσίαν βουλεταί δη- λοῦν καὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος οὗτος ὑπὸ τῶν Ρωμαίων καλεῖται. The same term is applied to the Sanhedrin by Philo 789 b. 1025 c. See also 2 Macc. 1, 10. 4, 44. "The word γερουσία (observes Bp. Pearce) seems to be used nowhere in the New Testament, except here. But Josephus in Antiq. 12, 3, 3. uses it as follows, in Antiochus's letter to Ptolemy: ἀπολύσας ἡ γερουσία, καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ὅπως ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς τελωνίας, let the senate, and the priests, and the scribes from the temple be discharged from the capitation tax. What the difference was (if any) between this γερουσία and the πρεσβυτερίων spoken of in C. 22, 5. and Luke 22, 66. is perhaps not to be now determined." Kuinoel thinks that St. Luke added καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν τ. ὑ. in order to show that though the attendance was often thin, yet in this case it was very full. But the words merely denote that the High Priest and his Assessors endeavoured to procure a full attendance by sending out summonses to all the members.

23. κεκλεισμένον ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἁσφαλείᾳ. Here we have an adverbial phrase for the adverb ἁσφαλῶς. Wetstein compares Cebet. Tab. πάντα καλὸς βιώσεται
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μετὰ πάσης ἄσφαλείας. The ἐν is for σῦν. So the Vulgate, "cum omni diligentia." The ἐξω is omitted in several MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and has been thrown out by Griesbach, Matthiae, and Heinrichs. But I agree with Kuinoel in doubting whether they have done right in this instance. For (as he observes) scribes often omit what to them seems superfluous; and, indeed, such exegetical additions are found in the best Greek and Latin writers: ex. gr. Plato Apol. 2. πάλαι πολλὰ ἦν ἐν ἑν. 24. ὅ, τε ἵερεως καθ' ὅ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς. Ἱερεῶς is here put κατ’ ἐξοχήν for the Pont. Max.; as in 1 Macc. 15, 1. Joseph. Ant. 6, 12, 1. Heb. 5, 6. See Drusius and Krebs on this passage, and Carpzov. Exerc. Phil. on Ep. ad Heb. 4, 14. p. 210 seqq. By the οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς are meant the twenty four chiefs of the sacerdotal classes. (See the note on Matt. 2, 4.) On στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ see the note on 4, 1. (Kuin.)

24. Αὔποροι περὶ αὐτῶν, τί ἀν γένοιτο τούτῳ; The Translators and Commentators are not agreed as to the true sense of the words τί ἀν γένοιτο. The Vulg. renders, "ambigens quidnam hoc factum esset." The same sense is expressed, but in better Latin, by Beza and Piscator: "Quonam hoc evasurum esset." So our English version, from Beza and Tindal (approved by Erasmus, Casaubon, and others), "doubting whereunto this would grow." This, however, seems too arbitrary and unauthorized a mode of interpretation. The same may be said of the version of Schmid and Kuinoel, "ambigebant quomodo hoc factum fuerit?" The words are best rendered by Grotius, Wetstein, and Valcknaer; "quid hoc esset rei;" which Latin phrase, like the Greek one, was a popular expression of somewhat extensive application, and therefore to be explained according to circumstances. Here the sense seems to be this: "did not know what to think of it, neither how or by what means it was done, nor what it
meant or portended." This mode of interpretation I am inclined to adopt, on account of the very similar passage infra 10, 17, ois de' ev éaútw διηφόσει, ti ãv eli to órama.

28. Oú παραγγελία παραγγελάμεν, &c. On this phrase see the note on 4, 17. In this sense the verb παραγγέλω is used in Dionys. Hal. 448. παραγγέλ- λομεν (scil. αυτω) τα δίκαια έκει λέγειν. By ónoma is meant person; as Pearce, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel remark; and the words ἐτι τω άνωματι τούτω may be rendered, "respecting this person" (namely that he was unjustly put to death, has been raised from the dead, and is the Messiah). The τούτω is by Priscæus and others thought to imply contempt; as in 4, 18. and of this Schoettgen adduces the following examples from the Rabbinical writers. Juchasim, fol. 16, 2. R. Tabai fugit Alexandriam, ne se Principem Synedrii constituerunt. Ei vero cum aliquo discipulorum in via eunti occurrat R. Jehoschua filius Perachja שְׁנֵהוֹנָה כְּפַר, cum illo viro. Et traditio est שֶׁנֵהוֹנָה כְּפַר, quod ille vir discipulus ejus (R. Jehoschua scil.) fuerit, a quo venit secta, &c. Verum quoque est, quod ille vir natus sit anno quarto Regis Jannæi secundi, qui alias dicitur Alexander, et est annus 268. a condito templo secundo, a tempore Chasmonæorum 51. ab urbe condito 36, 71.

28. πεπληροφάκτε τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν, "filled Jerusalem with your doctrine." Wetstein here appositely compares Liban. Ep. 721. οὐκ ἄδηλον, δι' δὲ ὅταν ἥλθες πόλεων, πάσας ἐνεπλησας τῶν ὑπὲρ ημῶν λόγων. Justin, 11, 7, 14. Midas — Phrygiam totam religionibus implevit, quibus tuitior omni vita quam armis suit. Βωλεοθες ἐπαγαγείν ἀφ' ημᾶς τα ἀλμα του ἀνθρώπου τουτου. Ἐπαγαγείν signifies to bring upon; as in Demosth. αἰθάπετον αὐτοῖς ἐπάγων- ται δυσλείαν. Gregor. (cited by Wets.) τις τοι περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπηγάγομεν κίνδυνον; Kuinoel truly observes (from Elsner) that ἐπάγωσθαι is a word appropriate to evils, dangers, and punishments (and he
might have added criminations) brought upon any one.* Elsner explains the phrase ἐπάγειν τὸ αἷμα τίνος by, “ascribe the cause of any one’s death to;” as in Levit. 22, 16. καὶ ἐπάγοντες ἔφι σεβούσας ἀνομίας πλημμελείας ἐν τῷ ἐσθίειν τὰ ἄγια αὐτῶν. Demosth. pro Corona, p. 388. ει δὲ πρὸς ἐχθραν ἡ φιλονεικείας ἱδίας ἐνεκα αἰτίαν ἐπάγια τούτω. Ἀπολλodor. Biblioth. L. 1. c. 8. p. 34. δίκαιος ἐπάγειν. Judg. 9, 24. τοῦ ἐπαγαγέν την ἀδικίαν τῶν ἐθνομήκοντα ὑπὸ Ἱεροθάλ καὶ τα αἵματα αὐτῶν. But the most apposite illustration is that of Wetzstein from Demosth. in Mid. εἰς ἐπατιασάμενος με φῶνο καὶ τοιοῦτο πρόγμα ἐπαγαγόν. Elsner well remarks, that it is strange these persons should accuse the Apostles of bringing this man’s blood upon them, when they had themselves exclaimed, “His blood be upon us.”

29, 30. ἀπεκρίθης δὲ ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἠταυ. Peter (who was usually spokesman) answers in the name of himself and his companions. In the Gospels, too, that is ascribed to many which properly belongs only to one. See the note on Matt. 15, 15. Of this speech of Peter Schoettgen gives the following plan.

The speech consists of three parts, Exordium, Proposition, Confirmation. I. Exordium, taken from a gnome, or maxim (ver. 29.) II. Proposition: “It is incumbent on us to preach the Resurrection;” which, however, is not expressly declared. III. Confirmation, because our divine calling consists in our testifying concerning the Resurrection of Christ.

29. πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ Θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις. See the note on 4, 19. The verb πειθαρχεῖν is especially used of obedience to the orders of those who are placed in authority, whether parents, or rulers. Compare Tit. 3, 1. Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 19. πειθαρχεῖν τοῖς ἐφεσ—

* He subjoins the following examples, derived from Elsner, Loesner, and other Philologists. Sir. 4, 17. φόβον δὲ καὶ διελθεῖν ἐκαίει ἐκ’ αὐτῶν. And 4, 21, 23, 16. καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐπάλει ὥργην. Philo, 80 x. 1039 b. Herod. 4, 6, 6.
See Munthe. To the examples produced by the Commentators I add Soph. Antig. 74. ἐκεῖ πλείων χρόνος, ὃν δεῖ μ' ἁρέσκειν τοῖς κάτω, τοῖς εὐθαδέ. Ἐκεῖ γὰρ αἰεὶ κείσομαι: where the Scholiast explains τοῖς.

30. Ὁ Θεὸς — Ἰησοῦς. "The God whom our fathers worshipped, and whose protection they experienced (see 3, 18.) hath raised up Jesus." Grotius, Rosenmuller, and Heinrichs here make a remark which seems derived from Grotius and Doddridge on 3, 18. "This was wisely introduced here in the beginning of his discourse, that it might appear they taught no new religion inconsistent with the Mosaic, and were far from having the least design to divert their regards from the God of Israel." Kuinoel, however, is of opinion that Peter intended rather to hint that Jesus is the Messiah promised to the Patriarchs; and he refers to Joh. 8, 56.

30. ἐν υἷς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐκ ξύλου. By διεχειρίσασθε is meant "put to death." in 26, 21. The word is used by the later Greek writers (as Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Josephus, Strabo, Plutarch, and Herodian) in the same sense as διεχρασθεί by the earlier ones: and so it is explained by Ócumenius. It signifies literally, "to take in hand, manage, and perform any business;" and, by a metaphor known in our own language, both to despatch business, and also to despatch a person, or vulgarly, (by the same metaphor,) "to do any one's business."

The ξύλου is rendered in the E. V. tree. But though the word denotes the trunk of a tree, either green, or sawn into a beam, it also signifies a beam, and especially the upright beam or post of a cross; and therefore ought, in such a case, to be rendered cross; as here and in 10, 39. Galat. 3, 13. and 1 Pet. 5, 14. So the Heb. שָׁפַל in Est. 5, 14. In justice, however, to our venerable Translators, it must be confessed that even the word tree had originally all that extent of signification just noticed in ξύλου, and
meant timber as well as green wood. Of this there are yet vestiges in our language; especially in some compound words, as saddle-tree, axle-tree, gallow-tree, treen-ware, &c. ξύλον, from ξύω, cognate with ξέω, signifies sawn or hewn timber. Of this sense I am not aware that any Classical examples have been adduced. The following passage may therefore be acceptable. Artemid. 4, 33. ἐπέληγη τὴν κεφαλὴν ξύλῳ.

31. τοῖς ᾽Θεσ ἀρχηγῶ, &c. The student will observe that the words ἀρχηγῶ καὶ σωτῆρα, though in apposition, yet must have supplied before them εἰς, or εἰς τὸ ἑλθεί. By ἀρχηγῶς is meant head, leader, lord; as κύριος in 2, 36. which (by the way) is derived from the Hebr. וֹ, rendered by the Sept. ἀρχηγῶς, in Is. 30, 4. Neh. 2, 9., and from whence seems to have come the French Sire and our Sir, the κ of κύριος being probably sometimes pronounced soft.


32. καὶ ἧμισι ζημην αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες τοῖν ῶμάτων τούτων, “and we are his witnesses of these things, and moreover (καὶ—δὲ) the Holy Spirit.” Τῶν ῶμάτων are genitives of object; and ῶμάτα is equivalent to πράγματα (see the note on Matt. 44. and Luke 1, 37),
and must be referred to what we read in ver. 30 & 31, namely, that God raised Jesus from the dead, and exalted him to be Prince and a Saviour. Others by ἡμῶν understand the doctrine of Christ, which is, in ver. 20, called ἡμῶν τῆς ζωῆς, namely, the doctrine of resurrection and the Messiahship of Jesus. At περιθαμμον, subaud ημῶν, “us the Apostles, by the command of God, bearing testimony to and teaching these things.”

33. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπριόντο. The word ἐπρίον signifies properly to saw through; as in 1 Chron. 20, 3. καὶ τὸν λαὸν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐξῆγαγε, καὶ διεπρίον ἐν προσι, &c. Both the simple and the compound are also used of gnashing the teeth: and of this numerous examples are adduced by Wetstein and others. But this signification, whatever Beza and Camerarius may urge, is not to our present purpose, except as giving an example of intension in the physical sense; but here we require an intension of the figurative one. For, as ἐπρίον signifies to saw through, so also it denotes to cut to the heart, as here, and in 7, 54. where the words ταῖς καρδίαις are added. Thus Hesychius explains διεπρίοντο by ἐρμοῦντο. It is well observed by Gataker, that the Greek Classical writers use in this sense ἤγνωσθαι, and διαφήγωσθαι, and the Latin ones Findi and Rumpi.

33. καὶ ἐβούλευσαντο ἀνελεῖν αὐτοὺς, “they decreed to put them to death.” (Kuin.) Others render, “they deliberated to put them to death;” which latter version I prefer. But the force of the imperfect tense requires, “they were taking counsel and deliberating,” &c. Now, both propriety and (as we find from Elsner and Princæus) custom required that, during deliberation upon the guilt or the punishment of a criminal, he should be withdrawn from the presence of his judges. It should seem that their rage made them, on this occasion, forget decorum, till they were reminded of it by Gamaliel, a Pharisee and (as some suppose) a secret follower of Christ, or at least a man of great prudence and moderation,
and who, after the Apostles had departed, took the opportunity of giving counsel to abstain from all violent measures, and to leave the issue of these new doctrines to God.

34. Ἀναστάς, rising up; as orators are wont to do.* See Matt. 26, 62. Ἀναστάς seems therefore merely ad ornatum, for ornament.

34. Γαμαλίη, Gamaliel. A frequent name among the Hebrews. (See Numb. 1, 10, 2, 20.) According to the opinion of most Commentators, we are here to understand the Gamaliel called κατ' ἐξοχήν Rabban, son of Simeon and grandson of Hillel, Paul’s master.† (See 22, 3.)

34. Τίμιος παντι τῷ λαῷ. So Hom. Od. κ. 38. cited by Wets. πᾶσι φίλος καὶ τίμιος ἐστιν ἀνθρώποις* and

* In illustration of this Wetstein cites Eustath. on Hom. II. a. 58. ἀναστάς ὦ Ἀχιλλέας δημηγορεῖ, οὕτω δὲ ἦν ἐθος τοῖς παλαιοῖς, κἂν βασιλεία ἦσαν, ὡς ἂν ἔχοις τοις κύκλῳ εὐνοοῦσιν, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων ἄλλως ἀκούσας εἰ δὲ τότε τίς καθήμενος ἐδημηγορήσε, καί ὄν τῷ τράγῳ ἐδόξει, καὶ ὦ τούτῳ τοιῶν παραιτήσεις ἐδέσθε καθα τοῦ Ὀλυμπίων-ποιήτου, ὥστε διὰ τὸ τετραμμαθήσαται αὐτόθεν ἕξ ἐδριή διαλέγεται. I need scarcely remind my readers of the Ovidian, "Surgit ad hos dominus elypei septemplicis Ajax."


34. Ἐξελευνε ἔξω ὑμῖν τὸ ἀποστόλους πωνήσαι, "he advised that," &c. By ἔξω ποιεῖν is meant remove; in which sense ποιεῖν is not unfrequently used with adverbs of place, such as ἔξω, ἔξω, ἐκτὸς, ἐντὸς, πόρῳ. See the examples adduced by Elsner, Kypke, and others. The most remarkable one is that from Philostratus. ἔκ ποιεῖν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, where the sophist seems to have this passage in view. Such imitations I have noticed on former occasions.

35. Of the speech of Gamaliel Schoettgen gives the following plan:

The speech consists of exordium, proposition, and confirmation. The exordium we have in ver. 35. The proposition is: The whole business must be left to the Almighty and to time (ver. 38). The confirmation establishes this, 1st. by historical arguments (ver. 36 & 37); 2dly, by an argument equally conclusive by contrary suppositions (ver. 38 & 39).

35. Ἀνδρες Ἰσραήλιναι, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. I assent to Alberti, Wolf, Kuinoel, and Markland, that the comma should be removed from τοῦτοις, and placed after ἑαυτοῖς; since (as they suggest) the Greek writers do not use προσέχειν with an ἐπί. But I cannot agree with Markland, that ἐπί must be rendered contra, for that signification is very rare in the New Testament, and Gamaliel was too prudent a person to offend those whom he wished to conciliate, by taking for granted that they had made up their minds to destroy the Apostles. Whereas δρᾶν and πράσσειν τι have after them ἐπί τινι, in the sense of respecting any thing. So Ἀριεία. H. A. 11, 1. (cited by Wetstein λέγω γὰρ ὡσα τε δράται ἐπί τοῦτοις τοῖς ταύροις, καὶ ὡσα ἐρεάχῃν. Lucian. Tox. 23. τὰ ὅρμα ἐπράζειν ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς. Hence (I must observe) is confirmed the reading of Suidas and Edit. Junct. in Aristoph. Concion. 295. ἐποὺ καταπείγων, σαυτῷ προσέχον, ὡποί which reading is preferred by Brunk, though, unaccountably, not adopted into the text.
36. Gamaliel now, with great judgment, adduces two recent and well known examples of men who had collected to themselves numerous followers, and who nevertheless, together with their adherents, came to destruction. Πρὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν, haud ita pridem, not long ago. The opposite phrase to this is ἀπ' ἀρχαιῶν ἡμερῶν in 15, 7. Wetstein cites Achill. Tat. 5. p. 301. καὶ ὁ ἄγιος πρὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν εἶχε τὸν Διώνυσον ἐξ Ἀἰγύπτου κτελευκώς. Phædrus 1, 1, 10. Ante hos sex menses. It is well remarked by Theophylact, from Chrysostom, that Gamaliel does not remind them of old, but new examples; since such are most efficacious in persuading men.

36. Ἀνέστη, rose up, arose. Vorstius and Loesner compare the Heb. <ם> in 1 Kings, 3, 12. where the Sept. has οὐκ ἀναστήσεται 2 Kings 23, 25. Sir. 47, 1. καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἀνέστη Νάδαν. Acts 7, 18. ἀνέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος. Heb. 7, 15. They add some other passages where ἐπανίστημι has the sense of rising into rebellion, especially Lucian Tyrann. p. n. 98. έτι δὲ τῶν δρασυτάτων προσαίτερομένων, καὶ δορυφόρως συναγαγόν ἐπανάστασιν, τῇ πόλει τύραννος κατέστη, which passage I quote, in order to emend. Instead of προσαίτερομένως read προσεταύρομένως; for so the sense requires.

37. Θευδᾶς. Josephus, Ant. 20, 5, 1., makes mention of a certain Theudas, who, in the reign of Claudius, excited disturbances in Judea, pretending to be a Prophet; and was destroyed, with all his followers, by Cuspius Fadius the Procurator. But this Theudas cannot here be meant, since the Theudas mentioned by Josephus excited the disturbances fourteen or fifteen years after the speech of Gamaliel was delivered. In order to remove this difficulty, the Commentators have pursued various methods; which may be seen detailed in the Critici Sacri, Pole's Synopsis, Wolf's Curæ, and Kuinoel's Collectanea. Of these opinions my limits will only permit me to state two of the most important: 1st, that of
Archbishop Usher and L. Capellus, which has been adopted by Ottius, Bp. Pearce. Wetstein, Bowyer, and others. This hypothesis I cannot do better than state in the words of Bp. Pearce.

In favour of Luke's account it has been generally said, that Josephus must have been mistaken in placing Theudas's insurrection so late as when Festus was governor of Judea, and that it must have happened before the insurrection caused by Judas of Galilee, as Luke has placed it. But surely Josephus could not have been mistaken in this point, when he lived in Judea, under Festus's government; and therefore must have known what happened in his own time, and what not. All the difficulty will be removed, and Josephus's account be made consistent with Luke's, if we follow the opinion of Archbishop Usher, in his Annals, A. M. 4001. He thinks that Luke's Theudas is the same with that of Judas, of whom Josephus gives this account (in Antiq. 17, 19, 5. and Bell. Jud. 2, 4, 1.) "a little after the death of Herod the Great, he raised an insurrection in Galilee, and aimed at getting the sovereignty of Judea:" and that he was defeated and put to death is implied in sect. 10. of the same Chapter. Now to prove that this Theudas of Luke is the same with that Judas of Josephus, the following considerations are laid before the reader. The same Apostle, who is called Judas in John 14; 22. and Luke 6, 16. and called Jude in Jude 1. is in Mar 3, 18. called Thaddeus, and in Matt. 10, 3. called Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus; which last Evangelist has (I think) given him the name of Judas in ch. 13, 55. for he, as is said there, was the brother of James (Luke 6, 16.) and as such the son of Alpheus, whose son James was. (Mark 3, 19. and Luke 6, 15.) This Apostle therefore having the names of Judas and Thaddeus, and Lebbeus, given to him, two of those names must have been one and the same; because no Jew had more than two names, unless when a patronymick name was given to him, as when Joseph, surnamed Justus, was called also Barsabas, i.e. the son of Sabas, in Acts 1, 23. See note on Matt. 10, 3. It is no unreasonable thing to suppose that Thaddeus and Theudas are the same name, and therefore it may be concluded with probability, from what has been said, that Josephus's Judas, mentioned as is before noted in Antiq. 17, 19, 5. and in Bell. Jud. 2, 4, 1. is no other person than he whom Luke speaks of under the name of Theudas. To which I add, that Archbishop Usher, in the place of his Annals before referred to, says that θαδδεὺς of the Hebrews is the same with θαθδεὺς of the Syrians, which, if true, strengthens this solution of the difficulty arising from the seeming contrariety of the two writers. In the following verse another Judas is mentioned by Luke, but he is distinguished by the name of Judas of Galilee, a title given him by Josephus in Antiq. 18, 1, 6. and in Bell. Jud. 2, 8, 1.

To others, however, this hypothesis has appeared extremely harsh. 2. I shall proceed to state another,
which seems by far the most probable; namely, that
of Scaliger, Beza, Camerarius, Lightfoot, Drusius,
Casaubon, Grotius, Hammond, Basnage, Heumann,
Krebs, Limborch, Whitby, Doddridge, Lardner,
Morus, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, who, on the
authority of Origen c. Cels. 1, 6. p. 44. maintain
that there were two Theudases, of whom the one
mentioned by Josephus was the more recent, and
the one spoken of Gamaliel, the older. The former
Casaubon and Krebs think lived about the time of
Christ's birth. Beza and Kuinoel, however, refer
this history to those times in which Josephus (Ant.
17, 24.) tells us that Judea was harassed with innu-
merable seditions, which Varus could with difficulty
suppress. For those events (as they observe) which
happened at the time in which, after the death of
Herod the Great, there was an interregnum in
Judea, while Archelaus had gone to Rome, to obtain
the confirmation of his father's will, and when Jesus
was yet in Egypt, Josephus has passed over in silence,
as he has done this insurrection of Theudas, which
probably occurred at that time; not to mention
many other events, of which, nevertheless, the truth
is unquestionable. (See the note on Matt. 2, 16.)

The second Theudas they suppose to have been a
son or grandson of the first, and who again brought
together his scattered followers, similar instances of
which may be remarked in long-buried and almost
forgotten sects, which sometimes revive. The first
Theudas (to use the words of Dr. Doddridge) seems
to have been supported by smaller numbers than the
second of the name, and (as the second afterwards
did) perished in the attempt: but, as his followers
were dispersed, and not slaughtered like those of the
second Theudas, survivors might talk much of him,
and Gamaliel might have been particularly informed
of his history, though Josephus only mentions it in
general. Dr. Lardner, in his judicious remarks on
this subject, has shewn that there were many persons
of the same name, whose histories greatly resembled

In addition to this I must observe that numerous passages cited by Wetstein prove the name Theudas to have been a common one; so that we need not be compelled to suppose the second Theudas was a son, or grandson, or near relation of the first; not to say that the second demagogue might assume the name Theudas, as knowing that it was yet held in reverence with the people.

36. λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτόν. Most Commentators suppose there is here an ellipsis of μέγαν (see Bos Ellips.) ; but Schæfer on Bos 268. and Weiske de Pleon. p. 81. reject it, and maintain that τις is put for μέγας, and denotes a person of no ordinary kind, eminent for rank, talent, &c. in which sense εἶναι τὸ also occurs. The idiom is not unfrequent in the Greek and Latin writers, from whom examples are cited by Wolf, Kypke, Elsner, Loesner, Valcknaer, and others; as Epict. Ench. 12. καὶ δέξῃς τισιν εἶναι τις. Liban. Ep. 1265. ὁ πεισας τε αὐτῷ ὅς εἰσιν ἔγα τις. Soph. Elect. 989. ὡξεῖς τις εἶναι, τοῖς χρήμασι σθένων. Juvenal. 1, 75. Aude alicquid brevibus Gyaris et carere dignum, si vis esse aliquis. I add Aristid. 2, 19 D. προσυπισχώνυμο τῷ τοῦ τινὲς εἶναι δοκεῖν. Liban. Orat. 61 A. ἐπιδυμεῖς—τοῦ δοκεῖν, εἶναι τις. & 1021. Δξιῶν εἶναι τις. See Kust. on Theocr. Id. 4, 30.

On the contrary, the Greeks use οὐδεὶς for a person of no estimation; as Epict. c. 51. ποῦ δὲ οὐδεὶς οὐδαμοῦ ἐσθ, ὅν ἐν μόνοις εἶναι τίνα δεῖ ἐπι σοι. Both these idioms have place also in our own language, a somebody, a nobody.

36. προσεκτική, was adjoined. Some good MSS., with the Syr. Vulg. Ital. and Arab. Versions, read προσεκτική, which is preferred by Griesbach, Morus, Hemsterhuisius, Valcknaer, Schleusner, and Kuinoel, as being too rare a word to come from the scribes, and which, on that account, was changed by them into one more common and obvious. Προσκλίνεσθαι τίνι signifies to incline to any one, adjoin oneself to
him, follow him. The verb does not occur in the New Testament; but its derivative πρόκλωσις in 1 Tim. 5, 21. And the reading προσεκλίθη, which is found in many MSS., may be an error of the scribes for προσεκλίθη. Yet, when I consider that προσκολλάθαι is a word of frequent occurrence in the Old and New Testament (as in Acts 5, 13. Gosp. 15, 15.), though disused by the Classical writers, I cannot but suspect that the readings προσεκλίθη and προσεκλίθη are only παραδιορθώσεις of half-learned sciolists.

36. διελύθησαν, “were scattered and dispersed.” So, among other passages produced by Elsner and Wetstein, Herodian 6, 7, 2. δια (στρατός) ἀπαξ διαλυθησεις οὐ μᾶριας ήθροῖτε. Arrian, Epict. A. 6, 18. To which I add Thucyd. 7, 34. διαλυθέντος τοῦ στρατοῦ, dispersed. And 4, 74. διαλυθέντων. And 5, 50. διελύθησαν. And 2, 23. 3, 26. (See other examples in Præcæus.) The phrase γίνεσθαι εἰς οὐδὲν answers to our come to nought; as also ἤκειν εἰς οὐδὲν: on which phrase see Elsner, Raphael, and Kypke. So Eurip. Hec. 622. ὡς εἰς τὸ μηδὲν ἴκομεν, φρονῆματος τοῦ πρὸν στερέωτος.

37. ἀνεστῆ Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς. Schoettgen here cites a passage of R. Abraham in libro Juchasin, fol. 139, 1. where mention is made of this Judas. “Illo tempore tres fuerunt sectæ, nam præter Pharisæos et Sadduceæos Jehuda Galilæus tertiam sectam incepit, quæ dicitur Essenorum. — Opinio Nasiræorum, qui Esseni dict sunt, quorumque auctor fuit Judas Galilæus. Illi vero caussam dederunt Judæis, ut contra Romanos rebellarent, dicentes, Neminem debere aliis hominibus imperare, neque Dominum vocari, nisi solum Deum S. B.” Ἀπογραφή here signifies a census, or valuation, not only of persons but of property. (See the note on Luke 2, 1.) Josephus, Ant. 18, 1, 1. calls it ἀποτίμησις οἰσιῶν. Neither ought the census here mentioned to be confounded with the census of
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population made in the reign of Herod by the order of Augustus. The present census was taken by Quirinus, after Archelaus, the son of Herod, had been sent into exile by Augustus to Vienna, and his kingdom had been reduced to the form of a Roman province. See the note on the passage of Luke's Gospel, and Deyling's Obs. Sacr. P. 3. p. 257. This census Judas and his companion Sadoc abused to the purpose of exciting insurrection, by representing to the people that it manifestly involved servitude, and that the Jews, as being the people of God, ought to be exempt from paying tribute to the Romans. (See Joseph. Ant. 18, 1, 1. and the note on Matt. 22, 16, seq.) Judas is by Luke called a Galilæan, and by Josephus a Gaulanite (from the town Gamala). But Josephus, who elsewhere (as, for instance, in Bell. 2, 20, 4.) carefully distinguishes Galilee and Gaulonitis, yet he himself, in another place, calls Judas a Galilæan; as in Ant. 18, 1, 6; 20, 5, 2. Bell. 2, 9, 1. Judas had, therefore, a double cognomen, perhaps because he had been born in Gaulanitis, but had been brought up or dwelt in Galilee; as Apollonius, though an Egyptian, yet was, from the place of his residence, called Rhodius. (Kuin.)

37. ἀπέστησε λαὸν. The verb ἀφίστημι, it must be observed, has, in some of its tenses, an active sense; namely, to excite to an insurrection, or revolt; as here, and frequently in the best Greek writers, especially the Historians as, for instance, Thucydides. It sometimes occurs with an ἀπὸ τινος, but never (as far as I remember) with ἐπίσω αὐτοῦ, which properly requires another verb, and not ἀφίστημι. The Vulgate renders, "avertit populum post se;" with which Priscæus compares Macrobi. 2, 5. avertere in se populum. On ἰκανόν see the note on Matt. 28, 12. and Luke 7, 11.

38. καὶ τὰ νῦν λέγω. Here there is an ellipsis of ἵνα καὶ πράγματα. See the note on 4, 29. Ἀπέστησε
A sort of euphemism for "abstain from putting them to death," as ye determined." There is a similar kind of passage in Diog. Laert. (cited by Præcesus) μη ἀποκτεῖνετε τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πείσθεντες, ἄφετε.

38. "Οτι ἐὰν ἦ ἢ ἦν ἀνθρώπων, &c. Drusius here cites a similar sentiment from Perke Aboth, 4, 11. omnis congregatio quæ fit in nomine Dei stabilis erit; quæ vero non fit in honore Dei, cadet. And Wetstein (from Præcesus) cites an opinion pronounced by Marcus Antoninus whether Avidius Cassius should be put to death. "Si ei divinitus debetur imperium, non poterimus interficere, etiamsi velimus. Scis enim proavi tui dictum, Successorem suum nullus occidit: sin minus, ipse sponte, sine nostrâ crudelitate fatales laqueos inciderit." Herodot. 9, 16. ἐὰν τει γενέσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀμηχανοῦ ἀποτεσσαρίων ἀνθρώπων. Eurip. Melanipp. 41. γάμους δ' ἄυστοι στειθούσι μη πεπρωμένους, μείζην πονοῦσιν' ἢ δὲ τὸ χρεών πότει μένουσα, κ' ἀσποδαστός ἠλθεν ἐν δάμοις. Moreover, the ἦ seems to mean but, if (as it seems); so in Soph. Antig. 278. ἀναφέρει, ἐμοὶ τοι μη τι θεηλατον Τούργον τον ἦ Ἐυνοία βουλεύσας παλαί.

39. Μήποτε καὶ θειμάχοι εὑρέθητε. The word θειμάχοι, Præcesus, Hammond, Valcknaer, Markland, and others, connect with εὑρέθητε αὐτῶς, and separate the intermediate word from the rest by means of a parenthesis. Others, as Camerarius, Grotius, Beza, and Kuinoel, regard the μήποτε, &c. as elliptical, and would subaud οὐ πάτε, or the like. That there is an

* Markland pronounces this signification (which also occurs in Acts 23, 29.) to be rare; and he asks whether it be not peculiar to St. Luke. I answer, not so; since it is met with occasionally in the Classical writers. So Thucyd. 2, 47. where he says that the Athenians, who had, during the plague, first had recourse to religious expiations, at length finding all means useless, αὔτων ἀνέστησαν, desisted from them. The words καὶ εὑρέθητε αὐτῶς are added καὶ εὖ ἔγγησιν, in which there is an ellipse of some word, either ἀπελθεῖν (as Valcknaer thinks), like the Latin missum facere, or an adverb. So our let alone. Here we may compare Joseph. 868. ἰωανάθην ἐανε.

40. ἐπείσθησαν αὐτῷ, “were inclined to accede to his opinion;” so far, at least, as to let them go, though not without chastisement. And this, as it seems, to save their own credit, lest they should appear to have apprehended them causelessly, as also to strike terror into the people. Now flagellation was, indeed, a punishment very usual both among the Jews and Romans for lesser delinquencies (see the note on Matt. 10, 17. Luke 23, 6. infr. 22, 19. 2 Cor. 11, 24.); yet it was regarded as τιμωρία αἰσχίστη, a most ignominious punishment; as we learn from Joseph. Ant. 4, 9. On δέσιν see the note on Matt. 21, 34. Ἐπὶ τῷ δομῶν τίνος, i.e. concerning Jesus. See the note on ver. 28. (Grot. & Kuin.) With the words δείχαντες — ἀπέλυσαν αὐτοὺς I would compare a very similar passage of Athen.
37 e. ἐπιτιμήσαντες, μὴ πλείονος οἶνου ἐκφορεῖσθαι, ἀφηκαν.

41, 42. καῖδοντες, remembering with joy the words of Christ (in Matt. 5, 11 & 12). A great height of virtue this to patiently and even joyfully suffer evil in a good cause. (Grot.) Ἄπε προσώπου, &c. A Hebrew pleonasm. See Glass. 108. Ἄπε τοῦ ὀνόματος, “for the cause of Jesus.” In the words κατηξιοθησαν ἀτιμασθήναι, Casaubon, with his usual taste, notices the elegant use of the figure Oxymoron, which arises when two ideas, repugnant to each other, are so joined as not to be really repugnant, but only to seem so; of which the following examples are cited by Wetstein. Terent. Eunuch. 5, 2, 25. Non te dignum, Chærea, fecisti: nam, si ego digna hac contumelià sum maximè: at tu indignus, qui faceres tamen. Senec. de Provid. 4. Digni visi sumus Deo, in quibus expperetur, quantum humana natura posset pati. Arrian Epict. 1, 29. ὅτι σε ἐτίμησε τοιαύτην τιμήν, καὶ ἄξιον ἡγήσατο προσαγαγείν εἰς μαρτυρίαν τοιαύτην.

42. πᾶσαν ἡμέραν every day. Subaud κατὰ and ἐκάστην. The preposition is in this distributive sense added to all nouns of time. And since κατ’ οἴκων is opposed to ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, it plainly signifies in private houses; κατ’ οἴκων being put for κατ’ οἴκους, from house to house: for κατὰ here, perhaps, exerts its distributive force; though it is not perceptible in Acts 20, 20. δημοσία καὶ κατ’ οἴκους.

CHAP. VI.

1. πληθυνόντων, increasing. For the word has properly a transitive sense; as in Heb. 6, 14., and the passive is often used in the New Testament. But it occurs in this intransitive sense here, and in Exod. 1, 20. ἐπιλίθωσεν ὁ λαὸς (which St. Luke seems to have had in mind) and 1 Sam. 14, 29. Bos tells us that there is an ellipsis of the pronoun ἐκατος; which may, however, be doubted. Many active verbs are
used as neuters in all languages, both ancient (Hebrew, Greek, and Latin) and modern, including our own. On γογγυσμός (whence, possibly, our grudge) see the notes on Matt. 20, 11. Joh. 7, 12. By the Hebrews are meant the Jews of Palestine, who spoke the Hebrew, or rather Syrochaldee, which was popularly called Hebrew. To these Hebrews are opposed the Hellenists, Ἑλληνισταί. Now in the interpretation of this word the Commentators are by no means agreed. Erasmus, Drusius, Heinsius, Scaliger, Lightfoot, Hammond, Le Clerc, Schoetgen, Bengel, Rosenmuller, and others, are of opinion that they were the foreign Jews who spoke Greek. On the contrary, Camerarius, Beza, Salmasius (de Hellen. 175 & 283. and in fun. Hellen. 26), Wolf, Morus, Zeigler, and others, regard them as Proselytes, men in origin and religion Gentiles, but afterwards made Jews by circumcision, and now finally converted to Christianity. Wetstein, Heumann, Paulus, Kuinoel, and Heinrichs, however, maintain that they were foreign Jewish Proselytes, who spoke Greek. "For no good reason (say they) can be assigned why we should not suppose them to be Proselytes. Nay, the very tenor of the whole narration seems to compel us to regard them as such. For of the number of those who were appointed by the Apostles to superintend the distribution of the alms to the Hellenistic widows, was Nicolaus a Proselyte. (See ver. 46.) That by the term Ἑλληνισταί are meant Jews speaking Greek, appears not only from the opposite term Ἑβραῖοι, but from the usage of the Greek language; since ἐλληνιζεῖν, by the force of its original signification, denotes to imitate those who speak Greek, either in language, or customs. Of the same form are περευζεῖν in Xenoph. Anab. 4, 5, 23., μηδεῖν in Suidas and elsewhere, and ἐλληνιζεῖν, which occur in the best writers; as Pausan. Beol. p. 23. οὐχ ἔλληνισαντα οὐδὲ αὐτῶν διαλεκτῶν ἰδε βαρβαρωκ. Thucyd. 2, 68. ἐλληνισθησαν τὴν τῆς γλώσσας τῶν πρώτων οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀμφιλοχοὶ βάρβαροι εἰσίν.
So also Strabo 156 a. Photius Bibl. Βοῖς δὲ ἦν τούτῳ ὄνομα, φησὶν, ὅν καὶ Ἑλληνίσται γλώτταν καὶ γνώμην. Lucian Philopseu. 16. ὁ δαίμων δὲ ἀποκρινεται ἑλληνιζον, ὃ βαρβαρίζον, ἢ θεν ἂν αὐτὸς ἢ. Philo V. Mosis T. 2. p. 139, 24. οἱ πρὸς τῇ πατρίῳ καὶ τῇ ἑλληνικῇ ἐπεσαίετο παιδεία. Dio. Gen. L. Anachars. 1, 102. νομίζουν τὰ νόμιμα παραλείπει τῇ πατρίῳ, κολύσαν ἐν τῷ ἑλληνιζεῖν. So also ἀπικιζεῖν, σικελίζειν, περσίζειν, &c. See the copious Collectanea of Wetstein, from whom the above Classical examples are derived; and who also cites many Rabbinical writers on the subject of Jews speaking or studying Greek, from which it appears that Greek literature was not forbidden by their greatest Rabbis. Thus in Bara Kama, f. 83, 1. it is said of Gamaliel, that he had had a thousand scholars, of whom five hundred had studied the law, and five hundred Greek literature.

So also Schol. ap. Matthiae ad h. l. Ἐλληνιστῶν τῶν Ἐλληνιστὶ φθεγμένων καίτοι Ἑβραίων ὄντων τῷ γένει. And of this opinion was Chrysostom. The reasons urged by those who endeavoured to show that these Ἐλληνισταὶ were Greek Proselytes are ill-founded and inapplicable. “If (say they) the Jews speaking Greek were called Hellenists, why has Paul of Tarsus, a Grecian city, never mentioned himself as a Hellenist, but a Hebrew or a Jew?” To this it may be replied, because in the passage where he calls himself a Hebrew (Phil. 3, 5. 2 Cor. 11, 22.) or a Jew (Acts 21, 39. 22, 8.) it would have been absurd to have called himself a Hellenist.

Those Commentators observe, moreover, that if the name Hellenists had been given, not to Jews born, but to Jews of foreign origin speaking Greek, one does not see how it could happen that the Hebrews should neglect the Hellenists, and overlook their widows. But, as we have observed on Joh. 7, 36., the Jews of Palestine, and especially the Jerusalemites, used to account themselves superior to the Jews residing out of Palestine, on the ground of their
birth and residence in the Holy Land, and especially the holy city, and because the foreign Jews could not so accurately observe the Jewish rites as those living in Jerusalem or Palestine; and finally because they used the holy language. See the note on Acts 2, 4, II. η.)

Hence also the Christian converts, Jews who spoke Hebrew, (such as are here mentioned,) held themselves far superior to those formed of the Jews who spoke Greek. Finally, the above Commentators appeal to Acts 11, 19 & 20, from which they think it appears that by the Ἐλληνισταί are meant Grecian proselytes. But to this it may be replied, that the true reading there is Ἐλληνας (as we have shown in the note on that passage). (Wets. & Kuin.)

The last detailed hypothesis seems to be, upon the whole, the best founded; though both the first and second have been maintained with considerable learning and acuteness. I admit, however, with Markland, that they were Jews (see Acts 11, 19 & 20.); though no more is certainly known of them, or the reason of their name, any more than of the Synagogue of the Libertines (λαβέρτινων, in which all the copies agree), ver. 9., as is clear (he observes) from the different opinions and conjectures of Commentators: an infallible mark that the passage is not understood.

The first mentioned hypothesis is ably supported by Schoettgen, who, though he has (I think) failed in his principal purpose, has brought forward some instructive remarks on the Hellenistic style of the Old and New Testament, which I consider it incumbent on me to lay before my younger readers, especially as I have reason to believe that they are little known, from having been introduced, as it were, praeter propositum, and in the middle of a commentary.

Si quis ex me quaerat, an credam, Novum Testamentum stilo Hellenistico scriptum esse, huic respondeo, me hoc credere, et per totum hoc opus demonstratum ire; sed ita tamen, ut hæc sobriè et
cum summa erga Deum reverentia statuantur. Nimimum Graecitas
N. T. non est tam pura, tam limata, tam concinna, qualis in Demos-
thene, Isocrate, aut alius priscorum temporum scriptoribus occurrit,
sed omnia hebraismis scatent, iid quod sane contra leporem sermonis
Attici est. Verum, quod proba notandum, culpa hujus rei non
redundat in Spiritum Sanctum, divinas hasce litteras inspiratant.
Is enim auctor est omnium linguarum, et, si voluisset, aut sapientiae
ipsei commodum fussset, sane stilum Demosthenes et Isocrates
milleos superanatem Apostolis inspirare potuisse, ita quidem, ut
Attici illi oratores prae sublimitate et puritate sermonis in N. T.
videri possent barbari. Verum Spiritus S. duas praecipue causas
habuit, quod hanc linguam Hellenisticam retinuerit.

1. Prima est, quia necesse erat eo sermonis genere uti, quod
auditores intelligerent. Evangelium praeclavandum erat primo Ju-
daeis, postea Gentilibus. Utrique callebat linguam graecam, sed
tamen cum insigni differentia. Priores em multis Hebraismis
continuaverant, sed tamen phrases permultae habebant ex V. T.
petias. Praeterea vero veram religionem majoribus traditam huc
usque conservaverant. Postiores Graecitatem quidem puriorum
habebant, sed tamen etiam aliquantum declinabant, nihil autem
verae religiosae possidebant. Hinc Dei sapientia, insuper habita
puritatis praerogitiva, Judaeis potius condescendit, quia Judaei
candem religionem retinebant, mutatis tamen mutandis, gentiles
vero novum plane cultum addiscere debebant. Ad Judaeos vero sic
loqui et scribere cogebantur Apostoli, ut ab ipso intelligerentur,
quemadmodum ipse Servator in concionibus suis lingua Hebraica
non pura, sed corrupta et depravata, locutus est, non, quod ipse
Hebraeum linguam purae loqui non potuerit, sed quia auditoribus
condescendere voluit, ut ab isdem intelligeretur. Rem exemplo
illustrabimus. Non ita pridem Franco furti ad Viadrum fato suo
suntus est Reverendus Vir, Christianus Mullerus, Verbi divini ibi-
dem Minister, qui in gratiam Judaeorum Novum Testamentum ex
versione Lutheri litteris Judaico-Germanicis imprimi curaverat.
Quae res ut ad gloriam Dei suscepta erat, sic ope illius libri multi
ex Judaeis, res nostras propius introspicientes, virtute verbi divini
ad veram religionem conversi sunt. Verum quo minus plures id
intelligant, adeoque convertantur, adest adhuc aliquid obstaculum,
quo ipsorum Judaeorum colloquis debeo. Nimimum notum est,
ipsei equidem inter nos Germanos habitare, et linguam nostraa uti,
sed admodum depravata, multas obsoletas nobisque prorsus igno-
nitas voces, imo et Hebraica satis multa admissent. Quodsi ergo
hunc librum majori utilitati gaudere velitimus, necesse est, ut polit-
tam illam vernaculi sermonis indolem, quam Divus Lutherus usus est,
paulisper seponamus, et in hujusmodi stilum transformatemus,
qualem illi legere et intelligere solent. Quamvis igitur nos ser-
monis Germanci puritatem exprimere valeamus, tamen in gratiam
rudioris Judaeorum populi sermonem Germanico-barbarum prae-
ferre necesse habemus.

1. δρι παρεδεχομενον εν τη διακονια τ. κ. Α. The
general term διακονειν and διακονια are often, in the
New Testament, applied to the collection, management, and distribution of the sums collected for the relief of the poor; as in Heb. 6, 10. Rom. 15, 25. Παραδεισεῖν signifies to overlook, neglect. Now the more Classical term is παρεδώκει; though, among the examples produced by Wetstein from those authors, there is one from Xenoph. Mem. ult. παρεδωκεῖν is used; καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους παρεδώκεσκον ἐμαυτοῖς. So also Diodor. Sic. 34. Ex. p. 687. ὁ τιτὸς Μάριος — ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν παρεδωκεῖτο, ταπεινότατος ὁ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν τῇ δόξῃ — ἐν ταῖς εἰς δόξαν προαγωγαῖς παρεδωκεῖτο. See also Valcknaer.

Kuinoel is of opinion that this complaint regarded the curators or guardians of the poor (Jews born, and in number exceeding the Hellenists), who were already elected by the suffrage of the congregation, and appointed to their office by the Apostles. "The common hypothesis (continues Kuinoel) is, that the Apostles did not use any certain men for the distribution of charitable contributions, but sometimes one, sometimes another of the Hebrews. The opinion of Mosheim, however, (in his Comment. de rebus Christ. ante Const. p. 139 & 118.) is, that there were already certain persons appointed by the Apostles to take care of the poor, and relieve their necessity out of the common funds of the society; but that they were all Hebrews, and now to be elected by the congregation; and that to them were added seven men of the Hellenists. Compare ver. 5.

1. εν τῇ διακονίᾳ. ‘On these Deacons of the primitive Church, their origin and office, there has been no little dispute among the Theologians of our age, especially Camp., Vitringa, and Rhenferd, the former de Syn. Vet. p. 920 seqq., the latter in his Dissertation de decem otiosis Synagogae p. 139 seqq. Vitringa maintains that this διακονία τῶν τραπεζῶν was extraordinary, and confined to the Church at Jerusalem, in which alone that communion of goods existed; and that therefore the Deacons mentioned by St. Paul in his Ep. to Tim. and Philo are to be
distinguished from those of whom we here read. Rhenferd, however, accounts it a perpetual office every where to be received in the Church; and he compares these Deacons with the Hebrew collectors of alms, not the דְּבָּרָה. To me (I confess) the opinion of Vitringa appears the best founded; though it is not my present purpose to weigh the arguments of either. (Wolf.)

2. προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ οἱ δώδεκα τ. π. τ. μ. By the πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν Lightfoot would understand those hundred and twenty Christians mentioned in 1, 15.; and he thinks that the seven men were elected from those only; though the number of Christians at that time amounted to several thousands. But his arguments have been ably answered by Hammond and Whitby, the latter of whom has a most instructive annotation, to which I must refer my readers. So also the word was understood by Grotius, and probably by the ancient Fathers; for Æcumenius plainly so takes it. Grotius observes that, at that time, the government of the Church was such as Plato tells us existed at Athens; namely, an ἀριστοκρατία μετ' εὐθυκίας πλῆθους.* Mosheim (de Christ. ante Const. 119.) and Kuinoel are of opinion that the whole πλῆθος of the Jerusalemite Christians was divided into seven parties, or families, for which there were as many places of public worship; and that hence also seven persons were elected for the purpose of taking care of the poor and of strangers, so that each family should chuse one, and over each of the families one of those seven should be placed. St. Luke does not, indeed, give a particular account

* I believe it has never yet been observed, that this is a very close imitation of an elegant expression which occurs in Thucyd. 2, 65. ἐγινετο τε λόγῳ μεν, δημοκρατία, ἐγραφέ δὲ, ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτον ἄνδρος ἀρχῆ. Many other imitations, also, of this passage I have noted down, which, however, I shall forbear, on the present occasion, to detail, reserving them for their proper place in my edition of Thucydides, where they will afford an ample field for illustration and emendation.
of this office, but only touches on the chief heads of early Ecclesiastical history, leaving his readers a most ample field for enlargement, reflection, and conjecture on what is by him so succinctly narrated.

2. οὐκ ἁρετῶν ἐστίν. This is rendered in some Versions non placet; which sense is adopted by Bp. Pearce and others. But by this close adherence to the primitive signification the real sense is sacrificed. "Pleasing" is here not an apposite idea. The Vulg., followed by Beza, Casaubon, Grotius, and others, more accurately represent the sense by "non aequum est," just and right, decent. For by this the Alexandrian Jews expressed the Hebrew words יושב and יוש. See Schl. Lex. on Vet. Test. By λόγος is here meant instruction; as in Joh. 17, 20.; since that formed the principal part of the Apostolic office. Tindal translates, "the work of God;" in which version work is probably a typographical error for word. The expression οὐκ ἁρετῶν ἐστίν I would render, "it is not seemly, decent." Chrysostom paraphrases it by ἀτοποῦ.

2. καταλείψαντας, neglecting. A metaphor (as Heinrichs observes) taken from soldiers deserting their post. Διακονεῖν τραπέζαις. All the earlier Commentators unite in assigning to these words the sense serve tables. Doddridge renders, "attend, see to the providing for the tables of the poor." But all the later Commentators interpret the words thus: "superintend the collection and distribution of the alms to be expended on the poor." This mode of explanation seems to have been adopted by Grotius; but was first developed by Krebs (whom see). It is certain that τραπέζα is sometimes used in the New Testament for a banquet; as Luke 19, 23. (where see the note): and since (as Krebs observes) διακονεῖν is, in 2 Cor. 8, 4 & 19., used to denote ministering alms, and διακονία the alms themselves in Acts 11, 29., it seems most agreeable to the context to so explain the present expression διάκονεῖν τραπέζαις.
This sense Krebs illustrates by a passage of Joseph. Ant. 12, 2, 3. οι δὲ λοιποὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς τραπέζης κομίζομενοι τὰ λύτρα.

After all, however, I see no reason why the words should not admit of both interpretations being united; nay, indeed, they seem to require it. This method, too, is adopted by Ecumenius.

3, 4. ἐπισκέψασθε — ἀνδρας ἐξ ύμων μαρτυρομένους ἐπτα. Ἐπισκέπτομαι signifies properly to look at; but has here a sort of significatio praegnans, and denotes to look at for choice, to look out; as it is well rendered in our common Version. I know no example of the elliptical phrase; but of the complete one Munthe adduces one, at least, from Diodor. Sic. 295 D. οὗτος ἐπισκέψαμεν τὰς ἀπάντων νομοθεσίας, ἐξελέξατο ὑπὸ κράτιστα.

3. Μαρτυρομένους, of good repute. So Acts 10, 22. μαρτυρομένους ὑπὸ διοῦ τοῦ ἐθνῶς. On this sense see the note on Luke 4, 22. Priceus cites Joseph. 15, 13. καλογαθία μαρτυρομένος. Doddridge renders, “men of attested character.” But this is, perhaps, adhering too closely to the primitive sense. Into this error he seems to have been led by an injudicious observation of Grotius, “that this shews the form of the Church; namely, that for election to any ministry it was necessary to have the testimonials of those with whom the candidate had lived.” All founded in mere fancy, and in pressing too much on the etymological sense. On the reason for the number seven the Commentators trifle egregiously. Lightfoot, Mele, and Dodwell, think there is an allusion to the seven Angels in the Apocalypse, or the seven nations who had murmured. The opinion of Kuinoel is, that there is a reference to the number of families of which the Church at Jerusalem then consisted. This, however, rests merely on a precarious conjecture of Mosheim. The simplest and most rational opinion seems to be that of Heinrichs, namely, “that it was chosen as being a favourite and sacred number with the Jews.”
3. πλήρεις Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ σοφίας. In the interpretation of this expression Commentators are much divided in opinion. The earlier ones take it to denote the faculty of working miracles; the recent ones no more than ardour, enthusiasm, and a desire for the propagation of the Gospel. But this latter mode of interpretation extremely lowers and enfeebles the sense. To steer a middle course seems here the most judicious step. The expression must, at least, denote reception of all the higher gifts of the Holy Spirit, and not only that of occasionally working miracles; and must include the faculty of knowing the truth, as it is in Jesus, and having will and power to propagate it by words, and exemplify it by actions. On this subject the reader may profitably consult the annotations of Hammond and Whitby; though the latter has been deeply indebted to the former, as, indeed, is frequently the case.

As to the term σοφία, it seems to have nothing to do with knowledge of the Scriptures (though it is by Grotius so explained); still less impartiality (according to Heinrichs); but merely indicates that other kind of knowledge, which was equally necessary with the spiritual to the performance of the office in question; namely, prudence, judgment, knowledge of the world, and acquaintance with business.

3. οὗ καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης, "whom we may appoint," or, as the best MSS. and Versions read καταστήσομεν, "whom we will appoint." This latter reading is adopted by Griesbach, by most Editors, and admitted into the text. By χρεία is not meant, as some Commentators explain, necessity, but business, and that necessary and important. Of this signification numerous examples are adduced by Elsner, Kypke, and Wetstein. So 1 Macc. 10, 37. καταταθήσεται ἐπὶ χρείαν τοῦ βασιλέως. It appears that theDiaconal office was adopted by the early Christians from the custom of the Jewish Synagogue, in which there were three almoners, or treasurers,
of the poor’s chest, called מנהיגים, Shepherds, who took care of the poor, especially strangers, and distributed money every seventh day. So Maimon. (cited by Wets.) Collectores sunt viri noti et fidi, sapientes et prudentes. Bava Bathra. fol. 2. Cibi collectiguntur per tres, et per tres distribuuntur, quia collectio et distributio eorum æquales sunt. See also Lightfoot. and Vitringa de Synag. 629 & 620. On these deacons consult the long and masterly annotation of Whitby, into whose discussion I must forbear entering, in order to be able to introduce some valuable illustrations of this subject from Mr. Hughes’s Dissertation, prefixed to his edition of Chrysostom. de Sacerdot. (as translated by Mr. Bulkeley):

Arguing, that the order of deacons, instituted in Acts the 6th, was not a secular and temporary, but a permanent and spiritual office. (1.) Because it was required that they who should be chosen to it should be men full of the Holy Spirit, i. e. endowed with its excellent gifts, and very conversant in the Old Testament, especially the Prophecies, that they might be qualified, as occasion offered, to dispute with the Jews, as Stephen did. Does not this imply an office more excellent than what relates merely to œconomy? Could the gifts of the Spirit, and a plenary knowledge of revelation, be necessary for the distribution of money? An upright mind, and approved integrity, are sufficient qualifications for this. The deacons were appointed to serve tables, and derived from this design their name. But the tables of the disciples, as the Bishop of Chester observes, were sacred and common in the service of the Eucharist. It is very probable, that the deacons assisted the Apostles in the distribution of the consecrated elements. (2.) They were ordained, like presbyters and bishops, by the laying on of hands. "This solemn rite could never have been used for the destination of any one to a temporary and civil office." (Hughes.) Schoettgen observes, that there were in the primi-
tive church two sorts of deacons. On the power of the congregation in the affair in question see the excellent note of Dr. Hammond.

It is strange, considering that the expression is καταστίσωμεν, whom we will appoint, that the Presbyterian Commentators, and, among the rest, Dr. Doddridge, should venture to explain it of what was to be the joint act of themselves and the whole Church. Such an interpretation could never surely have been thought of by any but such as were resolved to find their own opinions in the New Testament. His sneer, too, at the canons of the Church might have been well spared. He thinks that the three grand canons, of doing all with decency, in charity, and to edification, would have been sufficient, and, if rightly weighed, would be found to vacate a great part of the rest. But the good Doctor will forgive us for supposing that the antient Fathers understood what was for the good of the primitive Church far better than himself, or any Theologian of the present age; not to say, that were the canons reduced to the three he mentions, a very great number of others must be formed, for their better explanation, and application. An illustration of the true spirit of sectarism is supplied by the curious fact furnished by Bp. Pearce, namely, that in some English Bibles printed a few years before 1660 the we is altered to ye, with what intent is obvious, unless it were a mere error, which is not probable.

On προσκατηγέω, to give oneself up to, see the note on 1, 14. Προσευχὴ is by Rosenmuller taken in an extended sense to denote religious meditation, or divine worship in general; as in 1 Cor. 7, 5. and he refers to Luke 6, 12. But he surely must mean to include prayers.

We are not, however, to understand by this that the Apostles abandoned all care of the duties which they had transferred to the deacons, but exercised that kind of inspection over them which would, by a small sacrifice of time, secure the due performance
of these duties. "They did not (says Origen C. Cels.) decline that office as lowly and irksome, but for the purpose of attending to more necessary affairs."

5. ἡρεσεν δὲ λόγος ἐνάπτυον παντὸς. This is altogether an Hellenistic phrase, no where found in the Classical writers, but formed on the model of the Hebrew יֶעָר. So Deut. 1, 28. 2 Sam. 3, 86. The Greeks would have said ἡρεσεν παντὶ τῶν πληθεὶ. (De Dieu and Valckn.)

5. πλήγη πίστεως καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου. Πίστις is by the recent Commentators rendered fidelity, truth; as in Tit. 2, 10. 1 Tim. 4, 12. And this is countenanced by the two following quotations in Wetstein: Inscription quæ communem torum servavit casta mariti, et fidei plenâ pietatis nobilis. Cic. de Sen. ex Ennio. Ille vir haud magnâ in re, sed fidei plenus. But to this mode of interpretation I cannot assent; since, when associated with καὶ Πνεύματος, it contributes to make up a formula such as occurs just after, and frequently elsewhere. See Schleus. Lex. and Schmid's Concord.

5. Νικόλαος τ. Α. From this Nicolaus, Lightfoot, Grotius, and others, have thought the sect of Nicolaitans derived its origin. But the name Nicolaus, in the Apoc., is not the name of a sect, but a fictitious and symbolical one; as Balaumites in Apoc. 2, 14. The same are, at ver. 15, called οἱ κατοίκες τῆς διδαξῆς Νικολαϊτῶν. So that, according to St. John's custom of joining Hebrew names with Greek ones, the Hebrew noun Βαλαάμ answers to the Greek Νικόλαος. The words are compounded of νικάω ἱμαῖ and λάός ὑπ' meaning those who outwit and deceive the people. See Heuman Sec. 2, 391. and Janus's Dissertation De Nicolaitis ex Hæreticorum Catalogo expungendis, in Ikenius's Thes. 2, 1016. seqq. and Eichhorn's Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Since Nicolaus is called a proselyte of Antioch, Salmassius and others have inferred that the rest of the persons here mentioned were also proselytes, but
of Jerusalem, Gentiles not having yet been admitted into the Christian Church, which then consisted of real Jews and Hellenists, i.e. proselytes. But, as we observed in ver. 1. by the Hellenists are to be understood Jews and proselytes born out of Palestine, and speaking Greek; nor does there appear any reason why it should be inferred that, because Nicolaus was a proselyte, the rest should have been so likewise; nay, it should seem that Nicolaus is rather distinguished from them by this name; whence it would appear that the rest were Jews born. Moreover, since all the names of the persons here mentioned are Greek, and some disputes had arisen from the Hellenistic widows being neglected, we may with confidence adopt the well-founded opinion of Mosheim, Michaelis, Morus, and Heinrichs [as formerly of Camerarius and Grotius], that all of them were Hellenists, and not appointed curators and guardians of all the poor Christians, but only of the poor Hellenistic widows. See the note on ver. 1 & 2. (Kuin.) where see the further observations of Mosheim on this not uninteresting subject.

6. προσευχῶμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας. As καὶ προσευχῶμενοι is to be referred to the Apostles, the καὶ has the force of the pronoun relative; as in Mark 2, 15.

6. Ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας. Selden and Wolf rightly deduce the origin of laying on hands from the age of Moses, adverting both to the seven Seniores, on whom Moses laid his hands (Num. 27, 18.), and to Moses laying his hands on Joshua (so that the custom did not arise from that of putting hands on the victims). Hence the same was preserved in the Jewish Church, which they call מְפְלָה יִרְי. See Vitring. de Syn. 896 & 841. who has there shown how it was thence introduced into the Christian Church by the Apostles. Kuinoel observes, that among the Hebrews, he who prayed for good of any kind upon another used to lay his hands upon his head, in order to shew δεικτικῶς, for whom the bene-
fits were asked in prayer. See Gen. 18, 14. Matt. 9, 18. Mark 16, 18. Imposition of hands was moreover a rite of institution to a new office (see Numb. 27, 18. 2 Sam. 18, 19.), by which rite was designated, as it were, by symbol, the conferring of the office and dignity. See 1 Tim. 5, 22.

7. καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠζευε — ἐ Ἡ ἡ σ. Καὶ is by Kuinoel rendered and thus. A mode of interpretation, however, too arbitrary. It has merely the narrative, or transitive, sense, and (then); though there is no reason to doubt but that the increase may be attributed to the wise plans of the Apostles.

7. Πολὺς τε ὁ χλός τῶν ἱερέων ὑπίκουσα. Since it would appear wonderful that any considerable number of the priests should embrace the Christian faith, considering the bitter hostility they must expect from their unbelieving brethren, and the consequent expulsion from the sacerdotal office; hence many Critics have set themselves to devise means for removing the difficulty, either by conjectural emendation, or by employing certain exegetical machines. Some would read for ἱερέων, ἱωδαίων. But this reading, though found in a few MSS., seems a mere error. Besides, the sense hence arising would be utterly useless, after what preceded: and with pleonasm of this kind the sacred writers are not chargeable. Casaubon, Beza, and Valcknaer, would conjecture πολὺς τε ὁ χλός καὶ τῶν ἱερέων, with the subaudition of τίνες. But this is very harsh, and not agreeable to the usage of the Sacred writers. Heinsius, Elsner, Wolf, Óeder, Heumann, and Kuinoel, would take ὁ χλός, like the Latin turba, of the rabble, as it were, of the inferior priests, as opposed to the leaders of the twenty-four classes. But this signification always requires the article; as in the very passage of Mark 12, 37. to which Kuinoel appeals. Besides, the difficulty would thus be rather increased than diminished; since this expression could not denote many of the plebeian priests, but only (as in the passage of Mark) the great bulk of the priests,
i.e. nearly all. The interpretation of Heinrichs, who takes it of the priests’ servants, &c. is quite arbitrary, and deserving of no attention.

The common reading and interpretation, after all, must be retained, which indeed present no real difficulty, if we reflect that the expression πολὺς ἡχλὸς must not be too much pressed, but taken in a popular sense, and only understood of a considerable number. Thus Chrysostom (who, it is plain, had our common reading) explains τούτων πολλῶν, &c. That the whole number was very great, we may suppose; since, as De Dieu observes, we learn from Ezra 3, 36—39. that the number even of those who returned from the captivity was 4289. So Jos. c. Apion 2, 7. licet enim sint tribus IV. Sacerdotum, et horum tribuum singulae habeant hominum plus quam V. M. That a considerable number should believe is not strange, considering the miracles they had witnessed both in Jesus and the Apostles, and the truth of the resurrection established even on the testimony of the soldiers on guard.

8. πλήρης πίστεως καὶ δυνάμεως. Some MSS. and early Versions read χάριτος, which is preferred by Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Morus. Rosenm. and Kuinoel, and received into the text by Griesbach. Those critics tell us that the scribes (or rather the correctors) changed χάριτος into πίστεως, in conformity to the reading at ver. 5. and because they thought it more suitable to δυνάμεως. This, however, is not very convincing. The number, too, of the MSS. is very small, and those in general copies of MSS. which have been tampered with. Nor is the authority of the Versions, in a doubtful case like the present, of much consequence; whereas the number of MSS. has great weight. Vater has done well in restoring the old reading. If χάριτος be the true reading, it must signify the Divine favour; as in Acts 18, 27. Rom. 5, 21. 6, 1. and elsewhere: a signification very suitable to the words following.
9. ἀνέστησαν δὲ τίνες—Στεφάνῳ, i.e. “From the various synagogues of Jews born out of Palestine,” some actuated by anger and envy on account of the abandonment of the antient faith by so celebrated a person as Stephen, sought converse with him, and endeavoured to entangle him in argument, puzzle him with all kinds of subtle questions, and press him with the various artifices of Jewish disputants. But being vanquished by him, and reduced to silence, they, burning with shame and anger, suborned some persons who should accuse him of speaking contumeliously against God and Moses. Hence he was apprehended and brought before the Sanhedrim.

Συναγώγη denotes a public edifice, where the Jews used to meet for the purposes of prayer, and to hear the Scriptures explained. In every large city there were many synagogues, and at Jerusalem (if we may believe the Rabbis) four hundred and eighty. See Lightfoot on this passage, and Vitringa de Syn. p. 28 & 256., Deyling, in his Obs. P. 2. p. 839., Heumann and Klotz maintain that the Libertini, Cyrenai, and the rest here named, had one and the same synagogue; since we read ἐκ τῆς συναγώγης. But it is utterly improbable that so many thousand Jews as would meet together from those regions should have used only one synagogue. Besides, it is obvious that, from the words preceding, a verb or noun must often be repeated. See Glass, Phil. S. 632.

In the interpretation of Ἀβεβεβινε: the Commentators are much at variance. Now since the word denotes, not nature (i.e. country), but state and condition, and since Libertini occurs in the middle of these names of nations, and since Joseph. Ant. 12, 1. &. C. Apion 2, 4. has told us that many Jews were removed by Ptolemy from their country, and placed in the cities of Lybia, Beza, Le Clerc, Gothofred, Valcknaer, and others, have, on the authority of Οἰκομενιος, conjectured Ἀβεβεβινε, i.e. sprung from Lybia. To this opinion Wetstein also seems
to incline; since he cites examples of that word from Joseph. Ant. 16, 10., Catullus 60, Ælian, A. H. 14, 14. & 17, 41., Stephan 5. in voc. Kūra, and Macrobius, Sat. 1, 17. But all the MSS. and antient Versions agree in the common reading. Hence others understand by the Λεβερίνοι Jews inhabitants and citizens of Libertus, in Africa proper, or Carthage, either a town or a district. But that there was any such town cannot be proved.* The most probable opinion, and that adopted by most Commentators from the time of Chrysostom, is, that they were Jews whom the Romans had taken in war, and conveyed to Rome, but afterwards freed; at whose expense this synagogue had been built, which might have been properly called the Synagogue of the Romans.

* Yet Bp. Pearce observes: "We find Suidas, in his Lexicon, saying upon the words Λεβερίνοι, that it is δομα τού ευδονος, the name of a people; and in Gest. Collationis Carthagini habita inter Catholicos et Donatistas, published with Optatus's works, Paris. 1679, (No. 301, and p. 57,) we have these words, Victor Episcopus Ecclesiæ Cathlicæ Libertinensis dixit, Unitas est illic; publicam non latet conscientiam. Unity is there; all the world knows it. From these two passages it appears that there was in Libya a town or district called Libertina, whose inhabitants bore the name of Λεβερίνοι, Libertines, when Christianity prevailed there. They had an Episcopal See among them, and the above-mentioned Victor was their Bishop at the Council of Carthage in the reign of the Roman Emperor Honorius. And from hence it seems probable, that the town or district, and the people, existed in the days of which Luke is here speaking. They were Jews (no doubt), and came up as the Cyrenian and Alexandrian Jews did, to bring their offerings to Jerusalem, and to worship God in the temple there. Cæcæus, in his Rep. Heb. 2, 23. says, that the Jews who lived in Alexandria and Libya, and all other Jews who lived out of the Holy Land, except those of Babylon and its neighbourhood, were held in great contempt by the Jews who inhabited Jerusalem and Judea; partly on account of their quitting their proper country, and partly on account of their using the Greek language and being quite ignorant of the Jewish. For these reasons it seems probable, that the Libertines, Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, had a separate synagogue, (as perhaps the Cilicians and those of Asia had,) the Jews of Jerusalem not suffering them to be present in their synagogues, or they not choosing to perform their public service in synagogues, where a language was made use of, which they did not understand.
Acts of the Apostles, Chap. VI.

Λιβερτίνω is therefore a name of Roman origin, and to be explained by reference to Roman customs. [See Facciolati’s Lexicon. Edit.] This opinion, too, is confirmed by the circumstance that synagogue does not occur in the middle of the nations, but stands first, and has to it added τῆς λεγομένης: whence it clearly appears that Λιβερτίνω is not a name of region or country. Besides, there were, it seems, many Libertini of the Jewish religion at Rome. So Tacit. Anal. 2, 85. (speaking of the age of Tiberius). Actum et de sacris Αἰγυπτισ Ἰουδαικές pellendis, factumque patrum consultum, ut quatuor millia Libertini generis, ea superstitione infecta, quies idonea ætas, in insulam Sardiniam veherentur coercendis illis latrocinii, et si ob gravitatem coeli interiissent, vile damnnum, cæteri Italia cedere, nisi certam ante diem profanos ritus exuisset. So Suet. Tib. 36. & Philo, p. 1014. τῶν ὅπων ἀπεδέχοτο τὴν πέραν τοῦ Τιβέρεως ποταμοῦ μεγάλην τῆς Ρώμης ἀποτομήν, ἢν οὐκ ἤγινοι κατεχομένην καὶ οἰκουμένην πρὸς Ἰουδαίων. Ἰουδαίοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλείους ἀπελευθερωμένοι. Αἰχμάλωτοι γὰρ ἀκεφήνει εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ὅπο τῶν κτησαμένων ἀληθεράθησαν οὐδὲν τῶν πάτρων παραγαγότας βιασθέντες.

9. Κυρηναίοι, i.e. Jews of Cyrene. See the note on 2, 10. Matt. 27, 37. Krebs here observes (appealing to Joseph. Ant. 14, 7, 2, 16, 6, 1.) that Jews inhabited all the cities of the Cyrenaean territory, and enjoyed the same civil rights as the natives of the country.

9. 'Ἀλεξανδρείων, i.e. Jews of Alexandrian origin. So Joseph. Ant. 19, 5, 2. τῶν ἐν 'Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίων καὶ 'Ἀλεξανδρείων λεγομένων. That a great multitude of Jews had their abode there we learn from Philo, 971 c. ὅτι οὐκ ἀποδέουσι μυρίας ἕκατον τῆν 'Ἀλεξανδρείαν καὶ τὴν χάραν Ἰουδαίων κατοικοῦντες, ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς Λιβύην καταβαθμοῦ μέχρι τῶν ὄριων Αἰθιοπίας. The city was divided into five parts, or wards, two of which were entirely occupied by Jews, who had besides scattered habitations in the other quarters.
See Philo, 973 a. That they enjoyed the freedom of the city, we learn from Joseph. Ant. 12, 1, 1. 19, 5, 2: and that they had their own prefect, or governor, who was styled the ἐθναρχής, appears from Joseph. Ant. 14, 7, 2. (Krebs and Kuin.) The word ἐθναρχής reminds me of the Lacedemonian ἰεναγόλ, mentioned in Thucyd. 2, 75. The ἄπλ, which occurs just after, signifies descended from (like the Welch ap). See the note on Matt. 15, 1. On σοφιτείων see the note on Mark 8, 11. It is observed by Doddridge, that as the most considerable synagogues in Jerusalem had each a kind of academy or college of young students belonging to it, instructed under some celebrated Rabbi, it is no wonder such nurseries should afford disputants like those spoken of here.

10. καὶ οὐκ ἵσχουν ἀντιστήναι τῇ σοφίᾳ, καὶ τ. π. ὑ. Ἔσσά must, by the force of the context and of the subject matter, denote divine wisdom, namely (what chiefly constituted Jewish learning), a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, and of the Jewish Law and sacred history; as is clearly apparent from the discourse of Stephen, recorded in the next chapter. By πνεῦμα is meant the divine power which supported him and evinced its efficacy in him. See the note on Matt. 10, 20. Mark 13, 11. They could not, we are told, resist the weight of his arguments, or the force and power of his oratory. Kuinoel thinks that there is in ἀντιστήναι a metaphor derived from pugilism. This, however, may be doubted. (See Krebs on Gal. 2, 11. and the note on Luke 21, 15.) Priscœus cites two very similar passages; namely, Sap. 7, 30. σοφίας οὐ κατισχύειν κακίαν. Aemilius Probus, in Vit. Alcib. Tanta erat commen- datio urs ut nemo ei dicendo posset resistere.

11. τὸς ὑπέβαλων ἄνδρας — Θεόν. Τοποθάλλειν properly signifies to put under, and, (by a metaphor taken from the dams of animals,) denotes to introduce another and suppository child to any mother. Moreover, from the force of the ἄπλ, under, it signifies to
suggest a hint, advise, &c.; and also submittere, subornare, to set on an accuser in an underhand way. So Aristid. p. 618. (cited by Elsner) ἔτερους διακόνους ὑποβαλλόμενοι τῆς συμβουλής αἰς ἁληθῶς σκιαμαχεῖν ἠναγκάζοντο. Many other examples are produced by Elsner, Wetstein, and Loesner.

11. ῥήματα βλάσφημα εἰς Μωϋσῆν, “impious, abusive, and contumelious speeches.” This constituted a capital offence, since it involved contempt of the Temple and Religion, (see Deyling’s Obs. 2, 43, 3,) which was thought to imply contempt of the Deity, by whom the Law had been promulgated, and by whose presence the Temple was thought to be peculiarly favoured. On βλάσφημα εἰς Μωϋσῆν Wetstein cites Joseph. Bell. 2, 8, 9. de Essenis. σέβας δὲ μέγιστον παρ’ αὐτοῖς μετὰ τὸν θεὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νομαθέτου, καὶ βλασφημήσῃ τις εἰς τούτον, κολάζεσθαι βανάτω.

12—14. συνεκινήσαν τὸν λαὸν, “excited the people to commotion.” The words συγκινέω and συγκέω are, like the Latin words commovere, concitare, and sometimes misceo (as in Phædr. 1, 2, 2. civitatem miscere), used of stirring up any one to anger, sedition, or any other of the violent passions, by confounding the moral perceptions.

12. εἶποντατε, “coming unexpectedly upon him.” See the note on 4, 1. This word must be referred, not to the suborners, &c., but to the λαὸς, the πρεσβυτέροι, and the γραμματεῖς. Καὶ is not unfrequently, in Scripture, used for a pronoun relative; and of this I have remarked examples in the purest canon of Attic style, Thucydides. On ἀρπάζειν see the note on Joh. 6, 15.

12—14. ἦγαγον εἰς τὸ συνέδριον. Ἀγεῖν is a term appropriate to those who are brought before judges, or led to prison or execution. (See Matt. 10, 18.)

18. ἐςτησάν τε μάχαρας ψευδέως, “set up false witnesses.” It has been much discussed in what sense these persons are said to be false witnesses. Many Commentators, as Grotius, Michaelis, and Rosenmuller, think that it was because they mingled false-
hood with truth, and wished it to be believed that what Stephen had said was spoken in abomination and contempt of the Temple and the Law. But the true reason for the appellation is that brought forward by Chrysostom and Æcumenius, and which occurred to Kuinoel; namely, that they had reported the words of Stephen, perverting them to a sense different from that intended by the speaker. "For (observes Kuinoel) Stephen had not said that Jesus the Messiah would destroy the Temple; since not even Jesus himself had ever spoken to that effect. See the note on Matt. 26, 61. and Matt. 24. Stephen had not said that Jesus would abrogate the rites prescribed by Moses (τὰ ἱερὰ). Jesus had, indeed, taught that the true worshippers of God would worship Him in spirit and in truth (Joh. 4, 23 & 24.); whence it might be easily inferred that the favour of God did not depend upon external rites; but that their observance was to be altogether neglected by Christ’s followers, and would cease, not even the Apostles themselves, at the time now in question, believed. See Acts 10, 14. seqq. 11, 2. seqq. 15, 20 & 21. The Jews, indeed, held the opinion that a Divine Legate, a Prophet, (and therefore the Messiah,) had power to promulgate laws respecting the external worship of God, to permit some, interdict or abrogate others (see the note on Matt. 21, 12. Joh. 1, 25. Deut. 18, 18.); but that the Messiah would abrogate all the rites of Moses they by no means believed. Now if we compare the words of Stephen, in 7, 48. seqq. & 51. seqq., with those of Jesus, in Joh. 4, 23. seqq. and Matt. 28, 35. seqq., it is manifest that Stephen, in his discourses with those Jews who in ver. 9. are professedly named, had brought forward some more enlightened notions on the worship of God, and had, among other admonitions, told them that God was to be worshipped rather with the heart, and by right actions, than by sacrifices and external rites, and that the ruin of their state, and the destruction of their boasted
Temple, impended over the Jews, unless they should repent and acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah. They, therefore, by perverting the words and meaning of Stephen, were false witnesses."

There is, however, no reason to suppose that Stephen distinctly understood the mystery of the abrogation of the Mosaic Law, which the Apostles do not seem immediately to have understood; and it is much less probable that he openly taught what Paul himself so many years after insinuated with so much caution. (Doddridge.)

13. ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος. An appellative of contempt; as in 21, 28. Luke 15, 30., and frequently elsewhere. Οὗ ταὐτῆς ῥ. β. λαλῶν. Λαλῶν is for λαλεῖν; since (as Valcknaer observes) all verbs by which any continuation, or the contrary, is signified, are by the Greeks thus joined to participles, and not Infinitives. See the examples adduced by Valcknaer and Wetstein. Chrysostom remarks on the exaggeration contained in this expression, which hinted that this was Stephen's continual employment.

By ἁγίον τόκον some Commentators understand the city. But assuredly it must mean the Temple; for Jerusalem is never called ἁγίος τόκος, but ἁγία παλαιστίς; whereas by the former the Temple is often designated; as in Acts 21, 28. 25, 8. So also Esdr. 9, 8. Ps. 24, 3. Is. 60, 13. Τούτου is spoken δεικτικῶς; for in the Temple were held the sittings of the Sanhedrin. See Wolf on Matt. 27, 3. By νόμος is meant the rites prescribed by the Mosaic Law. (Kuin.) Ἀλλάξει. If Stephen used the expression, it was by a sort of euphemism for abrogate; as in Heb. 1, 12. Chrysostom adds in his paraphrase καὶ ἀντεισόγει έτερα.

15. καὶ ἀνετίσαντες εἰς αὐτῶν. On the verb ἀνετίσατε see Luke 22, 56. Some few Commentators, as Heumann, Whitby, Benson, and Doddridge, are of opinion that Stephen's face was made to shine supernaturally by a visible glory, as did that of Moses. (Ex. 34, 29.) The greater number, however, as
Grotius, Brennus, L’Enfant, Pricæus, Erasmus, Michaelis, Rp. Pearce, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, interpret it as a proverbial expression, indicating august majesty and divine grace, such as might inspire reverence and awe; and they appeal to Esth. 5, 2. 2 Sam. 14, 17, 19, 27. Gen. 38, 10. I am inclined to prefer the latter interpretation, since there is nothing said by St. Luke to lead us to suppose that this was a supernatural glory like that of Moses; and, as to the passage of Exod. 34, 29., the air and manner of it differs materially from that of the present. At the same time, I admit that the august majesty and angelic innocence which shone forth in the countenance of this great protomartyr, can only be ascribed to the power of the Holy Spirit; and therefore the case of Moses may, not improperly, be compared with it. And this, indeed, is done by Chrysostom. Pricæus appositely cites Prudent. (speaking of Laurentius about to suffer martyrdom) Illis os decore splenduit, Fulgorque circumfusus est. And Wetstein has quoted several Rabbinical passages containing the same phrase; as also Schoettgen, who remarks: “Indigitatur autem summa πληροφορία, quæ Stephanus instructus coram judice apparuit.

CHAP. VII.

Now follows the apologetic oration of Stephen; on the plan and intent of which Commentators are by no means agreed; and, considering that the oration was abruptly broken off, it is no wonder that we should be left in the dark as to the mode in which the speaker would have worked up the conclusion; for that Stephen was proceeding to speak further, is plain from the circumstance that the multitude rushed upon him, stopping their ears. In detailing the sentiments of Theologians on the plan and nature of the discourse, I shall not notice the rash and ill-founded opinions of many critics, from Le
Clerc down to Heinrichs, who presume to censure it as little to the purpose, and containing some historical errors. The latter charge will be best refuted by considering the matter in detail, and of the former the reader will be best enabled to judge after examining the following body of interpretation which I have formed with the utmost care.

Grotius, Hammond, Rosenmuller, and others, think that since Stephen had been accused of two things, namely, of having predicted the destruction of the Jewish Temple and state, he here meant to show that there was nothing unjust in this; and that his purpose in reviewing all their ancient history up to his own times was, to hint that the favour of God was never confined to any one place, neither to the Tabernacle, nor to the Temple; and also, that the Jews, if they carefully weighed their own deeds and those of this nation, would see how little reason they had to claim preference before foreigners. Now such a defence would not advert to the points of crimination in question.

Into the speculations of Eckerman, Krause, and Heinrichs (which may be seen in Kuinoel), I shall forbear to enter, in order to be able to introduce the following very valuable illustrations, brought forward by Schoettgen, on the plan of this discourse.

"In order to the understanding of this discourse, its scope and purpose must first be rightly settled, lest, while we err in that, we increase the difficulty of comprehending the details. Stephen was accused before the Sanhedrim (and, as appears from 6, 13., calumniously) of uttering blasphemous speeches against God, the Temple, and the Mosaic Law, because he had said that all these were to be abrogated by Jesus of Nazareth; thereby intending (as was represented) to introduce a new religion, and change and annul that of their fathers. This crimination he means to refute, and show that he neither speaks nor teaches blasphemy, nor any thing that is at variance with true religion, but what is
most agreeable thereto; and that his expressions are not to be so construed as if he rejected all worship, it merely being their purpose to show that worship may be pleasing in the sight of God even without any visible Temple, or the external pomp of Levitical ceremonies, on whose will it depends whether He will ordain it to be celebrated in one or other of those modes. The major, therefore, of his adversaries is restricted; he shows that the proof is weak; and he would have satisfactorily evinced the minor to be false, had he not been prevented by the fury of the Jews.

The arguments which he employs to establish his opinion are deduced from authority, and from ancient history. He shows, by the examples of the Patriarchs, with whom God had been formerly conversant, that the Supreme Being was present with them, had imparted to them his blessings, and fulfilled his promises, before the Temple was erected; adducing the example of Abraham, from ver. 2. to 8., then introducing the Patriarch's posterity, 8—13., from whence to ver. 15., where he especially adverts to the migration into Egypt, ver. 14., and, at ver. 19., the departure from that country. Then, at ver. 20. seqq., he introduces Moses, the great Prophet, whose nativity, early fortunes, measures for the liberation of the Israelites, the liberation itself, and his prophecy of the Messiah, he details with so much the more minuteness, in order to pave the way for convicting them of ingratitude, which had already been evinced towards Moses (ver. 35 & 39.), and had been punished by God's instilling into them a perverse mind, prone to idolatry, some of whose species he now details. And thus he shews that God was, at length, induced to grant them an external place of worship, symbols, and rites, first in the tabernacle (ver. 44.), then in the Temple of Jerusalem. (ver. 46.) Nor does he omit the rest of the Prophets, who, he briefly tells them (with a remarkable πάθος of indignation and anger) were,
for their sound doctrines respecting the true worship of God, persecuted and even put to death. On some points of the biography of the life of each Stephen treats, in order to manifest his adherence to the antient faith, and show that he does not introduce any new dogmas through ignorance of sacred history, but that he rests on such a firm foundation as may serve to prove that he has sufficient cause for his profession of faith in Christ.

Here, however, he had scarcely begun to make the application, when his auditors διερρήσατο (ver. 54); and thus abruptly brought the discourse to a premature conclusion, which otherwise, (had it not been interrupted,) our zealous Christian confessor would doubtless have brought to a most convincing and energetic conclusion. Hence it is that the consummate prudence of the discourse is not sufficiently clear to the generality of readers; insomuch, that many have not hesitated to affirm that it is so utterly devoid of sense, that nothing certain as to its tendency or object can be collected. The course of the argumentation appears to be as follows.

He who at his first selecting the people of Israel testified that He could be worshipped without a Temple of Jerusalem and ritual ceremonies, did, even when the Temple and Tabernacle had been erected, still further testify his pleasure in internal worship, although this doctrine had been much objected to and contradicted. To say of Him, that He would, after the advent of the Messiah, do away those shadows and images of things introduced by himself is not blasphemous.

Now the former argument is true; and so is the latter, namely, “that I have not spoken any thing blasphemous; nay, rather to you belongs the crime so peculiar to you, from antient times, namely, that of stiff-necked obstinacy and perversity. This you ought to utterly forsake, rendering obedience to your Redeemer and Messiah, and in him alone seeking your salvation.” (Muller ap. Schoettg.)
The prefatory remarks of Kuinoel, though partly derived from the above illustrations, will be found deserving of attention, and I have therefore thought it my duty to lay them before my readers.

"They had accused Stephen of blasphemy, because he had said that Jesus would destroy the Temple and abolish the rites ordained by Moses. To these criminations Stephen so answers as to briefly review their sacred history, selecting and glancing at such points as might favour his cause. This method was adopted, to gratify the self-complacency of his auditors, engage their attention, and make a stronger impression on their minds. Hence he mingles some historical circumstances connected, though somewhat remotely, with the case in point. Stephen, however, did not mean (as Krauser, Nicolai, and Valthusen tell us,) to shew that the Mosaic law would be abrogated, and the Temple destroyed; nor did he expressly intend to teach that Jesus was to be regarded as the Messiah, and that he had himself, from reflection and deliberation, gone over to the Christian faith (for those were matters which had, properly speaking, no relation to the case in dispute): but he meant to demonstrate, that though the rites prescribed by Moses had God for their author, yet the Jews were not approved to God solely by ritual observances: that their Temple might be destroyed, and would be destroyed, (as it had before been), unless they should repent and reform. (See Jer. 7, 12 seqq.) He doubtless meant, wihal, to take occasion to shew that Jesus was to be regarded by the Sanhedrim as the Messiah, and that his doctrine was to be embraced; for, in mentioning Moses, he has brought forward that passage of Deut. 18, 15. which Peter also, in 8, 22., has explained of the Messiah. He was, however, prevented from bringing his discourse to a conclusion; for, just as he was upon the point of applying this narration of the fortunes of the Israelitish nation to his own case, he was suddenly dragged away to punishment. Though if he had been
permitted to complete the thread of his discourse, he would (I imagine), in the other part, have shewn how ill-founded was the confidence in which the Jews relied on circumcision, and the other ritual observances of Temple service; since, in the first place, Abraham, before he had been circumcised, was approved by God, and received evident tokens of the Divine favour; whereas many of the circumcised had not approved themselves in the sight of God: 2dly, since God had, long before the building of the Temple, conferred many and signal blessings on the Israelitish nation; nay, did not even permit David to build the Temple, nor, in any way, take measures for its erection; and the Temple of Solomon had been destroyed. Hence Stephen would have argued, that he had not spoken contumeliously of Moses and the Almighty, when he maintained that the Divine favour did not depend upon circumcision and the Temple worship; and that the Temple might be destroyed, nay, would be destroyed, as it had formerly been, for the wickedness and impiety of the people, unless they should repent, and not, after the evil example of their forefathers, who had rejected Moses, persist in rejecting Jesus the Messiah announced by Moses. (Kuin.)

As to the authenticity of the above discourse, it is not (as some conjecture) the mere invention of St. Luke (like the orations in many of the antient Greek and Latin historians).* It was probably formed from persons who took down the speech in writing, whether St. Luke himself, or others, including, perhaps, St. Paul; in which there is no doubt but that our author, as a careful investigator of truth (see his Gospel, 1, 1). Had it been his own, and formed with

* Here, however, I must except Thucydides, most of whose orations appear to have been carefully formed from documents which recorded, as nearly as possible, the actual words of the speaker, especially in the orations of Pericles. The same may be said of some found in Herodotus. The subject is highly interesting, and on it I shall treat at large on a more suitable occasion.
study and deliberation, it would doubtless have been more elaborate and eloquent. As it is, it carries on the very face of it every mark of genuineness. But proceed we to an examination of the matter itself, which will be found to justify all our allegations.

Verse 1. ei ἀρα ταῦτα οὕτως (sub. εαυτα), namely, as the witnesses have said? This seems to have been a formula, not only forensic, but popular. See the examples adduced by Wetstein. Markland objects to ei ἀρα ταῦτα οὕτως, and would read either ei ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει or ἀρα ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει. But there is no occasion for any change, since this is merely a mixture of the direct and indirect modes of address.

2. Ἀνδρεὶς ἀδελφοί. See the note on 1, 11. By these words Stephen addresses the bystanding people, just as by πατέρες the members of the Sanhedrin. Thus by Patres conscripti the Romans addressed the Senators. 'Ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης some interpret “splendore et majestate insignis.” I prefer “most worthy of glory and honour.” See Ps. 248, 29, 1. 96, 7 & 8. Ap. 4, 11. This, it must be observed, is meant to refute the crimination of blasphemy against God. On χαρᾶς see Cellarius and Schl. Lex. Ὀφθη, namely, at Ur of the Chaldeans. See Gen. 11, 31.*

* That this Ur was the country of Abraham is probable, since those going from the Ur of Ammian (which was between Nisibis and the Tigris) by the direct road to Palestine, had to pass Carch or Charran. Besides, Abraham and his followers were Nomades. Now, no country could be better adapted to the life of Nomades than were the solitudes of North Mesopotamia, in which was situated the Ur of Ammianus, whose soil is so dry and sterile that it does not admit of being ploughed, but is only fit for grazing. (See Rosenmüller on Gen.) (Kuín.) To remove the slight discrepancy which may seem to exist between this passage and those of Genesis, it has been decided by the most learned Commentators, including Kuinoel, that Stephen here follows the tradition of the Jews, that God appeared twice to Abraham: first, when living in Chaldee; secondly, when resident at Charran, and commanded him to leave his habitation. So Philo de Abraham, t. 2. p. 11. ed. Mang. ἀμα ἀμα κελευθήναι μετανιστάτω — το μὲν πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῆς Χαλδαίας γῆς εὐδαίμονος κυρία — εἰς τὴν Χαρραίαν γῆν οὐκιν οὐ μακρὰν ὄστερον, καὶ ἀπὸ ταῦτα οὐσία ετεραν τόπον. & p. 12, 3. ὅπως δ' ἔνω βεβαιῶσῃ τῆς φανείσαν δὴν ἐν διανοικα ταγιώτερον, φησίν αὐτῷ δ
Of this city mention is made by Ammianus, Marcell. 25, 8. Et via sex dierum emensa, cum ne gramina quidem invenirentur, solatia necessitatis extræmæ: dux Mesopotamiam Cassianus, et tribunus Mauricius pridem ad hoc missus.

3. ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς, &c. Nearly the same words occur in Gen. 12, 1. (Sept). Δεῦρο is a particle of exhortation, like ἀγέ. The complete formula δεῦρο ἐλθέ occurs in Aristoph. Thesm. 324. But ellipses in verbs of coming and going are frequent. Priscæus cites a similar passage from a fragment of Petronius: Linque tuas sedes, alienaque litora quære, O juvenis, major rerum tibi nascitur ordo.

4. Καὶ ἐκείνη, μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, “then, after the death of his father,” &c. But from Gen. 11, 26 & 32. 12, 4. it appears that Terah, Abraham’s father, lived sixty years after the latter migrated into the land of Canaan. For Abraham was born in the seventieth year of Terah’s age (see Gen. 11, 26); made the migration when seventy-five years old (see Gen. 12, 4), and, if we add to these seventy years, he migrated in the hundred and forty-fifth year of Terah’s age; and since Terah lived two hundred and five years (see Gen. 11, 32), there remain seventy, during which Terah lived after the departure of Abraham. To remove this difficulty, the Commentators have pursued various courses. Knatchbull, Capellus, and others, think that the Hebrew text of Gen. 11, 32. is to be emended from the Samaritan version; and thus the number ccv is to be changed into cxxv. But the number seems to have been altered in the Samaritan MS. in order to correspond with chronology; and that the Samaritans have, in other places, interpolated the text, has been ascertained. See the note on Joh. 4, 20. and Michaelis Comm. de Chronologiâ Mosis post Diluvium, inserted in the Comment. Gott. 1762—8. Some Commentators there are who regard it as a slip of the
memory. I shall omit other far-fetched and arbitrary explications (which may be seen in De Dieu, Wolf, and Heuman, on this passage), and now proceed to detail what I regard as the true solution of the difficulty; namely, that brought forward by Michaelis, Krauser, Morus, Rosenmuller, and others, who maintain that Stephen here also followed the tradition of the Jews, that Abraham, after the death (i.e. the moral and allegorical death) of his father, migrated into the land of Canaan. So Philo de Migr. Abrah. p. 463, 47. οὐδένα τοίνυν τῶν ἑντευχηκότων τοὺς φόμοις ἄγγελων εἴκος, ὅτι πρότερον μὲν ἐκ τῆς Χαλδαϊκῆς ἀναστάς γῆς Ἀβραὰμ ἀκησεν εἰς Χαράν τελευτάσας δὲ αὐτῷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκείθεν κακτικὴς μετανίσταται, οὐ δύον ἦν τῶν ἀπόλεσιν πετυμόσαι. For the Jews, in order to clear Abraham from the charge of neglecting his father in his old age, maintained that the death of Terah Moses has related by anticipation, because, from being a worshipper of God, he now became an idolater (see Josh. 24, 2. Judith 5, 6 & 7): and thus, since all sinners are, as the Apostle says, dead while they live, Terah might be accounted dead, on the migration of Abraham into Canaan. * (Kuin.) See some remarkable passages adduced from the Rabbinical writers by Lightfoot in his Hor. Heb., Wetstein, and Michaelis. Kuinoel also refers to Hieron. Opp. t. 4. p. 94. Μετοικΐζειν is rarely used in a transitive sense; as here, and infra, ver. 48.

- 5. καὶ οἷκ ἐδωκεν αὐτῶ. It has been rightly observed that ἐδωκεν is to be rendered dederat, and δω is put for ὑπα. (See the note on Joh. 7, 8.) The sense, then, of the passage may be thus expressed: "And had not yet given him any possession in this land, not a foot of it, and yet he promised the pos-

* Bp. Lloyd, however, in his Chronological Index to the Bible, is of opinion, that what is said of Gen. 11, 26, of Terah's being seventy years old, relates only to the birth of Haran; and that Terah was one hundred and thirty years old when he begat Abraham. If so, then Abraham was seventy-five years old, and Terah (who died at two hundred and five) might have been dead when Abraham left Charran. (Bp. Pearce.)
session of it to him, namely to his posterity, although he had as yet no offspring." Now Abraham is commended because he had faith in the Divine promise, that his posterity should occupy Palestine, &c. Κηρονομία, like the Hebr. יָרָה, properly denotes the thing heired, or acquired by heirship. (See Matt. 21, 38. and Mark 12, 7.) But it is also used of any possession, especially that of Canaan, granted by God to the Israelites. Here it signifies possession, landed property; as in Josh. 13, 23 & 28. (Kuin.)

5. Οὐδὲ βῆμα τοῦδ', "not even a foot of land." A proverbial expression, by which is signified none at all; as in Deut. 2, 5. Gen. 8, 1. examples of which are adduced by Wetstein from Liban. Or. 312 π. μνηστὶ κατελεχυσθος αὐτῷ, μηδ' ὅσον δοῦναι χάραν πολ'. Cic. ad Attic. 18, 2. Quomodo nunc est, pe, dem ubi ponat in suo, non habet. So Agapet. C. 16. (cited by Priscus): καὶ οἱ μὲν (πλούσιοι) κατέχουσι τοῦ κόσμου τὰ πέρατα, οἱ δὲ (πενητες) οὐκ ἔχουσι τοῦ στήσαι τὰ πέλματα.

5. Εἰς κατάσχεσιν, subaud autēs, for ὅστε κατέχεσιν αὐτήν. Nor is this a Hellenistical use. I remember to have met with the same idiom in Thucydides. Κατάσχεσις, which, in the Sept. answers to the Heb. יָרָה and יָרְן, indicates "occupancy, possession." So Joseph. Ant. 9, 1, 2. οἱ τὴν ὅπερ αὐτῶν δοθείσαν γῆν ἐς κατάσχεσιν ἀφέλεσθαι πάρεισιν αὑτῶς. And κατέχειν, in the sense of inhabit, occurs in Joseph. Ant. 1, 11, 4. 2, 7, 2. Philo, 1014 c. Καὶ here means nempē, scilicet.

6. ἔσται τὸ στέρμα. The passage is quoted from the Sept. version of Gen. 15, 13; but from memory. Compare the Hebrew and Greek. By πάρωκος the Alexandrian Jews expressed the Hebrew יָרָה, a stranger; and παρωκέω occurs in Isocr. Paneg. C. 43. Κακώσω, ill-treat, afflict. The verb is used in this sense by the best Greek writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wetstein. I add Ἀeschyl., P. V. 1012. It very frequently occurs in Thucydides.
6. τετρακισία, four hundred. Or rather (as it seems from Joseph. 2, 15, 2.) four hundred and thirty. But Stephen uses a round number; which is often found in historians, and is still more admissible in an oration like this. Thus Josephus himself, Ant. 9, 1. and Bell. 5, 9, 4. limits it to four hundred. (See Krebs on this passage.) Many Commentators, however, as Hammond, De Dieu, and Wolf, maintain that the Israelites only abode in Egypt two hundred and fifteen years; and thus the space of four hundred, or four hundred and thirty years, must be reckoned not only up to the end of the Egyptian bondage, but also to the peregrination of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in Egypt. This opinion rests chiefly on a passage of Gal. 3, 17. where mention is made of the promise given to Abraham, and where the Law is said to have been promulgated four hundred and thirty years after. An appeal is also made to the Samaritan text of Ex. 12, 40. and the Sept. Version. In the former we have:

In the latter: ή δὲ καταίκησις τῶν ὦν Ἰσραήλ ἦν καταίκησις ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐν τῷ Χαναὰν (in the Alexandrine MSS. there is added, αὐτῶ οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν) ἐτῆς τετρακισίας τριάκοντα. [Hence there have been those who propose to alter the Hebrew text after the Samaritan or Septuagint. But, as Deyling observes, this would be cutting, not untying, the knot. Edit.] Finally, they quote Joseph. Ant. 2, 15, 2. where he mentions two hundred and fifteen years as the space of time during which the Israelites continued in Egypt. But to these arguments it has been opposed, 1st, that as to the passage of Galatians, since no fuller computation of the years before Jacob’s departure into Egypt existed in the Old Testament, and it was not St. Paul’s intention to adjust this chronological difficulty; he therefore used the common and generally received period
of time between Abraham and Moses, little solicitous whether it might be more agreeable to chronological computations to refer the beginnings of those years to the times of Abraham or to those of Jacob. (See Kopke supra.) 2dly, that the argument drawn from the consent of the Samaritan text with the Sept. is not of much weight; since either the Sept. acted the part of paraphrasts, and inserted a gloss into their text, which came from thence into our Samaritan MSS., or the Sept. translated from a Samaritan MS. (as Hassenkamp has endeavoured to prove in an express Dissertation): and moreover, in matters of chronology, the Samaritan text and the Sept. are not to be much relied on, since (as Michaelis observes) the more recent scribes used to alter the text according to a particular system. 3dly, that if the four hundred be referred also to the peregrination of the Patriarchs, the word καὶ διέλευσον αὐτοῖς καὶ κακώσοντιν will not be apposite. 4thly, that if the abode of the Israelites in Egypt be maintained to have comprehended only two hundred and fifteen years, one does not easily see how, in so short a time, they could have increased to so considerable a number.* 5thly, that the passage of Joseph. Ant. 2, 15, 2. was corrupted by the scribes, who had been accustomed to the Greek Bible, and was emended according to the chronology of the Sept.; which has been done in other places, as we learn from Ernesti, in his Exerc. Flav. 1.

Hence, to any unprejudiced person, it will easily appear that the opinion of those Commentators is to be preferred who think that the Israelites abode in Egypt two hundred and forty-three years; in proof of which see Koppe's Dissert. published in 1777. (Kuin.)

7. καὶ ἐγὼ, I will punish: a sense frequent in the

* And yet the rate of increase in population ascertained to have taken place in some parts of North America would seem to fully justify it.
Old and New Testament. Διαβήκησεν, μου εν τούτῳ τούτω, i. e. in Palestine, where Abraham then was. Tότε, it must be observed, is often used of countries. (See the note on Joh. 14, 2.) So Xen. An. 4, 4, 2. ο τότος οὗτος Ἀρμενία ἐκαλεῖτο ἡ πρὸς ἐσπέραν. To which we may add Herodot. 3, 14, 2, and Isocr. Evag. 9, 12. These words, however, are not found in Gen. 15, 13 seqq. Krebs and others observe that we have them in substance in Gen. 15, 18. But some Commentators, more justly, suppose them to be taken from Exod. 3, 12. For it was a custom with the Jewish Doctors, (followed also by the writers of the New Testament,) when they cited any oracle of the Old Testament, to add some words elsewhere employed on the same subject, and those sometimes a little changed, and this in order to amplify the thing. (See Surenhus. on the quotations.) Now this Stephen has here done. Besides, he does not say that the words were spoken to Abraham, but simply εξάλησεν δὲ οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς. (Kuin.)

8. ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαβήκην περιτομῆς. Διαβήκη is used generally of any constitution or "disposition;" and hence of a covenant or compact, which is founded on promises and conditions. Thus it may, like the Hebr. יִבְרָע, denote promises (see the note on Acts 3, 25.) and laws, or precepts. (See Ex. 19, 5. Hos. 6, 8.) Now the sense covenant is utterly unsuitable to the passage, since circumcision cannot be called a covenant, but circumcision might be said to be a sign of a covenant, i. e. something which attests it, and by which it may be known that we have a covenant with any one. Thus circumcision is, in Gen. 17, 11. said to be a sign of a covenant, and, in 18., simply a covenant, i. e. a sign of the covenant by which Abraham and his posterity were bound to the worship of the true God, or by which it was known that God had given promises which he would keep and observe. This signification, however, of διαβήκη is rather uncommon, and it seems better to give it here the sense of mandate, law, &c.; and thus the
words may simply be rendered: "He gave to him a precept of circumcision," or "he prescribed to him the rite of circumcision." (Kuin.) Grotius renders the καὶ thus: "Post eximia promissa." But, in truth, καὶ may mean and (then). Ouvos Kuinoel considers as pleonastic, and only noting consequence. It rather signifies and so; as often both in the Classical writers and the Scriptures. Πατριαρχαὶ, patriarchs; so called as being heads of pateral, or tribes. Thus Hesychius explains πατρία by φυλῆ.

9. ἕξιλασαντες Ἰωσήφ, envying. So 17, 15. 1 Cor. 13, 4. η ἀγάπη οὐ ζηλω. Sir. 9, 11. μὴ ζηλωσής δόξαν ἀμαρτωλοῦ. The word answers to the Hebr. נִק in Gen. 30, 1, 27, 10. Sir. 9, 11. Here we may observe that the ratio metaphora is the same in the Hebr. נִק (from whence κνῶ, to gnaw) and the Greek φθονέω, i.e. to pine away; which is applicable to all the more ardent affections, especially envy and jealousy. Markland points the passage thus: ἕξιλασαντες τὸν Ἰωσήφ, ἀπέδοντο [αὐτὸν] εἰς Ἀλγυπτον, and observes that here there is an ellipsis of the participle κοιμαθησόμενον, or ἀκομαθησόμενον sold Joseph to be carried into Egypt, which is frequently to be met with in the best Greek writers, as Herodotus, Aristophanes, Euripides, &c. Kuinoel refers to Glass, Phil. S. 185. and adduces from Valcknaer and Elsner the following examples. Hom. Od. 15, 386. ηδ᾽ εἴρησαν μοι θεὰς ἀνδρὸς πρὸς δαίμονα. And 442. αὐτὸν ἐπ᾽ εἰς Κύπρον ἤθειν δόσαν ἀντίλατι. Herod. 2, 56. 2 Macc. 4, 32. χρυσάματα τιμαὶ—πεπρακόω εἰς τὸ Ῥώμην καὶ τὰς κόκλας πόλεις. So also Xén. Ephes. 5. ἀποδίδοσθαι εἰς Ἰταλίαν. On which see Hemst. Misc. Obs. 6, 343. Herodot. 2, 56, 10. Αἰβυθη πεπρακόω: where Valcknaer would read εἰς Διβυθη, and observes that the phrase is frequent in that historian. He also cites Herodot. 8, 105. παῖδας ἐπαίλεις εἰς Σάρδις τε καὶ Ἑφεσον. Demosth. p. 708, 23. πρωδεὶς εἰς Δεικλά. Other examples are adduced by Elsner from Lysias and Demosthenes, in all which the verb is what the grammarians call a vox prægnans.
9. καὶ ἂν Θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶ. Here καὶ, like the Hebr. כ, signifies but, or yet. The formula μετ’ αὐτῶ is frequently used of help, deliverance, &c. See Krebs and Loesner in loc. ἐξείλετο, delivered out of: a signification frequent in the Sept., and which sometimes is found in the Classical writers. So Demosth. 256. 2. ἐξείλετο ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων κυνῶν.

10. καὶ ἔδακεν αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ σοφίαν. The most learned Commentators, as Camerarius, Grotius, Loesner, Valcknaer, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, are agreed that here we have the figure hendiadis, by which χάριν καὶ σοφίαν is for χάριν σοφίας, “gave him favour in the sight of Pharaoh by his wisdom.” Now this σοφία (wisdom) not only respects his interpretation of the dreams, but his subsequent prudent advice to the king. See Gen. 41, 32 seqq.*

10. καὶ κατέστησεν. Here καὶ is for the relative who. A frequent Hebraism, or rather a relick of the simple phraseology of antient times. Οἶκος, as used of a king’s house, signifies aula, palace.

11—13. χορτάσματα is properly applied to provender or food for cattle; but here it is used of food for man; as is χορτάζω frequently in the New Testament, and sometimes in the Greek writers, especially the later ones. Of χορτασμός in this sense an example is produced from Anaxandrides ap. Pollix by Valcknaer.

12. σίτα, corn. The student will observe this use of the plural for the singular, and of the neuter for the masculine termination. Eustathius (cited by Wets.) observes that the neuter form denotes loaves, bread. Πρώτον is for πρῶτερον. Ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ, subaud χρόνῳ. By this is not meant (as Kuinoel explains), “on the famine appearing a second time,” but “at the second time of their going.”

13. ἀνεγνωρίσθη Ιωσὴφ τ. ἀ. By this word the Sept. render the Heb. יָדָעָה. The Vulg. Erasmus, Beza, and others, assign to ἀνεχ. the sense recognised.

* It is truly observed by Philo, that in him ἔξελαμψε καλογαθίας ἐμπόρευμα.
But as Joseph recognised and made *himself* known to his brethren, *not they to him*, I agree with De Dieu and Kuinoel, that the sense of the Heb. is better rendered by the Syriac and Arabic "Joseph made himself known to his brethren." The conjugation Hithpael answers to the reflected verbs of our modern languages.

14. ἀποστέλλας δὲ Ἰωσήφ μετεκαλέσατο. Ἀποστέλλω, like the Latin mitto, often, as here, signifies to send messengers, or letters, &c. Ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐβδομηκονταπέντε, subaud συνανταμένην, consisting of seventy-five. So Deut. 10, 22. ἐν ἐβδομήκοντα ψυχαῖς κατέβησαν οἱ πατέρες σου εἰς Α. In reconciling this passage with the parallel one of Gen. 46, 27. the Commentators are put to great streights, and devise various methods of removing the difficulty. As to the conjectures hazarded, they merit little attention, since they are supported by no authority, and violate propriety of language. For (as says Markland) in the conjecture ἐβδομηκοντα πάντες for πέντε, the language requires τοὺς πάντας, not πάντες; nor is πάντας any better, which never signifies in all, when speaking of number. See also Krebs. Most Commentators are of opinion that Stephen (an Hellenist accustomed to the Sept. Version) followed different modes of computation to those pursued by Moses. Those interpreters, however, differ among themselves as to the persons who made up that number. (See Wolf and Bowyer.) Colvius, Buddeus, Krebs, Loesner, Rosenmuller, and others, are of opinion that Moses, who has only made mention of seventy, means those who went into Egypt with Jacob: whereas, Stephen and the Sept. interpreters, who have named seventy-five persons, have spoken of those who were invited into Egypt by Joseph, and that those amounted to seventy-five, reckoning the wives of Jacob (namely, Rachel, Bilhah, and Zilpah), and the sons of Judah (Ger and Onan): that those sons, indeed, if Judah died before the departure into Egypt, as did Rachel (see Gen. 35, 19.); though of that Joseph was igno-
rant. But (as Kuinoel observes) besides Rachel, the rest of the wives of Jacob, namely, Leah (which one those interpreters do not reckon in the number of those invited by Joseph), Bilhah, and Zilpah were dead (see Gen. 49, 81. 48, 7. 44, 19. 46, 5.); and of that, undoubtedly, Joseph was not ignorant. See Gen. 48, 7. 44, 19. “Besides (continues Kuinoel) in Gen. 46, 26. all the persons named are said to have come out of the loins of Jacob; which cannot apply to his wives; and, moreover, it is there expressly said, that the wives of Jacob were not to be included in the number.” Kuinoel then proceeds to observe that the most probable solution is that adopted by Hammond, Capellus, Wetstein, Michaelis, Kreuse, Rosenmuller, and others, who remark that the Sept. (whom Stephen followed) numbered amongst the posterity of Jacob the five sons of Manassah and Ephraim, born in Egypt; and that these were omitted by Moses because they were born after Jacob’s departure, but by the 70 at Gen. 46, 20., are expressly added from Paral. 7, 14. Nor need it be objected to this mode of removing the difficulty, that those five grandsons of Jacob did not go down with their father into Egypt; for if that objection were of any weight, neither would the total of the Hebrew reckoning amount to seventy; since in the catalogue there are numbered also Joseph, Manassah, and Ephraim, of whom the first did not depart with Jacob into Egypt, and the two others were born there. Therefore, to use the words of Hammond, “the number, whether seventy or seventy-five, belongs not precisely to those that came into Egypt, but to the progeny of Jacob there, of which because a greater part came down with him thither, therefore the greater part giving the denomination to the whole, it is said that so many went down with him, though some of that number were born there, who consequently were then in the loins of their parents (according to the sacred style, and by a figure frequent there) as Levi is said, by the
author to the Hebrews, to have paid tythes to Melchisedech, though he were not born till many years after that Abraham did so; or as in the enumeration of Leah's progeny in this very chapter of Gen. 5, 15, where having reckoned both her children and children's children to three generations, of which only six sons and a daughter were born in Padan-Aram, or Mesopotamia, and all the rest in Canaan, he yet adds, "These be the sons of Leah which she bare unto Jacob in Padan-Aram, with his daughter Dinah; all the souls of his sons and his daughters were thirty and three."

"That there were (observes Kuinoel) in the age of Stephen various calculations of the number of those who went with Jacob into Egypt (and consequently that we are not to suppose any inaccuracy with regard to this in Scripture), is moreover evident from a passage in Philo de migr. Abrah. p. 419 B. where he touches on this matter in the course of an allegory, and mentions both numbers."

Dr. Whitby says, he sees no reason why the Hebrew, the Sept., and St. Stephen may not all be right. But though he details this latter mode of solution, yet he evidently inclines to the former. Markland observes, that there are so many things in Scripture related with different circumstances, that he sees no reason why Moses's seventy and Stephen's seventy-five, may not both be true. "If, indeed, (continues he,) Moses had said, 'But there never were more of Jacob's family in Egypt than seventy,' there must have been a mistake somewhere or other. The Septuagint (or whoever first made the alteration) were to blame if they put down seventy-five instead of what they found in Moses's seventy; because though the thing were never so true and certain, yet they ought not to have acted the part of Historians, but of Interpreters."

The question is, indeed, a very perplexed and dubious one; though, like most such, it is of little
importance. I am inclined to adopt the solution of Hammond and others.

16. μετέθησαν — Ἀβραὰμ, &c. Here again we encounter what appears to be a contradiction. For, in the first place, Jacob and the twelve Patriarchs are said to have been buried at Sichem. But Jacob (as we learn from Gen. 49, 30. and Joseph. Ant. 2, 8, 7.) was buried in the cave of Machpelah, near Hebron. His bones, indeed, the Israelites are said to have brought with them out of Egypt, and buried at Sicham (see Gen. 50, 25. Josh. 24, 32.) but of the place where the rest of the Patriarchs were buried nothing is said in Scripture. 2. Abraham is here said to have bought the sepulchre with a sum of money from the sons of Emmon, father of Sicham. Yet it was not Abraham but Jacob that bought of the sons of Emmon a field at Sichem for cultivation, at the price of an hundred kēsits, i. e. (on the authority of the Greek and other ancient interpreters) an hundred lambs. (See Gen. 33, 19.) Abraham had, indeed, bought of Ephron a field and cave (for the purpose of burial) near Hebron, for four hundred shekels. These difficulties may, however, be satisfactorily solved, if μετέθησαν and ἐτέθησαν be referred only to the words οἱ πατέρες Ἰμαὼν, and Ἀβραὰμ be cancelled as spurious. The passage may then be thus rendered: “they were removed to Sichem, and were buried in a sepulchre which had been bought for a sum of money from the sons of Emmor, father of Sichem.” Now it was a common tradition of the Jews, not only that the bones of Joseph, but also of his eleven brethren, were buried at Sichem; as appears from the Rabbinical passages cited by Lightfoot and Wetstein. And so Jerome, in his Ep. 86. But Josephus, Ant. 2, 8, 2. says that the Patriarchs were buried at Hebron. The tradition, therefore, was twofold, and different. And since we learn from Scripture that at Hebron were buried Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Jacob, and (accord-
ing to report Adam and Eve, especially, too, as nothing is said in Scripture of the burial-place of the brethren, so arose the tradition that the brethren also of Joseph were also buried there.

At αἰνιγματο Beza, Bochart, and Pierce subaud 'Iακώβ, from the context (compare ver. 15); and they think that 'Αβέαδου was foisted in. So also Bover, Wassenburg, Valcknaer, and Tittman, who refer the word, (with great probability,) to the glosses. It is unquestionable, that sometimes all the MSS. unite in a false reading (see the note on Mark 15, 25); and the introduction of the present one may easily be accounted for.

16. αἰνιγματο is to be taken impersonally [by a subaudition of τις. Edit.], and rendered, “which was bought.” At τιμής ἀργυρίου subaud ἄντι; as in Matt. 10, 29. As to ἀργυρίου, (the Hebrew for which is ג考慮, ) its signification is uncertain. Rosenmuller and Michaelis think we cannot well understand it of coined money, since its antiquity reaches not so far back. Michaelis is of opinion that it was an antient silver weight unknown to us. The Sept. render it ἐκάτων ἄμβων, which Bochart, Hammond, and others, understand of a coin stamped with the image of a lamb. (Kuin.)

But if the antiquity of coining be really not so antient (though here I desiderate authorities in proof), this conjecture (which seems to have been suggested by the etymology of the Latin pecunia) must be abandoned. I am, however, inclined to think that for ἄμβων the true reading is μνάω. The ὅ seems to have originated from the ὅ; such as has happened in a thousand other cases. To this conjecture, however, (in which, I find, I have been anticipated), see what is objected by Schleusner, in his Lex. Vet. Test. in v. ἀμβός, who adopts the conjecture of Hammond.

17, 18. καθὼς δὲ ἡγγισεν ὁ χρόνος τ. ἐ. Καθὼς here signifies after that, when; as in 1 Cor. 5, 7, 2 Macc. 1, 31. καθὼς δὲ ἀνηλική τὰ τῆς θυσίας, &c. Χρόνος vol. iv.
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τὸς ἐπαγγελμας, by a sort of popular ellipsis, signifies the time for the fulfilment of the prediction (ὁς being put for ἤν) which had promised to Abraham a very numerous offspring, a deliverance of them from their oppressors, and the possession of the land of Canaan; all which is here alluded to.

18. ἀνεστη, was created. For ἀναστηναι, like the Hebr. יָשָׁר, is used of advancement to any dignity, especially royal. So Exod. 1, 8. 2 Kings 23, 25. By ἄτρος βασιλεὺς is meant not only another king, but of another family, or dynasty; as we find from Joseph. Ant. 2, 9, 1.

18. οὐκ ἤδει τὸν Ἰωσὴφ. Many Commentators render, knew not. But that the new king should not know Joseph and his actions is very improbable, in a country where historical events were carefully recorded by the priests; nay the very appearance of the Israelites would effectually perpetuate the memory of Joseph. Kuinoel explains the words thus: "Cared not for, had no regard to Joseph or his merits (and indeed we have a similar idiom in our own language, namely, neither know nor care); for examples of which signification he refers to 1 Thess. 4, 4, 5, 12. and to Abresch. on Ἀeschylus. I prefer, however, with others, to render ἤδει "was ill-disposed towards:" a sense found in Matt. 25, 13. and many places of the New Testament. He was (in fact) ill disposed towards the Israelites, whose rapid increase of population made them appear formidable to the King; and hence he could not be otherwise disposed towards Joseph, who had been the means of introducing them into Egypt.

19. οὕτος, κατασοφισάμενος—πατέρας ἡμῶν. Κατα-

κασφίσας, which in the Sept. at Ex. 1, 10. Eccl. 7, 17, Ps. 105, 29. answers to the Hebr. קָנָה, denotes properly to subdue by artifice, circumvent, deceive. So Joseph. Ant. 6, 11, 4. (speaking of Michael deceiving Saul, and by stratagem delivering David from his snares), says: μεμφομένου τού πατρὸς αὐτῆς δὲ σώσει μὲν τὸν ἔχθρον αὐτοῦ, κατασοφίσατο δὲ
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autōn. Judith, 5, 11. καὶ ἐπανέστη αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς
Αγώντος, καὶ κατεσφόσαντο αὐτοῖς ἐν πόλει καὶ ἐν πλαί-
σοι, καὶ ἐπατείνωσαν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοῖς εἰς δούλους.
& 10, 21. Other examples may be seen in Kypke, Krebs, Wetstein, Munthe, and Loesner. But the true force of the word is best expressed by Pricæus, in the following paraphrase: "By oblique arts and crafty counsel he plotted our destruction, by imposing upon us φοβεία δυσβάστακτα, heavier burdens than we were able to bear, that we might, without open force, be reduced to extinction." So Ezechiel the Tragedian, cited by Clem. Alex. ἄλοιν καθ' ἡμῶν πολὺν ἐμπυκοεστα ὁ βασιλεὺς Φαραώ* and Philo, on this very subject: τὴν ἴσχυν αὐτῶν ἀφαιρεῖν ἑπινοεῖς ἀνοσί-
ωροὺς ἑρημώντα, and not only by imposing severe labours, that they should be thereby deterred from matrimony, or abandon their children,* and be themselves worn out by excessive fatigues.

19. τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκδεσα τὰ βρέφη αὐτῶν, subaud ἔνεκα. Ποιεῖν ἔκδεσα is for ἐκτίθεναι, which is a word appro-
priated to the exposure and abandonment of infants. So Eurip. Ion. 18. ἐπήρεγκε βρέφος Εἰς τ' αὐτῶν ἀντρον
—κατείπηγαν αἰς διονύμενον. Philo. 604 b. (cited by Loesner): δεδακρυμένοι τὸν παιὰν ἐκτίθεασι περὶ τὰς ἔχον
tὸν ποταμό. Thus these words are to be re-
ferred to the Israelites exposing their own infants, not (as some explain) to the Egyptians ordering such exposure.

19. Εἰς τὸ μὴ ᾠῳονεῖσθαι (scil. τὰ βρέφη), that they
might not be preserved alive, to experience the miserable fate of their parents. The word ᾠῳονεῖ-

20. ἐν οἷς καὶ ἔγενεν Ἡσαῦ, καὶ ἦν ἄστειος τῷ
Θεῷ. 'Αστεῖος, from the dative ἄστει of ἄστυ, signi-

* Thus, as we learn from travellers, the female North American Indians, on the same principle, often deliberately destroy or abandon their female infants, in order to save them from the miserable fate which attends the weaker sex among those and all other barbarous tribes.
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...; like the Latin urbanus, city-like, elegant, polite, as opposed to ἀγέμοιος. See Etym. Mag. Now, since the inhabitants of towns are supposed to excel those of the country, not only in politeness and wit, but in grace and personal beauty, so the word came to mean handsome,* as here, and in Judith 11, 29. καὶ γνῖν ἄστεια εἰς ὑμῖν τῷ εἰδεί σου. See Suidas and Hesychius, as also Fisch. Prol. de Vet. Lex. 228. Thus Philo 604 λ. speaking of Moses, says: γένηθεις οὐν ὁ παῖς εὐθὺς ὡς εὐφημίην ἄστειοτέραν ἴνα ἴδιοιτην. In the parallel passage of Exod. Symmachus has, in the place of ἄστειος, καλὸς. This report of Moses’s beauty had even reached the heathens; as appears from Justin. I. 36, 2. (cited by Wets.): Filius ejus Moses fuit, quem præter paternæ scientiae haereditatem formæ etiam pulchritudo commendabat.

20. Τῷ Θεῷ. This is ill rendered gratus Deo by the Vulgate and some other Interpreters, who have not perceived the force of the Hellenistic idiom, which was first distinctly pointed out by Glass, Valcknaer, and other Philologists, whose matter has been thus condensed by Kuinoel:

"The Hebrews, inasmuch as the excellence of the God of nature and of all virtue is considered as supreme, used, in order to express the magnitude or pre-eminence of any thing, to adjoin to the positive, names of God, and even of the angels, which thus had the force of adjectives. So Ps. 36, 7. Mountains of the Lord. Ps. 80, 4. Cedars of the Lord. Cant. Sal. 8, 6, 7. flame of God, i. e. vehement and ardent. Αποκ. 21, 11. δεξα Θεῶ, the highest splendour. Sap. 16, 20. τραφή ἀγγέλλων, "angelic, excellent food." (See Glass Phil. S. 44. and Nold's Concord. 810.)

* It should seem, however, that the earlier Greek term ἀσέτειος did not entirely answer to our handsome, beautiful; but rather to the Latin bellus, pretty (which may be paralleled by the word smart); since Aristot. Nicom. I. 47. (cited by Wets.) observes: τὸ κάλλος ἐν μεγάλῳ σμαρίῃ οἱ μικροί δὲ ἄστειοι καὶ σμιμμετροὶ καλοὶ δ᾽ ὑμῖν. With this passage Wetstein appositely compares Marzial 1, 9. Bellus homo et magnus vis idem Cotta videri; sed qui bellus homo est, Cotta, pusillus homo est.
In the Greek writers we have not the name of God, but the adjectives θεῖος, δαμαίνος, αἰθών, sometimes serving a similar purpose, and denoting personal beauty, as θεοίτης and θεοεικης. (See Elsner and Abresch on this passage). The Hebrews, too, are accustomed to indicate the excellence or complete perfection of any thing, by prefixing to the name of God the particle ἵνα (to), so that מִלָּה or וּבָה may be equivalent to מֵלֶל or בָּה, before God, in the sight of God, i.e. judice Deo. Thus in Jonas 3, 11. Ninevah is called וּבָה, a city great before God; judice Deo, in the opinion of God. [and therefore really and emphatically so. Edit.] Thus, too, in Gen. 10, 9. Nimrod is called a hunter great in the sight of God. (See the note on Luke 1, 6.) And Josephus, Ant. 2, 9, 7. calls Moses παιδα μορφή Θείων, (Kuin.) which may, in English, be rendered divinely beautiful.

21. εἰκεῖντα δὲ αὐτῶν κ. τ. λ. As αὐτῶν occurs twice, εἰκεῖντα αὐτῶν may be regarded as accusatives absolute, or rather depending on some preposition as κατὰ, quod attinet ad. Such repetitions are, however, characteristic of the simple and popular style in all languages. 'Ἀναρεθῶµεν properly means “to take up from the ground,” and is used of raising or drawing sailors from the sea, or taking up corpses for burial; but sometimes, as here, of taking up exposed children. In all these uses there is an adjunct notion of taking under one’s care, by the force, it should seem, of the middle voice: examples of which are given by Wetstein. The following one, adduced by Luesner, may suffice. Aristoph. Nub. v. 531. καίγω — ἐξεθηκα, παῖς δ’ ἐνέρα τις λαβοῦν αὐτελειο.  

22. εἰκεῖνθη Μωσῆς πᾶση σοφίᾳ Αἴγυπτιοι. Similar examples are adduced by Wetstein of παιδευθασ with the dative (an ἐν being understood); as Xen. Pæd. 1. τοῖς τινι παιδεία παιδευθεῖσ. Ισοκράτες Paneg. καὶ τοῖς νεωτέροις τοιούτοις ἥθεσι παιδεύοντες. Plut. Apophtheg. Lacon. p. 216 d. καὶ τοῖς ταύτης
nýmos, ἐτὶ δὲ δικαιουσών καὶ καλλακαγαθία ἔπαιδεσματε. 
Priceus compares a similar passage of Lucian Philopseud. Θεωρήσιος τὴν σοφίαν, καὶ τὴν ταῦταν πάσαν τῶν Ἀιγυπτίων εἰδῶς, which is possibly imitated from the present passage. In what this wisdom consisted we may partly conceive from what Philo (cited by Priceus) says of Moses, in his Life: 'Ἀριθμοὺς καὶ 
Γεωμετρίαν, τὴν τε ῥυθμίκην, καὶ ἀρμονίκην, καὶ μετρικὴν 
θεωρίαν, καὶ Μουσικῆν τὴν σύμπασαν, διὰ τὴν 
χρήσεως ὀργάνων, καὶ λόγων τῶν ἐν τοῖς τέχναις καὶ 
διεξόδοις τοπικατέργας Αἰγυπτίωι οἱ λόγοι παρέδοσαν, καὶ 
πρὸς ἐτὶ καὶ διὰ τῶν συμβέλων ψιλοσοφίαν, ἐν τοῖς 
λεγομένοις γράμμασιν ἐπιδείκνυτο, &c. And again, the same 
writer bears testimony that he was not only learned 
in these sciences, but in those of other nations. This 
knowledge, therefore, consisted of astrology, (in-
cluding astronomy,) the interpretation of dreams, 
physic, magic (as it was called *), medicine, mathe-
matics, &c. This wisdom was almost wholly in the 
hands of the Priests, who, as we learn from Diodor. 
Sic. 46 d. (cited by Munthe) were, in a manner, 
rulers of the King and royal family: περὶ τῶν μεγίσ-
των οὗτοι προβουλεύουσιν συνδιατριβούσι τῷ βασιλεῖ, 
τῶν μὲν εὐνεργοῖ, τῶν δὲ εἰσηγηταὶ καὶ διδάσκαλοι γινό-
μενοι. See Herodot. 7, 164. and the other passages 
cited by Munthe. Kuinoel refers to Meiners on the 
causes of the Castes among the ancient Egyptians 
and Walch’s Obsb. N. T. p. 65. seqq. Wolf refers to 
Adami Exerc. Exeg. 1, 95. Compare also Vitringa 
on Is. 19, p. 566. What a high rank the Egyptians 
then held for learning and science is moreover ap-
parent from 1 Kings 4, 30. where the wisdom of 
Solomon, consummate as it was, is only compared to 
that of the Egyptians.† 

* Namely, that part of the magical art which might innocently 
be practised, which is all that we are warranted in ascribing to so 
faithful a servant of Jehovah.

† On this subject, namely, the wisdom of the Egyptians, Wetstein 
has brought together an immense number of citations, of which the
In thus describing the learned education of Moses, Stephen is supposed to have followed *tradition*: at least nothing to this purpose is said in Scripture. Doddridge justly observes, that all these extraordinary circumstances relating to the birth, preservation, education, genius, and character of Moses, serve to aggravate the crime of Israel in rejecting him when he offered himself to them as a deliverer under so many advantages, and when Providence had so wonderfully interested itself in his favour. “It must have been (continues he) a self-denial which none but a lover of learning, and one who has made some progress in it, can understand, for a person of such a genius and education, in the prime of life, to leave the polite court of Egypt, and live as a retired shepherd in the Arabian desert.”

22. ήν δὲ δύνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἐν ἔργοις. The former of these qualifications seems inconsistent with what is said of Moses in the Old Testament, namely, that he had an impediment in his speech. See Exod. 4, 10. 6, 12. And so Philo 615 b. who represents God as thus addressing Moses after he has refused the office laid upon him: μηδὲν δὲίσης ἐμῷ γὰρ ἐπισκεύαστος ἀνθρωπόστει πάντα καὶ μεταβεβλήθη πρὸς τὸ βεσίον, αἰτὶ μηδὲν ἐτί ἔμποδον ἐμὸν εὐρύον καὶ λείαν ἀκὸ καθαρὰς πηγῆς τὸ τῶν λογισμῶν νάμα. Hence some have thought that this obstacle was removed by the preternatural assistance of heavenly grace.


To these may be added, Jos. Ant. 2, 13. (cited by Wets’) where, speaking of Moses, whose rod was turned into a dragon, he says: κελεύς (ὁ βασιλεὺς) τοὺς λεπί τις αὐτὰς ὅφεις αὐτῷ παρασκευὴν ὁφήν, ὦ Αἰγυπτίων σοφῶν ὄντων καὶ τὴν περὶ τούτων ἐπιστήμην: at this prodigy Moses then addresses the King thus: οβ’ αὐτὸς, ὦ βασιλεὺ, τῆς Αἰγυπτίων σοφίας καταφρονῶ.
But this idea is overturned by the fact that Aaron is said to have acted as spokesman for Moses. So Exod. 4, 16, "he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth."

Kreb's, Loesner, Morus, Rosenmuller, and Heinrichs take δώρας ἐν λόγοις to be synonymous with δώρας or δεινὸς λέγειν, which is used of persuasive, and therefore powerful oratory. They quote Joseph. Ant. 3, 1, 4. where Moses is said to be πλὴρει ὁμιλεῖν πιθανωτάτος and the δώρας ἐν ἐργοῖς they refer to the miracles of Moses. Kuinoel, however, thinks that one cannot here understand the miracles of Moses, nor his writings, nor the power of speech granted him by God when He committed to him the office of leading the Israelites from Egypt; since the context [as Doddridge has observed. Edit.] plainly shows that Stephen spoke not of Moses as a leader of the Israelites, but of his manner of life in the court of Pharaoh. "The formula δώρας ἐν λόγοις (continues he) is to be understood of the force and efficacy of his oratory (see Krebs and the note on Luke 21, 19.); and the words may be thus paraphrased: 'oratione et rebus gerendis pollebat, vi persuadendi animis flecenti præditus erat, consilia optima dabant, et in rebus gerendis fortissimus erat.' Upon the whole, I must prefer this interpretation, which is nearly the same with that laid down by Dr. Hammond, who paraphrases thus: 'He was a person of great abilities above other men, both for speaking (viz. in respect of eloquence and power of speech, though, for the manner of utterance, he had some stammering in his speech) and also for managing his business. Very able both to give counsel, and to act any great affairs.' After the same manner, too, Doddridge explains it to mean such a weight and solidity in his counsels and speeches as may be very consistent with the want of a flowing elocution. See Archbishop Newcome. Chrysostom seems to refer the expression solely to learning,
since he paraphrases thus: καὶ παιδεία καὶ γράμματα. I suspect, however, an error, and would read πράγμα-
την: the words are (as every critic knows) perpetually confounded. I wonder that none of the Commenta-
tors should have thought of comparing a similar expression of Thucyd. 1, 138. (speaking of Alci-
biades) ἣν γὰρ βεβαιώσατα δὴ φύσεως ἵστον δηλώσας.
and especially 1, 139. (speaking of Pericles) λέγειν
τε καὶ πράσσειν δύνατότατος. Markland, too, cites a
similar one from Demosthenes. Whether the ἀργος refers (as some think) to Moses's successful
generalship in a war against the Αἰθιοπικόι (narrated by Joseph. Ant. 2, 5.) is, to say the least, very
uncertain.

23. οἷς δὲ ἐπιλημφότη τὸν τεσσαρακοντατμῆς χρόνος.
I do not remember to have seen any expression of
this kind in the Classical writers, and I suspect it is
Hellenistical. With respect to the fact, it is not
founded on any testimony of Scripture, but solely,
as it seems, on Jewish tradition; since of this there
are many vestiges yet remaining in the Rabbinical
writings. See the passages adduced by Wetstein.
On ἀνεβη εἰς τὴν καρδίαν (scil. διαλογισμός) see the

23. ἐπισκέψασθαι properly signifies to look at, or
upon; 2dly, inspicio, visito (as we say, to go to see any
one), to visit; and 3dly, to see their situation, and,
from the adjunct, relieve their wants. Hence it
sometimes, as here, signifies, in a general way, to
succour, assist, defend, &c.; so also in Acts 15, 14.
Heb. 2, 16.

24, 25. άδικεῖσθαι, to be beaten. By this word the
Sept. have expressed the Heb. רָעָה in Is. 10, 20.,
but in a parallel passage (Exod. 2, 11.) by τύπτειν.
(Kuin.) It properly signifies to be injured or ag-
grieved; as in Thucyd. 1, 6. 11, 20. 5, 38. See
also Wetstein.

24. ἡμιναυ. Subbaud τῷ ἁδικουμένῳ or αὐτῷ.
'Αμινανθά, with an accusative, signifies to ward off,
resist; with a dative, to defend. Examples occur in
the best Classical writers; especially Thucydidcs. "Εκάτωθεν ἐκδίκησεν. An Hellenistic phrase for ἐξεδίκηση. Κατατάσσομενω. Κατάτασσον properly signifies to wear down (κατά) or out with labour, ill treatment, affliction;* as in 2 Macc. 8, 2. ἐπὶ τὸν ἤπω πάντως κατατάσσομεν λαὸν.

24. πατάξας τὸν Διόγντιον, smiling, i.e. (as we find from the context) slaying the Egyptian. So the Heb. יִגֹּר and πατάσσειν in Matt. 26, 31. τὸν φρίνκον ἐν τοῖς περιπόλοις έν αγορά πατάξαντος ἐγχειρίδιῳ καὶ διαθείραντος. That Moses intended to slay the Egyptian cannot be proved. His wrath, however, was justly excited by the ill treatment of one of his fellow countrymen, and the act was justifiable, on the ground that, living under a tyrant who afforded them no legal protection, they had thereby returned to a state of nature, and were at liberty to use its rights. Now Grotius on this passage and L. 11. de Jure B. & P. C. 20, 8. says that the law of nature gives this right to an innocent person, and whoever is defending him: so that Whitby seems to be mistaken in supposing that it would not have been justifiable except on the ground of Divine impulse. In the Pentateuch the action is neither praised nor blamed.

25. εὐμαχεὶς ἐν συνέναι—συνήκαν, i.e. would have understood. They might have known that the time drew near which God had predetermined in his promise to Abraham, in a prediction which might probably be delivered down by tradition, and which would be

* Kuinoel says, it is especially used of those who labour under sickness; and he might have cited Diog. Laert. 5, 68. (ap. Wets.) ἔτελεύησεν νόσῳ πολαγραπτῷ καταπονθῆσις. I add Thucyd. 2, 51, (speaking of those sick of the plague), οἱ διαισθησθεὶς — τῶν πολλῶν φαίνεσθαι, where the Scholiast explains, τὴν ἀσθένειαν. I wonder none of the Editors should have seen that τὴν ἀσθένειαν ought to be altered to τῇ ἁσθενεῖᾳ. The ν and the iota descriptum are perpetually confounded. Πάνωσ is in the earlier Greek writers used of pain (which probably is thence derived), sickness. See the note on Apoc. 16, 10 & 11. It here seems to mean worsted, aggrieved, evil treated.
more like to be remembered under their oppression, as the Patriarchs had, in dependance upon it, directed that their bones should continue unburied in Egypt. And when they saw a person with so much dignity, authority, and influence, whom God had so wonderfully preserved, interposing in this generous and heroic manner, which plainly showed that he, in good earnest, intended at all hazards to do his utmost for their deliverance, it would have been highly reasonable for them to have taken occasion, from this action of his, to enter into some treaty with him relating to it. (Doddridge.)

25. διδόσων συντηρεῖν has the air of an Hellenistic phrase; but an example of it is cited by Wetstein from Demosthenes pro Corona.

26. τὴν τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρα, the morrow. So Glass, Cratinus; εἰπὼν. T. Mag. and Herodian say that ἡμέρα ought not to be added. But this is refuted by the examples from Herodotus, Appian, and Thucydides, cited by Wetstein. Yet it is probable that in the latter ages the substantive was almost always omitted, just as we now omit day in to-morrow; though our ancestors expressed it.

26. ἀφθη αὐτοῖς. There is here an occasion to read ἀλλοίς, with Valkenaer, since αὐτοῖς is to be referred to the preceding ἀδελφοίς. The construction has somewhat perplexed the Commentators; but it is best explained by Markland, who accounts it as a use of the plural for some, or a part of certain persons before spoken of; and he instances Joh. 6, 49. πατέρες ὑμῶν, "some of your fathers," and other passages. Now the some must here, by the context. (see ver. 27.) and Exod. 2, 13. be understood of two. Kuinoel observes that ἐπεσθαι is used of those who supervenient, come unexpectedly, like ἐφιστήμη. The μαχαίρι is might mean, and is by some explained, disputing; but the words of Exod. oblige us to interpret it of blows; as in Jam. 4, 1.

26. συνήλασεν αὐτοῖς εἰς εἰρήνην. Συνελαίνω properly signifies to compel to go anywhere, by encir-
cling and hedging in a person, and urging him forward, leaving him no other way. But it is used, especially by the later Greek writers, of compulsion generally; as in Plut. 716 b. (cited by Wets.) ἐν ἤδω ποτε συνεπαθῆς ὑπὸ χειμῶνος εἰς ἐκαυλὴν ἄνθροπον πένητος. 2 Macc. 4, 42. πάντας δὲ εἰς φυγὴν συνήσασαν. Sometimes, however, as here, it is used of compulsion metaphorically, and, like ἀναγκᾶς, of moral compulsion, strong persuasion, and earnest remonstrance (see Luke 14, 23. and Matt. 14, 22. and the notes). The sense is therefore this: "He strongly urged them to reconciliation." Neither is it necessary to understand "the attempt or will for the action;" as is done by Grotius, Valcknaer, and Kuin.


27. ἀπάσαντο αὐτὸν, thrust him back. So the Sodomites to Lot, "stand back." It may, however, be taken metaphorically for "he rejected his interference;" and in this sense the word occurs in the best authors; as, for instance, Thucydides. So infra ver. 39. ἀπάσαντο, scil. Μωσῆν.

27. τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ᾽ υμᾶς; This has the air of a proverbial expression, and reminds one of what the Sodomites said to Lot (19, 9.): "this fellow came in to sojourn, and he will needs be a judge. To the present passage there seems an allusion in Luke 12, 14. τίς με κατέστησε δικαστὴν ἀμειστὴν ἐφ᾽ υμᾶς; So Appian, Tyan. Epist. 59. sub. init. εἰ μὴ περίεγρον ἢ, οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πράγμασι δίκαιος, ἒ. ο. δικαστὴς.

29. ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, at this saying, or because of this saying. Εἰν is for διὰ; as in Matt. 6, 7. Nor was his fear groundless; for (as we learn from Exod. 2, 15.) Pharaoh, as soon as he knew that Moses acted the patron and advocate of the Israelites,
sought him out for punishment. Moses fled, because he perceived that the time for delivering the Israelites from the Egyptian bondage was not yet come. **Maitha** was a district of Arabia; on which see Ros. Schol. in Exod. (Kuin.)

30. ἔστών τεσσαράκοντα. See the note on ver. 28. 'Εν τῇ Ἑρμῷ τῷ ἄρους Σινᾶ, &c. In Exod. 3, 1. this vision is said to have appeared to Moses near Horeb. But, in fact, there is no opposition; since the mountain had a double top [like mount Parnassus. Edit.]; and of the two peaks one was called Horeb, the other Sinai. Thus Pietro de la Valla, in his second Epistle written at Cairo, says: "Duo sunt montes uno in loco, Horeb et Sinai, qui ambo nascuntur, ut ita dicam, ex radice una, et dividuntur postea judicis, suo altius adscendentur. (Kuin.)

30. ἐν φλαγά τυρὰς βάτων. A sort of Hebrew pleonasm for "in the burning bush." The Hebrew **שֶּׁנֶּרֶבֶל** φλοξ τυρὰς, is equivalent to τῷ φλαγάς, **שֶּׁרֶבֶל** in Ps. 104, 4. where the Sept. has **τῷ φλαγέων.** See also 2 Thess. 1, 8. Hebr. 1, 7. (Kuin.) I purposefully forbear to notice the speculations of recent Commentators on the nature of the burning bush; some of whom, endeavouring to account for it on natural principles, suppose it to have been a meteor. Others think that the bush was touched by lightning. But, supposing it were so, how are we to account for the bush's not burning? Certainly this must have been altogether preternatural: and well it were if some who call themselves theologians would learn a lesson even from the Heathen sages, whom they profess so much to admire. Thus in Pind. Pyth. 10, 76. ἐμὸ δὲ δαμασάω, Θεὸν τελεσάσαν, οὐδὲν τὸτε φαινέται ἐμὸν ἀπιστῶν. Arrian, Exp. Alex. 5, 1, 2.* Eurip. Bach. 181. οὐδὲν σοφίζομεθα

* Arrian. Exp. Alex. 5, 1, 2. οὐκ ἀκριβῆ ἔστειλεν χρή εἶναι τῶν ἱκέρ τοῦ θείου ἐκ παλαιοῦ μεμοθεμένων. Τῷ γὰρ τοιαύτῃ τάκει ξυνικέναι οὐ πιστὰ, ἐπειδὰν τὸ θεῖον τὶς προσβῇ τῷ λόγῳ, οὐ πάντη ἀπιστὰ φαινέται, "hoc tantum censetur, ea quae de diis veteres fabulis suis conscripsere, non esse nimium curiosè pervestiganda.
tou'i daimioun. And 313. vnu γαρ ρέτει τε καλ φροενον ουδεν φροεις. And 371. τε σοφον δε ου σοφλα, Το τε μη θνητα φοσειν βραχυς αιων επι τουτο δε τις αυ μεγαλα διαικων τα παραντ' ουχι φεοι; μαινομεναι ουδε τροποι και κακοβολαν παρ έμαγε φοστων. Such sentiments as these were passing through the mind of Horace, and perhaps some of those very passages (especially those of Eurip. Bacch.) when he wrote the exquisite ode beginning with "Parcus Deorum cultor et infrequens Insaniens durn sapientiae consultus erro. Indeed I have observed not a few imitations in Horace of the Bacchae of Euripides, (a drama whose excellence is little appreciated;) and also in Pindar, whom he not unfrequently imitates.

31. προσερχομενου δε αυτω κατανοησαι. Subaud ooste, or eis to. Katanosai usually signifies to, as it were, think down, subdue in one's mind, perceive, understand; but here, to examine. For (as Grotius observes) verbs of the internal and external senses are often interchanged. Kuinoel, Krebs, and Loesner, adduce examples from Xen. Cyr. 2, 4, 3. & 2, 2, 28. Joseph. Ant. 5, 1, 2. Indeed it is a signification of very frequent occurrence in the Greek writers. The kata in katanoησαι, to examine, has the same force as in kataβλητω, and seems to allude to the stooping posture which usually accompanies the close examination of any object.

32. εντομος δε γενομενος. It was the common opinion in those times (and indeed in all antient ones) that the sight of any deity or angel was unlucky, and ominous of evil. See the note on Matt. 28, 9. Luke 5, 8 & 9. John. 20, 17. Acts 5, 1. So Hom. II. u. 131. χαλεποι δε Θεοι φαινεσθαι έναργεις. (Kuin.) One may compare with entomos the similar word εκφοβα, both which are conjoined in Hebr. 12, 21.

Scripta enim quibus merito fides derogari posset, quando numinis aliejus mentio accedit, fit ut non omnino incredibilia esse videantur." Pausan. 10, 4, 4. τα παραβοα απιστους ειναι των ανθρωπων, οι δε μη παρα τον αυτων γενηται βλον θεαμαν ετινυριν λογου μειζονων.
which are equivalent to our expression, "to be all in a tremour," or fear.

33. λύσων ύπόσιμα — ἀγία ἐστιν. In all ages, and among all nations, cleanliness in the celebration of sacred rites has been thought especially requisite; and, in order effectually to secure this, it was usual to direct that the shoes or sandals of the worshipper should be taken off previous to his entrance into a sacred edifice. And as kings, being God's vicegerent's, claimed much of the honour due to Him, so it was sometimes forbidden to approach them without a similar mark of respect. The custom was probably one of remote antiquity, and prevalent even as early as the time of Moses. Indeed we find it even yet in the East, where customs never change (see Archbishop Newcome); and as it was a strict injunction of Pythagoras θυείν ἀνυπόδετον, καὶ πρὸς ιερὰ προσέναι, so it was doubtless borrowed by that philosopher, together with his other institutions, from Egypt, whither it had passed from Hindostan, &c. That the custom prevailed in the East, we learn from the Rabbinical writings, and that it passed in some degree into the West we gather from the Roman authors; examples from both of whom are given by Wetstein.*

34, 35. idem eis, &c. planissime cognovi. Valckenaeer renders: "I am thoroughly acquainted with."


I am inclined to think there is an allusion to this custom in 1 Kings 21, 27. "Ahab fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly:" and Is. 38, 15. "I shall go softly all my years in bitterness of soul." For those who are unshod may emphatically be said to go softly.
This idiom, by which there is added to the verb a
cognate participle, is commonly termed a Hebraism,
and is undoubtedly of Oriental origin. Compare
Exod. 8. 7. Hebr. 6. 14. εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, καὶ
πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε. 1 Macc. 5. 42. δυνάμενος δυνά-
μεται. Yet it has been strongly maintained by the
defenders of the purity of the style of the New Tes-
tament that this is good Greek; and undoubtedly
this point has been established by Pfchen, Stolberg,
&c. to the discomfiture of Gataker and his associates.
Among the examples brought forward are Herodot.
4. 23. καταφεύγων καταφέγη. Arrian, Hist. Ind. 4,
& Mund. ἰδὼν εἶδον ἄλλα, &c. cited by Wetstein.
Kuinoel refers to Glass, Phil. Sacr. 277., Vorstius de
Hebr. 611 seqq., Raphel on this passage, and Hem-
steruchius on Lucian, 1, p. 300. Many more pas-
sages are appealed to by the above critics, but few
of them are to the purpose, and of the passages just
referred to some question is raised respecting the
purity of the reading in the one from Lucian. Be that,
however, as it may, it is not three or four, or half a do-
zen passages, anxiously hunted out of the whole of the
Greek Classics, that will prove any idiom to be agree-
able to the usage of the best writers; neither is it a
few Atticisms found here and there in the New Tes-
tament that will prove its style to be Classical. The
idiom now in question is, I have no doubt, of Orient-
al origin, and the few examples which remain may
be reckoned among the other faint vestiges of the
Oriental origin of the Greek language. As a proof
of this, the best established examples of the idiom
are found in the most antient writers, and in the
Ionic and other antique dialects. Certainly many of
the Scriptural examples of the idiom are such as no
Greek Classical writer would ever have used; as
Hebr. 6. 14. εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε. And Habak. 2,
4. where Aquila has ἐρχόμενος ἔλεψεται, he shall
surely come. Besides, most of them are to be traced
up to some specific passage of the Hebrew of the
Old Testament. After all, why the critics above adverted to should continue to hold any idiom formed from the most antient and venerable of all languages (and what they term the sacred one) in such abomination, I know not. And why (to use the words of Valcknaer) should complete purity of style be so contested for in a book where we look for majesty of things, which needs not to be dressed out in all the ornaments of mere human compositions.

34. τὴν κάκωσιν. Of this word Wetstein cites an example from Plutarch; to which I add Thucyd. 7, 4. & 82, 2, 43.

34. καὶ κατέθην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτῶν, “I am come down in order to deliver them.” Here we must, as often, subaud ἀστέ or εἰς τὸ. Kuinoel takes occasion to observe that the antients supposed the Deity acted much after the manner of men: which, however, may be doubted. Such expressions (uttered ἀνθρωπότατος) were often resorted to from necessity, had their origin in human ignorance, and were used in deference to human weakness. Kuinoel cuts the idea down to “iis auxilium feram.” Against such sort of criticism (which when applied to Classical authors is always tasteless, and in respect to the Sacred writers not unfrequently irreverent) it cannot be improper, nor perhaps unseasonable, for me to caution students.

35. τούτων τῶν Μωϋσῆν ἄν θανάτῳ — τούτων ὁ Θεός ἄρχοιτα καὶ λυτρῶν ἀπέστειλεν. Αὐτρωτήν, a redeemer, liberator, answers to the Hebr. שׁנָה, in Ps. 19, 15. It properly denotes one who redeems any one from captivity by paying the λύτρων, or price of his freedom. Here Doddridge observes, that as the terms of high respect in which Stephen, through the whole of his discourse, speaks of Moses, tended to show how improbable it was that he should have spoken contemptibly of him, as the witnesses pretended; so this circumstance of the Israelites having rejected him whom God had appointed to be a
ruler and redeemer, intimated how possible it was that Jesus, whom they had lately rejected, might nevertheless be constituted a Saviour by the Divine determination.

36. οὗτος, ille, vir ille magnus. 'Ερυθρὰ θαλάσσα, i. e. the Red Sea, or rather Erythrean Sea, or Arabian Gulph. So the Hebr. יִשְׁרַי. It is by some thought to have derived its name from the weeds which abound in it, and tinge the water. Others however deny this. See the writers on Scripture Geography, Calmet, and others, including Mr. Horne’s Introduction.

38. γενέσθαι μετὰ τῶν denotes “versari cum aliquo, to hold converse or communication with.” But the present γενέσθαι μετὰ τοῦ ἄγγελου καὶ (μετὰ) τῶν πατέρων, signifies to be an internuntius, or mediating interpreter between God and the people, μεσιτὴς. (Compare Gal. 3, 19.) By ἡ ἐκκλησία many Commentators, as Grotius and Heinisius, understand the whole Israelitish assembly. But (as Krause observes) the article τῆς shews that it denotes some certain assembly; and from the whole of the context it clearly appears that we are to understand the assembly congregated at Mount Sinai, on the promulgation of the Law. On μετὰ τοῦ ἄγγελου see the note on ver. 53. (Kuin.)

38. δὲ ἐκδέξατο λόγια γὼντα, δούναι ἡμῖν. As the subject is plainly the promulgation of the Law, by λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ (answering to the Hebr. מִדְרֶשׁ נַבֵּי in Ps. 189, 38 & 58. and Numb. 24, 4.) are meant any divine oracles. See the examples in Raphel, Obs. Polyb. Now this, in respect of the context, is to be understood of promises and Divine precepts. They are moreover said to be γὼντα, which Piscator, Alberti, and Heumann, explain delivered vivd voce. But this signification is unauthorized. Others, as Heinrichs, explain γὼντα, valid, strong, efficacious, quoting Hebr. 4, 2. where the Apostle speaks of the Divine threatenings, which will assuredly have their event, and Soph. ÕEd. Tyr. 481. where by παντεῖα γὼντα are meant oracles of certain fulfilment. Now
is, not unfrequently, used metaphorically of what flourishes, exerts its force, &c. and Morus would explain ἄντρα "ēfficacius for procuring rewards and blessings." But there is no need to resort to any such ambages. Zνν is often, in the Sept. and New Testament, equivalent to ἡσυχία; as in 6, 51. where see the note, and Hebr. 10, 20. where ὅδος ἁλία is explained by Theophylact ἡσυχίαν, εἰς ἁλίν ἄγονα. And in Deut. 32, 47. the Law is said to be ἁλία, salvation. Therefore λόγια ἄντρα are πραξεπτα σαλβ. berrima. (Kuin.) In this last mode of interpretation I must acquiesce. It had been long ago brought forward by Drusius, Beza, Vatablus, and Grotius, (confirmed by the Vulgate, vivivica); as also by Pearce, Valcknaer, and Schlesner. Now λόγιον denotes an oracular response delivered in prose, χρησμός, one in verse. So Thucyd. 2, 8. πολλα μὲν λόγια ἐλέγετο, πολλα δὲ χρησμολογοι ἦδον. The name λόγια came at length to denote the Scriptures. So Procop. 158, 17. who mentions τὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγια. 39. ὃ οὖν ἥδεσαν ἑπικοιγενεῖται, "to whom, nevertheless, our forefathers would not yield obedience." This is observed by Stephen once and again; and he insists upon it largely, that they might see it was no new thing for Israel to rebel against God, by rejecting deliverers sent from him. (Doddr.) On the expression ἐστράφησαν τῶν καρδιῶν the Commentators are not quite agreed. The Vulg., Beza, Pisc., Vatab., Hammond, Morus, Rosenmuller, and others, interpret, "they were intent on returning into Egypt, their mind dwelt on returning thither." See Exod. 16, 8, 17, 8. Others, as Grot., De Dieu, Pearce, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, take the words in a figurative sense to denote "they meditated a return to the idolatries and sensual gratifications of Egypt." "And this (observes Kuin.), since mention is immediately made of idol worship." "Now (continues Kuin.) at the time when the Israelites sought of Aaron that he would make them a golden calf; they did not meditate a return to Egypt, but meant to
go on their journey. Nor can it reasonably be ob-
jected to this interpretation that we do not read in
the Books of Moses that the Israelites worshipped
idols in Egypt. For Moses has not related all that
happened to them there or in the desert, other cir-
cumstances being recorded in other Books of the
Old Testament. But that the Israelites had wor-
shipped idols in Egypt, is clear from Ezek. 20, 7.
8, 24. which passage exceedingly confirms the pre-
sent interpretation.

40. ποίησαν θείαι θεοὶ οἱ προσευχονται ήμῶν. By
θεοὶ are meant images of Gods, and Grotius observes
that the Egyptians (as we learn from Jambl. and
other writers) held the opinion that there were
various degrees of gods, and that by the inferior even
the superior attrahit in simulachra [by which, I sup-
pose, he means were drawn to worship them. Ed.];
and therefore, he says, the plural is put here and in
Exodus. But I assent to Kuinoel, that as we find
Aaron made but one such image, and as in the He-
brew we have דּוֹרֶנ, a word of plural form, but
singular sense, so here we are to understand only
one God, an image of a God.

40. Οἱ προσευχονται ήμῶν. It seems to have been
the custom among the Oriental nations of antiquity,
for the images of the Gods to be borne before the
people in journeys or military expeditions, or in
going out to battle; since they imagined that by so
doing they should the more effectually enjoy their
guidance, protection, and support. See Numb. 10,
33. compared with Deut. 31, 8. 1 Sam. 4, 3. 2 Sam.
3, 21. and Wesseling on Diodor. Sic. 20, 65. (Hein-
richs, Krause, & Kuin.) I know not what Markland
means by saying, "There is something foolish and
absurd in the very expression, make us Gods who
shall go before us. Stephen undoubtedly intended
it as a sneer."
—Davus sum, non οἴδιπος.

40. ὁ γὰρ Μωυσῆς ὁ δῶτος — τι γέγονεν αὐτῶ. Here
we have an idiom common both to the Hebrew,
Greek, and Latin, nay, even the modern languages,
namely, an *Anacoluthon* (as says Beza) or (as Piscator, Grot., Wolf, and Kuinoel contend) an *antiposis* or *enallage* of case, by which the nominative absolute is put for the dative (*τῷ Μωϋσεί τούτῳ οὖν οἴδαμεν τι γέγονεν*). It is, in translating, filled up by a *quod attinet ad* "as for," &c. The idiom seems to be of Oriental origin. For, as Valcknaer observes, the Eastern writers are accustomed to place nominatives absolute at the beginning of sentences. For examples see Glass Phil. p. 68., Bos Ellips., Wetstein, and Valcknaer.

41. ἐμοῦ σκοτοίησεν. This word is, by the Sept., (like many others) so formed as to express by one compound word two simple Heb. ones (namely יֶהָרָעֲלָ דַּיָּר). The nouns ἠθήνη (city) and ῥινος (bullock) are used promiscuously. (Grot. & Deyling Obss. p. 4, 425.) When Moses had departed, and the cloud was no longer discovered, unless, perhaps, on some peak of Mount Sinai, the Israelites thought that Moses was dead, and that God was no longer pleased to give them laws, but left them liberty to form some for themselves. (Le Clerc on Ex. 38, 1.) Now since they had seen that divinities were by the Egyptians worshipped under certain *forms* and *images*, they were induced to use a golden, or gilt, calf, or ox, for a symbol of the true God (compare Ex. 33, 5.); wherein they transgressed the express commandment of God, not to worship Him under any image. (See Exod. 20, 4.) Under the figure of *Apis* (who was a bullock), we may observe, the Egyptians worshipped *Osiris*, who formerly was an Egyptian king, and was supposed to have invented or introduced agriculture, horticulture, &c. That the *ox*, which, among the ancients, was a symbol of agricultural labour, was, to the Egyptians, a symbol of *Osiris*, we learn from Plut. de Is. & Osin, p. 366. On the worship of Osiris by the Egyptians Tibull. 1, 7, 27. says:

* This is better than making it, with Markland, a mere elliptical sentence, to be filled up thus: ὅσι τι γέγονεν οὐ ἔστιν (ὅτι) ὁ Μωϋσῇς οὗτος, ὃς ἐθηγάγε, &c.
Primus aratra manu sollerti fecit Osiris, Et teneram ferro sollicitavit humum, &c. See also Herodot. 3, 27. seqq. Plin. H. N. 8. 46. Selden de D. Syr. 1, 4. Bochart Hierog. P. 1. L. 2. C. 34. Jablonski Panth. Ægypt. t. 1. p. 122 & 258. seqq. Braun Select. Sacr. 388. Deyl. ubi supra, and Munthe in loc. (Kuin.) Bp. Pearce, however, maintains that this was not in imitation of Apis, whom they had worshipped in Egypt. "It may (continues he) be made to appear highly probable, that Apis was not known in Egypt so early as when the Israelites were there. See Sir Isaac Newton's Chron. C. 2. on the Empire of Egypt. But however that was, we read in Exod. 12, 12. & 18, 10, 11. and Numb. 38, 4. that the Israelites were brought up out of Egypt in opposition to the Egyptian gods, and with their destruction: and therefore it seems very plain that the Israelites did not make this calf, which they said (Exod. 38, 4.), was the God which brought them up out of the land of Egypt, in imitation of any of the Egyptian gods, which, as they knew, their God had at that time destroyed."

41. καὶ ἄντιγάγων θύσιν τῷ εἰδώλῳ. 'Ανάγεν signifies properly to bring up, lay upon, and is, in the Hellenistic writers, used to denote laying the victim on the altar, which was always raised (hence βωμὸς and altare, which denote this). This form of speech seems derived from the Hebrew; since we find נָאָל to raise followed by נְלָי offering in Judg. 6, 26, 2 Paral. 39, 21. Hence it is found in Philo and (as are many other words and phrases of Oriental origin) in Herodot. 2, 60.; as also in Heliodor. (10, p. 457.), himself an Alexandrian writer. But this will not prove it to be, properly speaking, a Classical phrase.

41. καὶ εὐφραῖνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν θεοῦν αὐτῶν, i.e. "they celebrated sacrificial feasts to the idol, and rendered to it the homage due to God only." For εὐφραῖνεσθαι, which properly denotes to indulge oneself in hilarity, is applied specially to religious
feasting and rejoicing. See the note on Luke 15, 24. and compare Exod. 32, 6. where the words are descriptive of a feast day.

42. ἐστρέψει δὲ ὁ Θεός, καὶ παρέδωκεν, &c. Commentators are not quite agreed on the sense of ἐστρέψει, which De Dieu, Glass, Morus, Dindorf, Pearce, Rosenmuller, and others, closely connect with παρέδωκεν, and assign to it (by a sort of Hebraism) the force of an adverb, as rursus. But to this it is justly objected that we do not read of the Israelites having before worshipped the stars. There seems more reason (with others) to regard the expression as elliptical. Krebs would supply γνώμην, and Loesner τρόπως; though he thinks that ἐστρέψει may be put for ἐστράφη, since verbs active have often a passive sense. He might have added a middle or reflective one; in which case there is an ellipsis of ἑαυτόν: and, indeed, verbs signifying to turn, are, in almost all languages, used either in an active or neuter, passive or reflective sense. So that ἐστρέψει may be rendered, “turned himself.” But the context and the circumstances of the case oblige us to understand this of turning away, aversion, &c. and therefore I assent to the interpretation of the Syr., Casaub., Beza, Pisc., Grot., Hammond, Doddrr., Wets., Krause, and Kuinoel, aversus est: thus becoming (says Beza) from a kind Father, a righteous Judge. Now turning the face from is a common Hebraism denoting aversion. Therefore the words may be thus paraphrased: “turned himself from them, and suffered them to be polluted with idolatry and vice.”

42. Παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐστρέψειν τ. σ. τ. ο. As a punishment, and in order (as Doddridge observes) to visit one sin by letting them fall into another, the Almighty permitted them to be more and more enslaved to superstition and idolatry; insomuch that they worshipped the stars. Παρέδωκεν is well rendered in our English Version gave them up. Here Kuin. observes (from Glass Phil. S. 284.)
that the Hebrews and all the Eastern nations often used active verbs in respect of those who are not authors of any action, but only give occasion for the commission of it, at least do not hinder it. "Besides (continues Kuinoel) the Hebrews attribute whatever happens in the world, even though it be only by the permission of God, to His operation and agency. See Ez. 20, 25. Rom. 1, 24. where see Kopp. Παρέδωκεν has therefore been well explained by Chrysostom and Theophylact eiασε, sυffered, pεrmissed. Grotius observes that this is not to be referred to the time in which they were in the desert, but after that period.

42. Στρατιά of ουρανοῦ, in the Sept. answers to the Heb. מִלָּה הָאֱלֹהִים in 2 Paral. 33, 5. Jer. 19, 18. 33, 22. where the stars only are meant, and in 1 Kings 22, 19., where it signifies angels. In the former sense it is used by Philo: ex. gr. de Op. M. p. 27 & 38. (cited by Wets.) οι γε μην πλάνητες, η γ' αντίφασος στρατιά της των ἄπλανων. & 806 D. (cited by Loesner) ἀναβλέψας εἰς αἰθέρα ἐδεύ ήλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ πλανήτας καὶ ἄπλανεὶς ἀστέρας, τήν μεροποιεστάτην οὐρανοῦ στρατείαν. It is also found in Luke 2, 18. where see the note. I add Arrian Exp. Alex. 7, 20, 1 & 2. λόγος δὲ κατέχει, ὅτι ἦκουν Ἡράβας δύο μόνον τίμιαν θεόν, τὸν Οὐρανόν τε καὶ τὸν Διώσουν τὸν μὲν Οὐρανόν τε αὐτῶν ὡραμένον, καὶ τὰ ἄστρα ἐν οἷς ἔχουτα τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ τὸν ἡλίου, ἀφ' ὅτι τοῦ μεγίστου καὶ φανερότατος ὀφέλεια εἰς πάντα ἦκε τὰ ἀνθρώπεια. Διώνυσον δὲ, κατὰ δόξαν τῆς ἐς Ἰνδῶς στρατιάς.

42. καθώς γέγραπται εἰς βιβλίο τῶν προφητῶν, i. e. the twelve minor prophets, which, it seems, were usually bound in one volume. (See Sir. 49, 10.) And yet that it was sometimes otherwise we may gather from Luke 4, 17, (Zieger, Pisc., Pearce, & Kuin.) The passage is from Amos 5, 25.

42. Ἡ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηγέκατε, &c. The interrogation ὡς (like the Heb. π.) is itself to be taken negatively. For (as Rosenmuller truly observes), in the passage of Amos, the ὡς interrogative,
when prefixed to an affirmative sentence, has the force of a strong negation. But from the Books of Moses it appears that the Israelites in the desert did offer sacrifices to God. (See Exod. 24, 4. seqq. Numb. 7, 9.) To remove this difficulty, the Commentators have devised various modes of interpretation (see Dath and Bauer in loc.), most of them far-fetched, as well as that of Lightfoot, Sanctius, and Michaelis, who explain the words of sacrifices voluntarily offered up, or which were seldom or never brought to the tabernacle of Jehovah. Morus, Rosenmuller, and Heinrichs, interpret thus: “was your worship bestowed on me at all times from the heart? Nay (kal. see Glass Phil. S. 604.) ye turned aside to the worship of the stars also.” So Cor. 9, 9. μὴ τῶν βοσάν (scil. μόνον) μέγει τῷ Θεῷ. And this seems to have been the mode adopted by Wetstein* who compares Menander ap. Athen. 4. p. 146 οἱ θυσίνι δὲ οἱ τοιχώρυχοι κατακεφαλαίοι, οὐγά τῶν θεῶν ἐνεκ' ἄλλ' ἐαυτῶν τὸ λιβανατὸν εὐσεβεῖς, καὶ τὸ πότανον τοῦτ' ἐλαβεν ο θεὸς, ἐξά τὸ πῦρ Ἀπαν ἐπιτεθέν οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐσφόνιν ἄκραν καὶ τὴν χολὴν ἔτ' ἐς τὰ βρονιατα τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπιθεντες αὐτοῖ τ' ἄλλα κατακηνοῦσι. (Kuin.)

I assent to the learned Commentator that this last detailed interpretation (which seems to have been devised from Whitby and Doddridge) deserves the

* And also by Whitby, who observes that the question is a strong negative, importing, that though they really did offer sacrifices as He had commanded, yet did He not accept, or look upon them as offered to Him; similar to which is the expression in Zach. 7, 5. And this is here denied (continues Whitby), 1st. Because God will accept of no worship as done unto him, which is not done unto him alone; and when any other is worshipped with him, he looks upon himself as not worshipped at all. So 2 Kings 17, 33 & 34. 2dly, Because God will not own any worship as performed to him, whilst men continue in their disobedience to his laws, and in their hearts depart from him, and incline to a worship he approves not of. Thus the Jews in Zachary are said not to fast to him, because they would not hearken to, or obey his words, ver. 8. and he is said to have been angry with them in the wilderness forty years, because they erred from him in their hearts, (Ps. 95, 10), that is (as the Chaldee explains), they had their idols in their hearts.” Whitby.
praise of simplicity and facility: but I agree with him in preferring that which he has himself adopted; though, upon the whole, the following, compounded from that of Bp. Pearce and Kuinoel, appears to be the simplest and truest. "Did ye indeed offer to me sacrifices for forty years in the wilderness; (yes;) and yet (καὶ for καίροι) so little real was your piety, that (in conjunction with my worship) ye raised the tabernacle of Moloch."

The words of Cæcumenius 70 d. & 71 a. (partly derived from Chrysostom and other ancient Fathers) place in a strong light the exquisite contrivance of this finely adjusted defence. "Ὅρα δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν δημηγορίαν, πόσο ἱσχυρὸς καὶ ἀνεπαρχός ισταται πρὸς ὅλην αὐτῶν τὴν κατηγορίαν, μονοσωφός λέγων, ὅτι, καὶ εἰπον τὸντε καὶ lυθησαν, καὶ τὰ ἐθνί καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἀλλαγήσει, οὐδὲν εἰμί δέν εἰρηκὼς. Μασῆς γὰρ, εφ’ αὐτὴν φρονεῖν δοκεῖτε, ἐὰν τεσσαράκοντα οὔτε θυσίας προσήγεικεν, οὔτε καὶ ἀνέστησεν ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ Δαοὶ, οὐδὲ τις ἀλλων ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, καὶ τῷ κατακληροδοτούμενας ὑμῖν τῷ γῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ προφῆται αὐτῷ μὴ ὅντα ἀναγκαίᾳ ταῦτα οὕτω περὶ αὐτῶν ἀποφαίνονται. Μασῆν δὲ νῦν πῶς σχηματίζεσθε διεσκοίνει, ὃν ἀποστάντε καὶ οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς; καὶ ἄλλως διὰ πάσης ἐστὶν ἰδείν τῆς δημηγορίας, σόφως τε ἄμα ἐπιεκαῖς καὶ δρήμει ἡν κατηγορίαν αὐτῶν διοικημένην."

48. καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολὸχ. Μολὸχ answers to the Hebr. יָהָ, a king, from יָהָ, to reign. Hence in the Sept. version of Amos 5, 26. יָהָ, your Sovereign Lord, i.e. your God, is rendered Moloch.* The worshippers of idols called

* It has been disputed by learned men which of the Gods or Kings the Israelites worshipped in the desert under the name of Moloch. And since Stephen has cited the passage of Amos for the purpose of showing that the Israelites worshipped the stars, it is natural to suppose some planet. Hence Grotius, Drusius, Michaelis, Gabler, and others, understand Saturn, because in Scripture human sacrifices, especially of boys, are said to have been offered to him. See Levit. 18, 21., 2 Kings, 16, 17., Jer. 32, 35. compared with 19, 5. Diodor. Sic. (20, 14.) Curt. (4, 3, 23.) Justin. (19, 1.) and Lactant. (1, 21.) relate that the Tyrrians and Carthaginians offered human sacrifices to Saturn.
their Gods by the name βασιλεῖς. So Hom. ἄνωτρες. Compare Jer. 47, 25. and Is. 8, 21. Thus in Is. 44, 6. Jehovah is said to be the King of his people. By the name Moloch, therefore, or some inflexion of it, various Oriental nations named their Gods, especially him whom they believed to be supreme. The same ratio may be discerned in the name Baal, or Bel (i.e. Lord); a generic term applied to all Gods, who were distinguished from each other by the addition of an epithet; and the name Jehovah had this in common with idols. See Hos. 2, 15 & 16., Peti, in his Var. Lect. c. 1., Spencer de Leg. Heb. 468., Wits. Misc. 486., Deyling, Obss. P. 2. p. 889., and Warnkeiros, in his Heb. Ant. p. 84. In the Scriptures Moloch is the name given to the idol worshipped by the Ammonites (see 1 kings 11, 7.) and Moabites. (See 2 Kings 3, 27.) He is by some called the idol, and sometimes Baal. See Jer. 32, 35. compared with 19, 5. Now Moloch was an image of hollow construction, with the face of a calf and the hands outstretched.* See Drus. ad h. l. and Wits. Misc. 492. So Jarchi on Jer. 7, 31. Moloch est idolum ex ære. Ascendunt autem eum inferiorius; manus habet expensas ac quodammodo elatos. Dant puerum in ejus manus; comburitur et rugit. Sacrificuli autem pulsant tympanis, ne pater audiat ejus.

Others, on the contrary, as Spencer, Deyling, Braun, Witsius, Kraus, Morus, Rosenmuller, Heinrichs, and others, on the authority of Theophylact (who contends that by this deity among the Ammonites was represented the Sun), assign the name of Moloch to that luminary, who, as the chief of the planets, was called King of heaven, and the Moon they called Queen of heaven. See Jer. 7, 18. 44, 25. [So Gen. 1, 16. “And God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.” Edit.] And this opinion is highly probable. For the Egyptians did worship the Sun, and believed that the soul of Osiris had migrated into the Sun, and were by these worshipped with great religious veneration. See Euseb. in his Praep Evang. l. 18, 5. and Spencer 806. Hence also the idol Moloch had the head of an ox. From Egypt the worship of the sun passed to the neighbouring nations. (See Munthe ad h. l.)

* So the Mexican idols described by Mr. Humbolt in his Antiquities of Mexico.
latum filii, et ne incalescat ipsius misericordia. Σκυ-νε, which answers to the Hebr. יָמָה, denotes the case in which was contained the image of Moloch, formed of some light and portable material, and of very moderate size, so as to admit of being conveyed and set up, or hidden, as occasion might serve, with little fear of discovery from Moses or the magistrates.* See Mich. Suppl. p. 1747, and Spencer 804.

Ἀναλαμβάνει (like the Hebr. נֶשֶׁך in Amos) signifies to raise, bear, carry on the shoulders; as in religious procession. (See Numb. 1, 50. and Joh. 31, 6.) It appears too (as Spencer 802., and Rosenm. on Amos, have observed) that the antients sometimes carried about their Gods hidden, as tutelary genii, but at other times took them on their shoulders, and carried them about on beds or couches with much pomp and formality of procession. (See Serv. on Virg. Æn. 6, 18. and Braun SelectSacr. 497.) But the external sign of worship is here mentioned in the place of the worship itself, of which it was the sign. So that to bear the tabernacle of Moloch is equivalent to worshipping Moloch. The Israelites indeed are no where in the Pentateuch said to have worshipped Moloch, or Saturn. Hence some Commentators, as De Dieu, Doddridge, and others, who think it improbable that such idolatry could have been practised without the knowledge of Moses, maintain that we are to understand the words of mental idolatry, dwelling in the mind as a tabernacle of the body, which the Israelites carried about with them through the desert. See De Dieu, Wits,

* Schoettgen, advertit to the slight difference which there exists between the Hebrew and Greek, thinks it may have arisen from a difference in placing the vowel points. "And (continues he) as to any difference which we cannot reconcile, that may arise from the obscurity consequent on the rites of the antients not being fully understood. Since therefore the Holy Spirit did not deign to bestow much care in describing them, we must be content to remain ignorant of them, as we are also of the nature or kind of worship paid to the idols mentioned in 2 Kings 17, 31."
and Deyling. But there is no need to distort these words from their natural sense, or to resort to so far-fetched an interpretation, and one so foreign to the native simplicity of the words.

The covers, or cases, above-mentioned, as also the idols, were (as Michaelis observes) very small, something similar to those silver shrines, or models, of the temple of Diana at Ephesus, mentioned Acts 19, 24. (see Spencer 817.); so that both the case and the idol could conveniently be carried about, and moreover easily hidden. Besides, Moses has not recorded all that happened to the Israelites in the desert; since circumstances which he has omitted are found in the other Books of Scripture. See 2 Tim. 3, 8. and compare the note supra on ver. 39. Neither, however, was Moses without a suspicion that the Israelites paid such adoration to Moloch; as may be collected from Lev. 17, 19: 18, 21. 20, 2 seqq. (Kuin.) Possibly in this sense σκηνη may be understood in a passage of Diodor. Sic. 20, 65. (cited by Wets.) συνέβη τὴν ιερὰν σκηνήν ἀναχθήναι πλησίον οὕτων τοῦ βασιλέως.

48. καὶ τὸ ἀστέρι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν 'Ερμᾶς. For 'Ερμᾶς the Hebr. has יְרָם, a word, on the authority of the Arabic, explained by Kimchi, Abercorn, and most Commentators, of the star of Saturn. Saturn indeed is, in the Arabic, called يِرَمُّ, which De Dieu and Deyling take to denote properly that attribute of the Deity which communicates existence, duration, nature and aptitude to all things, from יְרָם, to fit, dispose, generate, make to exist. From the notion of rectitude proceeds the Chaldee יְרָם, just. Now of all kings Saturn is said to have been the most just, and the Saturnian times are celebrated for peculiar simplicity and equity; and that by the Syrians Saturn was called יְרָם we are told by Pococke, in his Spec. Hist. Ar. p. 390. The points were therefore wrongly placed by the Masorites, and we should read יְרָם, as has been well observed by Michaelis, Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr. 1229. Now
Saturn was worshipped by the Phœnicians (see Michaelis ubi supra), the antient Arabians (see Pococke, p. 140), and the antient Egyptians, whose superstition was followed by the Israelites. See Gattarar de Theogonia Egypt, p. 144. Comment. Gotting. vol. 7.

43. τὸ ἄστρων τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν, i. e. "the image of Saturn, whom ye account as a God, and worship under the image of a star." See Spencer, p. 809 seqq. On comparing the Hebr. and Sept. we perceive in the latter a transposition. It has however been found in some Hebrew MSS. and is preferred by Kennicott and Dahl. (Kuin.) The words τῶν τύπων are to be referred to Μολχα, who was carried about in a portable tabernacle, and Ρηφα, Saturn, whom the star represented. Now τύποι is often used of images of the gods; as in Joseph. Ant. 1, 19, 11. where it is employed of the little images stolen by Rachel from her father Laban; and often elsewhere. Hence, also, in Philo de Opif. p. 4 ν. τύποι and εἴδωλα are used promiscuously. And so Hesych. τύπος εἰκών. See Kypke, Krebs, and Loesner. The words προσκυνεῖν αὐτῶι are added by Stephen by way of explanation. (Kuin.)

48. καὶ μετωκιῶ πῶς επέκειναι Βαβυλώνοις. Καὶ here signifies and (so), itaque, therefore. See the note on Mark 3, 23. Joh. 6, 57. 7, 22. 5, 30. In order to complete the sense, we must supply some such words as the following, because of your sins, and those of your forefathers. Μετωκιῶ, "I will transplant, remove." The word is used of removal or banishment to another country. It occurs in the Old Testament; as in 1 Chron. 5, 26. 8, 6. Hos. 10, 5., and occasionally in the Classical writers. But in these it generally signifies no more than emigration, or voluntary change of residence; as in Thucyd. 1, 12. ἐλλὰς μετανίκησα καὶ μετωκιήσατο. Ἐπέκειναι is a compound expression, standing in the place of a preposition. In it there is an ellipsis of μεν, on which depends the genitive following. So Xen,
Anab. 5, 4, 3. It is, in the Classical writers, usually preceded by an article in any case, which also requires the subaudition of μέσος in some case agreeing with it; though sometimes, as in the present passage, the article is omitted. So Xen. Hist. 5, 1, 10. ἀνέβαινον τοῦ Ἡρακλείου ἐπέκεινα. This is not unfrequently the case in the later writers; especially Arrian, Appian, Polybius, and Diodorus Siculus. And thus it becomes entirely a preposition. I am not aware that the Classical writers ever take the yet greater liberty of omitting both the article and the genitive, and thus converting it into a mere participle, equivalent to our further, henceforward; as in 1 Macc. 9, 30. Ez. 89, 22. Mich. 4, 5. In the Hebr. and Sept. we have, for Babylon, Damascus, which some account a slip of memory. Others (as Kuinoel) consider it as a deliberate alteration, for the sake of greater effect; which seems, indeed, more probable: but I am inclined to think that such may have been the reading of some Hebrew and Greek Copies in the age of Stephen. And so Ὑἰκομενιος (71 D.): ὁ Στέφανος ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλονίας φησίν, ἄκολουθος τῇ Ἐβραίων ἐκδοσει. At least it comes to the same thing; for Damascus, being on the borders of Syria and Palestine, those that were removed to Babylon were indeed removed beyond Damascus. And (to conclude in the words of Bp. Pearce) as they were carried so far as into Media (see 2 Kings 17, 6.) which country lay not only beyond Damascus, but beyond even Babylon, Stephen, who knew that to be the fact, might justly say, as he does here, beyond Babylon; thereby fixing the place of their captivity more explicitly than the Prophet did, who spoke before the event had taken place.

44. Having thus far dwelt on the ingratitude of the Israelites towards God and Moses, and their impiety and idolatry, Stephen now treats of the place of true worship rendered unto God; and to the tabernacle of Moloch, before mentioned, he now opposes τὴν σκηνήν τοῦ μαρτυρίου.
The sum of this part of Stephen's discourse, in which he recalls to the minds of his auditors (ver. 44—47.) things well known to them, is as follows: "The tabernacle was built by Moses, at the command of God, and before it all our forefathers, up to the time of David, worshipped. David was desirous of building a temple to God, which might be a firm and stable edifice for Divine worship, and which could not be transferred to different places, as the tabernacle had been. But although David had obtained the favour of God, yet it was not the Divine pleasure that the Temple should be built by him, but by his son Solomon. And thus the place destined to sacrifices and Divine worship was changed. Therefore the worship of God is not by Him so bound to one place, that it cannot be transferred to any other: nay, this Temple, of which you so boast, may be destroyed, as was Solomon's."

44. Ἡ σκηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου. By this word the Greek Translators of the Old Testament express νημίζω λαόν, i. e. "the tabernacle destined to religious meetings, and from which God used to issue his oracles." See Exod. 29, 42 & 43. and compare 25, 22. and Numb. 7, 89. It comes from νημίζω, to meet. But the Sept. derived it from νημίζω, to testify, teach; by σκηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου meant the tent where God teacheth his people: for both μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρίον often denote teaching. (Kuin.) from Hammond, whose annotation the student may, with advantage, consult.

44. καθὼς διετάξατο—ὅν ἐσφάκει, (so built) as He who had conversed with Moses (i.e. God) had commanded him to build it after the example shown to him." See Exod. 25. compared with Hebr. 8, 5. (Kuin.) Cæcumenius explains: σκηνή τοῦ προστάγματος.

45. Ἀν καὶ εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. Διαδέχομαι signifies to receive any thing as delivered (διὰ) by the hands of any one, or to receive any thing as left or bequeathed. It takes an accusative of the
thing or of the person, either expressed or understood; and it sometimes merely means *to succeed,* with an accusative of the *person,* and sometimes of the *thing* bequeathed, inherited, or succeeded to. Examples of all these uses may be seen in Kypke, Krebs, and Loesner, who have satisfactorily proved that we must not, with some Commentators, refer δια-δεῖγμοι to οἱ πατέρες, but subaud αὐτὴν, i.e. σκηνήν. Moreover Grotius, De Dieu, and others (following the Vulgate) take ἐν for εἰς; as in a very similar passage of Numb. 32, 5. δοθήτω ἡμῖν ἡ γῆ ἐν κατασχέσει and Deut. 32, 51. The words are therefore to be thus rendered: “which our ancestors, under the guidance of Joshua, brought into a land occupied by Gentiles.”

45. ἔν ξεσωσ' ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου π. τ. η. So the Hebr. ὡς ὑμῖν in Exod. 34, 24. Deut. 11, 23, 2, 21. Ὡ is also for ἂ. See the note on 1, 1. and 3, 25. The same idiom is found in an ancient Punic inscription mentioned by Procop. l. 2. Bell. Vand. (cited by Grot. and Elsner) ἄμειν ἐσμέν οἱ φυγόντες ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰσραήλ τοῦ λῃστῶν ὑπὸ Ναυν, where I conjecture Ναῦν, Νυν. Thus ν and η are perpetually confounded.

45. ἔσε τῶν ἡμερῶν Δαβίδ. There has been some doubt whether this clause should be referred to the immediately preceding words, ξεσωσ' ὁ Θεὸς, or the more remote ones ἔσε τῶν ἡμερῶν Δαβίδ. The latter mode is sanctioned by the common punctuation, and is adopted by the generality of Commentators. But this requires us to add some such words as ἔσοντες αὐτὴν, by a most arbitrary and harsh ellipsis. Besides, as Bp. Pearce observes, there is no reason to think that Moses's Tabernacle was in being up to David's time; since in Eli's days, and afterwards, though mention is made of the *Ark,* no mention is made of the *Tabernacle,* it being probably worn out and unfit for use. And this indeed (as Bp. Pearce, Owen, and Kuinoel remark,) is confirmed by facts; since it is certain that up to the time of David, the Israelites had to maintain a contest with the Canaan.
ites, and it was David alone that finally subdued and destroyed the last remnants of those barbarians. Nor is this interpretation, as Heinrichs thinks, less suitable to the context. For, as Kuinoel observes, though it was the intent of the speaker to notice that the Israelites had, up to the time of David, worshipped under this tabernacle, yet this circumstance is suggested in the following words, and was too well known to his auditors to need insisting on. Swayed by these considerations therefore, many (as Bp. Pearce, Dr. Owen, and Kuinoel) remove the comma at ἡμῶν, and adopt the former construction.

46, 47. ὅς εὑρε τὰ χάριν ἐν των Θ. Εὐρίσκει, like the Hebr. ἠν, often signifies to obtain (see the note on Luke 1, 30). The fact is narrated in 2 Sam. 7. Aἰτεῖν, like the Hebr. אַּתְּנָה, signifies not only to wish, desire, &c. ἢ ἄνευτο, i.e. asked for himself. So Doddridge, who well renders, "made it his petition." The following εὑρε creates some little difficulty. But it may be removed by referring to Ps. 132, 5. which is here plainly alluded to, and where it is evident that the Hebr. לָּתַּב must be interpreted, to find out (a place whereon I may build) an habitation for, &c. Now the latter member of the sentence is an exegetical parallelism of the former; and the ellipsis is so much the less harsh, since the word place (ἐπιστόρ, or τός) is found in the former member. Thus there will no be no occasion to resort to the harsh and unauthorized interpretation proposed by De Dieu, and adopted by Kuinoel.

46. Σκήνωμα, or σκηνή, like ὁσκος, is used of any house, but both words are used, κατ' ἐξοχήν, of a temple, or habitation of a deity. Σκήνωμα is by T. Mag. treated as an Hellenistic term.

48. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ὑψιστος ἐν χειροποιητοισ ναιοκ κατοικεῖ. See the note on ver. 44. and compare similar sentiments in 1 Kings 8, 27. Acts 17, 24. The words may be thus paraphrased: "But God needs not a temple in which to inhabit, nor is He contained by a temple.
He is circumscribed by no place; the whole universe built by his power is his temple."

48. χειροτονισάω, made with (human) hands. This word is applied both to idols, and to temples; as in Is. 16, 12. and Mark 14, 58. and indeed to that our Lord seems to have alluded. Grotius has here a learned and interesting note, in which he observes that the early Christians avoided applying the name temple to their places of worship, as being used of pagan edifices. "They were content (says he) to call them ecclesia, houses of assembly, houses of God." So Zeno: Quo tibi Ecclesia, si adeunda sint templa? And this distinction was long observed by the early Fathers and Christian Emperors." See more in Grot.

49, 50. "Here we have (says Kuinoel), Is. 66, 1 & 2. quoted from memory." Be that, however, as it may, the difference between the words of Stephen and what we have in our present Sept. is scarcely any, except in the concluding member, where the interrogative sentence including a negation is strongly affirmative, and they are by Stephen expressed in an affirmative sentence. A liberty not greater than such as are often found in the Septuagint: and therefore it is not impossible that some copies might have it in the time of Stephen. Kuinoel observes, that the Prophet then proceeds to reprehend his countrymen, who were boasting too much of the Temple, and, content with the external forms of religion, neglected real and substantial piety, and promised themselves all safety and prosperity because Jehovah dwelt among them. The words ἱδὲ γὰρ ὑποτέκων may be very well illustrated from the following passages. Lucian de Conscr. Hist. 27. (on Jupiter) τοῦ ὑποτέκων ἱδὲ τὸ τε εἰδουργεῖς καὶ τὸ εὐφέστων θαυμάζεις: which passage is cited by Wetstein, among many others, on Matt. 22, 42. Orpheus ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. 5. (cited by Lampe on John): Αὐτὸσ δ' αὐτὸ μέγαν αἰθίον ἐπ' οὕρανον ἑτηρίκται Χειρέω εἰς θέσιν, γαλὴ δ' ὑπ' ἡτοιμασιν βέβηκεν. Eurip. Jone, v. 1, 2. Ατλασ ὁ χαλέντως νῦν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Θεῶν παλαινὸν οἶκον ἐκτείνον.
51. The discourse of Stephen is now manifestly interrupted; nor does what follows exactly cohere with the preceding. The style is suddenly changed, and the speaker, who hitherto had recounted the history of the Jewish people in a calm and tranquil spirit, does not go forward in his narration; nor does he shew what he meant to be inferred from this enumeration of the fortunes of the Jewish people; but breaks off the thread of his discourse, speaks animo concitato, and sharply rebukes the judges. Hence some have thought that Stephen, in fact, said more, but that St. Luke has, for the sake of brevity, omitted it. (See Limborch in loc.) Others, however, (more rightly,) maintain that Stephen was here interrupted by his auditors. Those who support this opinion, most of them suppose that Stephen's discourse was interrupted by the tumult and clamour of the judges and the people, who demanded the death of the prisoner. This, however, is extremely improbable. For if Stephen had been compelled to break the thread of his history by the clamours and violence of the auditors, one does not see how it could happen that the author of the narration should pass this by, since he, further on, in ver. 54, has, in express words, related what effect this last part of the discourse had on the minds of his auditors; nor does it easily appear how the person who took down the discourse in writing could have heard these words. But these difficulties vanish, if we suppose that Stephen was interrupted only by the low murmurings and gestures of the hearers*. For the Sanhedrim, who had already determined to put him to death, weary with his long discourse, and irritated with the

* And so Doddridge, who paraphrases thus: "And Stephen finding, by a confused noise murmur in the place, that they understood whither his discourse was leading them, and perceiving by the eagerness of their countenance that they would be like soon to interrupt him, applied himself more closely to his persecutors in these remarkable words, which he boldly addressed to them under the influence of the Holy Spirit, by whose immediate direction he spoke," &c.
tacit reprehension of themselves which it contained, and clearly seeing whither this discourse tended, now began to evince their angry feelings, both by countenance, gestures, and murmurs. But Stephen, stung to the quick at this unreserved declaration of their obstinacy and malignity, now utters in vehemently accusatory language what, if they had not interrupted him, he would have couched in other and milder expressions. How it happened that he who took down the discourse in writing did not record this interruption, Heinrichs has well accounted for, by supposing that he did not wish to break the thread of it by recording the interruption, which, as it probably consisted chiefly in gestures, or at most hisses, or low murmurs, might be little perceived by the writer. That Stephen should have indulged in somewhat too bitter a strain against the hearers, and in this instance fallen short of the meekness of Jesus Christ, is, considering all things, excusable, since the rebukes were, upon the whole, well merited, and he had himself just cause for complaint. At all events, the indignant feeling was very transient, and more than atoned for by the Christian meekness with which he breathed out his spirit in entreating mercy and pardon for his murderers. (Kuin.)

The same view of the subject has been taken by Rosenmuller, and, upon the whole, it seems a tolerably correct one. I cannot, however, commend the hypothetical air which is thrown over Heinrich's annotation; nor can I approve of the over minute diligence shewn in accounting for the interruption not being recorded, by supposing the speech to have been taken down in writing by a single tachygraph, or short-hand writer. This is (not to say irreverent) altogether suppositional, and is allowing nothing to the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit, which, we may suppose, would sufficiently assist the inspired writer in recording this finely conceived address.

51. σκληροτράχηλοι, stiff-necked, obstinate. In most languages obstinacy and disobedience are expressed
by words derived from hardnesp. See Fisch. Prol. de Vit. Lex. 214. Hence σκληρωκαρδία in Matt. 19, 8. and Sirach 6, 10 & 11. where σκληροτράχυλος is used in the same sense. By the Hebrews a person of that sort is called πήγυς; as in Ex. 32, 9. where Symmachus, Theod. and the Sept. have σκληροτράχυλος, which, indeed, is frequently so used in the Sept.; as in Deut. 11, 6. Prov. 29, 1. See also Hesiod. Opp. 146, and Tzetzes on this passage. Here too we may compare Cic. Ep. ad Dio. 6, 13. Non fore in te Cassarem duriorem, where duriorem is opposed to milioem. Terent. Heaut. 4, 1, 51. Quam timui vale ne nunc Animo ita esses duro! Schoettgen and Wets. adduce examples from the Rabbinical writers. See Valcknaer.

51. ἀπειρίμπτοι τῇ καρδίᾳ κ. τ. ὁ. Ἄπειρίμπτοι, uncircumcised, answers to the Heb. ילע in Gen. 17, 14.: but here it is taken in a figurative sense. For the external circumcision was a symbol of mental and moral purity, and extirpation of evil affections and desires. So Philo, p. 450. τὸ περιτεμνεσθαι, ἤδην καὶ παθῶν πάντων ἐκτελή, καὶ δόξης ἀνδρείας ἀπερίμπτους συμβαίνειν. Hence, in the Old and New Testament, περιτομή is applied to the mind, and metaphorically used of those who abstain from vice, and suppress evil inclinations. So Jer. 4, 4. (Sept.) περιτεμνεσθαι τὴν σκληρωκαρδίαν υμῶν, where Symmachus has ἀφέλεσθαι τοιοῦτος τῶν καρδιῶν υμῶν. See Orat. Manass. ver. 11. and Philo 3, 3. Thus by the ἀπειρίμπτοι τῇ καρδίᾳ are meant men whose vices are uncorrected, and in whom evil propensities still retain their original sway. See Lev. 26, 41. and Ezek. 44, 7 & 9. In like manner, by the ἀπειρίμπτοι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς are denoted those whose ears are stopped, who obstinately turn a deaf ear to the Divine precepts.* This censure is frequent in the Old Testament, and so much the more severe, since the Jews

* And so Bp. Pearce, who observes that by the uncircumcised ears are meant such as have ears and hear not. And he compares Jer. 6, 10. their ear is uncircumcised, and they cannot hearken.
were proud of circumcision, and thought it affiliated them with the favoured people of God. (Kuin.) The metaphor is frequent in the Rabbinical writings, from which many examples are adduced by Schoettgen.

51. Τῷ Πνεύματι τῶ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε, you have perpetually resisted the Holy Spirit, i.e. the admonition of inspired precepts. (Kuin.) Ἀνατιππέτει, Valcknaer tells us, is properly used of a contrary wind; as in Plut. Thes. p. 13 d. (cited by Wets.) μηδὲν ἀντιπίπτει παρὰ τῶν ἱστορικῶν τοῖς τραγικοῖς. This might, however, be more truly affirmed of ἀντιπατριγίω (see Thucyd. 3, 22.); and the primitive idea seems to be rather that of one body falling foul of, or impinging another; and therefore the word came to denote resistance of any kind, both military and otherwise. It has been illustrated by Raphel, De Rhoer, Wets. and Irnisch on Herodot. 6, 3, 13. See also Grotius and Priceus. Καὶ has the sense of (so) also, by an ellipsis of οίτως. See Schl. Lex.

52. τίνα τῶν προφητῶν, &c. See Matt. 21, 33. seqq. 23, 34. seqq. and Luke 18, 34. Kuinoel observes that these words are not to be too much pressed; which is very true. Yet the history of the Jews might almost justify a literal application of them.* By the τοῦ δικαίου is meant the Messiah, i.e. Jesus Christ, so called by way of eminence. Compare Is. 53, 11. Zach. 9, 9. and Acts 3, 14.

52. οὗ ὁμοίως προδόται καὶ φονεῖς γεγένησθε. Προδόται they were by delivering him into the hands of Pilate; and φονεῖς by delivering him to Pilate in order to be put to death, and thus procuring his murder. Wetstein cites a passage of Diodor. Sic. where

* Here Doddridge observes, that there is no reason to conclude from hence that many scriptures containing the history of these persecutions are destroyed by the Jews, as Mr. Whiston maintains. "It is natural (says he) to understand this in a limited sense, only as intimating that most of them suffered such unworthy usage; and we know that attempts were sometimes made to cut off all the prophets of Jehovah at once. See 1 Kings 19, 10 & 14. and compare 2 Chron. 36, 16."
PRODÔTIS and Foveus are united, to hint, I suppose, that there is here a sort of climax. It is finely remarked by Grotius (ap. Dodd.) that the Sanhedrim was obliged, by virtue of its very constitution, to guard and defend the lives of the Prophets with peculiar care, how much more to protect such a divine messenger as Christ was from any injurious assault; instead of which they had not only basely deserted him, but had themselves become principals in his murder.

53. oitwes edábeta twn vómov ein diasayadí aggéláwn. On the interpretation of the formula ein diasayadí aggéláwn, the Commentators are by no means agreed. (See Wolf on this passage.) Grotius, Calovius, Glass, Heumann, Krebs, Loesner, Morus, and others, explain: "hosts of angels being present at the promulgation of the Law," or, "amongst troops of angels;" since (say they) diatássew not only denotes to constitute, and also to promulgate a law, but is likewise used of the disposition of troops for battle; as in Judith 2, 16. Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 12. 8, 5, 2. So that diasayal may mean troops, ranks; ein, too, being taken for en." Now since at Gal. 3, 19. the Law is said to have been diatayel di' aggéláwn, and at Heb. 2, 2. kaleisthai di' aggéláwn, the above Commentators render the words thus: "the law promulgated in the presence of angels;" as in 2 Tim. 2, 2. die polloí martírow. And Philo. 1019 a. die martírow kladíew. This interpretation of the passages of Gal., Heb., and the present they think is unquestionably true, since diatássew is a word appropriate to legislation. (See Krebs and Loesner.) "Besides, to God alone (say they) and not to angels (as appears from Scripture) is the promulgation of the Law suitable. See Exod. 21, 1. 19, 22." On the contrary, I accede to the opinion of those who explain the words: "ye have received the Law promulgated by Angels." (See Beza, Hammond, Kraus, and Heinrichs on this passage.) Kopp and Berger on Galat., and Carpzov. on the Hebrews. Now diatássew denotes generally to order and com-
mand (See Luke 8, 55. 17, 19.); also to appoint by edict, promulgate a law. (See Acts 18, 2.) Aelian V. H. 2, 15. τῶν πολιτικῶν ἐκαστα διατάτειν. Hesiod Theog. 74. (speaking of Jupiter) εὖ δὲ ἐκαστα Ἀθανάτος διέταξε ὅμως, καὶ ἐπέφραξε τιμάς. & Opp. 276. Τώνε γὰρ ἀνθρώπων νόμον διέταξε κρονίων. Hence διατάγῃ denotes a mandate, appointment, promulga-
tion (as in Rom. 13, 1.); διατάγμα an edict, order; like διάταξις in Ps. 119, 9. Eis is for ἐν or ἀνά. So that ἐλάβετε τῶν νόμων εἰς διατάγμα ἀγγέλων is equiva-
 lent to ἐλάβετε τῶν νόμων διατάγματα δι' ἀγγέλων. And so the words were taken by the Scholiast Cod. Mosq. The plural is moreover put for the singular. Nor need it be objected to this interpretation, that διατάσσειν is suitable only to God, and not to angels; for God promulgated the Law by the ministry of angels. Besides, the passages of Galat. and Heb., unless they be interpreted in a very contort manner, confirm this mode of explanation. In the narration, indeed, of Moses (Ex. 14, 22. seqq.) there is no mention made of the ministry, nay, not even of the presence of angels. But in Deut. 38, 2. the Greek Translators have, to the words κύριος ἐκ Σινᾶ ἦκεi added, ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγγέλων μετ' αὐτοῦ. In fact, it was the opinion of the ancient Jews that God, on all solemn occasions, when He declares his especial presence, is accompanied by angels (see the note on ver. 30.), and that He was so at the promulgation of the Law at Mount Sinai. In succeeding ages, this opinion was not restricted to the presence, but included the ministry of angels; and in the times of the Apostles it was a received opinion among the Jews, that the Law was promulgated by angels, as secondary authors. There is a remarkable passage to this purpose in Joseph. Ant. 15, 5, 3. ἡμῶν τὰ κάλλιτα τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ ὀσιότατα τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαθέντας. Finally, this interpretation is confirmed by many passages of the Rabbinical writers, produced by Wetstein and Schoettgen, Gal. 8, 19. Jalkut Ruben, fol. 107, 3.
Deus Mosen legem docuit; cùm autem descenderet—tanto timore perculsus est, ut omnium oblivisceretur. Deus autem statim Jesifiam angelum legis vocavit, qui ipsi legem tradidit bene ordinatam et custoditam: omnesque angeli amici ejus facti sunt. (Kuin.)

In this latter interpretation I must acquiesce, which is also supported by Schoettgen and Bp. Pearce. Doddridge adopts the first mentioned one; but I agree with Kuinoel that it has never been proved that διαταγή has any such signification as troop, squadron. Chrysostom (followed by ΟΕυμενιος) explains it; ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον τὸν διαταγθέντα, τὸν ἐγχειρισθέντα αὐτῷ δι' ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἑρθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἑτορ. But this interpretation, however ingenious, and in some respects preferable to the first mentioned one, yet is too harsh; and especially as it requires the plural to be taken for the singular.

54, 55. διετριβέντα. See the note on 5, 38. Πληρὴς Πνεύματος ἁγίου. This is explained by recent Commentators, "filled with sacred ardour, full of fortitude and tranquility." But this is an unjustifiable lowering of the sense, which requires, "completely animated and supported by the influence of the Holy Spirit." On ἀτελέσας see the note on Luke 22, 56, and Acts 1, 10. It is of more importance, however, to enquire into the meaning of the words ἐδὲ δὲξαν Θεοῦ. By the δὲξα Grotius, Wolf, Menochius, and others, would understand a cloud emitting lightning, as a symbol of the Divine presence; especially as the heaven is just after said to have opened; which is applicable to lightning. And they refer to Matt. 8, 16. But this is exceedingly lowering the grandeur of the idea; and (as Kuinoel objects) the spectators saw nothing of it. This is also a sufficient answer to the hypothesis of Menochius and Witsius, that the heaven was really divided, or rendered transparent, so that the throne of Christ's glory there became visible. For, as Doddridge remarks, it would thus have been a miracle exerted in respect.
to all present to prevent them from seeing it. Still less can I approve of the interpretation of several recent Theologians, as Michaelis, who take the words to be no more than an highly figurative expression of Stephen, arising from firm faith in Jesus, and a persuasion that he should soon be with him; and who represent that Stephen was as firmly persuaded of what he did not see, as if he had really seen it. This is, surely, quite explaining away the plain sense of the words, and supposes high poetic imagery in a simple prose passage. It is not as if there had been no more than ἄρεινας εἰς τὸν οὐρανῷ, ἐλθὲ δόξαν Θεοῦ, &c. But Stephen also affirms that he sees this. The best-founded opinion seems to be that of some antient, and most modern Commentators, who maintain that the thing said to be done is to be explained of an ἐκστάσις, or visionary representation, or (as Doddridge says) God's miraculously* operating on his imagination; as when Ezekiel sat in his house at Babylon among the elders of Judah, and saw Jerusalem, and seemed to himself transported thither. See also Is. 6. Apoc. 4, 2. Acts 9, 10.

This standing of Jesus at the right hand of God does not (whatever may be urged to that effect by Fabricius and Wolf), like the frequent phrase, "sit at the right hand of God," denote the royal dignity and majesty of God, but (as is remarked by Ecumenius, from Chrysostom, and other Fathers) the present and perpetual assistance of God: ἐστάτα καὶ οὐκ ἐκαθημένος ο μακάριος Στέφανος ἁρὰ τῶν Ἰησοῦν, ἵνα δέῃ τὴν ἀντίληψιν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν, καὶ τὸλλόν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ τὴν προθυμίαν παράσχεν, τὸ τῷ Βαθυσάντος ἐπιδείκνυται σχῆμα. The same view of the subject has been adopted by Grotius, Taylor, Doddridge, Rosenm. Knapp, and Kuinoel.

57. κράζεντες δὲ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. There is neither support from MSS. nor probability in the conjecture of Battier and Vaclnaer, κράζουσας; though it must

* I say miraculously, since the imagination of itself is not capable of performing any such wonders. (Doddr.)
be admitted that the term is sometimes applied to loud and earnest oratory, both in the New Testament, and in the Classical writers. As to the objection of Valknaer, that one does not see why the Jews should have stopped their ears, as if they had themselves been loudly vociferating, this is a mere quibble, and proceeds upon a misunderstanding of the purpose for which they stopped their ears, which was not so much to avoid hearing the words of Stephen, as a symbolical mode of expressing detestation and abhorrence at hearing blasphemy. See Matt. 27, 23. Joh. 19, 12. and Acts 19, 28 & 32. where of those who at ver. 28. are said κραζέων, as here, at ver. 29. ἄφησαν ὅμοθυμαδὸν, εἰς τὸ θεατρόν, συναρπάσαντες Γαίου καὶ Ἄρισταρχον.

57. ἔσχαξον τὰ ἀκούσαν, they stopped their ears. The word properly signifies to hold or draw together, as drawing close the strings of a satchel; and is therefore more properly applied to closing the ears, than to stopping them (though both produce the same effect). This is, in Latin, expressed by occludere aures. Priceus and Wets. produce many passages illustrative of the phrase, the action, and the thing signified. Of these the most important are Pollux. 2, 82. τὸ δὲ ἐμπέσασθαι τὴν ἀκούσαν ἐστὶ τὸ ταῖν χειρὸν φραγηναί καὶ ἐπιλαβεῖν δὲ τὰ ἀκοῦσαν, πεφραζθαι τὰ ἀκοῖν. Plut. p. 1095 Ε. τὰ ἀκοῖν καταλῆψα ταῖς χεραῖς καὶ βδελυγμένοις. Ib. 649 & 783. where we have the expression ἔσχαξασθαί τὰ ἀκοῖν. Philo. 384, 28. οὗτοι προσοποπευομένους ἐκατέρα ταῖν χειρῶν τὰ ἀκοῖν, μὴ ἄρα τι ἐναυλον ἄπολειψθαν ἀρίθμων — ἔφησασθαί. Irenæus ap. Euseb. H. E. 5, 20. (speaking of Polycarp): εἴ τι τιμωτὸν ἀκύροις ἐκεῖνος ὁ μακάριος καὶ ἀποστολικὸς πρεσβύτερος, ἀνακράζει καὶ ἐμφάζει τὰ ἀκοῦσαν. Cic. pro Sextio 50. Apulej. 9. Exhorruit Myrmex inauditum facinus, et occlusis auribus aufugit protinus. Hom. Od. 177 & 47. Acts 19, 34. Sir. 27, 14. Ps. 58, 5 & 6. from all which, and from other passages, including Rabbinical ones, it appears
that closing or stopping the ears was an usual action with the antients on using blasphemy or indecency. So that it was a symbolic action, expressive of detestation and abhorrence.

58. ἐλθοβόλου. Markland on Lys. 167. conjectures ἐλθοβόλγουν. But he afterwards abandoned this emendation. Many critics, however, as Valcknaer, stumble at the expression, which they maintain cannot be understood of the stoning itself, since that was commenced by the witnesses. Hence some think that the first λιθοβολοῦν denotes only the commencement of the action. But this mode is liable to the same objection with the last. Others take the former ἐλθοβολοῦν to denote the wish or intention, the latter the execution of it. Heinrichs understands it of preparation for stoning.

But all this seems little more than solemn trifling. Markland indeed observes, that if it be taken otherwise there will be an unnecessary repetition of the same thing. Now surely at repetition, (which is so characteristic of the Oriental, Hellenistic, and Scriptural style,) so learned a man ought not to have stumbled: and as to unnecessary, why should we be so rigid in criticising popular phraseology, in which many things, strictly speaking, not necessary, occur? I assent to Klosius, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, that the thing is expressed more historicorum (or rather in the way of popular narration), first generally (ver. 56.), and then (after an insertion respecting the keeping of the clothes by Saul) particularly (ver. 57 & 58.) i.e. by whom he was stoned; and then some remarkable circumstances are narrated, which attended the stoning.

58. οἱ μάρτυρες ἀκέδεντο τὰ ἱμάτια.* See 6, 18.

* This was necessary, since the stones were exceedingly large.

"The sad office (observes Schoettgen) of inflicting death on the criminal devolved on the witnesses. Therefore, if their testimony was true, they did a good work, since they administered justice. But if their testimony was false, such a witness put to death an innocent person. See Sanhedrin, fol. 45, 1. cited by Lightfoot."
Acts of the Apostles, Chap. VII.

"They laid aside their clothes (says Theophylact), to be lighter for their office." Wets. here observes, that though the whole procedure was illegal (see the note on Matt. 26, 66.), yet (as Grotius and Beza suggest) they wish to seem to do nothing against the law, by which it was ordered that the witnesses should cast the first stone. See Deut. 17, 7.

58. νεανίου, a youth. Saul had indeed then attained unto manhood; but this expression, including νέος and νεανίκος, is also used of men, and those in the flower of their age. Thus David, in his combat with Goliad, is by Joseph. Ant. 7, 9, 2. styled νεανίκος, though he was then thirty years old. And D. Cass. 36. calls Julius Caesar νέος, when about forty years old. Caesar, too, calls Anthony adolescens when thirty years of age. See Cort. on Sallust. Cat. 38, 1. Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 12.

58. ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα: Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δ. τ. π. μ. It is plain that Stephen here offers up prayers to Jesus. Why so many Commentators should have been anxious to make Stephen offer them up unto God the Father, I know not. Kuinoel, very properly, defends the common interpretation, which, as he observes, is confirmed by Apoc. 12, 20. where by the words ἐρχον κύριε Ἰησοῦ it is plain that Jesus is addressed in prayer. Hence it is strange that Dr. Bentley, Klotz, and Valcknaer, should have proposed to insert Θεόν after ἐπικαλούμενον. Bentley thinks that the Θεόν, i.e. ΘΌN has been absorbed by the preceding ω. But the article is also required, and indeed is found in the text of Chrysostom's 54th Homily. It is however put between brackets, as if spurious, and has every appearance of having come from the margin. Certainly there is no reason to suppose, from Chrysostom's own words, that Schoettgen then proceeds to say, that he has not seen any mention in the Jewish writers of this custom of laying down clothes and committing them to the charge of another. Therefore the following passage may be acceptable, Aristoph. Vesp. 408. ἀλλὰ ὑμάτια βαλόντες θείον.
he so read. But be that as it may, the reading cannot be received, since (as Markland observes) it is far from being necessary to understand Θεὸν after ἐπικαλούμενον, that it is quite contrary to Stephen's intention, which was to die a martyr to the divinity of Jesus Christ. So that it is him only he invokes, as if it had been written ἐπικαλούμενον [τόν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν], καὶ λέγοντα, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι, &c. calling upon the Lord Jesus, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. See Doddridge, Whitby, and Grotius. Such subauditions, or repetitions ἀντὶ τοῦ καίνου, from the context, are, even in the Classical writers, sometimes taken from the words which follow; though it is accounted careless writing. The other perversion of the passage, by which Ἰησοῦ is taken for a genitive, is too absurd to deserve a moment's attention, since that would require the article before Ἰησοῦ, and such an expression too is unauthorized in the New Testament.

59. δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμα μου. On this expression many Commentators trifle egregiously. Wets. compares Cic. in Varr. 5, 45. But it is nothing to the present purpose, since there we have only the expression "ut filiorum extremum spiritum ore excipere sibi liceat." Bolten explains, "make an end of my life;" and Kraus, "receive my life as a sacrifice:" both equally far-fetched, and, the former especially, frigid. It is evident that Stephen imitates the example of his blessed Master. See Luke 23, 34. Kuijnol very properly retains the common interpretation, rendering, "receive my soul to the eternal habitations." And he refers to his notes on Luke 16, 9. Joh. 14, 2. This, too, was the very opinion entertained by the Jews, who (as Schoettgen observes) maintained "that the just died easiest, when God himself receive their souls." And he cites Jalkut Rubeni, fol. 36, 2. Justi perfecti non moriuntur ab Angelis mortis, sed tantum per נפש, osculum, nam ושברירה מצבי ונפש, ipsa Schechina animas eorum suscipit. The הָנָשִׁי, which occurs in this passage,
Schoettgen illustrates by the following remarks:

"祂verted autem ipsis est genus mortis levissimum, quando Deus os suum quasi ad os moribundi applicat, animamque sic elicit. Originem hujus phraseos desumserunt ex Deuter. 34, 5. ubi Moses dicitur mortuus esse הָמוּר, ad os Domini, quod proprie denotat, secundum mandatum Domini, sed Judei more suo verba ista in sensu propriissimo accipunt, contra regulas bonae interpretationis."

60. θείς τὰ γόνατα, laying or putting his knees to the ground, throwing himself on his knees. A posture suitable to fervent prayer. See Mark 15, 19. Luke 22, 41. Acts 9, 41. Kuinoel observes, that when they were laying aside their garments, Stephen uttered the words Κύριε, &c.; and when struck by the blows, said: Κύριε μὴ στίγμης αὐτός τίν ἀμαρτίαν ταύτην. A somewhat remarkable expression, which will be understood by bearing in mind the following observations of the Philologists:

Ἰστημί, like the Hebr. לְשׁ, signifies to weigh, to try weight by the balance. So T. Mag. ἴναστατῶ. See Pollux 4, 171. and Valcknaer on Euripid. Frag. C. 25. p. 288. The complete phrase is ἴσταναι ἐν Διόνυσ (which is found in Jer. 31. ὁ ἴστησα τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν Διόνυσ), or σταθμῶν as in Herodot. 2, 68. ἴστασι φασί σταθμὸ ποὺς ἀγαθον τῶς τρίχας. Hence, (since the antients used, not to number, but to weigh out money) ἴστημι signifies to pay; like the Hebr. לְשׁ, which the Sept. render by τίῳ and ἀποτίῳ. (See Munthe and Raphael in loc.) Now God is by the Hebrews represented as weighing the actions of men, when He is about to visit them with retribution; as things are thrown into a pair of scales, when a price according to their weight is to be paid down. See Job. 31, 6. Dan. 5, 27. Hence the formula properly denotes, "do not examine their sin in the balance;" i.e. do not visit it with punishment.* (Kuin.) See the note on Matt. 26, 15. The

* In illustration of this metaphor Elner cites Isidor. Orig, l. 15, c. 17. Stipendium a stipe pendendâ nominatum: Antiqvæ enim ap-
above illustrations are almost entirely founded on
the annotations of Grotius, Heinsius, and Elsner;
from the first of whom I add the following:

"Quia autem in rationibus æquandis, quod alteri
imputo id non minus me liberat quam si penderem,
id est solverem, hinc factum est ut ιερασκα sit im-
putare. Et propter similitudinem quam crimina
cum debitis pecuniariis habent, (que de re egimus
libro 2. de Jure Belli ac Pacis C. 20. § 2.) sicut
solvere dicitur paenas qui eas patitur, ita imputare
qui eas exigere vult, non imputare qui exigere non
vult. Hic autem, ne impedas aut imputes, hoc
valet, "Ne tanti hoc crimine facias, ut viam illis ad
conversionem obstruas."

60. ἐκοιμήθη. An euphemism. See the note on
Joh. 11, 11. It should seem scarcely applicable to
those who die a violent death; yet that it is some-
times so applied has been proved by Lederlin Obs.
Misc. See Suicer’s Thes. T. 2, 121. Here, how-
ever, St. Luke has reference to the composure with
which this great martyr met death.

pendere pecuniam soliti erant, magis quæm annumerare. And he
refers to Meursius on Lycoph. 270; remarking too, that this mode
of speaking was common with the Jews, who used to say that the
vices and virtues of all men would, at the last day, be cast into the
scales of two balances, and they would be everlastingly happy, or
erternally miserable, according as these or those preponderated. A
dogma adopted into the Mahometan system; as has been proved by
Mill in his Oration on "Mahometanism as derived chiefly from Ju-
So also Job. 31, 6. "The Lord will weigh me in a just balance, and
will understand my righteousness." And Dan. 5, 27. "Thou hast
been weighed in the balance, and found wanting." Compare also
Ps. 90, 8. and see Schoettgen. Wetzstein here cites Maimonid. de
Poenit. 3. Singulls annis appendunt et examinant iniquitates unius-
cujusque venientes in mundum, cum virtutibus et meritis suis.

Something similar to this saying of Stephen is recorded of So-
crates, and also of Phocion. See Priceus.
CHAP. VIII.

There now commences a new period of Christian history, in the first epoch of which (narrated from Chap. 1—8.) the Christian society consisted of Jews only, who had hitherto remained in the city of Jerusalem. For although many of those who, on the day of Pentecost, had come thither from various regions, seem, after their return home, to have communicated to their countrymen some idea, however imperfect, of Christian doctrine; yet the Apostles had hitherto continued within the walls of Jerusalem, nor had they taught in any other country. The congregation, therefore, at Jerusalem was tolerably numerous; but it had not yet entirely separated itself from the Jewish communion; since we read that, during the whole of this first period, the Apostles and all other Christians yielded obedience to the Jewish Sanhedrim, frequented the Temple at the stated hours of prayer, and taught in it. In one respect, only, was there seen any vestige of a private society, namely, that the Christians had their funds for the relief of the poor, the administration of which they committed to the care of seven persons, whom they called Deacons. Now follows St. Luke's narration of the further propagation and the fortunes of the Christian Religion. (Rosenm.)

After the martyrdom of Stephen, there burst upon the Christians, yet resident at Jerusalem, a most cruel persecution, by which, with the active co-operation of Saul, they were scattered and dispersed throughout Judea and Samaria (ver. 3 & 4). But that very circumstance tended to the increase of the new society, since, by this means, Christianity pervaded the whole of Palestine, being zealously promulgated by Philip the Deacon (see ver. 5. seqq. and ver. 40.), who thus scattered the seeds of the new Religion beyond the boundaries of Palestine.
Together with this narration is interwoven (ver. 9—25.) a history of Simon magus. (Heinrichs.)

1. Σαυλος δε ἢν — αυτου. It is quite plain that these words have a close connection with the concluding verse of the preceding Chapter. Συνεδοκειν signifies comprobare; as we familiarly say, "to be agreeable to any thing." The word occurs not unfrequently in the later Greek writers. Examples are produced by Munthe and others. I have only to add, that it is often found in Demades. When it takes a case, that case is a dative depending on the συν in composition. So also Polyæn. 5. fin. p. 588. συνέθησαντο τω φωνε. Grotius remarks that this, and what follows concerning Saul, is related for the purpose of showing δος εξ οιων, "quantum mutatus ab illo."

1. πάντες τε διεσπάρσαν. The πάντες must here be taken in the limited sense of very many. Πλη των ἀποστόλων, except the Apostles. We may suppose that they remained at Jerusalem, in order to confirm the faith and support the courage of those Christians who had not fled, and by devoting themselves to their sacred office, they trusted that God would show them the fit time to depart; which, in fact, he afterwards did. See 14, 9. & 32. (Kuin.) Cæcumenius, too, assigns a similar cause why they remained at Jerusalem, ἐνα γὰρ πλείων ὧν πόλεμος, ἐκεί παρατάτησαν τοὺς πρωταγωνίστας ἔδει, καὶ προκείθαι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνδρείας καὶ δάφανος υπόδειγμα.

2. συνεκόμισαν δε τῶν Στέφανον. Συγκομιζω signifies properly to bring together, as fruits: but it is also a funeral term, and, like the Latin componere, denotes not only the closing the eyes and laying out the body, but every other preparation for the funeral, and likewise the funeral rites themselves. Hence the Syriac Translator here renders: "they cofined and buried him." But this is too free and paraphrastic. This sense of the word is sometimes found in the Classical writers; as Soph. Aj. 1068. μη συγκομιζων, where the Scholiast, μη θελεθετευν συγ-
κομίζειν ἀπὸ τῶν συναγομένων καρπῶν εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας ἐκ' ἐκείνων γὰρ λέγεται κυρίας τὸ συγκομίζειν καὶ η ἄνακομίζειν. So also the Schol. on Æschyl. Theb. 930. But it is not very frequent. The passages of Thucyd. 6, 71. (not 72. as Schl. writes), and of Plut. 606., cited by Wetstein and Schleusner, are quite inapposite, since in them the sense is merely collect together, as spoken of corpses. Duker quotes another example from Xenophon. I am surprised that Heinsius, Valckn. and Kuin. should have embraced the anile fancy of the Scholiast on Sophocles, that this use of συγκομίζειν “has a figurative reference to what is mortal in man being committed to the earth, as to a barn.” Συγκομίζειν (I repeat) merely signifies componere, to lay out.

Εὐλαβείς, religious persons. Whether these were Christians, or not, is a point on which the Commentators differ. Some, as Doddridge and Priceus, think they were, and that the burial of Stephen was the cause of the immediately subsequent persecution. But I assent to Kuinoel, that it is not probable the Christians would have ventured on so dangerous a step; and, what is a stronger argument, the word εὐλαβής has no such sense in any other passage of the New Testament, but always (except in Luke 2, 45. ἀνήρ δεικνος καὶ εὐλαβής) denotes a proselyte. These (as almost all Commentators are agreed) were religious Jews, or Hellenist proselytes, and (as Kuinoel conjectures) secret friends to Christianity. Certainly, the more religious Jews regarded it as a sacred duty to bury the dead, especially if innocent persons. See 2 Sam. 2, 5. Tob. 1, 20. 2, 3. seqq: 4, 17. 12, 12.

2. καὶ ἐποιήσαντο κοπεῖν μέγαν ἐπὶ αὐτῶ. This signifies, by synecdoche, that they paid him very great funeral honours, of which beating the breast is mentioned as forming the principal part, accompanied by the wailing of the hired mourners, &c. So Hesych. κοπεῖν: τρῆνος μετὰ ψόφου χειρῶν. The expression seems borrowed from Gen. 50, 10. ἐκ-
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3. Σαῦλος δὲ ἐλομαίνετο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. This expression is equivalent to that in Gal. 1, 13. ἐδεικνύει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπόρθησεν αὐτὴν. The middle or deponent verb ἐλομαίνεσθαι (from λυμαί, damage, waste) signifies to ravage, worry, waste, &c., and is used properly of beasts; though it is not un freq uently employed of persons; it denotes, as applied to things, to waste, spoil, ravage; and sometimes to injure, afflict, persecute. Of all these uses numerous examples are produced by Wetstein and others. On the syntax of this verb, which has both the accusative and the dative, see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 384 & 409. Consult also Dresigius de Verbis mediis N. T. III. 41. p. 566.

3. κατὰ τῶν οἰκους εἰσπορευόμενος. It was the duty of the Sanhedrim to take care that no false doctrines should be promulgated, and to make inquisition after those who were introducing innovations into the Church. (See the note on Joh. 1, 19.) Saul, therefore, armed with public authority (see Acts 26, 10.), broke into houses to apprehend those whom he suspected of being Christians, or could perceive to have any connection with them. (Kuin.) Κατὰ has here a distributive force, and implies that he made domiciliary visits by house-row. Σύρων, hauling, dragging away. The word is used of forcible removal, and is especially applied to those who are led away to trial, prison, or execution. Examples in abundance are produced by Grotius, Princeus, Wet-
stein, Loesner, and other Philologists. See also Steph. Thes.

Kuinioel observes that mention is made both of men and women, to shew the bitterness of that persecution which did not even spare the weaker sex.

3. παρέδωκαν εἰς φυλακὴν, delivered them into custody, i.e. of the jailors, and (as Grotius thinks) of the prison which appertained to the Temple, like that which belongs to the Inquisition in some Roman Catholic countries.

4. οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες, those, therefore, who had been thus dispersed. At διηλθον subaud τὰς χώρας; as in 11, 19.; and at τῶν λόγων supply τοῦ Θεοῦ. It appears that they confined their teaching to the Jews. See 11, 19. (Kuin.) Thus (observes Lightfoot) out of the darkness of persecution the Lord bringeth forth the light and propagation of the Gospel, providing at once for the safety of some by flight, and for the calling of many others by their dispersion.

5. Φίλιππος δὲ κατέλθαν. There is here a frivolous question agitated between Drs. Whitby and Doddridge; the former of whom thinks it was not the whole Church of Jerusalem, but the hundred and eight who were full of the Holy Ghost; "for (says he) what authority could the laity have to preach the word?" To this Doddridge answers: "There is no room to inquire where these poor refugees had their orders. They were endowed with miraculous gifts; and if they had not been so, the extraordinary call they had to spread the knowledge of Christ, wherever they came among those who were ignorant of him, would abundantly justify them in what they did."

He evidently treats the communication of the Holy Spirit to the hundred and eight as hypothetical and precarious; as indeed it seems to be. He might, too, have added, that there is scarcely reason to think that any distinction between the Clergy and
Laity yet existed. Besides, the word is so general a term, that it does not necessarily imply what we mean by preaching, namely, public teaching, but only private instruction, admonition, or exhortation.

Dr. Hammond, in a learned note, offers some excellent remarks on the distinction between the words κηρύσσειν and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, to which I can only refer my reader. That it may be so taken here is plain; and there will be no reason to inquire about their authority; though if it could be proved (which it cannot) that they had the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, no other authority would seem to have been requisite. And yet the persons elected by the congregation, and presented for ordination by the Apostles, though previously filled with the Holy Ghost, required the laying on of hands, &c. in order to the exercise of their Deaconal office.

The Philip here mentioned must (as all Commentators admit) be Philip the Deacon. See Whitby.

5. κατελθὼν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας. The Commentators are not agreed whether by Σαμαρεία we are to understand the country of that name or its capital, which bore the same appellation. The former opinion is adopted by Pearce, Markland, and Doddridge, which last mentioned Commentator conjectures that the city was Sichem. But to this it has been justly objected, "how then could it be said further on, at ver. 14., that Samaria had received the Gospel, when only one of its cities had heard it preached." Some Commentators, indeed, would understand the singular for the plural. But this is a principle by no means applicable here; not to say that it is a method evidently devised "for the nonce." I assent to Grotius, the Authors of our English Version, De Dieu, Drusius, Priscæus, Hammond, Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, Heinrichs, and Schleusner, that the metropolis of Samaria is here meant, which was called by the same name (as in Joseph. Ant. 20, 6, 2.), and which, though it was destroyed by Hyrcanus, restored by Gabinius, and
by Herod named Σεβαστή, yet seems to have commonly retained its old name. As to what Bp. Pearce urges, that Josephus and Strabo generally call it by the name Sebastia, that is nothing to the purpose, since they called it so in compliment to Augustus. It has been observed, too, that cities and towns scarcely ever lose their original name. It might indeed seem that the article were requisite, which is found in some ancient MSS., but perhaps *ex emendatione*; for the Hellenistic writers often omit the article in such a case. It must be observed, too, that Σαμαρείας is for Σαμαρείαν; on which *state of regimen* for that of *apposition* see Glass Phil. S. p. 15. Kuinoel observes, that Philip preached the Gospel to the Samaritans, following the example of Christ, and mindful of what he had said to his Apostles before his departure from the earth. See Acts 1, 8.

6. προσέγχαν τε αἱ δυσλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις, &c. Ατ προσέγχαν subaud τὸν ναῦν: which ellipsis is sometimes found even in the Classical writers. (See the examples adduced by Kypke, Munthe, and others.) E. V., Doddridge, and most interpreters render it *attend, give heed*. But this seems too feeble a sense. I therefore assent to Krebs, Loesner, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, who explain it by *yield faith*, *assent, obedience*. This the context requires; for (as Kuinoel observes) it is interchanged at ver. 14. with πιστεύειν. Examples in abundance are produced by Loesner and Krebs; as 1 Macc. 7, 11. Sir. 28, 17. Philo 104 Λ. Joseph. Ant. 8, 15, 4. πιστεύειν and προσέχειν are conjoined, as are προσέχειν and ἀπιστεῖν in Joseph. c. Apion. 1, 1. So Sir. 32, 24. ὁ πιστεύων νόμα, προσέχει ἐντολαῖς. In like manner we familiarly say, "*don't mind* him." Kypke, Heumann, and Rosenmuller, indeed, defend the common interpretation, on the ground that it is not credible all the Samaritans should have followed Christ ὀμοθυμαδίων. That argument, however, has little force, since (as Kuinoel observes) the words are not to be too much
pressed, but only to be understood of the great bulk of the people; as in ver. 10. πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἐως μεγάλου. See Mark 3, 5. Matt. 3, 5.

7. The construction of the preceding words of this verse is as follows: πνεύματα γὰρ ἀκάθαρτα (ἐκ) πολλῶν τῶν ἑχοντων (αὐτὰ) βοῶντα μεγάλη φωνῇ ἐξήρ-χετα. See examples of similar transpositions in Glass. Phil. S. 664. On πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα see 5, 16. The words βοῶντα μεγάλη φωνῇ are to be referred to demoniacs. (Kuin.) Thus we say raving mad. Kuinoel, as usual, treats these demoniacs as melancholic and epileptic persons. A most specious hypothesis, but which, though supported by the learning and ingenuity of Mede, Bekker, Farmer, Wetstein, Maltby, and many others, lies open to very serious objections. Into so extensive a subject, the nature of my plan, and limited extent of my work, will not permit me to enter. It may be observed that the παρακατώ-μενοι are those elsewhere called παραλυτικοί.

9. ἀνὴρ—Σίμων προοιμήρχεν ἐν τῇ πόλει μαγεύων. I assent to the opinion of Wolf, Heuman, Krebs, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, that this Simon was the Simon a Cyprian mentioned by Joseph. (Ant. 20, 5, 2.) whose words are these: Φιλιξ—Σίμωνα ὑμάτι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλων Ἦοδαίον, Κόπτριον τὸ γένος, μάγον εἶναι σκηνώμενον πέμπαν πρὸς αὐτήν (τὴν Δροσιστὰν) ἐπείδη τῶν ἀνδρα καταλιποῦσαν αὐτῷ γῆμασθαι. Justin Martyr indeed (in Apol. 2, p. 69.) tells us that this Simon was a Samaritan, from the village called Gitton. But (as Wolf observes) that writer falls into frequent blunders in historical matters, and seems to have thought that Simon was to be accounted a Samaritan, because he is here said to have abode, or sojourneed, in the city of Samaria, than which nothing can be more inconclusive.

9. Προοιμήρχεν μαγεύων, "who had aforetime exercised the magic art." Doddridge here deviates from our common version; but very much for the worse. The verb μαγεύων is somewhat rare; examples of it are however produced by Wetstein from Hippo-
crates, and by Pearce from Plutarch. It comes from Máγος. Now on the Máγος, their principles, and practices, see the note on Matt. 2, 1. In process of time the name was assumed by many who had little pretension to any thing more than a similarity of studies, and (as Kuinoel observes) the appellation was often given even to strolling quacks, who had some knowledge of natural philosophy and astrology, and abused it to the deception of the people, by pretending to predict future events from the stars, to cure disorders by the recitation of certain formulas, and even, by muttering certain incantations, to bring up departed spirits, and compel them to reveal secrets; as also by the repetition of certain verses, and the use of particular kinds of herbs, to terrify and drive away demons. See Perizon. on Αἰlian. V. H. 2, 18, 20. Ruperti on Juv. Sat. 6, 553 & 557. and the Commentators on Propert. 4, 1. That Simon was not a mere conjurer, or really exercised magic arts, but was imbued with some knowledge of natural philosophy, though he abused it to striking the minds of the vulgar with feigned portents and prodigies, Kuinoel thinks has been rightly maintained by Van Dale, Schleusner, Rosenmuller, and Heinrichs. This, too, was the opinion of Dr. Benson and Bp. Pearce. “Some discoveries (says the latter) these magi had made, which were generally unknown to other people, and with these they greatly surprised them; as the effects of magnetism and electricity would now-a-days surprise those who never saw or heard any thing of that nature.” The Bishop then adds an example of μαγεύειν in the good sense from Plut. Vit. Artax. where φιλοσοφεῦν and μαγεύειν are joined together as equivalent terms: though he acknowledges that many natural philosophers pretended also to be magicians, in the common sense of the word with us, and made their natural knowledge subservient to that imposture: and so μαγεύειν, he reasons, must here mean the exercising of unlawful arts. I do not quite understand the force of his reasoning; for
what he acknowledges seems to demand the other hypothesis. At all events, Simon’s arts were unlawful by being founded in imposition; and it is frivolous to object (as some do) that had he practised such, the Apostles would have had no intercourse with him, since, at the beginning of the passage it is said, that he had aforesaid practised such arts. See Valcknaer and Schoettg. in loc.

9. καὶ ἐξίστημι τῷ ἔδοξεν τῆς Σαμαρείας, had thrown into amazement.* On the force of the formula λέγειν εἶναι τίνα ἐστιν μέγαν see the note on 5, 36. In the same manner τις is used in Herodot. 4, 192. δοκεῖ δὲ μοι ὡς ἀφετίν εἶναι τις ὡς Διόνυσος σπουδαῖος, αἰτεὶ δὲ ἦ 'Ασίσι. Ἕυρεσεν παραβληθήναι: where Wesseling produces examples of this use, and yet does not seem to be aware of the ratio of the idiom. In fact, we must after τις subaud some such word as person, or understand τις as used for τι, with the subaudation of χρῆμα.

On ἐξίστημι see the note on Matt. 12, 22. and Luke 24, 22. That Simon wished (as Deyling and Moshem have thought) to be considered as the Supreme Being, or the Messiah, cannot be proved from the words of Luke, nor is it all probable. Those who in the three first centuries have mentioned him, make him the founder of the sect of Gnostics; but upon insufficient grounds, as has been shewn by Moshem and Heuman.

10. ὃ προσεῖσαι πάντες, &c. Here is an Hebrew form. Ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἑως μεγάλου is for μικρὸν τὲ καὶ μεγάλον, ἀπὸ εἰς τὸν χρῆμα: which has the air of redundancy, since πάντες might have seemed sufficient. This, however, is not unexampled in the Greek and Latin languages, nor even in the modern ones. See Loesner on this passage, and Bergler on Alciph. 2, 4, p. 266. We are moreover to understand, not the

* So Athen. (cited by Wolf): δὲ πῦρ τε αὐτῶν ἐστοίς ἀνάφεσθαι, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ φάσματα ἔτεκνατο, ἀφ’ ὧν ἔξιστα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς διανοίας. I add Onosander 93, ult. καὶ γὰρ ὅσα καὶ ὅσα καὶ πάντας ὃπλων ἔξισται τὰς τῶν ἐναντίων διανοιας.
high and low, (as Vorstius interprets), but the young and old; as in Gen. 19, 11. Compare ver. 4. 1 Macc. 5, 45. and Hebr. 8, 11. (Kuin.) I know not why we should limit this expression, which seems to have the general sense of high and low, young and old, rich and poor, i.e. all of every class.

10. Ὅτι οὗτος ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη. Here there is an hypallage frequent in popular language for "the power of God energises in him; he is a personification of the Messiah." (Kuin.) Doddridge explains: "he is omnipotence incarnate." See 1 Cor. 2, 4. and Rom. 1, 16. Kuinoel embraces the conjecture of Heinrichs, that Simon, in performing his tricks, had uttered the words δυνάμις Θεοῦ μεγάλη, and that the Samaritans were so stupid as to salute him by the name δυνάμις Θεοῦ μεγάλη. But this seems too absurd. Neither can I believe what the Pseudo-Tertullian, and some Latin Fathers, tell us, namely, that he claimed to be Jehovah.

12. ἐκτενεσθεν τῷ Φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ τὰ περὶ τ. Β. τ. Θ. Kuinoel explains this as a paraphrase for εὐαγγελιζομένῳ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ: which is indeed a common phrase in the best Classical writers; but as it very rarely occurs in the Scriptures, so it may be explained without resorting to any pleonasm, which is here unnecessary. Ὄνομαι. A frequent pleonasm. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, of Jesus, as being the Messiah.

13. Simon, a man devoted to lucre and ambition, when he saw Philip exhibit miracles far greater than his own (ver. 18.), and by which most of the Samaritans were inclined to receive baptism, and become Christians, pretended to be a Christian also, (ver. 21.) and having received baptism, attached himself to the Apostles, in order thereby to please the people, and acquire the same power with them of working wonderful works; so that he might by this means further his secular views of avarice and ambition. Yet he did not (as Grotius, Le Clerc, Limborch, Rosenmuller, and others, have rightly judged)
account Jesus as the *Messiah*, but as a great magician, who, by the aid of angels and demons, had worked great miracles, and had returned to life. For if he had really regarded Jesus as the Messiah, and the Apostles as Divine Legates, he could not have persuaded himself that the faculty of communicating the Divine Spirit to all on whom he should lay hands might be acquired by money. On προσκατέρ. see the note on 1, 14. (Kuin.) And so Lightfoot and Doddridge. *Eξίστατο, was astonished.* Here Wetstein observes that Simon, who astonished others, was now himself astonished.

14. ἡ Σαμαρεία, i. e. the inhabitants of the city of Samaria. *Ἀνέστησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν τ. Π. κ. Ἱ. Some recent Commentators, (as Noesselt,) contrary to the universal opinion of the antient Fathers and the early modern Commentators, maintain that the Apostles departed with no other design than to confirm the true believers in the faith, and establish them after the form of a Christian society. But this is paying no attention to the context. Heinrichs and Kuinoel both admit that the words following compel us to suppose that the Apostles went for the purpose of laying hands, with prayer, upon the new converts, in order to impart to them the gifts of the Holy Spirit. For (as Kuinoel observes), in the early ages of Christianity, those who acknowledged Jesus Christ as Messiah, were immediately baptized, and were *afterwards* more fully instructed in the truths of the Gospel. (See the note on Matt. 28, 18.) Meanwhile, however, the Apostles seem to have laid down a rule, that, after being baptized and catechised, the proselytes should have the imposition of hands, accompanied with prayer, in order to their receiving gifts of the Holy Spirit. Hence in Hebr. 6, 2. we find mention made first of baptism, then of instruction, and finally of imposition of hands. Now Philip had baptized and taught the Samaritans; and, in the primitive age, this solemn benediction and laying on of hands was limited to
the Apostles; but in process of time, when the seeds of Christianity were more widely spread, other teachers of that religion obtained this power of solemnly laying hands on the proselytes. (Kuin.)

17. ἑπτὰδε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ᾿ αὐτῶν. It was the custom among the Hebrews for him who prayed for blessings of any kind on another, to put his hands upon his head. See the note on Matt. 19, 13. and also Matt. 9, 18. Luke 4, 40. Acts 6, 6, 9, 12, 28, 8. Hence the Apostles laid their hands on the converts, in order to thus communicate, by a visible symbol, the gifts of the Holy Spirit.* (Kuin.)

18. St. Luke does not say that the Apostles laid hands upon Simon. Indeed that they did not do so is plain from the context. Neither did the Apostles lay hands on him at the same time; and perhaps he might undervalue the gifts commonly understood to be imparted, regarding the Apostles as only powerful Magi, and supposing that they could communic-

* The several uses of imposition of hands are fully detailed in note on 1 Tim. 4. f. Three in the Old Testament: 1, as a ceremony in prayer; 2, in paternal benediction; 3, in creating officers. And proportionable to them, many more in the New: 1, for curing diseases; 2, for absolution of penitents; 3, for blessing of infants, or those that are to be baptized, to prepare them for it; 4, in confirmation; 5, in ordination of officers for the church. Of the three former of these there is none which can pretend to be here meant; and so all the difficulty is, which of the two latter it was. That it was confirmation may appear probable, because it so soon attended their conversion and baptism: When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John (ver. 14.) This agrees well with that of confirmation, which is an act reserved to the Rulers of the Church, and not communicated or allowed to inferior officers, such as Philip, the deacon, here. That therefore which is most reasonable is, so to interpret this laying on of hands, and their receiving the Holy Ghost here, as to comprehend confirmation and ordination both, the Holy Ghost by their ministry coming on all the sincere believers, and endowing them with inward, and some of them with extraordinary external gifts, of healing, prophecy, &c. (see note on ch. 3. d.) and the Apostles, by laying their hands on some special persons among them, ordaining them Bishops and Deacons in several cities: a power which belonged only to the Apostles to exercise, and so was not suitable to Philip, though he had power to preach and to baptize. (Hammond.)
cate yet greater gifts by the imposition of hands, so as to be superior both to Philip and the Apostles. (Kuin.) Χρήματα, money. Here the plural is, (as often,) used for the singular. See Schl. Lex.

20. ἀργύριον σεω σύν σοι εἴη εἰς αἰωνελλαν. Piscator and Grotius explain: "tibi maneat cum maliis." The latter observes that there is a periphrasis of the devoting any one by ἀρσάκης, without a definition of time. Kuinoel calls it a Hebrew form of imprecation, indicating utter destruction, and corresponding to the Greek ἀκόλουθος, βάλλει ἑς κόσμας, ἑς ὀλέθρων, &c. and the Latin pereas, ab in malam rem. The sense seems to be: "May you be grievously punished on account of this your money." Or (as Wetstein renders): "May your avarice ruin you, not me." And he compares Ez. 33, 9. Or it may be thus Englished: "Keep your money to yourself, for your own ruin, not mine." There is a similar passage in Joseph. 461, 45. Δανίηλος δὲ τὰς μὲν δωρεὰς αὐτῶν (I conjecture αὐτῶν for αὐτῷ, sibi habere) ἔχειν ἥξιον τῷ γὰρ σόφου καὶ τῷ Θεῖον ἀδιαφόροντι τοῦτο εἶναι.

Here Doddridge, very justly, observes, that this is not an imprecation, but a strong way of admonishing Simon of his danger, and of expressing how mucli rather the Apostles would see the greatest sum of money lost and cast away, than receive any part of it on such shameful terms. Markland, too, observes that this is not an imprecation, but a pre-diction of what would befall Simon, without repentance.

21. οὐκ ἔστι σοι μέρις οὔδὲ κληρός ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ. That these words imply that he should by no means have the power he asked, namely, of conferring the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands, is plain from the subject of the words, and λόγος, like ῥῆμα and the Hebr. דבר, has very often the sense of thing, matter. See the note on Matt. 4, 4. Luke 1, 37 & 62. It must be observed, too, that μέρις and κληρός are synonymous terms, and when united have an intensive force. So the Hebr. נַעֲרֵי, in 2 Sam.
20, 1. where the Sept. render: οὐκ ἐστὶ μέρις ἡμῖν εὐ Ἰαβδή, οὐδὲ κληρονομία ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ νόῳ Ἰσσαί, we have nothing at all to do with the son of Jesse. Deut. 10, 19. οὐκ ἐσταῖ τοῖς Δευτεραίοις μέρις οὐδὲ κληρός ἐν τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν. Ib. 2, 12. and Job. 22, 25. (Kuin.) Others take λόγος for the doctrine of the Gospel; which, as a secondary sense, may be admitted.

21. η γὰρ καρδία—τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. “thy heart is not sincere, thou art not what thou oughtest to be, thou art a dissembler.”* So 2 Kings 10, 15. יָרָה יָדְפָא, where the Sept. render: εἰ ἐστίν καρδία σου εὐθεία. (Beza, Cam. and Kuin.) I add Ἀσώπ F. c λ a. οὕτως ἐδει εὐθῶν καὶ ἐπελόν εἶναι. Compare Ps. 95, 15. The words may be thus paraphrased: “For thou seekest not the honour of God, that God who is a καρδιογνώστης.” On ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ see the note on Luke 1, 6.

22. μετανόησον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας, “repent therefore, and abandon this thy wickedness.” The formula εἰ ἀρα is by Glass, Krebs, and Loesner, rendered ute, † “pray God that the evil thought may

* This is no instance of Peter’s miraculously discerning spirits, for every common minister or Christian might have made then inference in such circumstances. But, on the other side, this story will by no means prove Peter to have been destitute of this gift: He might (like Christ in the case of Judas) have discerned Simon’s hypocrisy long before he thought fit to discover it openly, or he might have had the gift really in some instances, though not in this; for there is no more reason to suppose that Christ ever gave any of his servants an universal power of discerning the hearts and characters of all they conversed with, than there is to believe he gave any of them the power of healing all the sick they came near, which we are sure that Paul (though he was not inferior to the chief of the Apostles, 2 Cor. 11, 5, 12, 11.) had not, otherwise he would not have suffered the illness of Epaphroditus to have brought him so near to death (Phil. 2, 25—27.), nor have left so useful a fellow-labourer as Trophimus sick at Miletum (2 Tim. 4, 20). Dodd.

† And so it is rendered by Schleusner in his Lexicon, in v. ei. § 6. We are however to remember that in this, as well as some other uses of ei, there is an ellipsis of some verb, which is to be supplied by interpreters. So Eurip. Hercal. 640. πάλαι γὰρ ὑδίνουσα τῶν ἀφιγμένων, πυγὴν ἐνόμισα, νόσον εἰ γενέσται, animo tabescens (dubium) an, &c. Here we are to subseius πείρασ, trying whether. So also Eurip. Hal. 1388. συγγένεωσι καὶ σε συνεσθαυ πάρε. In the former passage the ei may be rendered if perchance.
be forgiven thee.” They observe that the explication *si forte, an forte*, is at variance with Peter’s purpose. “For if (says Krebs) Simon’s prayers were sincere and devout (and that they ought so to be, Philip had of course instructed him), how can we suppose remission of sins doubtful. So εἰπως for *ut* in Phil. 3, 11. εἰ καὶ ibid. ver. 12., and εἰ πῶς in Thucyd. 3, 45. and Philo 752. Thus the Hebr. יִהְיֶה, *si forte*, is by the Sept. rendered יִהְיֶה in Exod. 32, 30. This is however a rare signification, to which there is here no need to resort. For (as it is justly observed by others) the doubt does not respect the benignity of God, but the reformation of Simon, of which there was little hope remaining. Nor are Peter’s words to be interpreted after the subtlety of theological principles, but in reference to the popular sense of common life. Peter meant by these words to hint, that a man so fraudulent, so greedy of lucre, and athirst for vain glory, whose iniquity had reached such a height, could with difficulty repent and reform, and obtain the pardon of sins.* See Grotius.

22. εὐνοια signifies contrivance, counsel: from εὐνοεῖν, to fix the mind upon something, to take up a thought, contrive, &c. Though both are words of middle signification, yet they are often taken in a bad sense for crafty and fraudulent counsel, guile; of which signification examples are produced by Raphel, Kypke, Wets., and Loesner. (Kuin.) The

* The same view of the subject is taken by Doddridge, who observes: “Here is so incontestable an evidence of an unconverted sinner being exhorted to repentance and prayer while he was known to be in that state, that it is astonishing it should ever have been disputed; and one would think none could be so wild as to imagine faith in Christ was not included in that repentance and prayer which an Apostle preaches to a baptized person as the way of obtaining forgiveness. The dubious manner in which he speaks of his being forgiven, intimates, not that his sincere repentance might possibly fail of acceptance, for that is contrary to the whole tenor of the Gospel, but that, after the commission of a sin so nearly approaching blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, there was little reason to hope he would ever be brought truly to repent. 
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last-mentioned signification is confirmed by the γερ in the next verse.

28. εις γερ χολήν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἁδικίας ὑ. σ. ἦ. Χολή signifies properly gall; though it is sometimes used of anything bitter (as, for instance, an infusion of bitter and poisonous herbs). See Joh. 16, 13. 20, 14. Prov. 5, 4. Thren. 8, 15. Deut. 29, 17. Ps. 69, 42. Jer. 22, 15. Now χολή πικρίας is put for πικρα, i.e. bitter gall. In order to more accurately determine the sense of the word, we must compare Deut. 29, 18. Heb. 12. 15. In the former we have καὶ, "let there be no root which may send forth a poisonous or bitter plant." Here the Sept. render: μὴ τις ἔστιν ἐν ὅμιν μία ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολή καὶ πικρία. Now as the subject is the worship of idols, the meaning of the passage is this: "let there not be among you any one who, like a poisonous bitter herb, may infect your minds with his own bitter poison, and may seduce others to idolatry." The passage of Heb. 12, 13. is entirely parallel, and the sense of it is this: "Take care that no bitter poisonous plant growing forth may excite disturbances, and many be by it infected." Here there is a plain reference to Deut. 29, 18. The Hebrew metaphor being therefore transferred to the present passage, the sense will be as follows; "I see that thou art a most pernicious person, like to a bitter poisonous plant, a pest to the Christian society, and so disposed as to be calculated to ruin and corrupt many." Again εἰς εἰς χολήν, &c. is for εἰς χολήν; as in Matt. 19, 5. 8, 10. Heb. 8, 10, 15. Acts 18. 47. Here we may compare Epigr. Gr. L. 2, 11. πᾶσα γυνὴ χάλας ἔστιν.

This interpretation being admitted, there arises a more nervous sense than if, with De Dieu, Palaiaret, and some others, we take εἰς χολήν πικρίας, &c. for εἰς χολή &c.: though this is supported by the authority of an ancient Gloss in the Cod. Cant. (Kuin.); from Hammond and others.

The above interpretation of εἰς χολήν πικρίας, which
is pronounced the true one by Valcknaer, was first brought forward by Alberti Obs. Phil. 286., and adopted by Wetstein. Valcknaer adds, that Archilochos was called πικρόχολος by Julian ap. Anthol. 3, 25, 18. So also Alexis ap. Athen 225 ο. ταυτ' ούχι πικρότερ' εστίν αυτὴς τῆς χολῆς. Priceus very appositely compares Plaut. Truculent. 76. In melius linguae sunt sitae atque orationes Lacteque: corda felle sunt sitae atque acerbo aceto: and Senec. ego in alto omnium vitiorum sum.

Thε σύνδεσμος is by Wetstein and Kuin. well rendered fasciculus ex improbitate quasi colligatus, colligatio iniquitatis. Kuinoel compares Cicero in Pison. 9. ex omnium scelerum importunitate concretus. Bp. Pearce thinks the expression the same with that of Isa. 58, 6. in both which places (says he) allusion is made to the custom (which the Romans used, and probably other nations) of fastening one end of the chain with which a prisoner was bound to the arm of the soldier who was appointed to guard him.” He therefore takes the expression to mean, that Simon was as much a prisoner to iniquity, and fastened to it, as a state prisoner is to his soldier and keeper. But this is very fanciful and precarious.

24. ἔδραπτε. There is little doubt but that the contrition and humiliation were only pretended, and produced by fear; as in the case of Pharaoh. See Exod. 8, 28. He might fear lest he should be punished as Ananias was. (Grot. & Kuin.) Now the reason why God did not see fit so to punish him was (as Cæcumenius observes) in order to show that faith was not a thing of compulsion, and to introduce repentance. One may observe, too, that by asking Peter to pray for him, he admits his own unworthiness.* In this view, Wetstein refers to Joh. 9, 31.

* Heinrichs fancies here an accommodation to the notions of those times, namely, that the curses imprecated by any one can only be avoided by the deprecation of the imprecation. But Peter’s words contained no imprecation. (Vide supra.) It is, however, well ob-
1 Pet. 3, 12. and cites Ter. Adelph. 4, 5, 70. abi domum, ac deos comprecare—abi, pater, tu potius deos comprecare : nam tibi eos, certo scio, Quo vir melior multo es quam ego, obtemperatus magis. That his repentance was not real we have every reason to suppose, both from the circumstances of the case, and from his subsequent conduct, if we may believe the testimony of early Ecclesiastical tradition. By his using the plural number we may suppose that John also was present.

25. διαμαρτυρόμενοι, καὶ καλώσαντες. These words must be understood like those of 10, 42. καίρει τῷ λαῷ καὶ διαμαρτύροντα. Διαμαρτύροντα signifies to prove on good evidence, shew, teach.

25. πολλάς τε κόμας τῶν Σ. ε., evangelized many villages of the Samaritans: such (we may suppose) as lay in their way to Jerusalem. Εὐαγγελίσασθαι has often the accusative, both in the New Testament, and sometimes in the Old; as Joel 2, 32.

26. ἄγγελος δὲ Κυρίου ἐλάλησε πρὸς Φ. Some German Theologians take these words to mean nothing more than that a thought rose in the mind of Philip, which he could not dismiss; the expression is, say they, agreeable to the common opinions of the Jews. Others, as Eckerman, Heinrichs, and Kuin., explain the words of an appearance in a dream. But there is no occasion to resort to any such far-fetched devices, since (as Storr. observes, Opusc. 3, 178 seqq.) it is no wonder that Philip should have been admonished sometimes (as at 29 & 39.) by the internal suggestions of the Holy Spirit, sometimes (as here) by the personal conversation of an angel; since, in a similar case, after he had been once and again internally admonished by a vision (see Acts 16, 6. seqq.), he was at length externally admonished by a messenger sent from God (ver. 10). See the learned annotation of Dr. Hammond.

26. ἀνάστησι καὶ πορεία — ἐρημος. The words αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἐρημος present some difficulty, and it may seem

served by Heinrichs, that there is no reason, from this story, to fix on Simon the charge of heresy.
doubtful whether they are to be referred to Gaza, or to the road thither. If it be taken of Gaza, the interpretation (as Kuin. observes) will be very contort, and one does not see why the remark should have been made; not to say that a city so well inhabited could in no sense be called ἐρημός. Others, to remove this difficulty, maintain that there were two Gazas, one, Old Gaza, destroyed by Alexander; the other, New Gaza. See Lightfoot and Wesseling on Diodor. Sic. and Munthe on this passage. But for this assertion (as Kuinoel observes) there is little authority; and moreover this sense would require αὐτὴν ἔστιν ἡ ἐρημός, this is the ruined one. In short, it is liable to obvious objections. I would prefer the interpretation of Chrysostom, Ecumenius, Beza, Casaubon, Le Moyne, Basnage, Glass, Schoettgen, Bengel, Doddridge, and Heumann, who refer the ἐρημός to ὅδω, and suppose that there were two roads to Gaza, one the more frequented, the other, on account of the interposing solitudes of Mount Casius, unfrequented. And it is certain that ἐρημός is, in this sense, applied to a road. One example from Wetstein will suffice. Arrian 3. ἐρήμην δ’ ἐλει ηὐν ὅδω δι’ ἀνυδρίαν. I add Thucyd. 2, 17. τὰ ἐρήμα τῆς πόλεως, the uninhabited places of the city. Some, as Rosenm., take the words to be a parenthetical insertion of St. Luke. But to this Kuinoel objects, that whether there be two Gazas, or two roads supposed, it would be necessary that Philip should be directed by the angel which to take, in order to meet the Ethiopian: and he accedes to the opinion of Valcknaer, Heinrichs, and Wesseling, that it is a later addition of some Scholiast. See the note on 5, 5. But this is cutting the knot. Indeed, on so perplexed a question it is difficult to form any decided opinion. I am inclined to agree with those who regard the words as a remark of St. Luke, and refer them to the city; which will be true, whether we understand it of Old or of New Gaza. To the road it cannot well be applied, since Reland says
there is no reason why that road should be called ἐκεῖος any more than other roads in Judea.

27. ἀνὴρ Αἰλίος εἰνώχος, δυνάστης κ. τ. β. Α. Ἀνήρ is generally considered as redundant; but it should rather seem to be a relic of primitive copiousness, afterwards cut down by ellipses. Thus it is found most frequently in the ancient writers.

27. εἰνώχος. This word properly denotes cubicularius, chamberlain, and is the same with the ἐκεῖ τοῦ κοιτῶνος at 14, 20 (answering to our Lord of the bed-chamber). It comes from εἰνος a bed, or couch, and ἔχεω to keep, guard; as in πολυῖος. Now since in the courts of the Oriental monarchs the prefects of the bed-chamber (especially that of the women) were castrati, hence εἰνώχος came to denote such. See Donat. on Terent. Eun. 1, 2, 87. Hesiod. Opp. C. 6. Dorville on Charit. 481., and Fischier de vit. Lex. 492. Moreover, since the castrati were, in various parts of the East (as they yet are), set over the most important offices, and used to be privy counsellors to the Kings; hence εἰνώχος came to denote generally a court officer, whether contrasted or not. Thus Potiphar, though he had a wife, is called in the Sept. of Gen. 37, 36. σπάδων Φαράω, and in Gen. 39, 1. εἰνώχος Φαράω. where the Chaldee Version has וּרְכֹל, and not חַשְׁנָו spado. See De Dieu and Spanheim on Julian Or. 174. and Diog. Laert, 5, 1, 5. In the present passage εἰνώχος can only mean a court officer, which is defined by the context to mean treasurer.

27. δυνάστης signifies properly one who has great power, like the Heb. ולבע; as in Sirach. 1, 1. : but also, as here, one who has great influence with a King.* That the Eunuch in question was not a Gentile, is plain. He was probably a Jewish proselyte (since many such there were both in Egypt

* So Thucyd. 1, 38. γίνεσται γὰρ αὐτῷ μέγας. 2 Kings 5, 1. "Now Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, was a great man with his master." Herodot. 6, 30. ἔνα μὴ διαφύγων αὐτὸς μέγας παρὰ βασίλεις γένηται. So πολλὰ δύνασθαι τινι in Syria. Ep. 107.
and Ethiopia); as appears from his reading the 
Book of Isaiah: and had doubtless come to Jeru-
salem for the purpose of religious worship. It is 
true that, according to the Law of Moses (see Deut. 
23, 2.), an eunuch could not be admitted as a pro-
selyte: but, as we have before observed, ἅλωξ does 
not necessarily denote this.

27. Κανδάκης. This (as we learn from Pliny, D. 
Cass., and Strabo) was a family name common to all 
the Queens of Ethiopia (like Pharoah in Egypt, 
Caesar at Rome, and the Czar in Russia). So Plin. 
H. N. 6, 29. Regnare feminam Candacen, quod no-
men multis jam annis ad reginas transiit. See Wolf 
and Wetstein.

27. βασιλεύς Aethiopian. Here we are not to un-
derstand Aethiopia superior, called Meroe. See 

27. δὲ ἢ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς. Subaud τε-
ταγμένος or καθισταμένος, set or appointed; as in 
Acts 6, 3. & 12, 20. Sometimes this is expressed; 
as in Diodor. Sic. 37 v. οἱ ὠπὸ τῆς θεραπείας τοῦ βασι-
λέως τεταγμένος. Τάγα is a word of Persian origin, 
denoing wealth, treasure, and καὶ ἔξοχον a royal 
 treasury. So Q. Curt, 3, 12, 27. pecuniam regiam, 
gazam Persæ vocant, cum pretiosissimis rerum efferri 
jubet, simulans fugam. See Brisson de regn. Pers. 
1. § 181. and Wets. on this passage.

28. ἀναγινώσκει. Ἀναγινωσκειν signifies to read, 
whether to oneself, or aloud. In the latter sense it 
is here used; as appears from the context. Τὰν 
προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν, i.e. (by a popular hypallage 
common to both ancient and modern languages) the 
book of the Prophet Isaiah. In reading the Scrip-
tures on his journey, this proselyte followed the 
injunction of the Jewish Rabbis; in illustration of 
which Schoettgen cites, among other passages, Erubin. 
fol. 54, 1. Sota. fol. 46, 2. “R. Joshua, son of 
Levi, said that whoever was going upon a journey, 
and had not a companion, should study the Law.”
That Jewish students used to read aloud, appears from other citations to be found in Schoettgen. He is supposed to have been perusing the Sept. Version then commonly used by all the foreign Jews; as also by Philip himself. It has been, not improbably, conjectured that he had heard of Jesus, his death, and resurrection, and that his followers appealed to the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Messiah, and especially Is. 53.: and that he was now revolting those sacred oracles, in order to determine whether they agreed with what had been related to him concerning Jesus. (Kuin.)

29. When Philip heard the Eunuch reading aloud, he immediately resolved to approach the chariot, hoping that he might bring him over to Christianity: and since his expectation was fulfilled, it might be said that God, or the Holy Spirit, had admonished him so to do, (Kuin.) But, unfortunately for this interpretation, we find, by St. Luke's words, that Philip had not heard the Eunuch reading until he had run up to the chariot; so that the thought could not well be his own. I am not, however, prepared to assert that the words were uttered by an angel, (as some ancient Commentatoris have thought,) they were only suggested by the operation of the Holy Spirit, in some such manner as that of the afflatus of the Prophets, whereby the inspired always distinguished such Divine suggestions from what arose naturally in their minds.

29. κολλήσθη τῷ ἄρματι. Κολλάσθαι, from κόλλα, glue; a word of uncertain (perhaps Northern) origin, has, with a passive force, a deponent or reflected sense, and signifies "to stick oneself to, to attach oneself to, join company, follow;" as here. So the Heb. ַֽשְׁמָּות is used in the Old Testament; as in Ruth. 2, 8. (Sept.) ἓκανεν Ἡρώδει πατέρων κρατείας & 1, 8: ἔστη δὲ μετὰ τῶν κουφιών, where the Sept. has Παῦλος ἐν οἰκολογήσει αὐτῆς, the literal meaning of which is, "Ruth stuck close to her."

30. Heumann and Kuinoel think, from a compa-
rison with ver. 35., that Philip spoke more to the Eunuch than is here recorded, St. Luke only giving the heads of the discourse. Most Commentators, from the time of Grotius to that of Kuinoel, agree that there is here a paronomasia; and they quote a parallel one of Julian in his laconic Epistle to Basil: ἀνέγνω, ἔγνω, κατέγνων. To which the Father, with equal wit, ἀνέγνως, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνως, εἰ γὰρ ἔγνως, οὐκ ἀν κατέγνων. So also Cato: Legere, et non intelligere, est negligere. So 2 Cor. 8, 2. But whatever may be thought of the last passage, I can scarcely recognize in the present any such paronomasia.

31. πῶς γὰρ ἐν δυναμεὶν, ἐδώ μὴ τ. 6. μ. Valcknaer remarks on the amiable simplicity of the answer; which contains a modest form of expressing ignorance. Here, too (as Pearce well observes), there is an ellipsis of the negative particle. And he, very justly, notices, that both affirmative and negative particles are, by the Greek writers, often thus omitted: in proof of which he refers to Rom. 8, 37. 1 Cor. 9; 10. 10. 80. 12. 31. Mark 7, 21. See also Matt. 15, 27. 2, 6. and the notes on those passages.

Kuinoel here observes that he is in doubt whether the passages of the Prophets, adduced by the followers of Jesus, had a reference to the Messiah. Valcknaer justly commends the shrewd remark of Grot. that this Eunuch did not find the Scriptures so perspicuous as they are now made, not only by low handicraftsmen, shoemakers, and tailors, but even by women.

32. η δὲ περιοχὴ τ. γ. θ. á. Περιοχὴ denotes the sum of what is comprehended in any book, oration, or passage: but here it simply signifies the passage itself; of which Wetstein cites an example from Thucydides, and Valcknaer one from Stob. Ecl. Phys. 164 Δ. Φράσω τὸ ἀκροτελευταῖον τῆς περιοχῆς: where I would read ἀκροτελεύτιον (fag-end). It is a somewhat rare word; and occurs in Thucyd. 2, 17. where I shall adduce several other examples.

"The passage (observes Kuin.) is quoted from Is.
53, 7 & 8. (Sept.) in which, however, for κείποτες we read κείπαρσε, and the pronoun αυτῷ added to ταξινομεῖς is wanting; as also δὲ interposed between the words τὴν γενέαν." Then, after detailing some sufficiently latitudinarian, nay sceptical, hypotheses of various German Theologians, he concludes by espousing the common opinion, namely, that the fortunes of the Messiah are adverted to in the words of Isaiah. In this, he says, he has the support of many distinguished recent Commentators, as Dath, Cube, Michaelis, Hezel, Hensler, Storr, Martinius, and many others. One may wonder that there should have been in that country those who came to any other conclusion."

"This passage (continues Kuinoel), as is plain from its very commencement and the whole tenor of it, does not cohere with the preceding verses. To advert however to the subject in question, Prophets, Divine Legates, and Kings, were κατ’ ἐξοχήν, named worshippers and ministers of Jehovah. By this appellation, therefore, the Prophet might, with propriety, distinguish the Messiah, who, we may observe, is here also described as a King (compare ver. 12): and thus this oracle of the Prophet (who lived at the time of the Babylonish captivity) teaches the same as the other Prophets had taught. Now by David and other most meritorious leaders and deliverers of the state much was to be endured, and a great conflict to be maintained, in order to remove all impediments thrown in their way by their enemies. Of the Prophets and Divine Legates many had been persecuted by the hatred of the corrupt populace; nay, not a few had been put to death. (See Matt. 23, 34.) In a later age, however, the Jews represented the Messiah to themselves as a King, Prophet, High Priest. (See 1 Macc. 14, 41 & 47. compared with 18, 15.) They regarded their evils and misfortunes as punishments inflicted by the angry Deity. (See Job 9, 1.) They believed also that an innocent person would suffer punishment in the place of the guilty, and
thus reconcile them to the favour of God. See Joseph. de Macc. § 1, 17. Now the wiser Jews who were living in captivity were aware that they had brought this calamity upon themselves by their own wickedness. Particular sacrifices had been offered up by them; and at that time they anxiously longed for some expiator, and represented the Messiah to themselves as the author of every kind of felicity; from him especially expecting the restoration of true piety and religion; and therefore hoped also that he would expiate the sins of the people, &c. See Schoettg. Hor. Hebr. t. 2. p. 647 & 650. Thus there is no reason to be surprised that the author of this passage, together with the other wiser Jews, should have come to the opinion that the Messiah would die, in order to expiate the sins of the people, (see the note on Luke 23, 42. Joh. 1, 29. p. 148.) and would, for their sins, suffer heavy afflictions; all which must take place till his kingdom were established: but that he would finally overcome these various calamities, reign gloriously, and that all the citizens of his kingdom would be most studious of piety and virtue. Compare Joel, c. 3. (Kuin.) I assent to most of the positions in this note of the learned Commentator; yet I cannot but take exception to the fundamental principle, which seems to refer the language of the Prophet to the ideas and notions of the Jews of his time, but which is inconsistent with the full inspiration which we are accustomed to attribute to this most distinguished of Prophets.

32. ὁς πρὸβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῆν, &c. This beautiful image (which needs no illustration) is found also in Jer. 11, 19. Wetstein has here citations in superfluous abundance, of which the most apposite are the following. Phaedr. l. 5. Patiens ovis injuriæ. Terr. Ad. 4, 1. Cum fervit maximè, tam placidum quam ovem reddo. And he remarks: "Maximam hostiam ovilli pecoris appellabant, non ab amplitudine corporis, sed ab animo placidiore."

33. ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρίσις ἡρθῇ; In the
Hebr. text, we have מֵעָרָשֵׁם הָמָּשָׁם לֵךְ, ex angustid et judicio abductur, in which passage מָשָׁם לֵךְ is, by a hendiadis, for judicii angustiā, oppressio, (Ps. 107, 39), i. e. severe, violent judgment. Now לֵךְ is an usual term, denoting the being hurried away to punishment; as in Deut. 30, 4. Judg. 18, 24. Ex. 3, 14. The Sept. seem to have read בֶּעָרָשֵׁם הָמָּשָׁם לֵךְ. On the interpretation, however, of the words of the Sept., as they now stand, the Commentators are not quite agreed. To omit other opinions, Michaelis, Hensler, and Thiess, on the authority of the Syriac, connect ἐν τῇ τάξεινόσει αὐτῶν with the last words of the preceding verse, and render thus: “He opened not his mouth, since great was his misery.” The words ἡ κρίσις αὐτῶν ἡρή are by Thiess explained: “his judgment was taken away; he was condemned.” I would, however, put a stop after the words ἡ κρίσις αὐτῶν, by which the sense will be as follows: “in his humility, when his condition was exceedingly miserable, was his judgment (i. e. he was condemned), he was taken off, destroyed.” (Kuin.) See Doddridge, who says that to take a person’s judgment is a known proverb for oppressing him.

33. τὴν δὲ γενέαν αὐτῶν—ἡ ἡγή αὐτῶν, “who can describe the wickedness of the generation, when his life has been taken away upon earth.” Γενέα, like the Hebr. רָע, signifies the men who live in any age. See Matt. 23, 36. Luke 16, 8. 21, 32. Not a few Commentators, however, assign to the words the following sense: “Who can number and tell his age, his years? for he has been carried up to Heaven, and enjoys eternal life.” But this signification of γενέα is unauthorized, and the sense is unsuitable to the words following. (Kuin.) On the meaning of the above words it is difficult to form any decided opinion; for (as Doddridge observes) this is one of the many passages of the Old Testament prophecies, in which it is not so difficult to find a sense fairly applicable to Christ, as to know which to prefer of several that are so. He adopts the following interpretation
proposed by Hammond, which does not differ materially from Kuinoel's: "Who can describe the obstinate infidelity and barbarous injustice of that generation of men among whom he appeared, and from whom he suffered such things."

35. ἀνοίξας δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀρέχάμενος, &c. The words ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα are an Hebrew pleonasm. So Acts 10, 34. and Matt. 5, 2. where see the notes. Γραφή is here used of particular passages of Scripture; as in Mark 15, 58. compared with Luke 22, 37. 4, 21. So Luke 24, 27. ἀρέχάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως, καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, διηρήθηνεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Philip shews that the words of the prophecy are to be referred to Jesus; and then he takes occasion to inform the eunuch about the person, doctrine, and merits of Jesus. (Kuin.)

36. τι καλύει με βαπτισθήναι; One may collect from these words that Philip had shewn the eunuch the necessity of baptism, as being a rite by which Jesus had ordered his followers to be initiated. "Thus (observes Grot.) many circumstances which precede are supplied from what follows." Wetstein adduces examples of τι καλύει and οἴδεν καλύει (to which it is nearly equivalent) from Demosthenes and Plutarch, and of the Latin quid vetat or prohibet from Virgil, Petronius, and Ovid.

37. This verse is wanting in A. C. G. and very many other MSS.; as also in the Syriac, Arab., Copt., Sahid., and Ἁθειοπ. Versions; and in others there is much of variation and transposition. It has been therefore rightly thrown out by Griesbach and Matthiae. The verse seems to have been introduced, lest any one should think that Philip had too precipitately admitted the eunuch to baptism. (Kuin.) To the last position I cannot accede: and as to the verse, since it is contained in so many MSS., and is found in the Vulgate and Syriac Versions, it should (I think) be retained, though put between brackets; especially since it assuredly represents the earliest
confession required of adults at baptism. And therefore, whether genuine or not, it will prove that the candidates had previously been informed of the doctrine of Christ’s divinity, which this confession manifestly recognizes.

On κατέβησαν, &c. Doddridge observes, that considering how frequently bathing was used in those hot countries, it is not to be wondered that baptism was generally administered by immersion, though there is no proof that it was essential to the institution. “It would be very unnatural (continues he) to suppose that they went down to the water, merely that Philip might take up a little water in his hand to pour on the eunuch.”

The phrase ἐκ τῆς καρδίας is thus illustrated by Valcknaer. “This expression, which is so often used by the Sacred writers, is also found, though with some variation, in the best Greek authors. In Theocritus ὑψὸς ἀλλὰς φιλέων μ’ ἐθνησὶν ἄνω καρδίας is equivalent to φιλέων ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς in Xenoph. and παντὶ ὑπὲρ in Demosthenes. The contrary term is, love any one, ἀνεύ γλῶσσης, i.e. with the tongue only, and by words. Both are conjoined in Sophocl. OEdip. Col. 990. τοιτά σοι Τῷ νῷ τῷ ὑπεύθυς κ’ ἄνω τῆς γλῶσσῆς θέαν.”

39. δεὶ δὲ ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ βαθοῦς—Φιλιπποῦ. Some, as Doddridge, following the opinion of Augustin, Didymus, and others, have thought that Philip was caught up by the angel, or conveyed in some other preternatural mode through the air to Azotus: a thing (observes Doddridge) which seems to have happened to some of the prophets. And he compares 1 Kings 18, 12. 2 Kings 2, 16. Ezek. 3, 14. But the most enlightened Commentators are now agreed that the word ἀφαίρεσθαι may very well be understood of the imperative suggestions of the Holy Spirit, which Philip doubtless well knew how to distinguish from ordinary thoughts. There seems also an allusion to the unwillingness with which Philip tore himself from this promising convert. Now ἀφάγειν is used in much
the same way as ἀναγκάζειν, and other similar terms, of moral compulsion: and there are many more passages in the Old and New Testament, where the inspirations of the Spirit are similarly described; ex. gr. 1 Kings 18, 12. καὶ ἔσται—καὶ Πνεῦμα ἁρεί σε ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἢν οὐκ ὁδα. The recent Commentators, indeed, almost explain away the force of the expression; which is a fault as great as that of the early ones in pressing it too much. Chrysostom seems to have taken the middle, and, as in most cases, the safe course. (See his 26th Homily.) OEcumenius, however, deserts us here, and evidently adopts the common opinion. I must observe that there is a similar passage in Herodot. 4, 13. Ἀριστέρας, ἀνὴρ π. ἀπίσκεψαί ἐσ' Ἡσσηδώνας, φοιβόλαμπτος γενόμενος.

The words πνεῦμα ἁγιον ἐπέκεισεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον ἄγγελος σε, found in some MSS. are (as Kuin. thinks) added by those who thought the snatch up of the eunuch was more suitable to an angel than to the Holy Spirit; and the words being found in Acts 10, 44. seem to have been transferred hither.

39. καὶ οὐκ ἔδειν αὐτὸν οὐκέτι ο εὐνοῦχος—χαίρων. Most recent Commentators, as Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, adopt the notion of Grotius; that the last words assign a reason why the eunuch no longer saw Philip, namely, because he was returning to his country: and to the word χαίρων, which ought, (as Grotius and Markland think,) to be pointed off separately, he ascribes the force of a whole sentence. But the sense thus arising is very frigid, and wholly unsatisfactory. To me it appears that the words καὶ οὐκ ἔδειν αὐτὸν ο εὐνοῦχος are a popular pleonasm, not unfrequently found after verbs of departing; and the words ἐπερεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὅδον αὐτοῦ χαίρων seem to have little or no connection with the preceding. The γὰρ has the sense of ὅτε, autem, vero, (as it is rendered by Beza, Schleusner, Vulg., and E. V.): or it may denote the ellipsis of a whole sentence, to which it has, reference; such as the following: "And the Eunuch scarcely missed him, for he was absorbed in
the new and sublime ideas which his conversation had introduced." The expression *ευρέθη*—*χαίρων* occurs elsewhere in Scripture. *Χαίρων* well expresses the genuine consolations of the Gospel.

40. Φιλαξισος ἐν εὐρέθη εἰς Ἀζωτον. Heinrichs thinks that εὐρέθη is a *dictio paenins* for "he went to Azotus, and there abode." But I agree with Kuinoel, that it is not necessary to resort to this principle; especially as cases occur where the preposition is to be used when that principle is inapplicable. Thus in Herod. 4, 14, where, speaking of Aristaeus, a poet who, after he had been thought to be dead, suddenly disappeared, nor could even his corpse be found, till seven years after he appeared, φανέρα αὐτὸν ἐσ Πρεσβυνσιον, ποιήσατ τὰ ἔκεια, &c. Indeed, the Latin *ad* seems to have a similar force; as appears from our *at*.

Εὐρέθησα, like the Heb. יָשָׁב, has often the sense of *be, abide*; of which Kuinoel gives the following examples. Esth. 1, 5. 1 Par. 29, 17. 2 Par. 29, 30, 21, 25, & 31. 1 Mal. 2, 6. Eurip. Iph. T. 277. πώς πορ' ἐνδεικνύειμαι. Sir. 44, 20. See Kypke on Matt. 1, 18. and Loesner on 1 Cor. 4, 2. Beza compares the French "*Il se trouva, for il fut trouvé*. On Azotus or Cæsarea see the Geographers or Schl. Lex.

CHAP. IX.

On the important subject of Paul's conversion, as now related by St. Luke, the recent Commentators are not agreed whether we are to regard it as strictly miraculous, and supposed that Jesus Christ really appeared, or whether it may be ascribed to, and accounted as the effect of, certain terrific natural phenomena, or the high-wrought imagination and wounded conscience of Paul. Since the question came under discussion, the *former* position has been ably maintained by several of the most eminent Theologians, as Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, and Lyttleton, and, of the German writers, Hase, Niemeyer, Michaelis, and many others. The arguments on that side of the question are thus summed up [though with little impartiality. Edit.] by Kuinoel.

a) "Paul is not simply said to have heard a voice, but a voice which said unto him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"
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(See 9. 4. 22, 7. 26, 14.) He asks who it is that addresses him, and having received the answer, again enters into a conversation with it, which is distinctly narrated by St. Luke (9, 4—6), and by St. Paul himself (22, 7, 8 & 10. 26, 14 seqq.); and in 26, 19, he calls it ὑπάρξεις ὁπράσια. Paul himself, in communicating this conversation, has been so exact as not to have omitted to detail any circumstance, even what would seem of minor importance, namely, that he who addressed him spoke in the Hebrew language. (See 26, 14.) b) Ananias, in 9, 17., says that Paul saw Jesus in the way; which he could not have known but from St. Paul himself: and the same is affirmed by Barnabas, to whom Paul had related the circumstance. c) St. Paul, in 1 Cor. 9, 1. 15. 8. Gal. 1, 1. 16. boasts of this appearance of Christ [but in Gal. 1, 16. another appearance of Christ is alluded to. Compare Acts 23, 18. Kuin.], and from it deduces arguments in proof of his Divine legation, which he could not have thus established, if Jesus had not appeared to him. d) The Apostles doubtless made every enquiry before they would receive into their society a man from whose cruelty and fanatic piety there might have seemed much to fear; nor would they have received him, unless they had been thoroughly persuaded that Jesus Christ had appeared to him. "From this common view of the subject, however, (continues Kuinoel,) many Commentators of our age dissent, contending that we need not imagine any miracle, or the corporeal appearance of Christ, but that, accommodating ourselves to the peculiar forms of expression used in the antient world, we are to explain the whole of a vision, seen amidst thunder and lightning, and of the thoughts which then arose in the mind of Paul. Such is the opinion of Ammon, Eschhorn, Eckermann, Gruling, Paulus, Schulz, Ravius, Heinrichs, Boehm, Wittig, Hezel, Rosenmuller, Dindorf, &c. The hypothesis had been broached, as far back as 1685, by Vitrington, Obs. Sacr. L 6, 10, 12., whose words are these: "Primo refertur, lumen de caelo Paulum praestassisse huini; dein vero illum audivisse vocem. Per lumen aevum de caelo, quis aliud hic intelligat, quam fulgor fulminis? Quod si admiseris, non negaveris, per vocem, fulmini conjunctam, vocem tonantem et gravem intelligendam esse, quia ex lege naturae fulmina comitari solent tonitrua."

The arguments adduced in support of this interpretation are thus summed up by Kuinoel. a) ὑπάρξεις, like the Hebr. הָרְפַּשׁ, in Ex. 19. 16. not unfrequently denotes thunder (see the note on Matt. 3, 17. 17, 5. Job, 12, 9.).; and φόβος, like ἀκρ., lightning, in Job 37, 3. το φῶς αὐτοῦ ἐμνετέραν τῆς γῆς. And so Hebr. 3, 10. Now thunder and lightning both Jews and Gentiles numbered among signs of the presence of God, prodigies Divinely produced, the meaning of which they interpreted according to circumstances. See the note on Matt. 3, 17. 17, 1. Joh. 12, 28. So Joseph. Ant. 3, 4. ἀναρραυτεῖ τὴν φοβηρα θεὸς ὀραίων, καὶ κεραυνοὶ κατενεχθέντες ἐδήλου τὴν παροίκιαν τῷ θεῷ. Senec. Naturat. C. 31. mira fulminis si intueri velis, opera sunt, nec quicquam dubii relinquentia, quin divina insit illis et subtilis potentia. Such thunder
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and lightning the Jews accounted as prodigies, may called by that name, and thinking that God spoke in them, termed them the voice of God. See Matt. 3, 17. Joh. 12, 28. They believed also that the Almighty, in order to strike terror into the minds of men, especially those of the wicked, manifested his presence amidst lightnings and thunders. See Ps. 18, 13 & 14. 1 Sam. 19, 17 & 18.

The above Commentators therefore maintain, that, agreeably to the notions of the antient world, we are here to imagine a prodigious crack of thunder, and suppose that the thoughts which then arose in the mind of Paul are related as the voice of Jesus speaking in the thunder.

c) "St. Paul no where in his Epistles appeals to any vision exceeding the bounds of nature, but only affirms this, that he was converted to Christianity by a heavenly vision. c) The corporeal appearance of Christ cannot be admitted, since if Christ had appeared clothed in a human form, and in a visible manner, not only the Apostle, but also his companions, would have seen it; which is, however, denied at 9, 7."

The foregoing view of the subject is also adopted by Kuin., who subjoins the following further illustration.

"Paul, a Pharisee and a strenuous defender of the religion of his forefathers (Acts 22, 3, 26, 5.) had heard of the doctrine of Christ, which, (distorted, misrepresented, and calumniated as it was by the Priests,) he held in abhorrence, as false and pernicious. The Messiah indeed he eagerly expected, but it was an earthly one; and thus Jesus (who had been crucified, and whom the Priests called an impostor and corrupter of the ancient religion) he utterly rejected. His followers therefore he persecuted, fancying that he was supporting the cause of God and of Religion. Yet he had not entirely forgotten the admonitions of his master Gamaliel, who was endowed with a remarkable exemption from prejudice in deciding on the merits of another religion, and who recommended this disposition of mind to others. (See 5, 34.) Besides, the constancy, and even joy with which Stephen and many Christians had met persecution and death, together with what he had heard from them of the doctrine of Christ, (so contrary to what it had been represented by the Jewish Rulers,) had produced such an effect upon his mind, that he began to doubt of the goodness of his cause. But, hurried away by desire of vain glory, and lest he should appear inconsistent with himself, and seem to be a colder partizan and a less zealous defender of the Pharisaical sect than he had heretofore been, he studiously repressed conviction and the force of truth, up to the time of his journey to Damascus, when he was compelled by a vision to abandon his prejudices and embrace the truth; and, as is the case with persons of ardent temperament, he then rejected and condemned the Pharisaical dogmas with the same fervid impetuosity as that with which he had before maintained them. When, therefore, to evince to his companions his zeal for his sect, he was proceeding to Damascus, with an intent to seize and persecute the Christians, and was, by the way, reflecting on the purpose of his journey, there occurred to his mind all that he had heard from the Christians con-
cerning Jesus and his doctrine, namely, that he had returned to life, that he sat at the right hand of God, and would return to judge the quick and dead. He recalled to mind, also, the admonitions of Gamaliel, and other moderate men, who disapproved of the persecution carried on against the Christians, and began to doubt whether he were engaged in a good cause. 'What (thought he) if the things which the followers of Jesus tell me be true? I would believe if he would appear to me!' While revolving this in his mind, suddenly, about mid-day, there arose (though the sky had been just before serene) a tempest conjoined with thunder and lightning, and that so much the more terrific since (as we learn from Maundrell) the valley of Damascus is closed in by exceedingly lofty mountains. There suddenly shone round about him a flash of lightning, and indeed, with a vivid imagination, he fancied he beheld a celestial nature, even Jesus. Struck with terror, he sinks to the earth, and falls into this soliloquy: 'Is not this the Jesus whose followers I have hitherto persecuted? Yes; it is he: He is rebuking my presumptuous attack on his society. I must repent, and abandon my prejudices. I will go to Damascus, and there consider what it will behove me to do. While Paul, amidst frequent peals of thunder, was revolving these things in his mind, he fancied that in the crack of thunder he discerned the voice of Jesus, accusing, threatening, admonishing, exciting him. Hence also he afterwards, when narrating the affair to others, related his own thoughts in the form of a conversation between himself and Jesus. When Paul had arisen from the earth, he saw no one (v. 8.), his sight being temporarily suspended by the dazzling effect of the lightning. As to his companions, they had seen nothing (v. 7.), since to them the lightning would not appear portentous, neither were they so likely to have been tormented by the stings of a rebuking conscience.'

Thus far Kuinoel, whose matter is chiefly formed upon the learned treatises to which he refers, and whose language I have reported at large and accurately, that I might not be thought to misrepresent it. But I must maintain that the hypothesis which it supports, though ingeniously devised and ably supported by De Dieu, Elner, and other Commentators, yet is utterly untenable; and though it professes to simplify, produces more difficulties than it removes. It were surely inconsistent with ingenuity and truth to dress up vivid impressions of the mind, caused by natural phenomena, in a dramatic style, and manufacture them into a dialogue. Paul, however ardent might be his temperament and vivid his imagination, could not so far deceive himself as to suppose that the conversation (related by him at large in his speech before Agrippa) really took place, if there had been no more than these Commentators tell us. The Apostle's mental powers were of too superior a kind to permit us to suppose that he could not distinguish between the thoughts of his own mind the address of a supernatural being. Besides, he is so minute as to say it was in the Hebrew language. And moreover, if he were so worked upon by his own high-wrought feelings and tender conscience, that could not be the case with his
attendants; and yet it is said that they also, struck dumb with astonishment, heard the voice, though they saw no one. Now this difficulty, which those Commentators have not noticed, cannot be eluded. As to the objection which they make at c), that the corporeal appearance of Christ cannot be admitted, since if Christ had appeared clothed in a human form and in a visible manner, not only the Apostle, but also his companions, would have seen it; which is denied at 9, 7. I answer, that we are not obliged, nor will we undertake, to prove the corporeal appearance of Christ; since it is no where asserted, nay not even implied: for when it is said of the attendants μηδένα δὲ θεωρώντες, opposition is involved in δὲ, and the words were only meant, in conjunction with the preceding ἀκούστε μὴ τῆς φωνῆς, to assign a reason why the attendants were so dumb with astonishment, namely, because they heard a voice speaking in the Hebrew language, but could not discern the speaker: and though it is said of these persons at 22, 10. τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἰκουσαν, yet ἰκουσαν there (with the accusative) has the sense of understand, and that, probably, because they did not sufficiently comprehend the language, and perhaps the words might have been uttered in a low tone.

By this admission and explanation, the objection at b) is also destroyed. Besides, φωνῆ, if it has ever been used for thunder, cannot be so taken here: for what would be more absurd than, "I hear a clap of thunder saying." And again, we are told that the attendants, hearing the—what? the clap, and seeing no one, (who could they expect to see?) were mute with astonishment. Then again, φως is no where used of lightning. And as to the example adduced from Job 37, 3. it is not to the purpose, since φως there means the sun's light. Besides, from the manner in which this φως is spoken of, it cannot be thought to denote a flash of lightning.* For where is lightning said περιστραπτεῖν: And moreover, we are told that it exceeded the brightness of the mid-day sun; which, I apprehend, cannot apply to a flash of lightning, any more than to the ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτός. Finally, when the attendants and Paul threw themselves with their faces to the ground, it is surely far more reasonable to suppose that they did so from connecting the blaze of light with the idea of a supernatural appearance, (which, with the superstition of their nation, they were anxious to avoid seeing,) than with that of merely a flash of lightning.

1. ἔμπνευσόν ἄτελής καὶ φῶν. *Etī, even yet; i. e. from the time of Stephen's death. 'Emπνευσόν is said to be for τυέων. Markland cannot see how ἔμπνευσόν can signify breathing out threatening. Even

* Hence may be excellently defended the common reading φῶς in Eurip. Bacch. 585 which Mattb. upon conjecture altered to φαγμα. Wetstein here compares Petron. 137. Toto mihi clarius cælo necio quid relucente, libuit Deæ nonuen querere.
εἰκνέων, he says, would not have expressed this: and he conjectures ἐμπλέως ἀπεγίης καὶ φόνων. But ἐμπνεύω signifies inhale, anhelare. Now either inhaling or exhaling the breath, strongly expresses, both in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, anger. So we use the word to snuff. It must be remembered, too, that, in Hebrew, the seat of anger is represented to be the nose. Similar passages are produced from the Classical writers by Abresch, Kypke, Wets., and Loesner. The only difference between the Classical use and that of St. Luke is, that the Classical writers use the simple verb, and that generally with the accusative, though instances of the genitive are found in Aristoph. Eq. 435. κακίας καὶ συκυφαντίας πνεύ. Q. Calab. 14, 72. Aristean. 1, 5. ἐγὼ ἦκεν εὐθὺς αὐτὸς καὶ εἰσεπτηδηκεν ἔνδουν κεκραγὼς ἀμα καὶ πνεύων ὑμῶν. In the same manner anhelare is used in Cicero and other Latin authors. And so Chrys. de laudibus Pauli, υμαμο πνεόντες. We may also compare Gen. 27, 45. breathing for your death. The genitive is dependant on ἀπό, and the accusative on κατὰ. To the above citations I add Niceph. 47 c. ἐπὶ δὲ πνεύμα κατὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας, where I conjecture, for κατὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας, κατὰ τῆς ἑσεβείας. Dionys. Hal. 1, 456. τῆς αὐθαδείας ἃς τῶλς ἔπνευ. Lecapenus de Atticismo ap. Villosi Anecd. 2, 84. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπκενίμ μάχην ἐπίθυμε μαχην πνεύμει λέγουσιν.

1, 2. προσελθὼν τῷ Ἀρχιερεῖ, ἠγίσατο π. α. ε. By ἐπιστολαῖ are meant letters credential, by which he received authority to apprehend or bring bound to Jerusalem such Christians as he should find at Damascus. (So 22, 5. ὅνι λοι αἰμαρχοῦσιν.) They had been written by the High Priest in the name of the whole Sanhedrim. (Compare ver. 14. and 22, 5.) Now the High Priest at that time was Theophilus, son of Anan, whom Vitellius had, in the year 37, appointed, having removed his brother Jonathan, on whom he had conferred the office at the Passover of that same year. Paul, we may observe, went to Damascus in the
year A. D. 40. (See Proleg. § de Chronologia libri n. 8.)

2. εἰς Δαμασκόν. A formerly celebrated city, situated on a most fertile plain between the Libanus and the Antilibanus, on which was the Syria Damascene (see 2 Sam. 8, 5. Is. 7, 8.), called by Strabo, p. 755. Cele Syria. The Jewish population may be imagined from the fact related by Joseph. Bell. 1, 2, 55. that, under the reign of Nero, four thousand Jews were immured in the public bath, and slain by the people. See De Dieu on this passage, Cellerus N. O. 2, 442., Walch Antiq. Damas., and Michaelis Spic. Geogr. Heb. 2, 126. (Kuin.)

2. πρὸς τὰς σωμαγωγὰς, i. e. " to the Rulers of the Sanhedrim." Τῆς ὀδοῦ is for ταυτῆς ὀδοῦ; as in Acts 22, 4. ταυτὴν τὴν ὀδον ἔδωκα. The article is also put for the demonstrative pronoun in Joh. 7, 17. (See Glass Phil S. 131 seqq.) Ὅδος denotes not only a way, but way of life, mode of thinking (as in Judith, 5, 8. ἐκβάλναι εἷς ὀδοῦ τῶν γονέων); and also sect in religion, as here and in Acts 24, 14. And so Lucian Herm. p. 577. ἀπάσης ὀδοῦ πεπεραμένος εν φιλοσοφία. (Elsner & Keuchen.) To these examples I add Suidas in v. Ἑμπεδοκλῆς: βαδίσαι φασὶ τὴν ὀδόν Πυθαγόρου.

2. ἄνδρας τέ καὶ γυναῖκας. This circumstance (as that in 8, 3.), is mentioned, in order to designate the bitterness of the persecution. The number of Damascus Christians was probably considerable; for not only many of the Damascus Jews, who frequented the feasts, would disseminate Christian doctrines to the people, but there must have been many refugees from Jerusalem. (Kuin.) On ἀγάπη see the note on 6, 12. It is, we may observe, a vox solemnis de hac re, a word appropriated to this subject. Wetstein compares Aristoph. Av. 1078. ἦν ἀποκτείνη τις ὑμῶν Φιλοκράτη τῶν Στοιχίων, λήψεται τὰ- λαντον. ἦν δὲ γὰρ ἀγάπη, τέταρα.

It appears that so great was the authority of the
Jewish Synagogue among the foreign Jews, they readily submitted to its decrees, especially in what respected heresy, &c. Hence the Rulers of their Synagogues yielded implicit obedience to the Jerusalemish Sanhedrim, to whom the Romans had granted the power of trial and condemnation in all cases which respected religion. See Joseph. Ant. 14, 10. 16, 6., Vitringa de Syn. Vet. 866., Witsius Melet. p. 23. and Wolf on this passage. Now Damascus was, at that time, under the power of Aretas, King of Arabia. (See 2 Cor. 11, 32. and the note on ver. 23.) Some have conjectured that this Aretas was a Jewish Proselyte, from the circumstance that he had married his daughter to Herod Antipas. (Basnage and Michaelis.) Certain it is that he was well affected to the Jews, and that he admitted the exercise of that dominion which the Jerusalemish Sanhedrim claimed over his Jewish subjects in matters of religion.

3. ἐγένετο αὐτῷ ἐγγίζειν. This is plainly a Hebrew pleonasm, and ἐγένετο answers to ἐγένετο. The Greek writers would say, ὅταν δὲ πορεύομενος ἔγγιζε, (Kuin.) It should rather, however, seem to be a relic of the simple and primitive phraseology found in the popular idiom of most languages.

Kuinoel observes that περιοστράτευν is only used by the Greek Fathers for περιλίμπανειν, which occurs infr. 26, 3., and which explains the word περιοστράτευν here used. They both signify "to shine all around," and are not applicable to lightning; still less (as I have before observed) is φῶς.

4. Ἴκουσε φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ. Many recent Commentators explain this of thunder, and cite Joh. 7, 28., which, however, is nothing to the purpose. Ti, why? Wetstein, in order, I suppose, to illustrate the power of fancy, quotes Lucret. 3, 153. Verum ubi vehementi magis est commota metu mens; Consentire animam totam per membra videamus. Sudores itaque et pallorem existere toto corpore, et infringi linguam, vocemque aboriri, Caligare
oculus, sonere aures, succidere artus, Denique concidere ex animi terrore videmus sepe homines.

5. εἰτε δὲ Τίς εἶ, Κύριε; The Commentators are not agreed whether Jesus was known by face to Paul, or not. The question is not of easy determination, but is of little importance, since (as I before observed) there is no proof that Jesus really appeared in a visible form, still less in that of a man. At all events, Paul, on seeing so glorious a blaze, and flood of celestial light, could not but expect that some supernatural being would appear, to avoid seeing which, he and the rest fell down with their faces to the ground. Nothing, therefore, can be more inap- posite than the exposition of κύριε proposed by Heinrichs, who says it is a form of address to an unknown person. See note infra 16, 30.

5. σκληρῶν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. A proverbial form common both to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers. The Philological Commentators here pour forth, certatim, the stores of extensive reading. The most important passages cited are Pindar Pyth. 2, 173. φέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς Εταυχένιον λαβόντα Ζυγόν γ' ἄρηγει. AEschyl. Prom. 323. οὐκοῦν, ἣρωιγε χρώμενος διδασκάλω πρὸς κέντρα καλοῖν ἐκτενεῖς and Agam. 1683. πρὸς κέντρα μῆ λακτίζε, μῆ πῦρας μογῆς. Rabbinical passages are cited by Schoettgen. See also Wets. and Valckn. To add more would be needless, since neither the ratio metaphorae, nor its application present any nodum vindice dignum.

7. οὐ δὲ ἄνδρει — ἐννελ. I cannot see any such difficulty as many learned Commentators recognize in these words. As to the seeming contradiction between this passage and that of 22, 9., it must not be removed in the manner proposed by Valla, and approved by Greller and many recent Commenta- tors (as Kuinoel and Heinrichs), namely, by suppos- ing that the men had first fallen down, and then risen again; since this is evidently a device "made for the nonce," and involves no little improbability: for if they had at first fallen down through over-
whelming fear and deep reverence, it would not be likely that they should have changed that posture until the apprehended danger had passed. I here desiderate the usual judgment of Kuinoel in not seeing that the only satisfactory mode of viewing the words is that of Beza, De Dieu, L'Enfant, and others. Στίγμα has here the sense of be, be fixed, constare. Doddridge here compares our stand in jeopardy for be in jeopardy; and he produces several examples of this idiom.

'Evneol.* "deprived of sense, mute with astonishment." This word properly signifies dumb; as in Prov. 17, 29. Is. 56, 10. (Sept.); or rather (if we may believe Ammonius), deaf and dumb. It denotes not so much one who is destitute of the natural faculties, as one in whom they are suspended, or destroyed: and it is also used figuratively of one out of his mind; as in Hos. 9, 7. See Steph. Thesaurus, Ruhnke. on Timæus 74., and Vackn. Schol. on this passage, who, among other citations, has the following. *Lucret. 1, 93. *Muta metu terram genibus submissa petebat.

7. ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες. This seems at variance with what is said in the parallel passage of 22, 9. τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθέασαν, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν ὅπως ἔγουσιν τῶι λαλοῦντος μοι. Various methods of reconciling this contradiction have been proposed. Valla on 22, 9. is of opinion that we ought here to read θεωροῦντες μὲν τὸ φῶς, μηδένα δὲ ἀκούοντες, which is somewhat confirmed by the Æthiopic Version, but seems to have been merely formed on a conjecture, and is, moreover, not countenanced by any MS. authority. The present reading is therefore to be

* The modern Philologists venture not to offer any conjectures on the etymology of this word, and in attempting it the antient ones grievously fail. To me it seems to come from ἐν and νέος now to, raw at (any thing); and consequently (to use the old phrase) is a gape, or surprise at anything. Thus, among other senses, it had that of μωπῶς; as we find by the antient Lexicons: and it exactly answers to the Latin stupidus. Thus our silly, from the Ang. Sax. sellig, full of wonder; which is an apt description of a fool.
retained, and another mode of explanation devised. Some ancient Commentators (as Chrysostom and ÓEcumenius), and a few modern ones, as Beza, Schmid., Castalio, and Heumann, understand the word φωνή here of the voice of Paul in answer; but at 22, 9. of the voice of Jesus speaking; and the purport of the words (they think) is, that Paul's companions heard him conversing with some one, but saw not the person with whom he conversed. But strong, and indeed just exception is taken to this method by Camerarius, Casaub., Hammond, and others, as being contort and utterly at variance with the context; since the immediately preceding words are, as Kuinoel observes, the words of Paul; and if Luke had meant the word φωνή to be understood of the voice of Christ, he would have added αὐτοῦ. Hammond, Elsner, Morus, Rosenmuller and Heinrichs take φωνή here to denote thunder, but at 22, 9., an articulate voice; which seems an untenable position. To me it appears to be the safest course to interpret ἡκούσαν, with Grotius, Bowyer, Kuinoel, and others, understood, and thus render τὴν δὲ φωνήν ὑπὲρ ἡκούσαν τοῦ καλούντος μοι, "did not understand the sense of what was spoken to me." For αἰκοῦν, like the Heb. צָוֶשׁ, is often used in this signification. See Gen. 11, 1. 1 Cor. 14, 2, &c. and Schl. Lex.

8. ἀνεφημένων δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ, οὐδένα ἐθέλετε. I cannot accede to the opinion of those critics who understand the οὐδένα of Jesus, because it had been before said that Paul saw Jesus. I assent to Kuinoel, that the words are simply descriptive of blindness (but can only refer to the companions, not to Jesus); as in ver. 9. καὶ Ἰον ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων & 22, 11. αἰς δὲ οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον. Οὐδεν is indeed read in the Alexandrian MS., is expressed by the Syr. Arab., and Vulg.; and is approved by Grotius, Priscæus, and Bengel. Kuinoel thinks it savours of a gloss. But, as it only occurs in one MS., it would seem to be a mere error of the scribe, from mistaking an abbreviation.
As to the Versions, they are not proper evidence in this matter, since they often use much license of interpretation.

With respect to the blindness of Paul, it is by most recent Commentators accounted for from natural causes, and ascribed to the effects of lightning, which hypothesis, however, as far as it rests on that principle, is untenable. We are not, say they, to attribute the blindness of Paul to any supernatural agency of God; especially since in 22, 11. it is said to have been produced ἀπὸ τῆς δοξῆς τοῦ φῶτος ἐκείνου, from that glorious and most splendid light, but this is too manifest a fallacy to need any refutation. The blindness is consideed by Michaelis, Heinr. Eichh. Plouquet, and Kuin., as a temporary amarauros, arising from excessive light. On this affection of the eyes Kuin. has the following interesting extract from Plouquet's Dissert. de amaurosi. "Sequitur species anaesthetic, cum medulla retinae quavis ex causâ facultatem sentiendi perdit. Huc pertinet 1) Exallactica, cum substantia ejus degeneravit, qualis est—d) hyperphaes, quæ ex nimis intensâ luce oritur. Vulgaris est experientia, solem vel focus radiorum ejus, nubes splendidas, colores nimis vividos inspicientes statim sæcultur, irides ipsis observari, dolores in imâ orbitâ urgere, et sic momentaneam quasi amauros in nasci. Ferri fusi fulgentes masse idem et perstan- tius efficiunt, teste Dunklero, Nootnagel. Ex fulmine ortam habet Richterus.—Nimia quippe irritatio a luce aut affluxum enormem humorum ciet, quo epispastica vel et thliptico-empharctica species oritur, aut nervosam substantiam nimis afficiendo motus in eâ ciet excedentes, non satis determinandos, qui- bus mutatio tristis permanens, enallaxis aliqua, stuporem retinae perpetuum comitem habens, efficitur. Apud hos tentandum, quid frigus actuæ possit," &c.

Michaelis, too, relates the case of an African, who having lost his sight by lightning, and continued blind for a week, at length received it during another terrible tempest, when the whole room was illu-
mined with lightning. This may, I doubt not, be accounted for upon optical principles, and by a “consideration of the structure of the eye:” but I see not what bearing it has on the present case. The above-detailed hypotheses manifestly leave many difficulties unsolved. 1st, Why was Paul alone struck blind? 2dly, How is the above description of an amaurosis consistent with what we read further on, namely, that scales had grown over the eyes? 3dly, How are we to account for a disorder of the eyes so inerterate as to occasion scales to grow over them, leaving Paul so soon, and suddenly, immediately on Ananias’s laying his hands on him. To believe all that is asserted by the defenders of those hypotheses would require a larger portion of credulity than is usually found, even in modern philosophers. But suppose this, as well as the preceding part of the affair, to have been produced by a preternatural interference of the Deity, and all becomes plain.

This blindness seems to have been inflicted, in order to typify to Paul the ignorance of his former state, and, by withdrawing his attention from external objects, and turning his thoughts inward, to favour self-examination, and promote repentance. We may suppose, too, that the scales were caused to grow over his eyes, in order that his blindness might be the more manifest to others. Many more objections to the first-mentioned hypothesis which I could advance, but which not fail to present themselves to every reflecting enquirer, I am compelled, from the nature of my work, to omit.

8. κειραγαγώντες δὲ αὐτὸν. Χειραγαγεῖν, to lead by the hand, is a word frequently used specialim of one who leads the blind; of which Wetstein produces several examples: as Artemidor. 5, 2. τυφλὸς ἐγένετο, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου ἐχειραγαγεῖτο.

9. καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα τρεῖς μὴ βλέπας καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν, οὐδὲ ἔδει. Among the three days we are perhaps to reckon the day on which he came to Damascus. Kuinoel observes that it does not follow from these
words that Paul abstained from all food (referring to his note on Matt. 4, 2. 11, 18. compared with 3, 4. and Luke 4, 2.) but that the words are to be interpreted, "abstained from all free use of food and drink, i. e. ate and drank, in a manner, nothing." But this seems an unwarrantable lowering of the sense, and still more so in the passage to which Kuinoel appeals. I would seriously deprecate this abuse of the principles of criticism, by which the extraordinary, and sometimes preternatural, circumstances of Holy Writ are degraded and brought down to the level of ordinary life, and the events of every day occurrence. This strict fasting was intended as a sign of deep penitence for his persecuting the Christians, and was likely to be so much the more rigid from his awful sense of his present visitation, not knowing whether he would ever be restored to sight. He therefore "humbled his soul with fasting." Dodridge thinks it was the result of bodily disorder, and of the attachment of his mind to those new and astonishing Divine revelations, with which he supposes him to have been favoured. Indeed we may easily suppose that he might have little inclination to eat or drink for that time.*

10. That Saul and Ananias had before been known to each other, is the conjecture of Ammon, Eichhorn, and Heinrichs; which is by Kuinoel thought ex-

* The exact length of this period cannot very well be determined, since we neither know the time of day when he arrived at Damascus, nor that on which Ananias removed his blindness, and baptized him. He fasted one whole day, and a part, (more or less,) of two others. For there seems no reason to doubt but that Ananias visited him on the third day of his blindness. This idiom is very frequent in the Old and New Testament. Thus when it is said that Christ was in the sepulchre three days, we are only to understand one whole day and a part of two others.

As to the Divine revelations which are supposed to have been vouchsafed during these days (and, as some think, ascending to the third heaven), all this seems mere speculation, founded on conjecture, and not very reconcilable with what we read in ver. 17., by which it appears that Paul had not received the Holy Spirit, when Ananias laid his hands upon him.
tremely probable. In this, however, I can by no means agree with him. It is very improbable that Saul and Ananias were acquainted. Had that been the case, God might not have thought it necessary to resort to any preternatural interposition; which, however, we learn from the plain words of Scripture that he did. Many German Commentators, indeed, as Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, make a desperate attempt to imagine how the event might have happened, (or in fact did happen,) in the regular course of ordinary life; and, what is more, they endeavour to reconcile and intermix this view of the subject with the extraordinary and preternatural method recorded by St. Luke. But surely never was there any thing more hypothetical,* contort, and far-fetched; so totally dissimilar to the plain and obvious sense of the passage, as it would appear to any man of plain good sense, reading it for the first time, and without any preconceived opinions.

11. ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι ἐπὶ τὴν βόρυν γ. χ. E. I would write Eudein. On the subject of the names of streets among the ancients I must refer my reader to the writers on antiquities. Yet may I be permitted to suggest that a memoir on this subject from the pen of some F. A. S. would be acceptable? At Σαυλον ἄνωμα must (as Kuin. thinks) be understood ἄνω. (Compare ver. 12. and see Bos Ellips. Schl. p. 89 seq.) On Ταρσος † see Calmet, Schl. Lex., and Horne’s Introduction.

* It was accidental, it seems, that Paul should dream of a person called Ananias coming to him, and healing him! Wetzstein, indeed, (with an intention, it should seem, of favouring this fancy,) cites a passage of Athen. 575 B. in which he says that it is related by the historians, “that a certain woman dreamed she saw a certain man, and fell in love with him; and that the very same thing happened to him in respect to her.” But I believe our Critics will themselves admit that this tale is of too apocryphal authority to materially aid their conjecture. That Ananias was unknown to Paul, is plain from the manner in which his name is mentioned in the relation of the dream.

* This city is called Tarsoi by Xenophon, Philostratus, and Hesychius: perhaps because it was divided into two parts by the Cyd-
12. Καὶ εἶδεν ἐν ὄνουμα τὰ ὄνομα τὸν Ἄνανιαν, ἰ. ἑ. "he saw in a vision or appearance a man whose name (he learnt) was Ananias." Kuinoel takes ὄνομα τὸν Ἀνανίαν for τὸν ἄνυδον, observing that the Hebrews are accustomed to put proper names in the place of pronouns; and he refers to Job 4, 1. Luke 3, 19. Gen. 4, 23. This is, indeed, a characteristic of the primitive style in general.

Προσεύχεται, he prayeth, i. e. that he may recover his sight (which words must be taken out of the following words, ἐπεν ἁναβλέψῃ). "Therefore (as Chrysostom adds) fear not."

13—15. By ἀγίοι are meant "Christians" in general. (Compare 32 & 41. and Rom. 1, 1. Eph. 1, 1.) So ἡγιασμένοι in Acts 20, 32. Just as the Jews were said to be ὄσιοι, as being separated from the society of Gentiles, brought to the true religion, and consecrated to God. See Koppe on Eph. 1, 1. and our note on Mark 1, 24. and Joh. 10, 36. (Kuin.)

14. καὶ ἀδε ἐξεῖ ἐξουσία, &c. How this came to the knowledge of Ananias, we are left to conjecture, and Commentators indulge their fancy. Wolf and Rosenmuller think that Ananias had received letters from Jerusalem, apprising him of the mischief which was brewing up. But counsels such as those of Saul are usually kept secret, and it is not probable that the Christians would be acquainted with it in time to apprise the Damascene Christians of their danger; for we find there was so little connection between the cities, that the news of St. Paul’s conversion was a very long time in reaching them. It is far more probable that the design of Paul’s journey

nus. On similar principles one may account for the use of the plural in several other names of antient cities, as Athens and Syracuse; the former of which was so called from its being compounded of the old πόλις (which occupied the Ἀκρόπολις), the new one South of it, and the Port Piraeus. As to Syracuse, it consisted of three or four distinct towns; on which see Thucydides, and Goller’s learned Tract De Situ Syracusarum. Thus also Thebes, Clazomenae, and many others, which we may suppose originally consisted of a high town and a low one, something like our city of Lincoln.
to Damascus was divulged by his companions, and thus reached the ears of the Christians. And Ananias might justly doubt whether so bitter an enemy to Christianity could have so suddenly changed, and become disposed to receive that doctrine. In οἱ ἐπι-
καλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα σου we have a periphrasis for μα-
θητῆς τοῦ κυρίου.

15. σκεῦος ἐκλογής μοι ἐστίν. Ὁ σκεῦος ἐκλογής is a He-
braism for σκεῦος ἐκλεκτῶν. The sense is, “He is a
chosen tool, or instrument, to work my plans.” So
Chrys. δόκιμος ἐστί, τὸ δόκιμον γὰρ ἐκλεγόμεθα. Now σκεῦος,
like the Hebr. יְסָרָה, though it properly denotes
an utensil or piece of furniture of any kind, es-
pecially a vessel (see Sap. 16, 7. and Toup. Emend.
ad Suid. p. 8), yet, like יְסָרָה in Isa. 13, 5., it denotes
also an ὄργανον, both literally and figuratively, i.e. a
person useful for or adapted to the execution of any
purpose. Thus Aristot. Pal. calls a servant ὄργανον.
Here Grotius cites Polyb. Exc. p. 1402. Δαμρικής
de ἐν ὑπηρετικῶν σκεύοις καὶ πολλὰς ἔχον ἁφορμὰς εἰς πραγ-
μάτων οἰκονομίαν.

In addition to this I must observe that σκεῦος oc-
curs in the sense of furniture in Thucyd. 7, 24., and
σκεῦη frequently in Thucyd. and other Attic writers.
Kuinoel remarks, that the metaphor is continued.
But I should rather think there is an allusion to the
other sense of σκεῦος, namely, vessel, such as we use
for carrying any thing about. By ὄνομα is meant doct-
rine (as often), and βαστάζειν signifies to promul-
gate, &c. Βασιλεῖς are here not only Kings, but
Rulers in general. See Matt. 2, 22. 10, 18.

16. ὥστε γὰρ ὑποδείξῃ, &c. The γὰρ here seems to
signify autem, and by ὑποδείξῃ is meant “will show,
teach.” Kuinoel paraphrases thus: “I will show him
that he must suffer much on account of my religion;
and yet he will continue in sincerity, penitence, and
faith. Therefore thou mayst lay aside all fear.”
Markland takes αὐτός for ἐν αὐτῶ, and, omitting αὐ-
tῶν, assigns to the words the following sense: “I
will show you in or by him, as by an example, what
every man must suffer." But I agree with Kuinoel, that this interpretation is inadmissible. Nor can I assent to Grotius ap. Doddridge, that "this intimates that Saul would presently have a revelation, and perhaps a visionary representation of all his sufferings among Jews and Gentiles by land and by sea, in tumults and imprisonments, of which this book and his Epistles give so large a description." This would not be necessary, and indeed (if we may presume to offer an opinion on the counsels of the Deity) would, in the present weak state of our neophyte, have been unseasonable.

17. Ἰσραήλ. I entirely agree with Kuinoel, that this word ought not to have been thrown out of the text by Mill and Matthiae, since, though some MSS. have it not, yet they are chiefly modern ones, and of little authority. A far greater number, including all the most antient MSS. and Versions, have it; and as it strengthens the sense, it should seem the more probable that Ananias would use the word. Certain is that Chrysostom read it.

18. καὶ εἰδὼς ἀκέφαλον ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ ἄνω κατάρας. Here again Eichhorn and others labour with all their might to destroy every idea of miracle, and to account for this sudden recovery on natural principles. They adduce three causes, either of which, they think, might produce it; and Kuinoel is inclined to think that all conjoined would render this possible; namely, the cold hands of the old man, the effect of sudden joy, and the result of poor living!!! Risum teneatis, amici? Now surely this is utterly inconsistent with that view of the subject which St. Luke evidently means to inculcate, namely, that it was effected by miracle. Nor is there any cause why Kuinoel should depreciate the greatness of the cure, by appealing to ἄνω, in order to prove that they were not real scales, but what Saul fancied to be such, namely, the humours of the eyes dried up, and which seemed to him to fall from his eyes. This, indeed, is doing manifest violence to the words, and trampling
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on every principle of legitimate interpretation. For, in the first place, the 
σέλ often detracts little or nothing from the sense of the word with which it is
united. Secondly, it is well known that sometimes humours in the eyes concrete, and form, as it were, scales, which is all that is here meant. See Job 11, 13. But it would be a waste of words to dwell longer on such a subject. We may, however, observe with Chrysost. that besides causing a stronger evidence of his blindness to others, it seems to have been meant to typify to Paul the darkness and pre-
judice which had formerly obscured his mental vision.

19. καὶ λαβὼν τραφήν, ἐνσώχασεν. The word ἐνσώ-
χάω, properly signifies corroborare, but like the cor-
respondent English term strengthen, has sometimes
a neuter or intransitive sense; as here and in Gen.
48, 2, where it answers to προσφέρω in 2 Macc. 2, 14.
ἐνσώχασαν καὶ οὐ διέστησαν τῆς ἀσέβειας. See Kypke
on this passage. The rapid improvement of his strength, after his blindness had been removed, may very well be accounted for both from physical and moral causes.

19. ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος. St. Paul to the Galat. 1,
17. relates that he, after his conversion, did not pro-
cceed to Jerusalem, but repaired to Arabia, and from thence returned to Damascus. Hence, according to the opinion of Pearson, in his Annal. Paul. p. 2., the words ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος are to be separated from the preceding passage, and constitute a new story, in which is related what happened at Da-
mascus after Saul’s return from Arabia. But the words ι光荣 νεραι may and ought to be referred to the whole time of Paul’s abode at Damascus, before he went into Arabia; and thus with the ι光荣 νεραι be numbered the νεραι τινῶς mentioned at ver. 19.: for the sense of the words is this: “Saul, when he spent some days with the Damascene Christians, immediately taught in the synagogues. Now Luke entirely passes by Paul’s journey into Arabia. (Kuin.) Doddridge imagines that his going into Arabia (to which, as he observes, Damascus now belonged), was
only making excursions from that city into the neighbouring parts of the country, and perhaps taking a large circuit about it, which might be his employment between the time in which he began to preach in Damascus, and his quitting it after having been conquered by the Romans under Pompey.” But in this view of the subject I cannot agree with him. The country in the neighbourhood of Damascus is not properly Arabia.

20. καὶ εὐθεώς — δὲ ὁ Ἰσραήλ Θεοῦ, i.e. the Messiah, of whom the Prophets of the Old Testament prophesied. For Χριστῷ many ancient MSS. and Versions read Ἰσραήλ, which is approved by Grotius, Mill, Bengel, Michaelis, Morus, Rosenmuller, Valckenaer, and others, and received into the text by Griesbach; and rightly, I think. For that Christ was the Son of God Paul had never denied; nor did the Jews deny that. They only denied that Jesus was the Son of God. Χριστῷ doubtless crept in from the margin. (Kuinoel.)

21. οὖς οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας. The verb πορθέω properly denotes to lay waste, devastate, ravage, and is often so used by the Greek Historians. Hence it came to signify to vex, persecute, &c., as here. Thus Hesychius explains it by διακεῖναι. And so Gal. 1, 13. where there is joined with it the synonyme διακεῖναι. See Wesseling on Diodor. Sic. 11, 32. Kypke on this passage, and Munthe on Gal. 1, 23. (Kuin.)

22. μᾶλλον ἐνέδωκαμοῦντο. His persuasion of the truth and excellence of Christianity daily increased, and with it his ἀπερίτα. And thus he confuted (συνέχυνε) the Jews. Συνέχυνει signifies to confound, perturb, and put to a stand. Συμβιβάζω properly signifies “to go up together;” 2dly, “to raise up together;” 3dly, “to bring together;” and is especially used of carpenter’s work. Hence it is employed metaphorically in Eph. 4, 16. Col. 2, 2. Now since he who proves and demonstrates truth, thereby shews its connection and traces the chain of demon-
stration, thus it comes to mean demonstrate, shew; as here and in 1 Cor. 2, 16. and often in the Sept.; as Exod. 4, 12. 18, 16. Deut. 4, 9. Is. 40, 14. Dan. 9, 22. In the Classical authors this signification is very rare. Kypke has, however, adduced one example from Ocellus Lucanus de universo, c. 8. p. 530. ἐπερ ἀληθῶς ὁ λόγος συμβιβάζει, μη μόνον τα μέρη συναρχεῖν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ περιεχόμενα τῶν μέρων.

23, 24. ἢς ἔλησώντο—ἀνεδεῖν αὐτῶν. In 2 Cor. 11, 32. we read that the Ethnarch of Aretas, king of Arabia, had placed a guard at the gates of Damascus, to seize Paul. Now it appears that Syria Damascene was, at the end of the Mithridatic war, reduced by Pompey to the Roman yoke. It has therefore been enquired how it could happen that Aretas should then have the government, and appoint an Ethnarch. That Aretas had, on account of the repudiation of his daughter by Herod Antipas, commenced hostilities against that monarch, and in the last year of Tiberius (A. D. 37.) had completely defeated his army, we learn from Joseph. Ant. 18, 5, 1. seqq. Herod had, we find, signified this by letter to Tiberius, who, indignant at this audacity, (Joseph. L. c.), gave orders to Vitellius, prefect of Syria, to declare war against Aretas, and take him alive, or send him his head. Vitellius made preparations for the war, but on receiving a message acquainting him with the death of Tiberius, he dismissed his troops into winter quarters. And thus Aretas was delivered from the danger. At the time, however, that Vitellius drew off his forces, Aretas invaded Syria, seized Damascus, and continued to occupy it, in spite of Tiberius's stupid successor Caligula. This is the opinion of most Commentators, and among others, Wolf, Michaelis, and Eichhorn. But I have already shewn in the Proleg. § de chronologia lib. 2, 3. that Aretas did not finally subdue Damascus until Vitellius had already departed from the province. (Kuin.)
24. παρατήρουν τὰς πύλας — ὡς αὐτὸν ἀνέλασι, "watched the gates day and night to kill him." But Paul in 2 Cor. says that the soldiers of the Ethnarch of King Aretas occupied the gates that he should not escape. This diversity Commentators have, by various means, endeavoured to reconcile. The most probable opinion, and that adopted by the generality of Commentators, is, that we are to understand an Ethnarch appointed by Aretas over Damascus and the circumjacent regions. For εὐνάγχης denotes in general any one who is set over a nation, whether great or small, with the power of governing it; and who is elsewhere called ἐπίτευγος. Now if in 2 Cor. there had been meant the Ethnarch of the Jews, Paul would have written ὁ εὐνάγχης τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐν ἑκατέρτῃ Ἀρέτας ὁ βασιλεὺς. In order to reconcile the diversity, one must suppose either that the Ethnarch had enjoined the Jews to watch the gates, or that, at their instigation, he had placed a guard there; so that παρατήρουν may be taken impersonally, and thus the Jews be said to have done what they did by another, or (which is more probable), that the Jews, by the authority of the Ethnarch, watched the gates in conjunction with the soldiers. The words εὐνάγχη ἐς — αὐτῶν are parenthetical. (Kuin.) Ἐπιστούλη. This always signifies a plot, or secret counsel, and is frequent in the best writers.

25. καβάκαν διὰ τοῦ τείχους, i.e. through an aperture of the wall, or the window of a house adjacent to it. In 2 Cor. 11, 38. we have διὰ θυρίδος. See Jos. 2, 15. and consult Harmer in loc. Wetstein compares Sallust Frag. e muris carnes sportis demittebat, and refers to 1 Sam. 19, 12. I add Procop. 155, 38. οἱ μὲν οὖν αὐτῶν βρόχοι των ἀνάβασται νύκτωρ, ἀπὸ τοῦ περιβόλου καβάκαν. Palæp. de Incr. Hist. 9. καβάς εἰς αὐτῶν διὰ θυρίδος. Athen. 214 a. διὰ τῶν τείχων αὐτῶν καβαμπούσας κ. τ. χ. Arist. Vesp. 354. μεμνησα — ἵς σαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ τείχος. & 379. ἀλλ έξάλασ διὰ τῆς θυρίδος τῇ καλαίδῳ, έτσι καβάμα Αίγινας

Saul, thus delivered from the snares of the Jews, did not go immediately to Jerusalem, but repaired to Arabia. See the note on ver. 19. Gal. 1, 17. seqq. Kuinoel is of opinion that Luke either knew not of the journey, or had forgotten it. But it seems most reasonable to conclude that he omitted the mention of it from some motive which it were vain for us to attempt to conjecture. The most probable opinion is that of Haselaar, that Luke only meant to narrate such parts of St. Paul’s history as especially illustrated the providential care of God, and the mode in which he was brought to apply himself to the conversion of the Gentiles. It is remarked by Chrysostom 728, 17. Eἰκότως ἦν ἄνωποτον ἣ τὸ πράγμα, τοῦ ὀν ὑπὸ τοῦ κίνδυνον διαφυγαῖν, ἀρα ἱσταται; οὐδὲνὸς ἀλλ’ ἀπέχεται ἐνα μείζονος ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑξάψοι, where Saville conjectures φέρεται. But this is very wide of the mark, and is both tautological and inelegant. The learned Editor might have emended the passage by the insertion of one letter only, namely, by altering ἂρα ἱσταται to ἁρ’ ἱσταται. The verb ἱσταται is used in that sense by the best writers, both Scriptural and Classical: but Chrysostom seems to have had in view the passage of Luke 8, 18. καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἱσταται.

26. παραγενόμενος δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, when Saul was come to Jerusalem. Not immediately after his conversion, through fear of the Sanhedrin, but when he thought the report of his conversion might have died away. Κολλᾶσθαι, to unite himself to, attach himself to the society of. Grotius, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, take it for συγχρᾶσθαι; as in Joh. 4, 9. See the note on 5, 18. Some MSS. have ἐν for εἰς: but that seems to have arisen from a misunderstanding of παραγενόμενος.

27. Ἐρνάσθας δὲ, ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτῶν, &c. Saul went
to Barnabas (of whom we read in the context, and to whom, as the Commentators say, Saul was before known), that he might be introduced by him to the Disciples. Ἐπιλαβόμενος, taking him by the hand: on which signification see Hemsterhus on Lucian 1, 313. It seems to be here used in a figurative sense, and not to be (as Kuin. thinks) a Hebrew redundancy.

27. πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, to the Apostles: namely, Peter and John. For Paul (Gal. 1, 18 & 19.), tells us that he only saw these: from which it may be inferred that the rest were not at Jerusalem. Δημήτριο τοῦτος. These words are by some referred to Saul, but more rightly, by the Greek Commentators, as also Capellus, Lightfoot, and others, to Barnabas. For that is required by correctness of language, and the relation would come with greater propriety from Barnabas. Besides, at introducing him, Barnabas would be likely to say something of him.

Wetstein paraphrases thus: “If the Lord hath vouchsafed to speak to him, is it for us to shun him? If the Damascenes received him, why should not we too?”

28—30. καὶ ἔν μετ’ αὐτῶν εἰσπροεύμενος καὶ ἐκπροεύμενος. See the note on 1, 21., to which I add the following passages illustrative of the expression. Soph. Phil. 147. ὄχθες γὰρ μῶλη δεινὸς δόθης τῶν ἐκ μελαθρῶν, where δόθης ἐκ μελαθρῶν is rightly explained by Wakefield, victor, qui ex his ædibus egreditur, incola, scil. harum ædium. Matt. 15, 1. οἱ ἄρτοι Ἱερουσαλήμων Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι. Eurip. Phæn. 534. (speaking of ambition) πολλοὶ δ’ ἐσ’ ὀλίκους καὶ πόλεις εἰσαίμονας ἐστήλε καξίλθω ἐπ’ ὀλέθρῳ τῶν χρυσήμων.

The period of Paul’s residence was fifteen days. See Galat. 1, 18.

28. παράφοιναξόμενος, “he had freely spoken and taught.” Ἐνάλει, disputed with. See 11, 20.

30. ἐπιρώντες, scil. τούτο. This ellipsis is not unfrequently found in the best writers; as Thucydides
and Æschyl. Agam. 1588. επὶ γεῦνας ἔργαν. Καθάγαγαν, brought him, viz. to the sea-coast. Spoken with a reference to the situation of Caesarea (κατὰ), on the sea-coast, in comparison to that of Damascus ἀνω, in the interior. Of this Wets adduces an example from Plutarch. Doddridge says he should have concluded this had been the celebrated city of that name on the Mediterranean Sea, so often mentioned afterwards, and from whence Paul might so easily have passed by ship to Tarsus, had he not himself told us he went through the regions of Syria and Cilicia (Gal. 1, 21.), which intimates (continues he) that he went by land, and makes it probable that it was Caesarea Philippi, near the borders of Syria, which is here spoken of. There was no need, however, to have resorted to this conjecture, since εἰς, in the passage of Gal. 1, 21., to which Doddridge advertists, signifies not through, but to. Paul now went to Caesarea, and took ship for Syria, visited Laodicea and Antioch, and passed from thence to Tarsus by land, through upper Syria, and what was called Cilicia Campestris to Tarsus. We may observe, that they sent him to Tarsus both for safety's sake, and to give him an opportunity of propagating the Gospel most effectually among the Hellenists of that great city.

31. The reading of this passage is approved by Mill, Bengel, and Griesbach, and probably the true one is, ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία — εἰχεν εἰσῆνην, οἰκοδομοῦμενα καὶ παρευμένη — ἐκλησίωνα. Now since various regions of Palestine are mentioned, the scribes changed the singular (which is put for the plural) into the plural. (Kuin.)

31. Οἰκοδομοῦμενα καὶ παρευμένα καὶ τ. λ. There is here, as in many passages of the New Testament, an architectural metaphor, which is well illustrated by Dr. Hammond; though as to the exact bearing which it has on the present point, Commentators are not agreed. Most of the earlier interpreters explain it of spiritual edification; and indeed it is frequently
so used in the New Testament; as in 1 Cor. 8, 10, 23. 14, 4. 1 Thess. 5, 11. The later ones, and, among others, Doddridge, take it to denote increase in number, as a house which, while it is building, increases in size. Either interpretation may be defended: but the former seems preferable.

Περευέσθαι, like the Heb. יְָּזֵנ, signifies to live. The metaphor, therefore, seems to refer to habitual action. So Luke 1, 6. Ἐν must be understood before φέβω, like the Heb. ו. Examples of this in the Old Testament are frequent; as in 2 Sam. 15, 11. Ps. 81, 14. 79, 81. Prov. 28, 26. So also the Targum on Gen. 5, 22. (cited by Wets.) “Enoch walked in the fear of God;” & 6, 9.

32. From this verse up to 11, 18. St. Luke treats of the journeys which Peter (who had hitherto taught the Christian doctrines at Jerusalem, and for a short time at Samaria, 8, 14.) undertook, in order to visit the congregations founded in Palestine, and, by preaching the doctrine of Christ, increase the number of his followers.

At διὰ πάντων subaud χιλιαν or τάσιν, by a very common ellipsis. It seems to be an adverbial phrase equivalent to every where. On Lydda (situated near the Mediterranean) and called by Joseph. Ant. 20, 6, 2. a town not much inferior in size to a city. See Reland’s Palestine, 878., Lightfoot, in his Chorogr. C. 16., Wets. in loc., and Horne’s Introduction. Καταγέννω is used, with reference to the situation, as κατάγεννα a little before. The opposite ἄνεξεθαι is always employed of those going to Jerusalem.

33. Aineas. From the name (which is Greek) it is probable that he was an Hellenist; and that he was a Christian may (as Kuinoel thinks) be inferred from the turn of the whole passage. To me, however, this seems to amount to no more than a high degree of probability. Ἐξ ἔτων ἴκτω κατακείμενον ἐπὶ κραββάτῳ, o. η. π. By this we are not (I think) to suppose that he had been literally ten years laid on a bed, but had been for that time, as we say, bed-
ridden. On κράββατον see the note on Mark 2, 4. and Joh. 5, 8. Παραλείμμενος is for παραλυτικός.

34. ιατεί σε Ἰησοῦς κ. τ. λ. Jesus is pleased to heal thee. Στραγων σεαυτῷ. On this passage most Commentators trifle egregiously. Στραγων must denote what we call making a bed (which, by the way, is not a mere Hebraism, since in Herodot. 7, 17. and in Vit. Hom. we have κολτον τοιεύσας). It is therefore a stronger expression than take up thy bed, which Beza thinks is meant here. The truth is, that the expression take up thy bed had reference to those portable couches on which cripples were laid, in order to excite charity, and which were made portable for convenience of frequent removal. But the present expression στραγων has reference to a bed properly so called, namely, of a large size, and suitable to persons of respectable situation in life: for (as Chrysostom tells us) Ἀνεας ἦν ἐπίσημος. The words are well paraphrased by Dr. Doddridge (from Grotius): "Ἀνεας, Jesus, the true Messiah, in whose name I preach and act, not at this instant healeth thee, and operates, while I speak, to strengthen and restore thy weakened frame. With a dependance, therefore, upon his Almighty agency, arise and make thy bed. And upon this the palsy left him, and the disabled man was, all at once, so strengthened, that he arose immediately and did it."

Dr. Doddridge (after Clarius, and he from Chrysostom) points out the difference there is between the manner in which this miracle was wrought by Peter, and that in which Christ performed his works of Divine power and goodness. "The different characters of the servant and the Son, the creature and the God, are everywhere apparent."

35. καὶ εἶδον αὐτῶν—ἐκ τῶν Κύριων. Some modern Commentators, as Heinrichs and Kuinoel, take ἐκείστρεφαν in the sense of a pluperfect, had turned; and refer to Glass. Phil. S. 299. And I do not deny that many instances occur of aorists in a pluperfect signification; but here it would lead to a peculiarly
awkward sense; as if no other had seen the healed person but the Christian converts. But surely all the inhabitants must have seen it; and this is what St. Luke means to assert; and not only that, but to narrate the effect which this most stupendous miracle had on those dwelling in that part of the country. I would therefore retain the common interpretation, which gives the best sense, and is not liable to any serious objection. Kαλ may be understood before επεστησαν, and οίνως may be taken for the relative: than which nothing is more frequent. As to the πάντες, we need only understand the greater part; and certainly all saw, or might have seen: which is an idiom very often found in the antient and modern languages. Kuinoel indeed objects that if Luke had meant this, he would have expressed himself otherwise. But this is begging the question, and is a mere matter of opinion. The learned Commentator might have more truly said, that a Classical author would perhaps have expressed himself otherwise: though I have occasionally met with some examples of this subaudition of καλ after a relative pronoun, in the best Attic writers, as Thucydides. In such a case, however, it may be most advisable to resolve the relative into its component parts, namely, the copula and a pronoun personal. That, in fact, is the force of the relative pronoun; though it may not be easy to prove this from the form which they now assume. Thus the Latin qui may come from quæ and ille, ille being melted down into s (whence our he), and quis comes from qui and is. And so the Italian quello.

36. Ἰέπη. See the writers on Sacred Geography, Reland, and Wets., including Horne’s Introduction. Μαθήμα, an Hellenistic or vulgar Greek word for the Attic μαθησίς. It is used, and in the same sense as here, by Diog. Laert. 4, 2. 'λέγοντο δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ Πλάττωνος ἀκόουν μαθήματα’ and Pyth. 8, 42. μαθήματαν δὲ Πυθαγόρου. On the name Dorcas I must refer my readers to the Commentators and Schl. Lexi-
con; who, however, come to no certainty. Indeed, there is not more egregious or unprofitable trifling, than that which is employed upon etymologizing proper names, antient or modern.

36. πλήρης ἀγαθῶν ἐργῶν, &c. is a popular expression for "she was highly studious of." Kuinoel observes that the term ἔργα ἀγαθὰ, in the New Testament, sometimes signifies generally actions agreeable to the precepts of the Christian Religion; as in Rom. 2, 7. 18, 3. and sometimes specially liberality and beneficence exercised towards the poor; as here, and in 2 Cor. 9, 8. 1 Tim. 5, 10. and elsewhere.

37, 38. λούσαντες δὲ αὐτὴν ἔθηκαν ἐν ὑπέρφορο. Kuinoel observes, that washing the dead was customary both among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans; and he refers to Geier de Luctu, Hebr. c. 5, 9. and Doughty's Anal. p. 2, 77. Some Commentators stumble at the sense which seems inculcated by λούσαντες, as if men had washed the body of Dorcas; which Bp. Pearce thinks not probable. And yet we read in Herodotus of men being professionally so employed; which, indeed, weakens the objection on the score of indelicacy. But Bp. Pearce, Markland, and Owen, are of opinion that it may be taken for λούσαντες, ἄνθρωποι being understood, which, as it is a general term, may include females. To me, however, this appears a far-fetched device. It is better to regard λούσαντες—ἔθηκαν as a popular mode of expression for "she was washed and laid out," "they washed and laid her out," i. e. they whose business it was, namely, the women. In such cases the masculine is used in a general sense for either sex, as being (if we may believe the Grammarians) the worthier. Now we learn, both from the Scriptures and the Classical writers, that women were employed upon such sad offices even towards men. So Ennius (cited by Wets.), Tarquinii corpus bona femina lavit, et unxit. And Socrates (as we learn from Plato in Phaedon,) chose to take a bath just before he drank the fatal cup, thinking it better not to trouble the wo-
men, μὴ πράγματα ταῖς γυναιξιν παρέδω. Thus we cannot doubt that women performed the same offices one to another: and this is proved by a very pathetic passage of Apuleius 8. (cited by Priscæns and Wetstein): Familiaries miseræ Charites accuratissimè corpus ablutum unita sepultura ibidem marito perpetuam conjugen reddidere. On ὑπερήφανον see the note on 1, 18. Such rooms were, no doubt, selected for their privacy.

38. ἀκτενείλαυ—ἐως αὐτῶν, "sent unto him two men, desiring him that he would not delay to come to them." Not merely to condole with them (as some Commentators think): for that is inconsistent with ὅκνησαι, which hints that he should come without delay. So Joseph. Ant. 2, 7. τῶν δ' ὁκνούντων ἅλλ' ἱεμένων μετὰ σπουδῆς to which may be added the following passages cited by Wetstein: Thomas. ἀποκεφαλω δοκιμαστέρων ἡ ὁμοιο. Galen. Anat. 4. μηθ' ὁδῷ μὴκοι ὅκνησας μήτε πλοῦν. Etymol. ὅκενῶ τὸ βαθμημ, οἰλιον οὐ κινῶ. Num. 22, 16. Plato sēpiss. ὅκεν. Diog. Laert. Periand. 1, 99. μὴ ὅκνησε καὶ παρ' ἐμὲ φωτῆν. So the Hebr. ἄξυ in Judg. 18, 2. where the Sept. render μὴ ὅκνησητε τοῦ παρευθήναι. (Kuin.) This, indeed, seems to be the primitive sense of ὅκνειν, namely, to delay, be slow: and ὅκνος, sloth, which I am surprised the etymologists should not have seen comes from ἐχω, to hold, stop, detain; whence ἐχεῖ and ἐχος, a bank, also, ὀχλος, ὀχ-μα, ὀχ-μη, ὀχ-μος, ὀχ-μος. Thus our loath comes from the old word lag-an, lageth. Valckenaer here remarks that ὅκνος properly denotes sitting on the ground, complicatis manibus et pedibus. This, however, does not make against the above derivation.

39. παρέστησαν αὐτῶ. It is well known that the women of antient times, even those of the higher ranks, used to manufacture garments for the use of the family. There are often allusions to this, both in Homer and Virgil, from the latter of whom Priscæns cites, "Vestes ostroque auroque rigente; Extulit Aeneas, quas illi laeta laborum ipsa suis manibus

These words are generally understood as if the widows exhibited to Peter stocks of clothes provided for the poor. Some recent Commentators, however, as Kuinoel, (and formerly Cyprian,) suppose that they shewed Peter their own garments such as they had then on, and which had been made and given them by Tabitha. This, indeed, seems the preferable mode of taking the words, and is more agreeable to what we should expect; though the common interpretation is more easily elicited from the words as they now stand, and in a Classical author no other could be thought of.

The expression μετ’ αυτῶν ομοὶ has great simplicity and pathos, and is not unfrequently found in the Classical writers, from whom several examples are produced by Wetstein.

40, 41. ἐκβάλλων δὲ έξω πάντας. On this mild sense of ἐκβάλλειν see the note on Matt. 9, 25. Peter seems to have imitated his blessed Master on this occasion, nor were his actions (on which see the Commentators) dissimilar. See 2 Kings 4, 35. There is great delicacy in the words δοσάσα τὸν Πέτρον ἀνεκάθισεν.

41. παρέστησεν αὐτὴν ἔζωσαν, "and he exhibited her (to them) alive." There is great elegance in this use of παρέστησιν, of which an example is given by Wetstein from Sext. Emp. 254. ὥστε Ἀδριατῷ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τὴν Ἀλκησίν γένειν ἀναγαγὼν παρέστησεν. The Sceptical Theologians of Germany, as usual, deny that there was any miracle. Their speculations are, however, so ludicrously absurd as to deserve no notice.

43. θυμοῦ. Doddridge well observes (from Chrysostom) that the purpose for which St. Luke mentions Simon's business is, that it might appear the Apostle was not elevated, by the dignity of the late miracle, above mean persons and things. And so
Schoettgen, who observes that this circumstance is not mentioned in vain, since though this was a trade stigmatized by the Jews, yet Peter did not hesitate to tarry with him, nor did this injure him in the opinion of the others.

CHAP. X.

Hitherto the Apostles had received into the Christian society none but Jews and circumcised proselytes (see 11, 9, 18, 43.), since for them alone they thought the benefits of the Messiah were destined; and that the Gentiles, if they would participate therein, must first become Israelites, by circumcision. See Acts 16, 8, 5, 1 & 4. Divine Providence, however, ordered that they should communicate the doctrine of Christ to the Gentiles also, and bind them, too, by the solemn rite of baptism to the profession of the Christian religion. (See Matt. 28, 19.) This important office was undertaken by Peter, who (as it is related in this chapter) brought over Cornelius to the Christian Religion. It is the opinion of most Commentators that this Cornelius was not a mere Gentile, but a proselyte of the gate, i. e. one who, having abandoned idolatry, had embraced the Jewish religion; so, however, that he had not received circumcision, and therefore could not be numbered among the Jews. So Deyling, Obs. 2, 357., Fecht Diss. de Pietate Cornelii, Hammond, Wolf, Benson, Moschius, Ernesti, Ziegler, and others. Their arguments are as follows: 1. Cornelius is said to be φολογμένος τω Θεω. Now this is a name given to proselytes of the gate (see 13, 16, 26, 43.) For proselytes of justice, i. e. Gentiles who had embraced the Jewish faith, and undergone circumcision, were considered as having become part of the Jewish people, and were called Jews. 2. Cornelius offered up his prayers at the hours usual among the Jews (see 3, 30.), and that he had read the Old Testament, is plain from the circumstance that Peter, in
demonstrating Jesus to be the Messiah, appeals to the prophecies. He had too conferred many benefits on the people (ver. 2.), not the Gentiles only, but also the Jews. 3. Although the Jews did not refuse to mix with the proselytes of the gate (as we learn from Joseph. Bell. 6, 3, 8.), yet the more rigid ones despised them, since they had not undergone circumcision, nor used to observe the precepts of the Mosaic Law concerning clean and unclean meats.

But these reasons seem not very convincing. For, in the first place, the words φιλούμενος, or σεβόμενος τον Θεον, or εὐλαβεῖς, are also used of any persons studious of piety, and filled with reverence towards God. See Acts 18, 11. 19, 27. 22, 12. Luke 1, 50. 2, 25. 2 Pet. 2, 9. Apoc. 11, 18. 2dly. Cornelius is called by Peter ἀλλήλων, with whom it was not lawful for Jews to associate. See 10, 28. But there was nothing in the whole Law which forbade the holding society with proselytes of the gate. Nay the Law of Moses permitted to foreigners a perpetual abode among Jews, on condition that they should renounce idolatry, and abstain from whatever had a reference thereto; as meats offered up to idols, food formed from blood. (See Lev. 17, 10. 11, 18.) The Law had moreover enjoined the Israelites to treat such proselytes as fellow-countrymen, and love them as themselves. (Lev. 19, 33 & 34.) See Michaelis on the Law of Moses, and Nitch de sensu Decret. Apost. Actt. 15, 29. Hence also to such was permitted free access to the Synagogues (see Acts 14, 1.) and familiar intercourse with Jews. (See Luke 7, 3. and the note on Matt. 8, 5.) Besides, had Cornelius been a proselyte of the gate, the news of his conversion would not have occasioned such astonishment to the Apostles and others (11, 1. seqq.) 3dly. Cornelius is, in 11, 1. expressly numbered with Gentiles. (See also 10, 34 & 35.) Now what is predicated of Cornelius is transferred to the Gentiles; and in the Council of Jerusalem
Peter claims to himself the glory of first preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles. (See 15, 7.) On all which accounts it seems far more probable that Cornelius was a Gentile. (Kuin.)

1. Σαείρα signifies a cohort. See the note on Matt. 27, 27. Σαείρας Ἰταλικής. So called by way of distinction, as being formed chiefly of Italians; since most of the cohorts and other forces of the Romans then stationed in Syria and Judea seem to have been raised from Provincials. Thus Joseph. Ant. 13, 27: relates that most of the recruits were derived from Syria. See also Bell. 1, 18. In Gruter's Inscriptions, p. 481, mention is made of a cohors militum Italicorum voluntaria quæ est in Syria. (Kuin.) Wets. cites similar passages from the Greek and Latin historians, who make mention of Italian cohorts, or legions; as Tacit. Hist. 1, 59 & 64. 2, 41. 3, 14. Arrian, Tactic. p. 78. προτεσάχαν δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ τῆς σαείρας Ἰταλικῆς πεζών: πάντων δὲ γιγνίσκω Πολύχερον καὶ τῆς σαείρας τῆς Ἰταλικῆς ἀρχεῖ. Joseph. Ant. 19, 9, 2, Bell. 3, 4, 2. D. Cass. L. 55. p. 384. It seems to be admitted by all recent Commentators and Critics, that we are not to understand (as was done by the older Commentators) the Italian Legion: an error which (as Valcknaer observes) arose from Tacitus and other writers mentioning an Italian Legion, but few or none the Italian Cohort. Arrian, above cited, is one of the few who mention an Italian cohort. Dr. Doddridge, however, thinks that Mr. Biscoe (ap. Boyle's Lect.) has proved that the Italian Legion did not at that time exist, that this cohort was different from the legionary ones, and (as Doddridge conjectures) was the life-guard of the Roman Governor. As to whether Cornelius was a Gentile, or a Jewish proselyte, most recent Commentators maintain that he was a pious Gentile. And so Valcknaer, who remarks that those among the Jews who, though of Gentile origin and uncircumcised, yet worshipped the true God of the Israelites, like Cornelius, are by St. Luke called...
καὶ ἐξοχὴν, φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεὸν; and thus in Acts 15, 16. the Israelites καὶ φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεὸν are distinguished.

Here Wetstein observes that he is called εὐσεβής, because he acknowledged one God; φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν, because he regulated his life by the rule of the Law of Nature.

That Cornelius was a Gentile is also decidedly the opinion of Dr. Doddridge, who maintains that the name proselyte was never by any antient or correct writers (such as St. Luke) applied to an uncircumcised person; and indeed he positively asserts (and meant, in a separate treatise, to prove) that there is no sufficient authority for the distinction generally admitted by learned men between proselytes of righteousness, who by circumcision became debtors to the whole law, and proselytes of the gate, who, worshipping the true God, renouncing idolatry, and submitting themselves to the observation of the seven (supposed) precepts of Noah, were allowed, though uncircumcised, to live among the Jews, and converse familiarly with them.

It is well observed by Chrysostom, that the Treasurer of Queen Candace and the Centurion of the Italian band are not mentioned, because they were persons of rank and authority, but because their rank and official duties did not hinder them from discharging the duties of piety. He observes, too, that Cornelius, though not a Jew, nor a Christian, yet lived the life of a good Christian. Therefore (adds Oecumenius) τοῦτον ἴδον ὁ τῆς εὐθείας φιλαμίας, ὃτι καλὰ μὲν τὰ ἔργα, νεκρὰ δὲ, ἐτὶ πίστιν οὐκ ἔχοντα, ἀποστέλλει βραδεύσοντα τοῖς ἔργοις ἄγγειοι, ὡς καλῶς ἀδιόντα στεφάνασαι τῇ πίστει, where for εὐθείας I conjecture εὐμενείας. See Matt. 6, 2. By the λάος is meant the people in general, both Gentiles and Jews.

3. εἶδεν ἐν ὄραματι, saw in a vision. Eichhorn and others contend that this vision was presented in a dream. And this opinion is embraced by Rosen-
muller and Heinrichs, the latter of whom maintains that it signifies no more than a mind joyful under the determination of embracing the Christian Religion, and sending for Peter. And to this opinion Kuinoel strongly inclines. It is unnecessary for me to point out the absurdity of this hypothesis, which scarcely merited the full refutation it has received from Storr. Opusc. 3, 181. There is nothing in the words that leads one to imagine a dream. The hour at which this happened was one of the hours of prayer, and that the most solemn of all. Cornelius was, doubtless, engaged in prayer when the angelic vision was presented to his view. It is well observed by Lightfoot, that Φανερός is added, in order to show that Cornelius was awake, and saw this with his corporeal eyes. On this subject the student may also, with advantage, consult Priceus.

4. ἀτενίσας. See the note on Luke 22, 56. Τί ἐστιν κύριε; I am surprised that Dr. Doddridge should have recognized no more in these words than a sudden exclamation and prayer to God to preserve him, such as “good God.” This, surely, is as objectionable as the Socinian interpretation of Thomas’s words, “My Lord, and my God.” It is moreover destitute of any authority. The true one is that adopted by Beza, “quid me vis.” In fact, it is a popular form of respectful answer to the call of a superior, though sometimes to that of an inferior, varying according to the tone of voice with which it is pronounced. Kuinoel aptly cites Esth. 5, 1. τι ἐστιν Ἱνῆρ; So also Esth. 5, 6 & 7. 7, 2. τί ἐστιν Ἱνῆρ βασιλέως; καὶ τί τό αἰτήμα σου; there is therefore ap ellipsis of some such word as αἰτήμα or βασιλείας. It may be Englished thus: “what is your will, or business with me.”

4. αἱ προσευχαί σου — ἐνάκτιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. The words εἰς μυηλόντων must be pointed off from the rest of the sentence. Another example of the phrase ἀναφοίνουν ἐνάκτιον τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs in Apoc. 8, 4. ανέθη — ἐνάκτιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Some Commentators think there is
reference to the Jewish opinion, that men's prayers are carried up by angels to God in Heaven. See Apoc. 8, 4. Tob. 12, 12. But there is here no occasion to entangle ourselves with Jewish opinions. If such a notion were really entertained, it must have been by the vulgar, and have arisen from interpreting figurative language in a literal sense. Most assuredly the words of the present passage have the same meaning as those further on in ver. 31. ἐν ὕμνῳ σοι ᾧ προσευχή καὶ ἀνέβη ἐνόσσων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Kuinoel, too, adduces examples of this use of ἀναβαίνειν from 1 Macc. 1, 31. ἡ κραυγὴ τῆς πόλεως ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, i.e. to God in heaven. Exod. 2, 23. καὶ παντετέναξαν οἱ ἦλιοι Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰσραηλινῶν ἁμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἐρχομάν, καὶ ἀνεβάζονταν καὶ ἀνέβοντο ὑμᾶς ἀντί τῶν Θεῶν. The μνημόσυνον (continues Kuinoel) is equivalent to μνημεῖαν and the Latin monumentum. So the Heb. נֵיט denotes monumentum in Ex. 12, 14. 28, 12, 30, 16. and Josh. 4, 7. Now since monuments are set up for preserving and recording the memory of any person or thing, hence the Heb. נָשֵׂע in Exod. 17, 14. (where the Sept. render εἰς μνημόσυνον.) Neh. 2, 10., and Mal. 3, 16., also signified remembrance; and the Jewish writers so used μνημόσυνον. See Sir. 45, 1, 10, 18, 35, 6. 1 Macc. 3, 7., and 2 Macc. 6, 31.

5. καὶ νῦν, "now then." An hortatory formula, examples of which are produced by Elsner from Xenophon and Aschines. Μετάτευψαι, send for. In this sense the word is used in the best Classical writers, especially Thucydides, and almost always in the middle voice, whose force we may here plainly discern. For ὁ ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος many MSS. have τὸν ἐπικαλοῦμενον Πέτρον, which reading is preferred by Matthæus and Griesbach. To me it appears to be derived from the margin: and the less elegant reading seems here (as generally in the New Testament) the truer one.

6. ἐκοίμηται παρὰ τοῦ Σιμώνι βυρσεῖ "is a guest," &c. ἐκοίμηται is by Hesychius explained ἐνοδοχεῖται.
See the valuable philological illustrations of this word brought forward by Valcknaer. *Σίμων βυροείς*, Simon a tanner; who is supposed, from ver. 28., to have been one of the Christians. By βυροείς* is not meant a currier (as some explain it), but a tanner, one who softens, and otherwise prepares ψωρια (hides) for various uses; regarded by the ancients as a very mean occupation. See Schoetg. Hor. Hebr., Wets. in loc., and Walch’s Diss. de Simone coriario.

6. τυρά θάλασσας. Amongst the ancients, tanners used to have their houses and workshops apart from towns (on account of the fetid odour arising from the dead animals), and near rivers, for convenience of water necessary to the preparation of the skins. So Artemid. 1, 53. *νεκρῶν ἄστεται σωμάτων καὶ βυροδεΐς, καὶ τῆς πέλας ἀφαίτηται*, Surenhus. Misch. T. 4, p. 64. Cadavera et sepulcrar separant et coriarium L. cubitos a civitate. Nor is it (as Walch observes) certain, because St. Luke says that Simon’s house was at Joppa, that it was situated in the city itself, since *suburbs*, especially within so short a distance as fifty cubits, are reckoned as forming part of a city. (Kuin.)

6. οὗτος θαλάττει σοι τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. These words are wanting in some very good MSS. and Versions, and in others we have another similar sentence. So difficult, indeed, is it to account for their omission, and so easy for their insertion, that I assent to Wets., Griesbach, Matthæe, and others, that they are derived from the margin, where they were noted from 9, 6, 10, 32, 22, 10, 11, 14.

7. αὕτη δὲ ἀντίλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος. Heinrichs and Kuinoel, most unwarrantably, take these words to be equivalent to “finita ecstasi.” *Διὸ τῶν εἰκετῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ στρατιατην εἰσεβῆν.* 'Eisēbēns must here be taken in the same sense as just before, where it was applied to Cornelius, namely, a virtuous person, a wor-

* The Attics used, not βυροείς, skinner, but βυροδεΐς, i.e. a skin softener, coriarus, leather maker, tanner (which word comes from taia, cognate with the French teindre, to stain).
shipper of the Supreme Being; "a very rare epithet of a soldier," says Grotius.

7. Τῶν προσκαρτερούντων αὐτῷ, "who attended upon him." Priscæus here recognizes a parallelism: but without cause. He rightly, however, takes the word (as does Kuinoel) in the sense of "standing guard, or sentry;" and aptly cites the Ovidian line, where, speaking of the lover and the soldier, the Poet sings: Ille fores domine servat, et ille Ducus.

8. καὶ ἐξηγησάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀπαντα, "having related all that happened, and told them what to do and say in the execution of their errand." At προσεδεξάμενος subaud eiς τὸ or ὅστε. By the δῶμα many Commentators, as Jerome, Erasmus, Priscæus, and Heinrichs, understand an upper room next the roof, such as those to which the Jews used to resort for prayer. But it was also the custom to ascend to the flat roof of the house for such a purpose: and certainly δῶμα suggests the idea of the latter more than the former: for in the Sept. and the New Testament it is perpetually used in the sense of roof; and so also in the later Greek Historians. That the Jews were accustomed to offer up their prayers on the roofs of their houses, is plain from 2 Kings, 23, 12. Jer. 19, 13. 32, 15. Zeph. 1, 5. Neh. 8, 16. Tob. 8, 11 & 17. Dan. 6, 10. Ps. 55, 17. So also Taanith, fol. 23. (cited by Wets.) Adscendamus in tectum, et imploremus misericordiam—adscenderunt in tectum, et stetit ille ab uno angulo, et illa ab altero—cūm descendisset, dixit.


10. πρὸς ἐστὶνος, very hungry. The πρὸς has an intensive force, like κατὰ, i. e. worn down with famine. The word is very rare, and is said to occur no where else. One may, however, compare with it κατὰ πνευμονος ἐκπεινος, δραπεινος, all which forms (and one in ṇṣ) have the force of our old English word an hungered
(from the participle hungered). At γεῦσασθαι subaud τὴς τροφῆς or βρωμάτων,—a common ellipsis. Τεῦξασθαι answers to the Heb. יָּאָת, to which is sometimes added רָבָל. I am surprised that Dr. Doddridge should have fallen into the common error of understanding this expression as denoting to take a slight refreshment. It is perpetually used of taking a meal, without reference to any precise quantity; of which examples in abundance are produced by Limborch, Elser, Raphel, and Valcknaer. Now γεῦσασθαι, by the force of the middle voice, signifies to oneself, to take, eat, &c. Ἡθελε γεῦσασθαι must be rendered, "he was desirous of eating." After πάσας κεκαταληκτὸν we must again subaud τροφὴν from the context. This verb is perpetually used (as here) to denote cooking.

10. ἐπέσεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἕκστασις. The word ἕκστασις properly signifies a removal of any thing from any former state: but it is especially applied to that alienation, or (as we call it) absence, of mind, by which, even though awake, our senses are so far from conveying to us the impressions of external objects, that the mind seems, as it were, to have retired from the body, and to be wholly absorbed in the contemplation of internal and spiritual images or objects. So Doddridge, who observes that the word ἕκστασις properly signifies such a rapture of mind as gives the person who falls into it a look of astonishment, and renders him insensible of the external objects round him, while in the mean time his imagination is agitated in an extraordinary manner with some striking scenes which pass before it and take up the attention. The reader may see some extraordinary instances of this kind mentioned by Gualterperius, in his long note on this text.

So ἐν ἕκστασις ἦναι infr. 11, 5. 22, 7. Chrysostom explains the expression thus: πνευματική θεωρία γέγονεν αὐτῷ; and adds, τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἐν εἴπῃ τις, ἐξέστη καὶ ψυχῇ.

We may render: "there fell upon him an ecstasy
or trance." "Εκσκότωση, it must be observed, is a strong term, not ill rendered by Heinrichs "vis numinis ingruit." It is strange that Bolten and Eichhorn should have considered this ἐκσκότωσις as a deep sleep or deliquium animi: for (as Kuinoel observes) had that been the case, the mental impressions could not have been so vivid as they were. See Dr. Hammond. Lightfoot observes that there were seven ways in which God formerly revealed himself to men; 1. by dreams: 2. by apparitions while they were awake: 3. by visions while they slept: 4. by a voice from heaven: 5. by the Urim: 6. by inspiration, or auricular revelation: 7. by a sort of rapture or ecstasis; of all the other modes the most excellent, by which a man was snatched into Heaven (2 Cor. 12, 2.), and was in the Spirit (Rev. 1, 10.): and which is the one here meant, as in Gen. 2, 21.

11. θεωρεῖ τὸν αὐτάκατον ἀνεφραγμένον, i. e. "Heaven seemed to him to open." He saw with the mind, or in a vision. (Pisc., Hamm., & Kuin.) Σκέως, which comes from σκέω, κέω, τέσσερα, signifies any vessel, utensil, or furniture. It seems properly to denote basket.

11. Θόρυβος. In tracing the origin of this word the Etymologists are much puzzled. Perhaps it comes from ἔδω, cognate with ἄδω, to bear, carry, and signified a sheet (from the Ang. Sax. shet-an to cast, throw,) or coverlid. Valcknaer, however, thinks it in vain to search for a Greek etymon, since the use of sheets came, together with the coverlid, from Syria. This may be very true; but still, as much of the Greek language can be traced to an Oriental origin, the above derivation may be thought not improbable. Dr. Doddridge regards it as equivalent to a wrapper, or piece of linen, which things (says he) are wrapped. But I cannot find that the ἔδωρ was ever used for such a purpose. The only significations it had were sheet, coverlid, shawl, and sometimes vast.
Doddridge thinks the Ὁβη was meant to be emblematical of the Gospel, as extending to all men. This is, too, the opinion of Wetstein, who considers the four corners of the sheet as typical of the four quarters of the world, North, South, East, and West: But this seems very fanciful and precarious; though it had the countenance of Chrysostom. Other Fathers, with as little probability, take it of the Church.

11. τέσσαριν ἀρχαῖς δεδεμένον. There is no occasion (with Bowyer) to read ἄρχας; for ἀρχαῖ signifies the extremity of any thing of oblong form, since each end may be considered either as beginning or end. The word was especially used of ropes, bonds. (See the numerous examples produced by philological illustrators.) Sometimes, however, it was applied to other things of an oblong form; as, for instance, in Exod. 28, 29., to the High Priests' breast-plate; and is therefore very applicable to an Ὁβη, which was a square or oblong web of cloth. But as a quadrangular figure may be said to have four ἀρχαῖ, beginnings, or ends, namely, the four angles, hence the word is here rendered by some interpreters angles or corners. This use, however, I have no where found in the Classical writers. See Michaelis, and especially Commentators on Eurip. Hipp. 772. and on Herodot. 4, 60. Our learned Commentators seem not to have recollected the following interesting passage, cited by Wets. Galen. de Chururg. 2. καὶ τίσιν ἔδωκεν ἀρχαῖς ἐπίδεσμοι ἀνωτέρως ἀντὶ τοῦ πέρατα, κατὰ γενικάτερα δύομα τὰ πέρας ἐστι τῆς ἀρχῆς, ὡς καὶ Πλάτων ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξε, πέρατα λέγων ἐπίστ. καὶ τὴν τελευτήν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγχώριον γενικάτερα προσηγορίαν ἀντὶ τῆς εἰδικῆς ἐπιφέρειν τῷ πράγματι, τῆς μὲν ἀρχῆς ἐξέστι λέγειν ἡμῖν πέρας, ἀπετέρω καὶ τελευτήν, ὡς μὲν τελευτήν ἀρχην.

12. εἰ δ' ὑπῆρχε πάντα τὰ τετράγωνα τῆς γῆς. The πάντα is by Vatablus, Camerarius, and Piscator, rendered omnigena. So Kuim. omnium generis: and he refers to Matt. 4, 23. Acts 18, 10. We may compare the Hebr. 552, in Gen. 40, 16. The addition of
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τῆς γῆς after τετράποδα Vorstius and Kuinoel account a Hebraism. It may rather be regarded as characteristic of the copiousness of inartificial and popular diction. Besides, it better corresponds to the πετεινα τοῦ ὄρανου. I had forgotten to remark that καθιέμενος is especially used of what is let down by ropes. With the whole of this passage I would compare a very curious one in Herodot. 3, 18. where he is describing the table of the Sun: Ἡ δὲ τράπεζα τοῦ ἥλιου τοίηδε τις λέγεται εἰναι· λειμαγν ἐστὶν τῷ προοντείῳ ἐπίπλεον κρέας ἐφθαν πάντων τῶν τετραπόδων· ἐστὶν τῷ τάσ μὲν νῦκτας ἐπιτιθεόντας τιθέναι τὰ κρέα τοὺς ἐν τελεί ἐκάστως ἐνταῖς τῶν ἀστῶν, τὰς δὲ ἡμέρας δαίμονες προσφέροντα τῶν θουλομένων· φάνει δὲ τοὺς ἐπιγραφούς ταύτα τῇ γῇ αὐτῇ ἀναδόμναι ἐκάστοτε· οἱ μὲν δὲ τράπεζα τοῦ ἥλιου καλεομένη, λέγεται εἰναι τοίηδε. Also an elegant passage of Ἀσχυλ. Choeph. 576—584. πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ τρέφει· ἴλεινα δειμάτων ἄγα, Πόντια τε ἀγκάλαι κενδάλαν Ἀνταίον βροτῖς Πλάθουσι· ἐλπίδοις καὶ περανθυμίους ἐπιδώρο; Πτανά τε καὶ περαδίμωνα, κανέμοντ' ἀν Αἰγίδαν φράωσις κότων. Where see the remarks of the learned Bishop Blomfield. So Pseudo-Orpheus Argon. 73. κηλάσω δέ τε κῆρας, ἣν ἐρπετα· καὶ πετεινᾶ.

The Apostles, while they thought that the distinction of clean and unclean animals and meats was to continue, had forgotten, or never understood, the contrary declaration of Christ, in Matt. 15, 17 & 18. for otherwise they would readily have conceived that the Gentiles were not to be accounted unclean, but that an access was afforded them to salvation by Christ. Nay even our Lord's precept, "Go prostrate all nations, baptized them," &c. (Matt. 28, 19.) they had misunderstood, thinking that the command only applied to those who had previously embraced the Jewish religion: for which reason they had hitherto avoided the society of Gentiles, and had not communicated to them the doctrines of Christ.

As to the removal of the distinction of meats, typified by the symbolic representation, that need
not have seemed strange to the Apostles, since we find from the Rabbinical writings that the Jewish Masters maintained that this would take place in the time of the Messiah. So, among the Rabbinical citations found in Wetstein, Midras Tillin on Ps. 146, 7. Temporibus Messiae Deus omnia licita prono nciat, quaé fuere prohibita. — Sunt qui dicant, omnia animantia immunda in hoc mundo Deum S. B. munda pronunciaturum tempore futuro.

It is well observed by Doddridge, that this seems a general intimation, that the Jewish Christians were by the Gospel absolved from the ceremonial law, in which the distinction between clean and unclean formed so considerable a part.

14. κοινον signifies properly what belongs to all; as in Sap. 7. 3. κοινὸς εὐρ. But the Jews applied the term (like the Hebr. 󰇢) to what was profane, not holy, and therefore of common and promiscuous use. So Ez. 42, 20. where it is opposed to αγιον. And Joseph. Ant. 12, 12 & 13. τὰ ἱερὰ ἐκφερέων ἐπὶ κοινοῦς ἀνθρώπους. They also applied the term to what was impure, both naturally and legally; as in Mark 7, 2, compared with 1 Macc. 1, 47 & 62. Finally, it was used of meats forbidden, or such as had been partaken of by idolaters, and which, as they rendered the eaters thereof impure, were themselves called κοινοὶ and ἀκαθάρτος; terms indeed synonymous, though the latter seems added by way of explication, (Kuin.)

14. Μηδαιμῶς. Οὐδαμῶς and μηδαιμῶς, nequaquam minime gentium, an usual form of denial and repugnance, are relics of the old word ἀμως, which in the antient language signified aliquis. In the place of this formula is sometimes used μη γένοιτο. Absit! So St. Paul and the best Greek writers. In this sense the Tragedians often use μη δητα. (Valcknaer.)

15, 16. ἀ δε Θεὸς ἐκαθήμερε, σῦ μη κοινοῦ, “hath declared pure,” or made so, by removing the law which forbade their use. By κοινοῦ is meant, “do not account or pronounce impure.” So Hesych. (doubt-
less from an antient Scholium): μᾶ ἀκάθαρτον νομίζει.<sup>+</sup> Kuinoel well observes, that in both the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers, any one is said to do a thing, who declares and maintains it to be done: and thus (continues he) those are said to do any thing who say it is done, or think it done. Thus in Levit. 13, 3. 18, 17. (where the subject is leprous persons,) he pronounces a person to be impure, is said μακαρινει, and, if he declares him pure, καθαρισειν. So Theoph. 8. 4. περιομαχία καὶ γαμμασία νικάων, i. e. relates victories. So also Plut. 2. 891. τον ἑλιον ἱστησί, την δὲ γην κινεί. Philo, 946 D. καὶ οἱ ἐφεβεῖοι μαθόν (τῶν κόσμων) λογικὸν εἰλικρνοῦσιν. Eustath. on II. a. p. 18, 22. σ μιθος τοὺς είς ἀρχαις ἀνθρωποις ἐκ δρωμῶν καὶ πετρῶν ἔγενε. Hor. Sat. 1, 10, 36. Turgidus Alpinus jugulat dum Memnonæ. (Glass. Phil. 216. Al- berti, Loesner, Valcknaer, and Kuin.) See more in the learned note of Kuinoel.

15. πάλιν εκ δευτέρου, scil. γενέσιν. There is an appearance of pleonasm in πάλιν εκ δευτέρου: but such redundancies, (if indeed they be such,) as are found both in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages, are not unfrequent in the purest Attic writers, and those least addicted to pleonasm, as, for instance, Thucydides. Among these redundancies are found πάλιν αὐτο καὶ αὐτο, αὐτό πάλιν.

16. εἰς τοῖς. I cannot assent to Kypke and Kuinoel, that there is here a redundancy of εἰς. The preposition signifies unto, as far as; must always be understood, and tends to invigorate the τοῖς: which idiom is frequent in the Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wetstein. There is however this difference, that in them the expression is almost always εἰς (though the εἰς occurs in Polybius). We may observe that the vision was re-
peated, in order to infix it the more strongly in Peter's mind, and indicate certainty. Hence oracles and visions are generally repeated. The number three was indeed a favourite one with the Christians. See Acts 11, 10. 2 Cor. 12, 8. And not the Christians only, but the Pagans: in illustration of which Bishop Pearce aptly cites Virg. Æn. 2, 174. (speaking of Minerva's image): terque ipsa solo (mirabile dictu) Emicit. And he refers to 2 Cor. 12, 8. “thrice I besought the Lord.” The learned Prelate might also have compared Hor. Od. 3, 22, 3. where of Diana it is said: Virgo quæ laborantes in utero puellas Ter vocata audis. On the force of the repetition, as indicating certainty, Kuin. aptly cites Gen. 41, 32. where we read that Pharaoh's dreams were repeated, in order to shew that the Lord would certainly and shortly bring the things to pass.


It is well observed by Kuinoel, that Peter was in doubt whether by this vision God meant only to indicate that every distinction of meats was abolished by the Christian religion; or whether something of yet greater importance was concealed under it; namely, that the Gentiles, who did not observe the distinction of meats, and had been hitherto accounted impure, were no longer to be considered as such, and thus their society was no longer to be avoided; and that the doctrines of the Gospel were
to be preached to them. That this latter interpretation was the true one, Peter was soon convinced by the arrival of the messengers from the Centurion.

17. Καὶ ἰδοὺ. We may observe that the circumstances are narrated with that genuine (and as it seems Oriental) simplicity, which we admire in the Old Testament and the very antient Greek Historians, as Herodotus: Ἑσάοντας ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶνα, "stood at the porch." See the note on Matth. 26, 71.

18. φανήσαντος, i. e. (as Wets. and Rosenm. think) the Porter. But as it is not very likely that the tanner kept a porter, we must understand some pronoun; as τίνα, namely those in the House. "The messengers (observes Kuinoel) did not choose to enter the house, as being that of a Jew." And he refers to ver. 28.

19. ἑυμαθείς—τὸ Πνεῦμα. Heinrichs and Kuinoel unite in excluding the influence of the Holy Spirit. "For (say they) when Peter saw three men standing at the gate, he rightly judged that they were sent by God to resolve his doubts, and he determined to go with them wheresoever they should require. Now when he saw that his conjecture was well founded, he thought, and said, that he was Divinely admonished of this. And when he heard from them that Cornelius, a Gentile was desirous of embracing the Christian doctrine, he thence inferred that God had meant, by that vision, to declare that the Gentiles were no longer to be accounted impure, but to have the Gospel preached to them."

The laxity of this interpretation I cannot too severely censure; and indeed there is the less excuse for it, as the sense had been correctly pointed out by Grotius: Dixit Deus non per visum, sed per aflatum, sive internam inspirationem.

For ἑυμαθείς some very good MSS. and Versions, as also some of the Fathers, read διευμαθείς, which is preferred by Kuinoel, and received into the text by Griesbach. The verb is occasionally found in the Greek Fathers, from whom examples
are produced by Boissonade ap. St. Thes. edit. Valpy. And indeed all these examples prove that those writers read διενιθμομένου in the present passage: but when I consider how few are the MSS. in which it is found, I cannot help suspecting it to be an emendation, or perhaps a mere mistake made by the scribe of some very antient archetype, in whose mind the δι in δημιουργοι, just before, still remained. It is well known to critics how frequently similar mistakes arise from the very same cause, by which the Lexicons (and especially the recent new edition of Steph. Thesaurus) have been enriched with more compound words than ever were received by the Classical writers; which should put a Lexicographer on his guard.

20. ἀλλὰ ἀνωτάτας κατάθηκι. Wolf and Elsner render the ἀλλὰ igitur, quare. But I assent toLoesner and Kuinoel, that it is a particula hortativa, signifying age, agedum, of which they give several examples. Kuinoel refers to Devar. de Part. p. 3. Kuster on Aristoph. Eg. 202. and Warton on Theocr. 2, 18.

20. Μηδὲν διακρινόμενος, doubting not. The phrase is, from its brevity, somewhat obscure. Kuinoel supplies, “because they are not Jews, but Gentiles.” On the sense of διακρινόμενος see the note on Mark 11, 23. Διότι ἐγὼ ἀπεστάλκα, “I have caused them to be sent.” A sort of Hebraism.

21—23. The words τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους ἀπὸ τοὺς Κορνελίου πρὸς αὐτόν are omitted in so many MSS., and one may account so much more easily for their addition than their omission, that they are with reason suspected by Mill and Grotius, and have been rightly expunged by Griesbach.

22. Μαρτυρομένοις ὑπὸ ἥλιου τοῦ ἔθνου, well spoken of. See the note on 6, 3. “Εἴρηματισθῇ, “was admonished in a Divine vision.” See the note on Matt. 2, 12. Τὰ ῥήματα here signifies mandates, orders. So ver. 33. πάντα τὰ προστεταγμένα σοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ; See the note on Luke 3, 2.

23. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ὁ Πέτρος ἐξῆλθε σὺν αὐτοῖς. Now
Joppa was nine miles from Cæsarea. On the day that the Angel had appeared to Cornelius, when fasting and praying, he sent messengers to Peter. (8—7.) The messengers, on the second day, are received with hospitality (ver. 23.); and, on the third day, they return with Peter to Cæsarea. On the fourth day they approach to Cæsarea (ver. 24, 30.) Kuin. So that the τῇ ἐκείνῃ in ver. 24. must mean the morrow (after). When Kuinoel speaks of nine miles, he must be understood to mean nine German miles, or above forty English. It is reckoned fifteen hours distance from Cæsarea to Joppa, which would require more than one day: though Peter and his companions would arrive probably by mid-day of the second day. Thus the messengers had travelled the distance in a day and a half.

23. καὶ τινὰς τῶν ἀδελφῶν, and some Christians: in number six, as we learn from 11, 12. These Christians, who had been Jews, Peter took with him for very wise and prudent reasons, namely, (as Chrysostom suggests,) ὅστε ἐναὶ μάρτυρες μετὰ ταύτα, ὅτι ἀπολογεῖσαι δεῖ Πέτρον. See also Doddridge.

24, 26. προσδοκῶν, anxiously expecting. See Luke 1, 21. and 8, 40. Τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους. Kypke has here a very learned annotation on this sense of ἀναγκαῖος, and the Latin necessarius, of which I shall give the heads.

The sense here is intimate friends. Now the the terms ἀναγκαῖοι and necessarius denote, 1. relations by blood; 2. by affinity; 3. those connected by the bands of friendship. Sometimes the word comprehends all these three senses. Thus Demosth. p. 570. says an invitation to a marriage is given to ὁ ἀναγκαῖος. See also 673. Lys. 478 & 310. 2. Ἀναγκαῖοι are affines; as in Eurip. Andron. 671. where Menalaus says to Peleus: τινὰ τὰ λάσκεις τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους. By ἀναγκαῖοι are however frequently denoted relations, both by consanguinity, and by affinity; as in Lys. 585. Hence Dionys-.
Hal. p. 85. speaks of συγγενικαί ἀναγκαιοτηταί, which may be understood equally of consanguinity and affinity. And so Polyb. 5, 71. and Isocr. 577. 9. It very frequently happens that by ἀναγκαιὸν φίλον are meant intimate friends, conjoined only by the bands of love. Thus in Joseph. Ant. 7, 11. David's ἀναγκαιὸν φίλον are said not to have invited Adoniah to the feast. And in 10, 1. Hezekiah sends to Rab-shah τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων φίλων. See also 5, 384, 350, 375, 378, 379, 447, & 1015. Dionys. Hal. A: L. p. 161 & 482. Plutarch de Discr. Adul. et. Am. p. 51. gives a reason for the use of this epithet: καθὸ δὲ καὶ λέγεται πυρὸς καὶ ὑδατος ὁ φίλος ἀναγκαιοτέρος εἶναι. (Kuin.) The learned Commentator might have adverted to the expressive gnome of Solomon, Prov. 18, 24. “There is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.” To this may be subjoined the following passages cited by Wetstein. Xenoph. Hell. 5. ἀναγκαιοῦ μοι ὑπός καὶ ἐπιτηδείου. Isocrates: ἰδοὺ μηδ' ἄνομα συγγενείς ἔχουτε, οἰκειοτέρους σφᾶς αὐτῶς ἐν ταῖς συμφοραῖς τῶν ἀναγκαίων παρέσχον. Berossus 2. μετὰ τῶν συγγενῶν καὶ ἀναγκαίων φίλων. Athen. 4: p. 154. τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις φίλοις διαδοθείσαμεν. Demosth. in Evag. οἰκείοι, ἡ συγγενείς, ἡ ἀναγκαίοι. I would also compare Eurip. Orest. 804, 794. τοῖς ἐκεῖνοι κτάλθ' ἐταίρους μὴ το συγγενές μοῦν. Ὡς ἀνήρ, ὡς τρόπωσι συντακτή., θυραίος ἄν, Μυρίων κρείσσαν ἐμαίμων ἀνδρὶ κεκτήσατε φίλος.

25. ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο εἰσελθεῖν. Subaud τοῦ as depending upon ἔνεκα, which is added in several MSS.; but probably from the margin. Πεταῖν ἔτι τοῦ σώδας, προσεκύνησεν. Προσκυνοῦσι denotes a total and reverential prostration of the body to the earth: a mark of profound respect which the Jews, and other Oriental nations, rendered not to kings only, but also to persons of high dignity. But the Romans yielded this homage to the Deity only; and therefore Peter declines it, by saying καὶ γενείος ἀνθρώπος εἶμι. Yet it does not follow that Cornelius meant to have transferred the honour due to the Deity to Peter;
for he was ευσεβης και φοβούμενος τον Θεόν (ver. 2.),
but, struck with reverential awe at the sight of a
Divine legate, he could not preserve the due dis-
tinction between the honour to be rendered to the
Ambassador and the Principal. (Kuin.) The same
view of the subject is also taken by Chrysostom.
There is no reason to suppose, with Grotius, that
Cornelius took him for an angel, whatever the inha-
bbitants of Lystra might do (14, 11 & 13). More-
over, if Peter was justified in declining this mark of
profound respect, knowing that among the Romans
it was reserved for Divinities only, yet the Centurion
may be held, in some degree, excused for offering
it; knowing, as he did, that the custom of the East
allowed of such reverential homage being shewn
from man to man; though Peter, most judiciously,
discourages it, as leading to evil. Ἐννομιζών, con-

28 seqq. ἀδεμίτων ἔστω, unlawful. This use of the
word is copiously illustrated by Wetstein; ex.
gr. from Herodot. 3, 57. ἔστηλε δὲ καὶ ἐς των καβείψων
tὸν Ἰρών, ἐς τὸ οὗ δέμιτον ἔστι ἐστίναι ἔλλον γε ἢ τὸν ἱρέα.
And 5, 72. πάλιν χαρεί μὴ ἐστὶ ἐς τὸ Ιρών, οὐ γὰρ
δέμιτον Δαρείσιον παρείναι. Aristoph. Thesm. 1162.
ἀνδράσιν οὐ δέμιτον εἰσορᾶν ὄργια σεμνὰ θεαῖν. Dionys.
Hal. 57. οὐ οὐ δέμιτον αὐτοῖς ἐφ’ ἱερὸν παρείναι — πρὶν
ἀφοσιώσασθαι τὸ μίαμα. It not unfrequently occurs
in the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament.
Κολλάσθαι signifies to use familiar intercourse with,
as in 5, 13., and προσέρχεσθαι, to enter any one’s
house. There is a sort of climax; so that we may
insert, “or even.” And so Wetstein, who aptly
compares Plut. 2, 94 d. διδ ἰη μη ῥαδίως προσέχεσθαι
μηδὲ κολλάσθαι τοῖς ἐνυγχάνωσι. I am not aware
that κολλάσθαι occurs in the antient Greek writers
in this sense: but I have remarked some not dissimi-
lar metaphors used by them: ex. gr. Eurip. Orest.
804, 794. ἃτις πρόποισι συνταχῇ. So Hesychius ex-
plains ἐνέτεικνεν by ἐγκεκάληται.
'Αλλόφυλος must here, from its being opposed to
'Ἰωνήδαιος signify a Gentile. But in the Sept., Philo, and Josephus, (as Kuinoel observes from Krebs, Wolf, and Loesner,) the word occurs in a double sense, so as to denote not only such as are distinguished from Jews, but from all others, neither Jews by birth nor by religion (as in Joseph. 9, 5, 3. Philo 909 c. Judg. 3, 8.), and elsewhere styled ἡ ἔναρξ, and ἀναλόγως. See Joseph. Ant. 9, 5, 3. Philo 714 ἐ. Is. 2, 6. Schoettgen and Michaelis observe that there is no command found in the Law of Moses forbidding familiar intercourse with the Gentiles, * but that this was an interdict of the Jewish Doctors, who had burthened the Mosaic Law with many added injunctions. Bp. Pearce here cites Joseph. c. App. 2, 28. τῶν (scil. ἀλλοφύλων) ἐκ παρέργου προσκόμησαν ἀναμήργοτας ταῖς συμφέρας τοῖς ἑλεύσεις, qui ven (scil. alienigenae), non nisi obiter ad nos, atque aliud agentes accederent, eos in consuetudinem penitus admitti noluit: those strangers, who came to us on any other account but that of religion, he (Moses) permitted not to be mixed with us in any familiarities. And 86. Ant. 16, 1, 1. Tacit. Hist. 5, 5. (speaking of the Jews): Apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, adversus omnes alios hostile odium.

Καὶ is for καίτω, and (yet). Kuinoel refers to

* It is remarked by Schoettgen, that even the Jews acknowledged that God would not wholly reject the Gentiles. And he cites Schenothi Rabba on the words of Job 31, 32. "The stranger did not lodge in the street." "For God doth not account any one profane, but receiveth all. The gates are open at all hours (compare Actor. 14, 97.), and he that will, may enter."

"Now (says Schoettgen) considering that the above tradition was not unknown among the Jews, it may justly be thought strange that Peter should have been censured by the rest of the Jewish converts for having associated with Gentiles (11, 3.) But to this it may be answered: that the truth in question, though, beyond all doubt, known to the more antient Jews, was afterwardschoaked by the pride and arrogance of the Pharisees, of which our Lord so often complains. This pernicious prejudice, therefore, the Jewish converts having first contracted from the Pharisees, still retained." (Schoettgen)
Joh. 6, 7, 7, 4. Matt. 7, 26. where see the notes, Gataker on Marc. Ant. 2, 7., and Elsner on Joh. 6, 70.

28. ἐμοὶ δὲ Θεὸς ἓδειξε, God hath shown unto me: namely, by the heavenly vision sent from God. Μηδένα κανον ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἀδόσανων, "to call (i. e. to account) none common, or unclean; and consequently hath permitted me to hold society and intercourse with them."

29, τίνι λόγῳ, on what account? Subaud εἰς. Now λόγος, like the Heb. דְּרֵי in Gen. 19, 8. and Jer. 38, 14. denotes thing and cause; as in 1 Cor. 15, 2. τίνι λόγῳ εὐγγελισάμεν ἥμιν. (Kuin.) Kypke, however, still maintains that this is not a Hebraism. But he only succeeds in proving it to be a Grecism; as Raphel had done before him. So Iph. Taur. 358. τίνι λόγῳ παραβιβάσετε. Yet as the idiom (like many others) is common to both languages, so it is not difficult to conceive from what quarter the New Testament writers derived it. As to the quibbling query proposed by some, namely, “why did Peter ask the reason of his being sent for, since he had been informed of it by the Divine communication?” we may answer (with Chrysostom), that he did so because he wished them to make confession, and become engaged to the faith. Kuinoel, too, observes that this was done for the information of his companions. And so Doddridge, who, with his accustomed good taste, observes that the repetition of the circumstance gives a dignity and spirit to Peter's succeeding discourse beyond what we could otherwise so sensibly perceive.

30, 31. ἀνδρὶ τετάρτῳ — ἕμνεν ποιεών. Some Commentators, as De Dieu, Morus, and Heinrichs, take these words to express that Cornelius had fasted from the time of his vision to the present hour. But I entirely assent to Grotius, Beza, Pearce, Kuinoel, and Doddridge, that it must signify: “four days ago, when I had been fasting, up to this very hour”; i.e. about the ninth hour, at which time
Peter probably arrived. The other interpretation is refuted at large by Kuinoel; but it is so manifestly false as scarcely to deserve dwelling upon.

33. καλὸς ἑστίνησας. A common form of expression denoting approbation and praise, frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, of which examples, in superfluous abundance, are produced by Raphael and Wetstein.

33. Ἐνοχίον τοῦ Θεοῦ. I am surprised that Grotius, Bengel, Morus, Rosenmuller, and Griesbach should adopt the reading of one MS. and some ancient versions σοῦ, the origin of which is manifest, namely, from the abbreviation of Θεοῦ. Besides (as Kuinoel observes) the common reading, which is defended by almost all the MSS., has the greater appearance of genuineness, as being the more difficult one.

34. ἀναλίθας δὲ Πέτρος τῷ στόμα, ἐπετε. The discourse of Peter consists of two parts; namely, a twofold proposition: the first declaring that the Gentiles are no longer to be accounted unclean (ver. 34 & 35.): the second containing an announcement of the Gospel. (ver. 36—43.) (Schoettg.)

34. 'Ες’ ἀλήθειας καταλαμβάνωμαι, i.e. “I fully comprehend, and am thoroughly persuaded.” By προσωπολογίας is meant one who is partial in his attentions, and shews his favours with preference to rank, dignity, or other grounds of external superiority, to the neglect of those who are destitute of these advantages. See Jam. 2, 1. and the note on Luke 20, 21.

35. ἀλλ’ ἐν παρα ἑνεὶ ὁ φθονόμενος, &c. Φθονομένος τῶν Θεοῦ is a periphrasis for a pious person. Peter has reference to the prayers, alms, and other works of righteousness, by which Cornelius had become acceptable to God. Ἐργάζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην is by the Sept. used to express the Heb. יושע, as in Ruth 1, 8. θείοις ἔλεος. Sir. 27, 9. Ἐργάζεσθαι ἀλήθειαν & 51, 3. Ἐργάζεσθαι ψευδός, and as by יָדוֹ the Hebrews expressed virtue in general, so they join it with יָדוֹ;
as in Is. 56, 1 & 2. This the Greek interpreters translate sometimes by ἐργάζεσθαι δικαιοσύνη (as in Ps. 14, 2.), sometimes by τοιεῖν δικαιοσύνην, as in Ps. 105, 5. And so the writers of the New Testament; as Joh. 3, 7. where it is in ver. 8. opposed to τοιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, and Matt. 7, 23. ἐργάζεσθαι ἁμαρτίαν. (Kuin.) There seems an idea of habit involved in the terms πώς and τοιεῖν. With the phrase τοιεῖν δικαιοσύνην we may compare the more elegant one of Herodot. 1, 96. ἀσκεῖν δικαιοσύνην. So Ps. 15, 2. Is. 64, 12. Nor is this use of ἐργάζεσθαι unknown to the Classical writers: we have something similar in Lyophobic. 128. ἐργάτης δίκης. See Doddridge and others, cited in Mant's Family Bible.

36, 37. τὸν λόγον ὑπ' ἀπετέειλε — Ἰωάννης. With the construction and (as depending thereupon) the interpretation of this passage, Commentators have been much perplexed. They generally unite in supplying κατὰ before τὸν λόγον: but in determining the sense thence arising they are by no means agreed. Now an ellipsis of κατὰ is usually filled up by quod attinet ad: but that is not suitable here. Others, as Thalamon and Rosenmuller, therefore explain "according to." It might, however, be better rendered, "in accordance with." Doddridge wanders too far when he renders: "And this I apprehend to be the meaning of," &c. Indeed, to ascribe any such extensive signification to elliptical words is precarious and uncritical. This method is, however, adopted by Beza, Grotius, De Dieu, and L'Enfant; and is somewhat sanctioned by Chrysostom and other ancients. Thus ρῆμα will denote the "words of Christ, including both miracles and doctrine. Those Commentators, too, are of opinion that Peter has reference to the saying of Christ in Matt. 8, 11. Joh. 10, 16. Matt. 28, 19., and declares that he now recognizes their fuller sense, namely, that the doctrine of Christ was not only to be announced to the Jews, but that Gentiles were to be received into the Christian communion. See Doddridge's para-
phrase, which indeed yields a very plausible sense; but loose paraphrases are little to be trusted. I therefore agree with Kuinoel, that the above interpretation is to be rejected, from the harshness of the ellipsis, the consequent obscurity of the sentence, and the want of connection between verses 36 & 37. Kypke and Wetstein take κόριος adjectively; and so indeed it is used by the best Attic writers, as Thucydides: but I see not how this helps the interpretation. Passing over rash emendations, and unauthorized critical conjectures, I must confess that I accede to the interpretation of Erasmus, adopted by the authors of our English Version, Schmid, Heumann, Bolten, Beck, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, who refer τὸν λόγον to ὑμεῖς οἴδατε, and put a stop after οἴδατε, by which τὸ γενόμενον may be said to be in opposition with τὸν λόγον, and the words οὖτος ἐστι πάντων κόριος are to be put in a parenthesis. The sense thus arising will be as follows: "The doctrine which God caused to be delivered to the Israelites, announcing salvation by Jesus Christ (he is the Lord of all) you yourselves know; the doctrine, I say, which was promulgated through all Judea," &c. Λόγος (observes Kuinoel) is the doctrine of Christ; as insf. 13, 26. ὑμᾶν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἀποστάλη. At ἀπέστειλε we must repeat from the context Θεός. Now ἀποστέλλειν here signifies to deliver, give; and in the Sept. corresponds to לְנ in Jer. 87, 14, and מָלַש in Ps. 107, 20. See ΑΕιλ. V. H. 1, 15 & 21 and the remarks of Perizonius on that passage; as also Alberti on Acts 27, 30. Compare, too, Sir. 15, 9.

In the place of ἀπέστειλε τοὺς υἱὸς Ἰσραήλ — ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς υἱὸς Ἰσραήλ would have been better Greek. But we have a kind of Hebraism. For the Hebrews add ג to verbs of motion. See Nold. Concord. Partier.

36. Ἐπιγγέλθημεν εἰρήνη. Some explain this of peace between Jews and Gentiles. But the context shows that this word has here a more extensive and
figurative signification. Compare ver. 48. and Is: 40, 9., which passage Peter seems to have had in mind.

36. οἱ πάντες ήσιν τὰς κύριος, i.e. all, both Jews and Gentiles. These parenthetical words are of great weight; and were meant to prove that what Christ preached to the Jews was equally applicable to the Gentiles. For, as Lord of all he must alike intend the salvation of all. See Rom. 10, 12. St. Peter seems to have urged the argument in this concise and covert manner, that he might give no offence to the Christian Jews, his companions. (Dr. Owen ap. Bowyer.) See Joh. 17, 2. Kuinoel takes ὅστος for ὅσ; as in 8, 26. Luke 2, 36. 36. 37. 7. 12. and refers to Storr's Obes. ad Analog. et Syntax. Heb. 119. But this seems inconsistent with the parenthesis which Kuinoel himself supposes.

37. οπείς οὖσαν. The interpretation of Erasmus and others is most vulnerable in this quarter: and Doddridge has attacked it with some effect. "I do not see (says he) how Peter could reasonably take it for granted that Cornelius and his friends were acquainted with the message of peace and pardon sent to Israel by Jesus Christ, that is, with the Gospel, which if they had known, there would have been no necessity for his own embassy to them." But this objection is rather plausible than solid, and proceeds (like many such) upon a too minute pressing on the sense of a single term; which, in interpreting popular phraseology, is highly injudicious. οὖσαν is (as Kuinoel suggests) to be here taken in a circumscribed sense, not as denoting full and accurate knowledge, but, in a popular way, signifying \"hear and know;} as in 2, 22. 5, 7. 9, 13. Now at Cæsarea (continues Kuinoel) where there lived many Jews, the Gospel had already been preached by Philip (8. 42). Cornelius, therefore, together with his family and friends, had undoubtedly heard and known of Jesus and his doctrine; though they now required a fuller instruction and confirmation in the faith.
37. ῥῆμα is here for λόγος, doctrine; as in Rom. 10, 8. Eph. 5, 26. Heb. 6, 5. Joh. 3, 34. 'Ἀρξάμενον ἀπ', commencing from.

38. Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρῆτος, οίς ἔχομεν αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς. This is put for (οἴκοι) αἰς ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔχομε. There is a similar transposition of οἴς in Rom. 12, 3. 1 Cor. 3, 5, 7, 17.; and αὐτῶν is, by a Hebraism, redundant; as often. (Kuin.) I do not quite accede to this view of the subject. Ὅς has here the narrative force, and (as Pearce observes) is put for ὁς. See his note on Mark 6, 15. to which he here adds examples from Longin. de subl. § 32. ἀπορχή τὰ διδαχαμένα, αἰς μεγάλαι τὴν φύσιν εἰςν αἱ τροπικαί, καὶ αἰς ὁδηγητοῖς αἰς μεταφοράς, καὶ ὃς οἱ παθητικοί καὶ φραστικοί κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον χαίρουσιν: τότε: these instances are sufficient to show that figurative expressions are naturally great, and that metaphors contribute to the sublime, and that they are best employed where the subject is either the making descriptions or raising the passions. Sect. 30. ὃς τῆς κυρίως καὶ μεγαλορέποις ὄνομάτων ἐκλογή θαυμαστῶς ἄγει καὶ κατακηλεῖ τοὺς ἀκατόντας, καὶ ὃς τῶν ἐνορθῶν, &c. that the choice of proper and grand words wonderfully takes and pleases the reader, and that among orators, &c.

38. Χρίεω properly signifies to sprinkle, anoint with oil, or ungueants: and since anointing formed a solemn rite of inaugurating and appointing kings, so it came to denote generally, create, appoint, &c.; and as the unction was supposed to confer certain powers, so the word came to mean, as here, invest, endue with power. In πνευματί ἀγίῳ, καὶ δυνάμει, we have an hendiadis for "the powers and endowments of the Holy Spirit."

38. Ὡς διήλθεν ἐφεργετῶν, who traversed Judea, &c. A very expressive term. Ἐφεργετῶν. What is here meant by this general expression do good is unfolded in the following words. Thus the noun ἐφεργεσία is used of the healing of the sick in 4, 9. We are, however, to understand it as referring
to soul as well as body. See Tillots. ap. Mant. *Katadunastein* signifies to press down (κατὰ), overpower, tyrannize over. The word often occurs in the Sept., Josephus, and Philo, and is used by the later Greek Classical writers. Examples are adduced by Krebs, Loesner, and Wetstein. The persons here described as *katadunasteinomen* ἶσα των διαβόλου are the same with the δαιμονιστέρων, demoniaces. "Оτι ο Θεος ἰν μετ' αυτω, for God enabled him to work such miracles.

39, 40. πάντων ὢν ἐκτόησεν, for πάντων ἐκτόησεν. The verb is here to be understood emphatically of what Christ effected; including (as some think) the doctrines which he preached.

39. ὢν ἀνέδωκ. The best MSS. have ὢν καὶ ἀνέδωκ, and the καὶ is rendered by some tamen or denique. It may be expressed by also or even. On ἐδωκ, cross, see the note on 5, 30. "Εδωκε is a vox praecognas for "gave him (power), appointed," &c., which Vorstius, Leusden, and Kuinoel think is derived from a similar use of ἐδωκα.

41. οὐ παρεξ τω λαῳ. This is not a place for indicating the wisdom and righteousness of that dispensation of providence which ordered that Christ should not appear publicly after his resurrection. Many valuable writers have done it at large. See Mr. Ditton on the Resur. Part III, § 60—70; Bishop Burnet's Four Disc. p. 59—56; Dr. Sykes, of Christianity, chap. 10. p. 164. et seqq.; Mr. Fleming's Christol. vol. 3. p. 494—498. ; Bp. Blackwall at Boyle's Lect. Serm. 4. p. 25, 26. ; Sermons de M. Superville, tom. 4. p. 9—12. ; Bishop Atterbury's Posthum. Serm. vol. 1. p. 182—190.; and Miscell. Sacra, Essay 2. p. 77, 78. I shall only observe, in one word, that as God was by no means obliged to give that perverse people, the Jews, the highest and most striking degree of evidence that could be imagined, (supposing this would have been such,) so it is certain that the evidence which he gave of this fact, by the miraculous gifts conferred on the
chosen witnesses in general, in a much more convincing manner than Christ's appearance in the temple for several succeeding days could have been. (Doddridge.)

41. προχειροτονεῖν is by Kuinoel regarded as the same with the simple χειροτονεῖν. But I cannot agree with him in this. It denotes not only appointment, but previous destination. Χειροτονεῖν signifies properly to extend, or raise the hand, and then to chuse, appoint by suffrage; as in Acts 14, 23.; and finally to appoint, &c. generally; as here and in Herodot. 2, 10 & 16. 3, 6. 5, 7. 10, 3, Philo 1028., besides other passages cited by Loesner and Kuinoel.

"This was (says Doddridge) declaring, in the strongest terms, how entirely their happiness depended upon an humble subjection of soul to him who was to be their final Judge."

41. Ἡμίν — ἐκ νεκρῶν. The last words μετὰ τῷ ἀναστήναι αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν Cameron and Bengal think are to be joined with the words of ver. 40. and those of 41., namely ὥσ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ — συνεπιόμεν αὐτῷ to be included in a parenthesis. They moreover deny that Jesus drank with his Disciples after his resurrection, since that is no where mentioned, and Jesus, at the conclusion of his last Paschal supper, declared to his Disciples that he would no longer drink with them the fruit of the vine. See Matt. 26, 29. Luke 22, 18. On the contrary, it is urged by others, that Jesus, after his resurrection, did eat with his Disciples (Joh. 21, 12.); and (say they) that he also drank there can surely be no doubt; though both actions were done in order to satisfy his Disciples of his being really a body.” (See Chrysostom in loc.) But with these far-fetched modes of explication we may very well dispense, if we take συνεφαγομένου καὶ συνεπιόμεν as a popular phrase denoting familiar intercourse. See the note on Luke 13, 20. (Kuin.) The same mode is also adopted by Camerarius. I cannot, however, but consider it as involving great uncertainty.
42, 43. καὶ παρῆγγελεν ἡμῖν—διαμαρτύρωνται. I cannot agree with Kuinoel that διαμαρτύρωνται simply signifies to teach. The did communicates an intensive force. It is well observed by Chrysostom: 'Ἐνταῦθα καὶ φοβερῶς εἶπεν, ἵνα μὴ ἐγκοσιν εἰς ἄγνοιαν καταφυγείν, καὶ ώσ τι ἐπεί, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ μάλιστα αὐτὸς ἡφαίστει, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ αἰρισμένος υἱὸς Θεοῦ κρίνεις χώντως καὶ νεκραίν.

Διὰ, i.e. openly and without restriction to both Jews and Gentiles.

43. τούτω πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν. On these words Schoettgen offers the following remarks. "Sæpe numero miratus sum, quod quidem ex scriptoribus homileticis tam valde desudant, ut ex scriptis Prophetarum, quæ exstant, comprobent, Jesum esse Messiam, et quod per ipsum omnibus credentibus peccata remittantur. Certe ex Obadiā et Jonā nemo id comprobavit, nisi verba Spiritus S. fidiculis eo torquere cupiēt. An enim hi, quorum vaticinia habemus, sunt omnes Prophetæ? An vero illi, qui nihil scipserunt, Samuel, Iddo, et reliqui, de Christo muti fuerunt? Imo omnes de Christo vaticinati sunt, quam vis non omnia ipsorum verba litteris mandata sunt." This, however, seems too fānciful a device to be satisfactory. It is better, with most modern Commentators, to take πάντες in a restricted and popular sense for very many.* The Jewish

* The same view of the subject was also taken by the pious and learned Dr. Doddridge. "It is observable (says he) that in this discourse to an audience of the Gentiles, the Apostle Peter first mentions Christ's persons, miracles, and resurrection, and contents himself with telling them in the general, that there were many Prophets in former ages who bore witness to him, without entering into a particular enumeration of their predictions. And Limborch recommends this as the best way of beginning the controversy with the Jews themselves, as being liable to least cavil.—It would, however, have been easy to have proved the truth of what the Apostle here asserts, from several testimonies of the Prophets, (had it been proper for that audience,) as will appear by comparing Isa. 53, 11. Jer. 31, 34. Dan. 9, 24. Mic. 17, 19. Lech. 13, 1. Mal. 4, 2. The latter part of the aboveremark seems to have been derived from Chrysostom, whose words are these: Διὰ τι δὲ μηδὲν ἀναστίας ἐποίησε σημεῖον, ἀλλ' ἐφαγε καὶ ἐπαινε; ὅτι καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἀνάστασις
Karaites, indeed, maintained that all the Prophets testified of Christ. (See Trigland de Karæis, p. 121.) But these deserve no more attention than our modern fanatics.

In μαρτυρεῖν τιμίῳ there is a datius commodi, and the expression signifies to bear testimony in any one’s favour, or to his honour; and is therefore aptly employed of the testimonies of historians or of prophets.

44—46. ἔτι καλαύντος τοῦ Πέτρου τ. β. τ. ἐκέπεσε τῷ Παύλῳ, &c. Here I cannot but severely censure the latitudinarian spirit evinced in commenting on these verses by many continental Commentators, as Noesselt, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, who seem to labour to bring down the extraordinary and preternatural circumstance here recorded to the level of common occurrences. They interpret the illapse of the Holy Spirit (as usual) of the being seized with a religious fervour. “Thus (says Noesselt) they could not refrain from expressing their pious feelings in their own phraseology, and in their own language, namely, the Roman. Therefore the Jews present, struck with amazement at so unusual and unheard of a thing, never expecting to hear the praises of God and Jesus expressed in foreign languages, attributed it to the afflatus Dei; as also did the Apostles and St. Luke.” But can any thing be more far-fetched and absurd than this interpretation? To omit many other obvious objections, I must observe that the manner in which the narration of the illapse of the Holy Spirit is introduced, is manifestly such as conveys, and was meant to convey,

καθ' ἑαυτὴν μέγα σημεῖον ἦν· ταύτης δὲ οὐδὲν οὕτως εἰς ἄποδειξιν μεῖζον, ὥσ τὸ φαγεῖν καὶ πίειν. I can only refer my readers to the masterly observations of Dr. Paley on this subject, as they are found in Bp. Mant’s Family Bible. It is further remarked by Chrysostom: Ἐνά γὰρ καυμα (read καυμα ἦ) κατασκευή καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν (μεσημβρίῃ γάρ εἰχον δόξαν ἐκεῖνοι) τούτη πάντες οἱ προφητεύσαι μεταφρασθήσετε οὗ τῷ φῶς κατέσεσθε, τότε ἐκάγαι τὴν συνεχήσειν, οὐ παρ' αὐτοῦ λεγόμενην, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῷ μὲν φοβερῷ, παρ’ αὐτοῦ τῷ ἡμερον δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν. See the note of Bp. Sherlock ap. Mant.
something preternatural, and the same with that previously vouchsafed to the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. 2. What room would there have been for the extreme amazement felt by the Jewish Christians at hearing the praises of God and Christ expressed in foreign languages. That was no more than they had witnessed in the Hellenists. 3. How can we be justified in interpreting γλώσσαις "in their own languages." That is surely an unwarrantable license. The scope of the context, and a comparison of the exactly parallel phraseology at C. 2. fixes the meaning of this otherwise indeterminate expression to "various languages, and foreign to them." Indeed, it was to be expected that some miraculous interposition of the Deity would be exerted, to remove the deep-rooted prejudices of the Jewish Christians, when the partition wall was to be broken down between Jews and Gentiles.* Besides, Peter just after says: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" And in 11, 16. "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit." Now as to the mode in which the Apostles received it there can be no doubt. Peter must therefore be understood as meaning that they had received the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit, as had he himself and the rest of the Apostles.

47. μή τοῦ ὅπως κωλοσαί — τούτως. There is here a remarkable brachylogia (not, however, unexampled in the Classical writers). Κωλοσαί is a vox prægnans, signifying to hinder any one from taking or using any thing. So Luke 6, 29. ἔλθεν κωλοσαί τοῦ ὅπως. Ovid Met. 6, 849. Quid prohibetis aquas? The idiom is, however, not confined to ὅπως, but applies, mutatis mutandis, whenever κωλοσαί takes an accusative of

* It is well observed by Chrysostom that this economy was adopted for the sake of the Jews. See Doddridge, Pearce, and Lightfoot ap. Mant. On the astonishment of the Jews see Schoettgen.
the thing; as in Gen. 23, 6, Sir. 4, 6. Xen. An. 4, 2, 15. ἐκάλαν τὸς παρόδους, and other passages, which I forbear to notice. Chrysostom points out the energy imparted to the language by the interrogative here employed. The student, too, must notice this pleonastic use of the negative, which is not uncommon in the Greek language after verbs of forbidding; though, in the Classical writers, it is more usual in the nominative than the genitive. So Thucyd. 3, 1. εἰργον, τὸ μὴ προεξιόντας τῶν ὅπλων τὰ ἔγγος τῆς πόλεως κακουργεῖν, where Haack compares Eurip. Phæn. 5, 1185. ἐργάθευν — τὸ μὴ οὐ κατ' ἄκραν περγάμων ἐλείν πόλιν.

48. προστατέξε τὸ αὐτὸς βαπτισθῆναι, &c. Dr. Whitby here raises a difficulty very needlessly, by enquiring whether it was the Gentiles that Peter commanded to do this, or his companions only permitted to baptize in case of necessity. He therefore concludes that we must understand the words of St. Luke to mean that Peter commanded water to be brought him, and himself baptized them. Dr. Doddridge manifestly adopts this view of the subject, since he thinks we may conclude from hence that affusion, not immersion, was employed. But the foundation is insecure, and consequently the superstructure must fall. There is no good reason for supposing it was not his Jewish companions. The ancient Greek Commentators seem to have been generally of that opinion; as also Lightfoot, Erasmus, and Grotius. To suppose, however, with Lightfoot, that they were ministers, is too arbitrary, and proceeds on the mistake of confounding this with the later periods of the primitive Church. It is truly remarked by Grotius, that the Apostles rarely themselves baptized. (See the note on Joh. 4, 2. and 1 Cor. 1, 14.) Besides, as Dr. Doddridge sensibly observes in his paraphrase, he chose to make use of the ministry of his brethren in performing that rite, rather than do it with his own hands, that by
this means the expression of their consent might be the more explicit.

48. τότε ἐπροσέσασθαι, &c., "then prayed they him to tarry certain days:" which, as we find from what follows, he did; though St. Luke does not positively say so. This, however, seems to be, in some measure, included in ἐπροσέσασθαι, by a sort of idiom not unknown in our language. "Thus (observes Grot.) he emphatically shewed that he held himself loosed from the ritual precepts. He seems, however, not to have used forbidden meats; for of that there is not a word in the charge made against him in the following Chapter; nor does it appear that any converted Jews did so until their final dispersion."

CHAP. XI.

1. κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, in Judea. This use of the preposition is found also in the Classical writers; though not (I think) with proper names, and, if common ones, only such as πόλις and ἄγρα. See the examples produced by Munthe and Kuin.

2. διεκρίνεται πρὸς αὐτὸν. The word διεκρίνε-&omicron;ta answers to the Heb. בָּר in Aquila and Theodotian's Version of Jer. 15, 10., and signifies to dispute, litigate, to be at difference with, expostulate with. (See Schl. Lex. Vet. Test. the note on Judg. v. 9.) So Eurip. Hipp. 767, 33. ἐστε Δούκαλλω καὶ Τιγράνην ἐπ' ἄλληλοις διακρίνεται, where I would read ἄλληλοις, which will suggest the true interpretation of that passage.

2. Οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, scil. άντες, i.e. "the Jewish Christians." These Kuinoel thinks are to be distinguished from the Apostles. But I see not how any such distinction can be founded on the words of St. Luke. Whether the Apostles were among the number of expostulators is uncertain. Most probably they were not; nor need we understand by οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς all the Jewish Christians, but only
a certain number, and those perhaps of more zeal than knowledge.

Kunoel here adopts a notion too common among recent foreign Theologians, namely, that the Apostles often omit much of what is said or done, which must be supplied from the nature of the circumstances. Now this is a very precarious, and indeed dangerous principle, little reverent towards the sacred writers, and unsafe in application. Here there can be no need to resort to it. For though Peter, in his reply, does advert to more than is expressed in the accusation, yet the expostulators seem to have spoken after the popular manner, in which much is left to be understood.

In ἐνήλθες καὶ συνέβαγες αὐτοῖς is meant to be included what followed from this intimacy and eating with them, namely, familiar intercourse, and a reception of them into the Christian society. Besides, we may suppose an aposiopesis after αὐτοῖς, caused by Peter’s cutting short their expostulation, and proceeding to an explanation.

4. ἀρέσσαμος—εξηγηθέντο, expounded, explained, narrated: a signification found in the Classical writers, from whom examples are produced by Wetstein. Ἀρέσσαμος is here said to be redundant. It is, however, not without elegance. The rest of the explanation or apology is thus stated by ΟΕcumenius.

"Peter shows that he has no where been the cause of any thing that has been done; but every where God. For (says the Apostle) it was He who threw me into the ἑκτασία: it was He who showed me the vessel. But I contradicted, and did not render prompt obedience. God sent me, but I did not go: God told me to baptize, but I did not even then baptize. It is God that hath baptized them all, and not I. For as I was yet speaking, the Holy Spirit fell on them, and they spake with tongues." &c. On the rest of the verses to 15. see the notes on 10, 30. seqq.

12. τῶν ἀνδρῶν. Though this may not sound well vol. iv. 2 B
to our ears, yet the ancients applied ἄνηρ and νηρ to persons of the greatest consequence: in illustration of which Wets. cites Virg. Ἀει. 4, 3.

17. εἰ but if (as he did). See the note on 4, 9. Τοῖς πιστεύσωσιν must not be referred to ἡμῖν (us, the followers of Christ), but to αὐτοῖς, namely, Cornelius and his family. (Kuin.) Ἔγώ δὲ τίς ἡμῖν δυνάτος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς, “who then was I that,” &c.

This is a spirited, and, at the same time, popular expression for “How could I oppose,” &c., or “I could not continue to oppose,” &c. Wetstein aptly compares Lucian Dem. 12. ἡμῶν τῶν Δημαίνακτα, τίς ἄν χλευάζοι τὰ αὐτοῦ; and so Plaut. Pers. 1, 1. (cited by Priceus) Diis aduersor? quasi Titani cum Diis belligerem, quibus sat esse non queam? ἡμῖν is a form of the common dialect for ἦν, and occurs not unfrequently in the Sept. So Mæris: ἦν 'Ἀττικῶς' ἡμῖν Ἑλληνικῶς. ἐδὲ is not (with Beza and Simon) to be thrown out, on the authority of some MSS., since it is not unfrequently thus employed in interrogative sentences. See Raphel and Sturz. Lex. Xen. in l. v. § 18. (Wolf, Valcknaer, & Kuin.)

18. ἡσύχασαν, they silently acquiesced; i. e. (says Doddridge) till the controversy was renewed by some fiercer zealots (C. 5, 1—5). Schlesner compares 21, 14. μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ, ἡσύχασαμεν, and observes that ἡσύχασαν ἔχειν occurs in this sense in Demosth. Philipp. 1.

Metánoia properly signifies change of mind, and may very well denote (thought not, in the theological sense) the abandonment of one religion and the embracing of another. We have also δεδομαι μετάνοιαν in 5, 31. Wetstein here compares Appian. Hisp. p. 458. μάχης δὲ οὐκ ἠρχε, δίδοσ τοῖς Καστακαίων μετάνοιαι. Bulkley cites Plutarch de Ethic. Virt. καὶ γὰρ ἡ νοῦθεσι καὶ ὁ ψιγός ἐμποίει μετανοίαν καὶ αἰσχρόν — καὶ τούτοις μάλιστα χρώνται πρὸς τὰς ἐπανορθώσεις.

18. Eis ἔσχάν, i. e. “in order that they might thus be put into the way of salvation.”

19. There now follows a narrative of the propaga-
tion of the Christian Religion beyond Palestine among the Gentiles, and first of all at Antioch.

19. οἱ μὲν οὖν διασταφέντες. In the particle μὲν οὖν we have an epanalepsis, or resumption of what had been before said in 8, 4. Ἀρα is for οὖν, and denotes cause. An idiom sometimes found in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. Wetstein cites Thucyd. 1, 24. ἀπὸ πολέμου — ἐφθάρησαν. Hermogen. Method. c. 35. on the passage of Thucydides: οὐδὲς γὰρ λέγει ἀπὸ πολέμου ἐφθάρησαν. Liv. 1, 1. Αἰνεας ab simili clade domo profugus. And he refers to Apoc. 9, 18.

19. ἐπὶ Στεφάνου. Some would render the ἐπὶ propter (as it is done by the authors of our English Version, and Doddridge): others contra. But both these modes of interpretation Kuinoel rightly accounts harsh. Others, (with the Vulgate) render it sub, “at the time of.” But to this it is objected by De Dieu and Alberti, that that sense would require Στεφάνου, which, indeed, is found in some MSS., and is agreeable to the usage of the writers of the New Testament. And so infra 28 & 29. Mark 2, 26. Luke 4, 27. But the dative might be taken for the genitive. Many modern Commentators, however, as Drusius, Vatablus, Wolf, Alberti, and Rosenmuller render it post. And this mode of interpretation Kuinoel approves of. “For (says he) the persecution which arose after Stephen’s death, cannot well be referred to his time; and therefore ἐπὶ, with a genitive, may denote time. Yet (as it is observed by Valckn.) the noun must be one of office, (such as King, Magistrate,) according to which periods are reckoned.

This signification post is frequent in the Classical writers. On Ἀντιόχεια see the Geographical writers, and Mr. Horne’s Introduction.

20. ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τοὺς Ἐλληνιστὰς, “spoke (the word of the Lord) to the Hellenists.” This passage involves no little difficulty. By Ἐλληνισταὶ some interpreters, both ancient and modern, have under-
stood Jews speaking Greek: but, as it should seem, erroneously. For the Hellenists are, at ver. 19., opposed to the Jews; and if Jews speaking Greek had been meant, the Cyprians and Cyreneans mentioned at ver. 20. would have done nothing else than what those Jerusalemite Christians had done, who were dispersed after the death of Stephen (among whom were many Hellenists, (ver. 6, 1, 5.), and who, passing over to Phenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, had taught the Jews only, i.e. the foreign Jews speaking Greek, namely, the Hellenists.

Other interpreters, however, observing this objection to the above explication of Ἐλληνισταῖς, adopt the opinion either that Ἐλληνισταῖς must be taken in another signification, or the reading be changed. And Drusius and Wetstein maintain that by Ἐλληνισταῖς are to be understood Gentiles. But this signification cannot be established on good grounds. (See the note on 6, 1.) Schmid and others understand proselytes of the gate. But they adduce no proofs to confirm this signification. According to the opinion of Wolf and others, by Ἐλληνισταῖς are meant "Gentiles by birth, but proselytes of the Jews," who had received circumcision. This interpretation, however, is also at variance with the usus loquendi; for such proselytes were always reckoned with Jews. Abandoning this opinion, Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmuller, Heinrichs, and others, maintain that Ἐλληνισταῖς, which is found in some very ancient MSS. Versions and Fathers, is to be adopted, as being confirmed by the whole context; since Luke, after having narrated the conversion of Cornelius (ver. 19. seqq.), goes on to say that, from this time, the Christian doctrine was more widely propagated among the Gentiles, and first at Antioch. This, after the martyrdom of Stephen, certain Jerusalemite Christians had come (8, 1.) but preached the doctrine of Christ to the Jews only. Afterwards, however, when the conversion of Cornelius had been noised abroad, some Cyprians and Cyreneans, con-
verted to Christianity by these Jerusalemite Christians, came to Antioch, and, as being Hellenists dwelling among Gentiles, and thus so much the more disposed to tolerate and admit pagans, they communicated the doctrine of Christ to the Gentiles dwelling at Antioch.

How the reading 'Ἐλληνιστὰς arose, is obvious. (See Kuin., from whom the substance of the above annotation is derived.) Dr. Doddridge observes that the common sense would induce us to adopt "Ἐλλήνας. See Chrysostom and Ὑσεκομενίου.

It must be observed that αὐτῶν is not to be referred to the διασπαρέντες, but to the Ἰουδαίοις in ver. 19.

21—23. καὶ ἦν χείρ κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν. An Oriental expression, denoting help, assistance. It may be rendered thus: "the power of the Lord co-operated with them." Chrysostom understands this of miracles: and so does Archbishop Newcome. Πολὺς is put for μέγας. See the note on Luke 16, 10.

22. ἡκουσθη—εἰς τὰ ὅτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Λόγος here signifies rumour, report. Εἰς τὰ ὅτα is considered as an Oriental redundancy. But perhaps the sentence is more significant with than without it; and the idiom is also found in the Classical writers.

23. ἵνα τῷ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Grotius and others understand by this the increase of the Church; (as in Eph. 2, 8.) the cause (says Kuin.) being put for the effect."

23. παρεκάλει πάντας τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ Κυρίῳ. Προθέσεις signifies purpose or intention; as in Acts 28, 18. and frequently in St. Paul's Epistles. Now the addition of τῆς καρδίας has (by a Hebrew idiom) the force of an adjective. The phrase therefore denotes "a hearty purpose;" and Grotius, Schleusner, and Kuinoel refer to 2 Tim. 3, 10., but (I think) without reason. (See the note on that passage.) So Alberti Gloss. Gr. N. T. p. 87. τῆς προθέσεως τῆς σπουδῆς. Wolf compares Herodian 1, 7. ποδείν τινα ἀληθείας κυρίας διαθέσει.

Προσμένειν properly signifies to wait for; as in
Thucyd. 6, 44.; but here, and in Joseph. Ant. 14, 2, 1. (cited by Rosenm.) “to wait, stay by, adhere to, remain attached to.”

24. ὅτι ἂν ἄνηρ ἀγάθος. Heinrichs and Kuinoel think that these words assign a reason why the Christians at Jerusalem chose Barnabas for the mission to Antioch. And certainly the ὅτι may have a causal force; and thus the words ὅς παραγενώμενος... τὸ κυρίον, may be regarded as parenthetical; and the ὅτι be referred to εὐκαπτοστειλαν. The sense of ἂν ἄνηρ ἀγάθος is best to be understood by a reference to the usage of our own language, in which we have a very similar idiom, whereby the notions of integrity, benignity, and gentleness are united. Heinrichs is the only foreign Commentator who has discerned the true sense. Wetstein adduces some examples; as Joseph. Ant. 12, 9, 1. ὅς ἄγαθος ὁν ἄνηρ. and 18, 5, 2.; and Hor. Epist. 1, 9, 13. Scribe tui gregis hunc, et fortrem crede bonumque. But this last is scarcely apposite; and still less Thucyd. 5, 9. ἄνηρ ἄγαθος γινεται, where nothing more is meant than, “act the part of a brave man:” a significatio of ἄγαθος not unfrequent in that author.

24. πλήρης Πνεύματος ἀγίου. This phrase is, as usual, explained away by many recent Theologians, so as to mean no more than a man well affected to religion. But surely, as applied to so eminent an Apostle, it must have its full force, including all the Divine helps necessary for so arduous a work as he had to accomplish.

We may observe that Barnabas took Saul as his colleague, both as being known to him, and from his being an Hellenist peculiarly fitted to assist him; as also in consideration of his eminent abilities, his high mental acquirements, his eminent piety and zeal; and, above all, his extraordinary conversion, which seemed to point him out as an instrument in the hands of God, fitted to accomplish the most important purposes, in bringing over the Gentiles to the profession of the faith. (See, however, Dr. S. Clarke
ap. Mant and D'Oyley.) Συμανχθήκας were united together in the bonds of fellowship.

26. κρηματίσαι τε πρῶτον—Χριστιανός. Χρηματίζω is here used in a sense quite unusual in the Classical writers, among the earlier of whom (as Valcknaer observes) it signifies to dispatch business; but among the more recent ones, to so dispatch business as to thence obtain a name; and hence it at length simply denoted to be called, or named. Of this signification many examples from Josephus, Philo, and other writers are adduced by Valcknaer, Raphel, Kypke, and Loesner; as also by Wets. on Romans, which establish the sense in question; after all, however, there is a sort of catachresis in the expression.

Χριστιάνος. It has been matter of enquiry whether the followers of Christ gave this name to themselves, or received it from others? That they first applied it to themselves, is not only devoid of authority, but may be disproved by many weighty arguments. For, in the first place, if they had appropriated the name to themselves, they would have thereby excited a greater enmity against themselves. Again, if the Antiochian Christians had done so, Luke, in recording this origin of the appellation, would undoubtedly, in the rest of his work, have so employed it; which he has not done. On the contrary, he calls them the believers, the disciples, the brethren, &c.; the very same names by which he had, in the former part of his book, designated them. Furthermore, if at the time when Paul was teaching at Antioch, Christ's followers had voluntarily taken this name, he would have used it in his Epistles; whereas he always employs other terms.

Finally, whenever, in the New Testament, the name Christians occurs, it is applied by persons not professing the Religion; as in Acts 26, 28, and 1 Pet. 4, 14. "If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil
spoken of, but on your part he is glorified;" and 16.
"Yet if any man suffer as a Christain, let him not
be ashamed," &c. The name, therefore, seems to
have been then meant for a reproachful appellation.
Was it, then, given them by the Jews? Certainly
not. By them they were called *Nazarenes* (Acts
2:4, 51.): and, indeed, they would have called them
by any name rather then that which would seem to
admit the pretensions of Jesus to the Messiahship.

Beyond all controversy, the name was given them
by *Gentiles*, and, very probably, the Romans dwelling
at Antioch; as indeed the very Latin form suggests:
for by that were characterised the *partisans* of any
great man; as Cæsariani, Pompeiani, &c. Now by the
Antiochians (who, as we learn from Zosimus, p.258,
and Ammian. Marc. 22, 14., and other writers cited
by Wets., were not a little prone to scoffs and coarse
jokes) they were called *Christianoi* in derision of the
pretensions of Jesus to be King of the Jews. Tacit-
us, Annal. 15, 44. says: Nero—*quæsitissimis poenis
affectat, quos, per flagitia invisos, vulgus Christianos
appellabant*. Auctor nominis ejus Christus (i.e. a
ducis sui nomine traxerunt hoc nomen), Tiberio
imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum suppli-
cio affectus erat. The Christians, however, felt no
aversion to the name, but rather reckoned it an
honour, and therefore retained it. (Kuin. & Wets.)

In this view of the subject I must, upon the whole,
acquiesce. The common opinion however is, that
they applied the name to themselves, or had it given
them by Barnabas or Saul, or Euodius, the first
Bishop of Antioch. But this is destitute of *au-
thority*. I must not omit to notice a strange mistake
into which Doddridge has fallen, misled by Benson,
who explains *Χριστιανοι* "was done by Divine direc-
tion;" conformably to which mode of interpretation
he translates: "were, by *Divine appointment*, first
named Christians at Antioch." Into such errors do
those Commentators run, who, without attending to
the *usus loquendi*, dwell on some fancied etymological sense.

I must conclude with observing, that from Philostr. Vit. Ap. 8, 21. it appears the Greeks called the disciples of Apollonius *Ἀπολλωνίωι.*

27. προφηται. Commentators are not quite agreed on the exact sense to be here attached to προφηται. The term seems to denote teachers, who, with more or less of the *afflatus Divinus* applied themselves to both public preaching and teaching, and appear to have occasionally foretold future events. Kuinoel refers to Koppe’s third Excursus on the Epistle to the Eph. p. 152 seqq. Now these were in dignity inferior to the Apostles, but superior to other teachers. See Ephes. 2, 20. 3, 5.

28. ἐσήμανε, he (fore) showed, predicted. This term seems to have been applied of prophecies and auguries, both by the sacred and profane writers. So Joseph. Ant. 7, 8. (speaking of Nathan): *σημαίναν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ παιδὸς ἐσομένην ἐκδησιν.* It occurs also in Euripides and Xenophon. See Sturzii Lex. Xen.

28. μέλλειν ἐσεθαι. The student will observe this use of μέλλειν with the future, which is found in the best writers, especially Herodotus, Thucydides, and Lysias.

By ἤ δὲ ἡ ὁικομένη most modern Commentators unite in understanding, not the *whole world*, but *Judea only*; as in Luke 2, 1. where see the note. Bishop Pearce here observes, that in proof of this dearth being in Judea only, it appears from ver. 39, 40. that it was not expected, and probably was not found in Syria, where Antioch was: for, if it had, the Christians there would scarcely have been able to relieve those of Judea. “Besides (continues he) when Joseph. in Antiq. 3, 15, 3. and 20, 2, 6. and 4, 2. speaks of this dearth in Claudius’s reign, as having happened in Judea, he not only says nothing of its being elsewhere, but he tells us that large quantities of corn were sent up to Jerusalem from other countries, for the purpose of the *feast of unleavened*
bread."* See also Dr. Lardner's Credibility, and Doddr. in loc.

* Kuinoel, in order to prove that the words must be understood of Palestine only, adduces descriptions of the four famines which happened in the reign of Claudius, from the original Historians.

1. The first was that which afflicted Rome, and fell on the first and second year of Claudius. So Dio Cass. p. 949. edit. Reimar. λυμοῦ ἑσχυροῦ γενομένου, οὗ μόνον τῆς ἐν τῷ τῆς παρόντι ἄφθονίας τῶν τροφῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἐς πάντα τὸν μετὰ ταῦτα αἰώνα πρόνοιαν ἑκούσατο. Aurel. Vict. Cas. c. 4. Announce egestas sub Claudio nimirum composita, quam Caligula induxerat, dum, adactis toto orbe navigis, pervium mare theatris curribusque damno publico efficere studuit.

The principal cause of this famine was the difficulty of importing provisions to Rome by sea, during the winter season. (See Dio, ibidem); which induced Claudius to form, at a great expense, the port of Ostia.

II. The second famine came on towards the end of the fourth year of Claudius, and especially afflicted Judea. It was alleviated by Helena Queen of Adiabene, who had embraced the Jewish religion. (See Scaliger, Anim. on Euseb. 194. and Wesseling, Obs. 1, 9, p. 28.) Of this mention is thus made in Jos. Ant. 20, 2, 6. λυμοὺ αὐτῶν τῆς πολίν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον πιεσοῦσα καὶ πολλῶν ἕκαστας ἀναλωμάτων φθειρομένων, ἡ βασιλεία Ἑλένη πέμπει τινὰς τῶν ἐκείνης, τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, πολλῶν σίτου ἔνθραμμάς των δὲ εἰς Κύπρον ἵσχάδων φέρον δίσσυνα.


From what has been said, it is sufficiently plain that we must suppose the words of St. Luke to denote that famine which, in the fourth year of Claudius, overspread Palestine; and that we must understand, not the Roman Empire, but Judæa only; for whose relief the money was gathered at Antioch. (Walch, Krebs, Michaelis, and Kuin.)

Archbishop Usher has endeavoured to prove that the famine in the fourth year of Claudius was universal; and Mr. Biscoe ap. Boyle's Lect. p. 60—66. thinks that there may be a reference to all the famines. But all put together would not make up half the Roman Empire, much less the whole world: not to say that the singular λυμοῦ cannot apply to all those different famines. Besides (as Dr. Doddridge remarks) the persons with regard to whom it is
29. καθὼς ἡμπορεῖτο τίς, &c. I entirely accede to the mode of interpretation adopted by Grotius, the authors of our English Version, and many other Commentators, namely, " pro modo facultatum," " in proportion to the respective ability or wealth of each." Nor need any one object that this would lead us to suppose all the Antiochian Christians were rich, or that the rich only were contributors; for εὐπορείθαι, like many such words in all languages (ex. gr. our wealth), is a comparative term, and we must here subdue χρημάτων. It is an elliptical expression for "in proportion as any were wealthy, (or not)." Now this is all that needs be borne in mind by the reader, who may consult the long annotation of Kypke; in which, however, the sense is rather obscured than illustrated by the numerous Classical citations adduced. Among these there is a curious one from Musonius: ἄλλ' εὐπορεῖ χρημάτων ἄντες τίνες δὲ καὶ πλούσιοι. But this is not to our present purpose. The rest have the ellipsis of χρημάτων filled up. He might more aptly have cited Thucyd. 6. 44. καὶ ἡκαστοὶ εὐπόροι εὑφρησαν where there is the first mentioned ellipsis. The sense is, "just as any had power to make the coast (or not)." The student will bear in mind that εὐπορος does not of itself signify πλούσιος (as is plain from the passage of Musonius just cited), but rather, according to its etymology, one (as we say) "well to do, in good circumstances." So Ammonius (cited by Wets.) πλούσιος, ὁ πολυύσιος, ὁ πολλὴν ἕχων οὕσιαν. Εὐπορος δὲ, ὁ πρὸς τὰς ἑπὶ βαλλούσας τύχας ἀνενδήεις — εὐποροί, καὶ μὴ πλούτωσιν, ἄν δέοιται, ἕχουσιν.

To pass, however, from words to things, I conclude by adducing a passage of Dionysius Corinthius ap.
Euseb. H. E. 4, 23. (cited by Wets.) ἐξ ἄρχῆς γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐστὶ τοῦτο, πάντας μὲν ἄδελφοὺς ποικίλως εὐεργετεῖν, ἐκκλησιαῖς τε πολλαῖς ταῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐφόδια πέμπειν, ὥσπερ μὲν τὴν τῶν δεόμενον πενίαν ἀνακύκλωσας, ἐν μετάλλοις δὲ ἄδελφοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἐπιχορηγοῦντας.

29. ἀφικνόν, determined, resolved. The word properly signifies terminare, determinare, to determine limits. Adly, it denotes determine generally, decree, in which sense it is frequently used in the New Testament; especially in the writings of St. Luke; as Luke 22, 22. Acts 2, 23. 10, 42. 11, 29. 17, 26. 16, 29. So also Prov. 16, 30. ὄρθιεν πάντα τὰ κακὰ. Heb. 4, 7. Schleusner refers to a passage of Diodor. Siculus; but he might have cited a more apposite one from Thucyd. 3, 82. ἐς δὲ τὰ ἐκατέρως ποὺ ἕδωκεν ἔχων ὑποτοναὶ, determining and appointing (punishments), just according to our own pleasure.

29. Εἰς διακώνια, in subsidium. So Theophylact: ἡ διακώνια ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν χρημάτων ἐπιχαρηγία. In the same sense διακώνια is used in Heb. 6, 10. διακωνίσαντες τοῖς ἀγίοις. Vitringa has shown at large (de Synag. Vet. 809—11.), that it was common for the Jews living in foreign parts to send relief in times of distress to their poor brethren at Jerusalem. And it is observed by Grotius, that the Jerusalemite Christians were, for the most part, poor, and for that reason they were commended to the benevolence of the Achæans and Macedonians.

30. ἀποστειλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους. This is the first time that there has been any mention made of elders in the Christian Church, which was (as Vitringa and Casaubon observe) formed almost wholly on the model of the Synagogue. Dr. Hammond has here a profoundly learned, curious, and instructive annotation on the origin and various uses of this important word, in which he proves that these elders were the same in office with those called ἐπισκόποι: and he thinks there is no certain evidence from Scripture that the name of elders or presbyters
was given so easily to another order between them and deacons.

The extreme length of his annotation forbids its insertion here; and therefore I can only refer my readers to it, whose trouble it will abundantly repay.

CHAP. XII.

1. κατ' ἐκείνου δὲ τῶν καυρῶν. Valcknaer observes that κατ' ἐκείνο τῶν καυρῶν (as in Thucydides) would have been better Greek. Yet very pure Greek writers use the common form, examples of which Wetstein produces from Joseph. Ant. 6, 44, 1 & 7, 2. It is further remarked by Valcknaer, that instead of ἐπέβαλε τὰς χεῖρας the Classical authors would have written ἐπεχειρησε (as in Luke 1, 1. Acts 9, 29). Those writers, however, sometimes use ἐπιβάλεσθαι in this sense without χεῖρας. And so Diog. Laert. 6, 2, 4. ἐπέβαλε τερετίζειν. (See Kypke on Mark 14, 72.) It appears to be Hellenistic Greek. Thus we have in Deut. 12, 7. εἰς οὖν ἐπιβάλετε ὅτι τά σα οὐκ εἴπαν ἐπιβάλλετε τὰς χεῖρας. See also 15, 10. The Classical writers also use ἐπιβάλει in the sense of enterprise; as Thucyd. 3, 45. καὶ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιβολὴν εἰκονιζόμενοι where the Scholiast explains ἐπιχειρησών.

1. Ἡρῴδας ὁ βασιλεὺς, i.e. the Herod who is by authors styled Agrippa, and also major. This Herod was the grandson of Herod the Great, son of Aristobolus, who was destroyed by his father (as we learn from Jos. Ant. 18, 5). See more in Deyling’s Obs., Fisch. Prolus., and Krebs. Κακῶσας to afflict, ill treat; as in Acts 7, 6. 18, 10. 14, 2. and often in the Sept. and Josephus. (See the note on 7, 6.) The. δὲ just after may be rendered ίμο ετιαμ: and we may observe a sort of climax. It is neatly remarked by Wetstein, that “this persecution was commenced by the Priests, continued by the people, and completed by the Prince.”
2. ἀνείλε, i. e. "beheaded him." For he had the power of life and death, as had the Roman procurators before him. Wetstein here cites Sanhedrim 52, 2. Decollatio ignominiosissimum apud Judæos mortis genus habebatur. "The accuracy of the sacred writer (says Dr. Paley ap. Mant) in the expressions which he uses, is in this instance 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 three last years of this Herod’s life, within which period the transaction here recorded took place." See also Walch’s Dissert. on the captivity of Peter, p. 6. Doddridge here notices, with approbation, a remark of Clarius (derived, however, from Cæcumenius, and by him from Chrysostom), namely, that this early execution of one of the Apostles after our Lord’s death, would illustrate the courage of the rest in going on with their ministry, as it would evidently show, that even all their miraculous powers did not secure them from dying by the sword of their enemies.

3. καὶ ἴδὼν ὅτι ἁρεστὸν ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἰούδαίοις, "when he saw it was acceptable to the Jews." Some confine Ἰούδαίοι to the Sanhedrim; and in that sense the word is often used by St. John; but it here seems to have a general signification, including both the Rulers and people.

3. προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν, "and he proceeded to take." A Hebraism, on which see the note on Luke 20, 12. Ἡσαν δὲ ἡμέρας τῶν ἁγίων, i. e. the paschal week, during which they were to have no leaven in their houses. See Deut. 16, 6. Ex. 12, 18. Matt. 26, 17. These words (as A. Lapide Menochius, and Lightfoot observe) are added in order to show how it happened that Peter was not immediately put to death; and 2dly, to place in a strong light the obstinate malice of the Jews at a holy season, when
they ought to have given themselves unto religious duties, and purged away the leaven of malice and wickedness.

4, 5. πιάσας ἢθεο εἰς φυλακὴν παράδος τέσσαρες τετράδιοις στρατιωτῶν. Herod had his own soldiers in the city (see Joseph. 19, 7, 1.), and they guarded Peter in the mode usual with the Romans, whose customs (except in matters of religion) Agrippa, who had been educated at Rome, studiously imitated. See Joseph. Ant. 19, 7, 4 & 5. 19, 8, 2. Amongst the Romans the night watch was distributed among quaternions, or detachments of four soldiers, each of whom watched three hours; and since Herod chose that Peter should be watched by four soldiers, of whom two should be in the prison, and two be stationed at the gates, it was necessary that four quaternions of soldiers should be appointed for that purpose. See Veget. R. M. 3, 8., and Fisch. Prol. de Vit. Lex. N. T. 452.

Τετράδιον, a quaternion, the regular number for a guard, as a file is with us. So Polyb. 6, 33. ἐδίδασκαὶ φυλάκαις ὅν, ὧν ἐγερεῖς ἐκ τεττάρας ἄνδρων. Philo in Flacc. 981. στρατιοῦ τῆς τῶν ἔν τοῖς τετραδίοις φιλάκων, &c.

4. Βουλόμενος μετὰ τὸ πᾶσχα ἀναγαγαῖν αὐτὸν τῷ λαῷ. Βουλόμενος, meaning. Ἀναγαγαῖν, for προαγαγεῖν, bring him forth for trial and punishment, as we say, “bring any one up for trial.”

5. προσευχῇ δὲ ἐν ἑκτενής. Ἔκτενής is properly used of a rope at full tension, and signifies, 1st, extensus, then intensus, continual, fervent. So 1 Pet. 4, 8. ἁγάπην ἑκτενῆς. Acts 26, 7. ἐν ἑκτενεία ηλετρεῦν. Luke 22, 44. ἑκτενεστερον προσηύχετο. This metaphor is also to be found in the Sept.; ex. gr. Judith 4, 7. ἁνεβάλεσαν πρὸς τὸν Ὑσῖν ἐν ἑκτενεία μεγάλῃ. See 2 Macc. 14, 38. Jon. 8, 8. Joel 1, 14. κεκράξατε πρὸς κύριον ἑκτενῆς. See Dr. Hammond’s note.

6. ἐμελέτην αὐτὸν προάγαγον. Subaud eis ἐκκλησίαν or eis δίκην, which words are supplied in Joseph. Ant.
16, 11, 6; Vit. §. 11., and Bell. 1, 27, 2. And so the Latin *prodo*; as in Cic. Ep. ad Fam. 12, 4. *produ-ductus* in concionem, and in ver. 5, 6. ad necem *producre* (Krebs.) Kuinoel refers to Valckyn. on Eurip. Phoen. 219.

6. *κοιμάμενος μεταξὶ δύο στρατιωτῶν, δεδεμένος ἀλυ-σεῖ  δυσι*. It was the custom of the Romans to fasten the prisoner with a small and light chain to some soldier, who was appointed to guard him; one end of which chain was fastened to the right hand of the prisoner, and the other end of it to the left hand of the soldier. To this custom Seneca alludes, when he says, in Epist. V. Eadem catena et custodiam et militem copulat; et De Tranquill. C. 10. Eadem custodia universos circumdedit, alligatiq; sunt etiam, qui alligaverunt; nisi tu forte leviorem in sinistrâ catenam putas. I find, too, in Plin. Epist. 10, 80. Rogo, domine, consilio me regas hæsitatem, utrum per publicos civitatum servos, quod usq; adhuc factum, an per milites asservare custodias debeam: the latter was the custom of the Romans, the former that of the province where he then governed. It seems to have been for the better securing of Peter from any escape, that they bound him, as here described, with *two chains to two soldiers*. (Pearce.) To these passages may be added Lucian. Tox. (cited by Priscæus): *Ποιεσ ἡμέρας ὁ κλαύσ ἤρει, καὶ ἡ ἐκείνα χείρ τεπεδημένη εἰς δε τὴν νυκτὰ ἐδει ἄλοι καταδέσσαι.*

It is interesting to notice how entirely this faithful servant of God resigned himself to the Divine care, and slept soundly an the night before that day which was probably to terminate his life. With this Wetstein aptly compares the sound and composed sleep enjoyed by Socrates on the night before his execution.

6. *ἐπίρου τὴν φυλακὴν*. Raphel would render *φυλακὴ watch*: but the word signifies prison, both here and in ver. 4., as also in Matt. 26, 10.
7. καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέστη.* Many recent German Commentators, as Eichhorn, Hezel, and Heinrichs, entirely deny the reality of this angelic appearance, and account for Peter’s release from natural causes.

Hezel thinks that the light here mentioned was lightning, which melted Peter’s chains, and caused the doors to open, &c.!! Heinrichs suspects that the gaoler was a favourer of Christianity, and so somehow contrived to let Peter escape.

It is unnecessary for me to point out the extreme absurdity of these conjectures, which (as Kuin. acknowledges) are inconsistent with the manifest intent of St. Luke. Heinrichs, indeed, observes, that in whatever way this escape took place, it must be ascribed to a Divine providence guarding Peter’s life for important purposes: but in the way in which he supposes it to have been effected, it could hardly appear, either to the Apostles or to his followers, that there was the hand of God in his deliverance.

7. Οἶκημα is for δισμακτήριον, by an euphemism frequent with the Athenians, who (as Helladius Christ. 22. and Pollux 9, 45. observe,) call bad things by good names. (Kuin., from Alberti and Kypke.) In addition to this, I must observe that Thucydidcs seems to refer to this in a very fine passage of 3, 82. 1, 496. edit. Bekker. καὶ τὴν ἐκδύον ἀξίων τῶν ἀναμάτων ἐς τὰ ἔφοιτα ἀντήρρισαν τῇ δικαιοσθείρᾳ τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀλόγοιστος ἀνδρία πεῖλεταρος ἐνυμίσθη, μέλλουσι δὲ προμηθῆς δειλία ἐμπεσῆς, τὸ δὲ σώφρον τοῦ ἀνάνδρου πρόσχημα, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἄταν ἔνεκτον ἐπὶ πᾶν ἄργον. On this principle we may account for ἐλώμας and many such words among the examples of this signification adduced by Kypke, in Thucyd. 4, 47. ταραταβάντες δὲ
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The learned Commentator, however, was deceived by the Latin translator, Portus; for ἐξοικημα μέγα there signifies no more than aedificium; as appears from the want of the article, and the addition of μέγα. So Thucyd. L. 2, 4. ἐστιντωσιν ἐξοικημα μέγα where it is rightly rendered aedificium, and Diodor. Siculus, too, paraphrases it by οἰκίας. It is strange, however, that Pollux should have taken it to mean prison. But, besides that the article is required (which is found in all the examples produced by Wetstein), the door could not have been open; nor could the συκημα have been large in such a small place as Platææ. Indeed, I am not aware that the word ever has in Thucydides the sense of prison.

Kuinoel remarks that on the situation of this prison there has been much discussion among the Commentators; though nothing can with certainty be determined, since St. Luke has not very particularly described it. "That it was not (continues he) the public prison, is clear from the expression ἐν τῷ ἡμιστήρῳ πόλεως." Lightfoot thinks it was without the city; which, however, Wolf has shewn to have been contrary to custom. He conjectures that it was in the city, and near to the Judgment hall; and that by the iron gate, mentioned at ver. 10., is to be understood the outer gate of the prison. De Dieu and Fessel suppose (on the authority of Adrichomius) that this prison was in the court of Herod's palace, and that it was his private prison. From this area and prison (as Fessel thinks) extended a street, through which was the outlet from the palace to the city, and, as it seems, closed by an iron gate.

Walch observes, that from the Jewish writers, we find Jerusalem was surrounded by three walls, of which the interior and most ancient had sixty towers; the exterior one ninety; and the intermediate one fourteen. In one of these towers, namely, of those belonging to the intermediate wall, he supposes Peter to have been confined: and the iron gate (he thinks) was at the entrance of the tower. An opinion (as
Kuin. thinks) not improbable; since it is ascertained that jails were formerly in towers, which seems to account for our old word gate-house. See the Scholiast on Juvenal 6, 57.

By prison must be understood that part of it in which Peter was confined.

7. πατάξας τὴν πλευρὰν τοῦ Πέτρου, smote Peter on the side: as is usual (observes Grotius) in rousing persons from sleep. See the examples adduced by Priceus and Wetstein.

7. εξέσευν—αι ἀλώσεις. With the whole of this passage may be compared Eurip. Bacch. 448 seq. (cited by Wets.) ἄδικως ὑμῖν ταύτα, χαίρεις, τοῖς ἐν δεσμῷ, τὸν δικαιόν πείθει, λευκώς ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ δικαίως έπευκάλεσεν, θεοὶ οἱ ἀνδραί ἀναστάσεις τῆς ἀνθρώπου, κύριος ἐν ἀνθρώποις. He also quotes Ovid. Met. 3, 696. Solidis Tyrrhenus Acætes clauditur in tec- tis, et dum crudelia jussæ instrumenta necis, ferrumque ignesque parantur, sponte sua patuisset fores, lapasæque lacertis sponte sua, fama est, nullo solvente, catenas. Philostr. Vit. Apollon. Tyan. p. 817. εξέ- γαγε τὸ σκῆλος τοῦ δεσμοῦ—τὸν πρᾶτον ὁ Δάμας φησὶν ἀκρίβειαν ἐννεῖται τῆς Ἀπολλωνίου φύσεως, ὅτι βεία τὸ εἴρ καὶ πρεπτ υπὸν ἀνθράκου, μη γὰρ γίνεται, (καὶ γὰρ τὸν κτήτηρ); μὴ εὔχαριστον τι, μήτε ἐποίηται καταγελά- σαι τοῦ δεσμοῦ.

8. σαμαλαία. See the note on Matt. 10, 10. and Priceus in loc. It is a beautiful circumstance (as is noticed by Chrysostom and Priceus,) that the angel bids Peter fasten his sandals; which, in a hasty flight, would be usually neglected; and this in order to hint to him, that his deliverance is certain, and no danger will attend the attempt to procure it.

On περίξωσαν see the note on Luke 12, 35. and on Ἰακώβ, cloak, see the note on Matt. 9, 20.

9. εὐδώκει δὲ ὁ ὅρμα βλέπειν, i. e. "he thought he was in a dream." Wetstein refers to Ps. 126, 1, 2 & 3, and compares Curtius 4, 1, 23. Somnio similis res Abdolomino videbatur.
10. Διελθόντες δὲ προάτην φυλακὴν. By the φυλακὴ are here to be understood the two soldiers, of whom one guarded the entrance to the prison; the other stood guard at the iron gate.

10. πυλὴ τὴν σιδηρᾶν. Wetstein compares Hom. II. 8. 15. ἐνδίκησα σιδηρᾶς τε πυλῆς, καὶ χάλκεος οὐδος: and Priceus cites a beautiful passage from Calpurnius, Declam. 4. Video carcerem publicum saxis ingenti-bus structum, angustis foraminibus tenuem lucis umbram recipientem: in hunc conjecti robur Tullianum prospiicint, et quotes ferrati postis stridor excitat, examinantur; et alienum supplicium espectando (read aspectando) suum discunt.

We need not suppose the gate to have been of solid iron, but only cased over with iron.

10. αὐτομάτη ἄνωγχη. Αὐτόματος properly signifies self-moved; and is used both of persons and things. When applied to the former, it may be rendered of his own accord; but not so in the latter case (as is done by the authors of our English Version), in which it should be translated self-moved. Numerous examples are adduced by Raphel, Kypke, Munthe, Loesner, and Wetstein, on Mark 4, 28. and by Priceus and Wetstein on the present passage.*

The circumstance of the gate being caused to open of itself, without the intervention of the angel, was meant to impress the mind of Peter still more

* Of these the following are the most apposite. Hom. II. e. 749. αὐτομάτας δὲ πυλὰς μύκον οὐρανῷ. And Θ. 393. Xen. Hell. 6. ὅτι ἐφ' ἐνω πάντας αὐτόματον ἄνωγχοντο. Virg. Aen. 6, 81. Julius Obsequens. Nocte, cum valvae cubilis clause essent, sud sponse apertae sunt. Petron. 16. Sera, sud sponie delapsa, ceedit, recluseque subito fores. Dio (speaking of Nero) 63. Αἱ θύραι ἀμφότεραι, αἱ τοῦ μυθουλεύτου του Αὐγουστείου, καὶ αἱ τοῦ κοινῶν τοῦ ικείου, αὐτοματα εν τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτὶ ἀνωγχθαν. Artapanus ap. Euseb. p. 9, 27. εἰς φυλακὴν αυτὸν καθεδρικαί, νυκτὸς δὲ ἑκτενομένης τᾶς τε θύρας πᾶσε αὐτομάτως ἀνοιχθήναι τοῦ δεισιδηροῦ — ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὸν Μωυσῆν ἐπὶ τὰ βασιλεία ἐλθεῖν. Apollonius Rhod. 4, 41. (speaking of Medea): τῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτομάτοι θυρέων ὑπόδειαν ρχῆς ὠκείαι άναβρασάμενς ὀδώρας. Besides many other passages, from which it appears this was a frequent phrase with the Classical writers.
strongly with a sense of Divine interference. For it appears to have been both by the Jews and Gentiles regarded as a prodigy indicating the presence of the Deity. So Callimachus Hymn. Apoll. 6. (cited by Wets.) αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχήνεις ἀνακλίνεσθε πυλάων, αὐταῖς δὲ κληθές ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακάριν. Nonnus Dionys. 7, 313. (speaking of Jupiter,) αὐτομάτοι πυλεών ἀρχηγον ὁχύτες. Targum on Ps. 86. Quo tempore Salomo filius meus introducet arcam in domum Sanctuarii, aperient sese portae; ideo videbunt adversarii mei, te mihi condonasse.

11. καὶ ὁ Πέτρος, γενόμενος ἐν ἐαυτῷ, i.e. having come to himself, (for he had thought it was only a dream, and that he was not really liberated,) and, shaking off the stupor and astonishment, having collected himself. The phrase ἐν ἐαυτῷ γένοιτο occurs in Xen. ΟEcon. 1, 5, 17. Polyb. 1, 49. Liban. Ep. 319. See other examples in Wetstein and Kypke.

11. νῦν ὁδα ἀληθῶς. Now, and not before, he felt (says Grot.) that there was fulfilled in him the saying of Is. 21, 14.

11. Ἐξειλετό. On this word see Alciphron. ap. Schl. Lex. Πάνις τῆς προοδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, of the Jews; a great number of whom were assembled at the feast. In προοδοκίας Vatablus and Kuinoel suppose a metonymy for the thing expected, and πάνις (as Priscus observes), by a sort of Hellenistic hypallage, properly belongs to λαόν; by which the sense of the words will be this: "hath delivered me from the punishment expected by all the people of the Jews." Or πάνις may be taken for πάνως. The Syriaco Translator, who renders, " de omni machinatione," seems to have read προοδοκίας, a word not to be found in the Lexicons, but which probably was formerly in use, since the cognate προοδοχίῳ occurs in Thucydides and other writers.

12. καὶ συνιδών. Casaubon renders it, "et sciens;" and Kuinoel, "conscious of himself, having returned to himself." But this, after the preceding γενόμενος ἐν ἐαυτῷ, would be unnecessary; and leads, indeed, to an
unauthorized sense. I prefer, with Erasmus, Vatablus, Beza, Fisca tor, Grotius, Wetstein, and Doddridge, “after reflecting upon his situation, and other circumstances;” numerous examples of which signification are adduced by Wetstein.

12. εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Μαρίας, &c. came to the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose surname was Mark. That this was Mark the Evangelist, is a general, and indeed highly probable opinion of the Commentators. Προσευχόμενος, praying, i. e. (as we may suppose) for the deliverance of Peter.

13. κρούσαντος * δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου—Ῥοδή. By θύρα τοῦ πυλών is meant the porch door. (See 10,17.) Dr. Doddridge (from Dr. Shaw) takes it to be the gate-way of a large house, by which, if there be an area surrounded with buildings, any one may enter it; and he thinks it could not be a small house, from the many assembled. But the poverty of the Jerusalimite Christians forbids us to suppose any thing like a portal. Παιδίσκη is by the Commentators taken to mean fortress: and such an office was often performed by females. (See the note on Matt. 26, 69. Mark 13, 84.) But, considering the narrow circumstances of these persons, it may be more rational to understand by παιδίσκη a young woman, or maid-servant. Thus Pollux, 3, 76. (cited by Wets.) notices this Attic idiom, and seems to censure its uncertainty, as not determining whether it is to be understood of sex or, condition; and he cites from Lysias, καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἡ παιδίσκη, τὴν θύραν ἄνοιξεν. But there the article sufficiently determines the sense to be maid-servant; whereas in the present passage, as there is none, it should seem to mean simply young woman.

13. Ἑκατοντάται, listen to, attend on the sound of the knocker, to enquire who was there. Now this is a vox solennis de hac re; as appears from the examples cited by Alberti, Elsner, and Kypke; ex. gr. Xen. Sympos. 690. κρούσας τὴν θύραν, ἐπεὶ τῷ υπακουόντι εἰσαγ—

* In the antient authors κόπτειν is used in preference to κροῆσειν; but in the later ones vice versā. These two terms exactly correspond to our knock and rap.
Acts of the Apostles, Chap. XII.

Lucian. Icaromen. p. 292. ἔκκατον προσελθὼν τῇ δόραν, ὑπακούσας δὲ ὁ Ἐμμής, καὶ τὸν νομον ἐκποθεμένος. Plaut. Trucul. 1, 2, 2. where a maid servant says to the porter, "ad foras auscultato, atque serva has ædes."

Bp. Pearce was therefore under a mistake in here fancying extraordinary caution. I suspect that ὑπακούω came at length to mean little more than to mind the door, attend to the door; as in Theophr. Char. Eth. 4. καὶ κόφαντος τὴν δόραν ὑπακούσα αὐτὸς where see Needham. So serva has ædes, in Plaut. just cited.

The Grecian name of this girl seems to denote that she was an Hellenist.

14. καὶ ἐπιγινώσκα τὴν φωνήν τοῦ Πέτρου, and having recognised the voice of Peter; which, as is apparent from the joy she felt, was well known to her. Ἐπιγινώσκω is in this sense used with an accusative both of person and thing. See Mark 6, 54. Matt. 14, 35. Luke 24, 16. Acts 8, 10, 4, 13, 27, 39.

14. ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς οὐκ ἠνοίξε τ. π. i. e. not knowing what she did, out of joy, she neglected to open the door, but went to tell the news to the assembled Christians; both circumstances being (as Bp. Pearce observes) the effect of her joy.

15. μαύρη, "thou are beside thyself." A popular idiom, used of any one who utters what is absurd, or incredible. Price compares the ἄφραινεισ Μενέλαε of Homer, and refers to Joh. 10, 20. and Acts 26, 24. Beza, Mill, Bengel, and Griesbach, take it interrogatively, but (as Price and Kuinoel observe) without any necessity.


15. ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῶν ἐστιν. By ἄγγελος Cameron, Hammond, Clarus, Sir Thomas Browne, Basnage, Amelius, and others, understand a messenger sent by Peter from the prison to inform those assembled
of his condition, and who, in order to be admitted; had used the name of Peter. But (as Kuinoel observes) it is by no means credible that the collected Christians would be inclined to believe that Peter, who was so closely confined and watched in prison, had sent a messenger at midnight. Besides it is scarcely possible to suppose but that the girl must have known Peter's voice. To say more would, however, be a waste of words, since the common interpretation, (which supposes that they either thought it was an angel who had assumed the form of Peter, or that it was his tutelary angel,) is sufficiently well founded, for the Jews believed that such were appointed to all men. * See the note on Matt. 18, 10.

"The assembled Christians (says Kuinoel) knowing that Peter was most closely confined by a bitter enemy of Christianity, in order to his immediate execution, and not being able to persuade themselves that he had escaped out of prison, thought that his guardian angel had appeared, and had pronounced the name and imitated the voice of Peter,

* This was an opinion held by the Gentiles also. To this purpose Kuinoel cites (from Lightfoot, Wets, and others) Censorin. dedie Natal. c. 3. Genius est deus, cujus in tutela ut quisque est, vivit. And a little after he says: Genius ita nobis assiduos observat dissertationes, ut ne puncto quidem temporis longius abscedat; sed ab utero matris exceptus ad extremum vitae diem comitetur. Martian. Cap. L. 2. p. 39. Genius—tutelator fidissimusque germanus animos omnium mentesque custodit. See also Macrobi. Saturn. i. 19. It was moreover (continues Kuinoel) a received opinion among the Gentiles, that the Gods assumed the figure of this or that man, and also borrowed his voice. So Hom. Il. v. 43. (speaking of Neptune): 'Ἀλλὰ Ποσειδών γαϊδοσ, ἐννοούντας, Ἀργείους ἐτίνεις βαθείας ἐξ ἄλος ἐλθον, Ἐπάθων Κάλχαντι δέμας καὶ ἄρετὸς φωνῆν. See also ψ. 600. and Odysse. a. 105. And the Jews had the same persuasion respecting Angels. Thus Deebbarim Rabba, fol. 290, 4. Scriptum est: liberavit me a gladio Pharaohis. Bar Kaphra dicit. Angelus descendit in similitudine Mosis, et fugere fecit eum, illi autem qui venierunt, ut apprehenderent Mosen, putarent angelum esse Mosen. Midras Coheleth, fol. 87, 4. dicit Sanctus Beneficentus: lætitiae dixi, quidnam hæc agit? quidnam agit hæc corona in manu tua? descendit angelus in specie Salomonis atque insedit in throno ejus.
for the purpose of presignifying that he would die, and of forewarning them of it, in order that they might pray that he should meet death with firmness. It is, however, very uncritical to suppose all this; since it is merely founded on conjecture, and therefore cannot but be considered as extremely precarious.

16. κατασείσαι δὲ αὐτῶι τῇ χειρὶ σιγᾶν. Κατασεισων denotes to shake down, move down; and was especially applied to making a motion with the hand by waving it down, an usual mode of enjoining silence. (See Acts 12, 19, 13, 16, 22, 40.) In this sense the word occurs in the best writers. Among other examples, Wetstein produces the following. Persius 4, 6. Ergo ubi commota fervet pectoris bile, Fert animus calidæ secissae silentia turbae Majestate manús. Lucan 1, 298. Dextrâque silen-tia jussit. Herodian 1, 9, 8. τῷ τῆς χειρὸς νεύματι τῶν βημῶν κατασεῖσαισ. Ovid. Met. 1, 206. Postquam voce manuque murmura compressit, tenuere silentia cuncti. Joseph. Bell. 2, 3, 2. ἐπὶ πόργων ἀναβὰς κατέσει τοῖς ἐν τῷ τάγματι στρατιωταῖς. Virg. Æn. 12, 692. Significatque manu, et magnó simul incipit ore.

17. ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔτερον τόπον. What place this was Luke does not tell us. Some imagine Caesarea; which however is not agreeable to the context. Others, with much less probability, conjecture Rome. The most probable opinion is that it was Antioch. (Kuin.) It was convenient that he should withdraw from Jerusalem; but it is utterly incredible that he now went to Rome, and made that abode of twenty-five years there which the Popish writers pretend. The absurdity of which pretence has been abundantly demonstrated by many Protestant writers, and by none more pertinently, in a few words, than by Beza on this place. (Doddridge.)


18. τῇ ἁρα δὲ Πέτρος ἐγένετο. This is a somewhat ex-
traordinary idiom, of which no very satisfactory ac-
count has yet been given. One thing seems certain,
that it cannot have the sense ascribed to it by Eras-
mus, which implies that they supposed Peter to be a
magician. The context seems to confirm the inter-
pretation adopted in the E. V. "what was become
of Peter." So the Vulg. "quid Petro factum esset,"
"what had been done with Peter." This mode is
indeed followed by most recent Commentators; but
the passages which they cite in proof are not all to
the purpose; as, for instance, Joh. 21, 21. (where
see the note), and Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 12. The most ap-
posite are the following. Thucyd. L. 11. (cited by
Vit. p. 1021. οἱ δὲ εἰκοσὶ εἶπεν ἄνθρωποι — τί γεγόνασιν;
and Ant. 17, 14. ἐξήταξε περὶ Ἀριστοβοῦλου τί καὶ
gεγόνοι. Theocrit. Id. 15, 51. Ἀδίστα Γοργαῖ, τί
gενομένα. Longus Pastor. 4. p. 186. τί γεγόνας μοι,
βυγάτρων; ἄρα καὶ σὺ δεῖς; what has become of thee?
what has happened to thee?

19. ἐκέλευσεν ἀπαχθῆναι. Ἀπάγειν is a vox solennis
de hac re, or word peculiarly used of those who are
led away to prison, or to execution. Eis elyxhyn and
eis bánavon, or épi bánavo, are usually expressed;
but sometimes (as here) left to be understood. And so
Esth. 12, 3. καὶ ἐξῆτας ὡς βασιλέως τοῦ δύο εὐνοίων,
558 11. μηδέποτε τούτῳ εἰργαζαμην οὐς τοσοῦτοι ἀπά
gειν ἔνοι ἄμαρτόντος. See Theophr. Char. 6, 2.

Thus the Latin abducere is used either with ad
supplicium, or ad mortem, or without. (Kypke and
Loesner.) See Wakef. Silv. Crit. 2, 131. It has
been debated whether the punishment inflicted was
death, or something short of it. The former seems
the most probable opinion; 1st, from the cruel dis-
position of Herod; 2dly, from the greatness of the
crime thought to have been committed, which, in
ancient times, was usually accounted a capital of-
fence; 3dly, because the term ἀπαχθῆναι is almost
always used of capital punishment.

After διέτριβεν subaud ἕκει. (See 14, 3.) It is,
however, supplied in Joh. 3, 22, 11, 54. Acts 14, 28. 25, 14.; insomuch that Markland thinks it has here slipped out. But he does not enough allow for the variety and elliptical nature of Hellenistic phraseology.

20. ἂν δὲ Ἡρῴδης θυμωμαχὼν Τύριοι. Commentators are not agreed on the sense of the word θυμωμαχῶν, which properly signifies "to be ill inclined towards, to be at variance with," and also "to be at war with." Some, as Markland, adopt the latter signification, and maintain that Herod was at war with the Tyrians, or at least meditated hostilities. This they endeavour to prove from the expression ἐπονυτε ἐπίθην, which occurs just after. But this position cannot be established on sure grounds; for the Tyrians and Sidonians were allies of Rome, and therefore that power would not have suffered war to be carried on against them by Agrippa. Nor is there anything here said of their having been conquered in battle, but only of their seeking peace, because their country was supported by the king's. And moreover there exists no vestige of any such war, either in Luke, Josephus, or any other writer: θυμωμαχῶν is therefore to be explained "was at variance with, ill affected towards." And in this sense the verb is used in several passages of Polybius, Diodorus, Siculus, and Plutarch, cited by Grotius and Kypke, the latter of whom observes that peace is opposed not only to war, but to ἀκαταστασία in 1 Cor. 14, 33., to μάχεσθαι private quarrels, and ἀδικεῖν in Acts 7, 26.: and ἐπίθην ἐξουσία is, in Acts 9, 3., said of those who live in quiet and tranquillity. (See Heinsius Exerc. S. p. 290.)

Now there seems to have been between Herod and those cities a misunderstanding arising from commercial jealousies. A port had been formed at Caesarea by Herod the Great, adapted to the reception of a large fleet, and therefore well fitted for commercial purposes. Hence it might very easily happen that Herod, at the complaints of the Cæs-
reans and of his other subjects, should take offence at the Tyrians and Sidonians, whose interests interfered with theirs. (See Ranisch Comment. de Lucæ et Josephi in morte Herodis Agrippæ consensus on Acts 12, 19., and Joseph. Ant. 19, 7. p. 7.) Now, since the territory subject to these cities was far too limited to be able to supply such a population with food, they were necessitated to import a considerable quantity from Judæa, Galilee, and other provinces of Herod. See 1 Kings 5, 9. Ez. 27, 17. and Michaelis on this passage. Agrippa was, it seems, highly offended from some cause or other, and having it in his power to straiten and vex these cities, had, perhaps, threatened to do so. In order, therefore, to conciliate this king, they send ambassadors to him while he was, opportunely, sojourning in their neighbourhood.

Of this embassy Josephus says nothing, but only relates that Herod celebrated solemn games at Cæsarea. Nor does he make mention of this misunderstanding with the Tyrians, since it did not seem of consequence enough to deserve recording; especially as the celebration of the games formed the principal object of his journey; whereas Luke, whose intention it was to show how signal a punishment God inflicted on Agrippa, and what was the cause of it, relates only the oration, because it was that which brought on the punishment, and therefore premised a reference to this affair of the Tyrians. (See Ranisch. p. 9.) (Kuin.) Nearly the same view of the subject is taken by almost all the recent Commentators, to whose opinion I must accede.* At the same time I would compare Luke 14, 32. Πεσόβελαν ἀποστείλας ἐρωτᾷ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην. Wetstein,

* Markland, however, thinks the expression ἐν εἰρήνῃ seems to imply something more, and that they had been at war: and he cites Plutarch in Demetr. p. 898 D. οδικὲν ἐδεικνύειν λόγον τριστον ὁ Δημήτριος, δὲ εἰς ἑπτομαχεῖν πρὸς αυτούς, δὲ, &c. He would therefore translate ἵνα θυμομαχῶν Τυρίων, &c. “was at war with the Tyrians and Sidonians out of some pique.”
too, aptly cites Servius on Virg. Æn. 1, 39. Morís erat, ut de publicâ pecuniâ Phœnices, misso a rege auro de peregrinis frumenta coëmerent. Dido autem a Pygmalione ad hunc usum paratas naves abstulerat. Urbs erat magna, regio exigua. See also Bp Pearce in loc.

20. ὑμοθυμαδίως, conjointly, i.e. both Tyrians and Sidonians. Καὶ πείσαντες βλάστων, &c. Πείθω is here a vox prægnans, and signifies "having persuaded Blastus to be their friend in the business." It often, as here, denotes to attach to one's interest, either by entreaties or gifts. See the note on Matt. Ψ8, 14. and Elsner on Gal. 1, 10. On βλάστως the reader may consult Wetstein and Schl. Lex.

20. τὸν ἐξὶ τοῦ κοιτώνος. Subaud ὁν or τεταγμένος; as in 8, 27. ὁ ἐξὶ τῆς γαίης. It stands for κοιτανιστῆς, cubicularius, chamberlain. See Wessel on Diodor, Sic. 1, 457.

20. Ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς. Subaud χάρας, which had just preceded. So Thucyd. 8, 46. ἐν τῇ βασιλείως. The complete phrase occurs in 8, 58. ἡ χάρα ἡ βασιλείως. See Raphael in loc.

21. ταυτῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ, i.e. "on the day appointed for the formally giving audience to the ambassadors." Odetos, it must be observed, is often used with words of time. (See Wets.)

It was the second day of the games which were then celebrating in honour of Claudius Cæsar. So Joseph. Ant. 19, 7, 2. δευτέρα δὲ ταῖν θεωρῶν ἡμέραν ἑνδυσάμενος ἐκ ἄγρυροι πεποιημένην πᾶσαν, ὡς βαυμάσιον υφῆν εἶναι, παρηλθεῖν εἰς θεάτρων ἀρχομένης ἡμέρας' ἔθη αὐτῶν πρῶταις τῶν ἑλλακῶν ἀκτῖνων ἐπιβολαῖς ὁ ἄργυρος καταγωγοθεῖς βαυμασίως ἀπέστηλβε, μμιμαλων τι φοβηρὸν καὶ τοῖς εἰς αὐτῶν ἀπενευρεῖ φιλικάδες.

The stole was a robe reaching to the heels, worn by Oriental Kings. See the note on Mark 12, 38. (Kuin.)

21. καὶ καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βῆματος. By βῆμα is here meant, not tribunal (as in Matt. 27, 19.), but a raised suggestus, presenting the appearance of a throne, in
the theatre at Cæsarea, from which Herod both viewed the games, and delivered the oration. Indeed, βῆμα often, as here, denotes a suggestus oratorius for Kings, magistrates, or orators. See Isocr. de Pace 1, 366. (Batt.), and Xen. Mem. 3, 6, 1. It may be observed, too, that the custom of holding orations in the theatre was a Greek one. See Cic. de Flacco. C. 7., Demosth. pro Coron. C. 58., and Acts 19, 29. (Kuin.)

21. εὐηγγέρει πρὸς αὐτοῖς. Glass, Ranisch, and Markland would refer πρὸς αὐτοῖς to the people, because they are just afterwards mentioned. But this is a harsh, and, indeed, inadmissible mode of interpretation, being neither permitted by propriety of language, nor by the context. Δημογεῖν has here, as often in the later Greek writers, not the original sense, "address a speech to the people," but simply to harangue, "deliver an oration." See Munthe, who cites Diodor. Sic. 382 d., 289 c., and Herodian 6, 3, 5. 2, 8, 2.

22. οὐ̄ δὲ δῆμος ἐξεφάνει, "the people made acclamation." By the people Grotius would understand the courtiers and other flatterers, set on for the purpose. And, indeed, some of the numerous citations brought forward by Wetstein seem to countenance this; especially a passage of Josephus. Elsner, however, is of opinion that by δῆμος are meant the ambassadors and their companions, including other Gentiles, of whom great multitudes inhabited Cæsarea.

21. Θεοῦ φανῇ, καὶ σῶκ ἀνθρώπων. It was the evil customs of those times for kings and emperors to be called Diœ, not only after death, but while yet alive.*

It is plain, from Josephus, that these persons (who were probably of both the classes above mentioned, but certainly not Jews,) did here profess to regard Herod as a god. So Josephus. 1, 1. (cited by Kuin.) εἰ δέ ὁ πάλαις τάς οὖδε ἐκείνης πρὸς ἀγαθῶν, ἄλλας ἀλλοθέν φανάς ἀνεβάζειν, Θεον προσαγορεύοντες, εἰμενής τε εἰς, ἐπιλέγεσθε, εἰ καὶ μενία ὑμῖν οὐκ ἀδραστον ἐφοβηθή-μεν, ἄλλα τοιόνευθεν κρείττονά σε θητῆς φύσεως ὄμολο-γεύμεν. Krebs, Ranisch, and Kuinoel observe that, though Josephus seems to attribute their hyperbolic expressions of admiration to the sight of the splendid robe, and Luke to the eloquence of the orator, yet there is, in fact, no discrepancy, since both causes doubtless operated, and in such cases historians select and dwell upon whatever is most suitable to their purpose.

23. παραχρήμα δὲ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος Κυρίου. By στρυκ is here meant "struck him with a mortal disease." The word is often, in the New Testament, used of striking with death, or a violent malady. See Schl. Lex. Josephus (ubi supra) makes no mention of the angel, but proceeds thus: ἀναικών δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελον, τὸν βουβοβάς τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλῆς ὑπερκαθό-μενον εἰθεν ἐπὶ σχοινίου τινὸς ἄγγελον τε τοῦτον οὐκ ἐκάστος κακῶν εἶναι, τὸν καὶ πότε τῶν ἁγαθῶν γενόμενον καὶ διακάρδιον ἐσχεν δόλῳ ἄλφων δὲ αὐτῷ τῆς κυρίας προσέφυεν ἄλγημα μετὰ σφοδρότητος αρνήματον. "An owl, it seems (says Kuin.), was observed upon the

rope* above the suggestus, which soon settled on the king's head. Now the prodigy mentioned by Josephus in l. c. corresponds to what is related in Ant. 18, 18. All this is, with reason, thought by Heumann, Michaelis, Morus, and others, to savour of false; yet there are no grounds for thinking it fabricated by Josephus, who is a favourer of Agrippa, but rather by the Jews, who were incensed with Herod for receiving the adulatory acclamation.† Josephus has, however, brought it forward (together with some other facts of this kind), in order to court the favour of the superstitious‡ [which, however, seems doing injustice to the motives of the illustrious historian. Edit.], and because the fable was in the mouths of all. It is therefore useless labour to endeavour to reconcile the narration of Luke with that of Josephus, by supposing, as some do (from Euseb. H. E. 2, 10.), that Josephus indicated the angel of death as sent under the form of an owl, or (as others) that the owl, as the angel of God, was the author of the death (see Wolf), or (with others) that Josephus has narrated what fell under the view of men, but that Luke has followed the mode of thinking and speaking usual among the Jews. Nay, indeed, the historical faith of Luke is exceedingly confirmed by his making no mention of this fable. (Kuin.)

As to the cause of Herod's death, many recent Commentators, as Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and Kui-

* This rope (as Ranisch remarks) was one of those by which the vela were stretched out over the heads of the spectators, during the heat of the day. See Lucret. 4, 73. and Plin. H. N. 19, 1.

† That the Jews thought his disease was brought on by his impiety in receiving Divine honours, is plain from Joseph. 766, 10. (edit. Hudson): καὶ γὰρ δὴ διὰ τὴν τόλμαν αὐτῶν, παρ' ἀ διηγό- 


rectum venturi nuntium luctus, dirum mortalibus omen.
noel, are of opinion that what is here said is all to be understood by a reference to Jewish opinions; that, in fact, Herod died of a dysentery brought on by cold taken through incautious exposure to the piercing air of the early morning, and that mention is made of the angel, according to the Jewish mode of thinking, and in order to shew that Herod’s death might be attributed to Divine interposition.

Yet, with glaring inconsistency, they maintain that the very words following, καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκό-βρατός, ἦξενον, clearly show that the death was not brought on by Divine interposition. “The last words of the verse (says Kuin.) were meant to more exactly define the nature of the disease.” And he adds, that the Hebrews were accustomed to refer all things, whose causes lay concealed, to invisible agency, to name even the sudden and unusual affections of nature angels of God, and to maintain that all grievous diseases were produced by an angel.” He then refers to 2 Sam. 21, 16. seq. and his note supra, on ver. 7.; and he compares a similar passage of 1 Macc. 9, 55 & 56. ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἐπληγή Ἀλκαιος, καὶ ἐνεποδήθη τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπεφράγη τὸ στῶμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρελύθη, καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἐτί λαλήσαι λόγον, καὶ ἐντελεσθαι περὶ τοῦ οἰκοῦ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀπέθανεν Ἀλκιμος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ μετὰ βασανοῦ μεγάλης.

But this hypothesis can by no means be admitted, without sacrificing the credit, and impeaching the veracity of St. Luke; nay, without convicting him of ignorance, superstition, and even inconsistency. For my part, I see not what we have here to do with Jewish opinions, or with Josephus (though the account of St. Luke is, by no means, at variance with his). The historian narrates the secondary cause of Herod’s death; the Sacred writer considers the primary one, even the immediate interposition of Heaven. And this will hold good, whether we take the ἄγελλος literally, or metaphorically: though it seems safer to take it (as does Dr. Doddridge) of the real, yet invisible agency, of a celestial spirit. He refers to
2 Sam. 24, 16. 2 Kings 19, 35. It is plain, by the words ὠδὲ ἐκεῖνῳ πρὸς ἀγαθῷ, and others, that Josephus himself (notwithstanding that he was favourably inclined to Herod, and speaks respectfully of his memory,) regarded his death as the effect of supernatural interposition.

23. γενέμενος σκωληκόβρατος, consumed by worms. Of the same disease died Antiochus Epiphanes, who had endeavoured to abolish the worship of God; as we learn from 2 Macc. 9, 5. ἔλαβεν αὐτῶν ἀνάκεστος τῶν σπλάγχνων ἄγαθῶν, καὶ πικραὶ τῶν ἐνδον βάσανος. On this disease consult Bartholin de Morbis Biblicis, c. 23. and Mede de Morbis Biblicis, c. 15. Many critics of great name, as Beza, Camerarius, Erasmus, Elsner, Kuhn, and Morus, are of opinion that by σκωληκόβρατος is denoted the morbus pedicularis, or the being consumed with vermin, of which many tyrants are said to have died. * Josephus, indeed, makes no mention of worms, but seems to refer all to a dysentery. That however (as is well observed by Lightfoot, Heuman, Lardner, and Dodridge,) may be attributed to the delicacy of the

Historian, who wished to conceal the odious truth, out of regard to Herod and his family.

29. ἀνθ' ἀν οὐκ ἐδώκε τὴν δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, i.e. because he took to himself, or permitted to be given to him, the honour due to God alone. ἐξεψωξεν, expired. Though it appears from Josephus, that Herod died after five days illness, yet this is not inconsistent with the account of St. Luke, who only says that he died of the disorder, but not how soon.

24, 25. St. Luke now goes on to narrate the further propagation of Christianity. What we read at ver. 25. has reference to 11, 29. seq.; and ver. 25. exactly coheres with c. 3.

24. Ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ γενανε καὶ ἐπλησύνετο. Now the deliverance of Peter and the death of Herod would both tend to promote the increase of the Christian Religion. Nor would the miseries of the severe famine, which succeeded, be unfavourable thereto; since such awful visitations draw men to religion. In γενανε καὶ ἐπλησύνετο Kuinoel recognises a metaphor derived from fruits; and he takes ἱπερτρέφαν, which occurs just after, in a pluperfect sense, understanding, to Antioch. Compare 11, 27 & 29 seq. 13, 1. “For (says he) they had returned to Antioch before Peter’s imprisonment and the death of Herod.” But see Doddridge.

25. πληρόσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, “having fulfilled their office of ministering to the distresses of the poor.” Πλησάω is not unfrequently used of accomplishing any work. See Schl. Lex.

CHAP. XIII.

From this Chapter, to the end of the Book, St. Luke narrates the journies of Paul among the Gentiles.

The following is a summary of what is recorded in this chapter.

Paul proceeding with Barnabas through Seleucia, and from thence to Cyprus, directs his way to Sala-
mis and Paphos, and there chastises a certain magician, who had opposed him (1—12). From thence he goes to Perga in Pamphylia, and to Antioch in Pisidia. The events which there took place are narrated in 13—fin.


The διδάσκαλοι are also mentioned in 1 Cor. 12, 20. and Eph. 4, 11. where see Koppe. These were persons, who, for their wisdom and eloquence, were appointed to the office of teaching in the Church. Of Simeon we hear nothing further; but of Lucius mention is made in Rom. 16, 21.

1. Μαυριν. This corresponds to the Hebr. בָּהֲם, consoler. That the Herod here mentioned is Herod Antipas, and not (as Grotius supposes) Agrippa the second, son of the Agrippa whose death was recorded in the last chapter, has been proved by Walch, in his Dissert. de Menachenas.*

* For Agrippa Junior had, when his father died, scarcely reached his seventeenth year, (as we learn from Joseph. Ant. 19, 9.) and on that account Claudius had denied him the succession to his father's kingdom, and committed him, for education, to his uncle Herod, King of Chalais. At whose death, which happened four years after, Claudius appointed him to his kingdom; and when he had reigned four years, Claudius, after having taken that kingdom from him, and probably apportioned it to Syria, set him over the tetrarchies of Phillip and Lysanias. See Luke 3, 1. Acts 12, 1. Joseph. Ant. 20, 7, 1. But although this Agrippa had received two tetrarchies from Claudius, he did not bear the title of tetrarch, but king; because, before those tetrarchies had been given to him, he had been King of Chalais: and for that reason it is that he is never called by any other name than king by Josephus and Paul (Acts 26, 9, 13, 19 &
1. τοῦ πετράρχου συντρόφος. The word συντρόφος is properly an adjective, denoting "brought up, educated with:" but it here seems to be a substantive, formed like our words foster-brother, name-sake, bed-fellow, &c. See Ach. Tat. 5, 358. cited by Wetstein. So also ὀμογάλακτος, explained contactanieus in the Glossaries, and here used by the Vulgate. Many other examples of the word may be seen in Wetstein. Thus it denoted, 1st, foster-brother; 2dly, one who took his food with another, table-fellow; 3dly, school-fellow. The term was especially applied to children who were brought up as companions to kings, princes, &c., and shared their food and education. Of this we find mention in Diodor. Sic. 3, 10. p. 240. (edit. Wess.), and 1, 53, 62. 2 Macc. 9, 29. (See Munthe, Raphel, and Wets.)

To which of the above classes Manaen may be referred, is somewhat uncertain. Erasmus, Grotius, and others, fix on the second; Heumann and Walch, with more probability, on the first. See his Dissert. above referred to.*

2. Before the conversion of Cornelius (as we observed at 10, 1.), the Apostles had received only circumcised proselytes into the Christian society; nor had they preached the Gospel to the Gentiles. But when Cornelius, a Gentile, was, by the providence of God, received into that society, and thus the Jerusalemite Church had acknowledged that the

* Walch remarks that the συντρόφοι used to be of nearly the same age; which, if we suppose the Herod here mentioned to be Agrippa the second, would make Menaen but seventeen, an age unfit for the weighty office of teacher in the Church; whereas the age of Herod Antipas would be very suitable to what that office would require. He moreover observes, that Herod is here called tetrarch, though he had already been deprived of his tetrarchy, and sent into banishment; by a custom frequent in Scripture, namely, of giving persons any title of dignity which they have once borne, and generally denoting any thing from its pristine state.
instruction of the Gentiles was agreeable to the will of God, some Cyprians and Cyreneans had communicated the doctrine of Christ to Gentiles of Antioch (11, 20), and the Church at Jerusalem had sent Barnabas and Saul thither, that they might forward the work so happily begun (11, 22 & 25). And these sojourning there a year, taught both Jews and Gentiles promiscuously. But now the Christians were anxious that the Gospel should be more widely propagated among the Gentiles; so that from the congregation at Antioch other congregations might be generated, as from a common parent. Therefore the chief teachers of the Church met together, in order to chuse from among them some who should sustain the weighty office of promulgating the Christian doctrine among the Gentiles.

2. λειτουργούντων. Some antient interpreters, as Chrysostom and Οękumenius, understand by this preaching the Gospel. But (as is observed by Kuinoel) there is no proof that the congregation was assembled. Now λειτουργία properly denotes the discharge of some public office, whether religious or civil. In the Classical writers it is almost always employed of the latter; in the Sacred writers, of the former. Hence it is used in the Old Testament, and sometimes in the New, (as Hebr. 10, 11.) to denote the ministration of the Priests and Levites. Here we may understand by this term the whole of Divine worship, especially prayer; since fasting is added, and the two were frequently conjoined. See Matt. 17, 21. and Luke 2, 37. Kuinoel, however, takes the θυσεύων to have merely the effect of raising the signification of λειτουργούντων (as in 14, 23. προσεύχεσθαι μετὰ θυσεύων), and thinks it may, like many similar phrases, denote only to pray fervently. But this seems explaining away the sense. According to this mode of interpretation the following words, τότε θυσεύσατε καὶ προσευχήσαμενοι must be similarly understood; whereas θυσεύσατε there evidently means to appoint a fast.
2. ἀφοίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν τῷ Βαρνάβαν καὶ τῷ Σαῦλον. The δὴ is by Valcknaer thought to have (as often) an hortative force; and he would render it quæso. It seems to stand for ἦν ὑπο. Our word now is similarly employed.

This use of μοι, too, deserves to be noticed; which is found with phrases of commanding. So Thucyd. 2, 200. Bekker. ἀλλὰ τὰς πύλας τῆς ἀνοιγέτω ἐμοί, where I shall adduce numerous examples of this idiom. The μοι is sometimes elegantly pleonastic: but here it signifies for my service; and the following words εἰς τὸ ἔργον are added by way of explanation.

As to εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν Kuinoel tells us that the communication was made by the mouth of some one of the congregation, probably one of the Prophets. But that is more than he or any one else can tell.

The ἔργον evidently denotes the office of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles. Αφοίσειν signifies to separate from, chuse for, designate, destine unto, &c. (See Schl. Lex.) At δὲ there is an ellipsis of εἰς; and Kuinoel remarks that prepositions are omitted before the relative ὅ, when the substantives or pronouns demonstrative, to which they are referred, have them adjoined; as in Plato, Phædr. 21. ἡ ἐν τούτῳ ἀπόλλυσεν ὁσπέρ καὶ λαμβάνωμεν, (where see Fischer), and Nepos, Vit. Cim. 3, 1. Incidit in eandem invidiam quam pater suus.

Προσκέλημαι is by Kuinoel taken for κέκλημαι. But it appears to have more force than the simple verb, and signifies to call to any office, destine, designate, and appoint to it.

3. νηστεύσατε καὶ προσευχάμενοι. Kuinoel renders the words, “peractus precibus atque jejunio.” But why should he put the fasting after the prayer, which in the original stands first? Besides, it would have been better translated, “indicto jejunio.”

Kuinoel observes, that by this imposition of hands they did not receive the authority to evangelize the Gentiles; since they had before taught at Antioch.
(11, 22 seqq.); but that by this ceremony they only implored the blessing of God upon their labours. And it is true that imposition of hands sometimes implied no more (see the note on 8, 15), but it not unfrequently denoted designation and appointment to any office. I therefore agree with those Commentators, who assign that sense to the word here. Besides, the ἀφορίσατε, just before, seems to require it; also the following, ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγιοῦ.

We may observe, that they were especially dedicated to the systematical evangelization of the Gentiles.

3. ἀπέλυσαν. This word has no particular sense, but is often found in sentences of this kind. It may be rendered, “and so dismissed;” as in Acts 15, 30. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολύθητες and ver. 22 & 23. So ver. 33. ἀπελύθησαν μὲν εἰρήνης.

4. Σελευκία. A city of Syria, situated at the mouth of the Orontes, and opposite to Cyprus. See Wetstein and the Geographical writers, including Maursius, Cypr. 1. 21, p. 56 seq.

6. διελθόντες—ἀχρι Πάφου. Paphos was a city on the west coast of Cyprus, where the Proconsul held his residence. It was famous for the worship of Venus, to whom a most splendid temple had been erected. Hence the epithet Cypria and Paphia, often given to Venus. See Hor. Od. 1, 30, 1. Virg. Æn. 1, 415. Tacit. Hist. 2, 3, and Menes. on Cypr. p. 42.

Barnabas and Saul therefore traversed the whole island: for Paphos was situated on the west, and Salamis on the eastern coast. Hence in some MSS. αὐτα is found added, which has been received by Griesbach. It, however, savours of a gloss. (Kuin.)

6. εὐφόν τινα μάγου—Βαρίσσους. By μάγου were denoted persons versed in the knowledge of natural philosophy, but who too often, from avarice or ambitious motives, abused it to deceive the vulgar. (See the note on 8, 9.) Hence this Barjesus is called
ψευδοπροφήτης, either because he falsely pretended to be a Divine Legate (8, 9.), or as being one who pretended to predict future events and the fortunes of men, from the planets, stars, and other celestial signs. See Propert. 4, 1. (Kuin.) Βαρισσωίς signifies son of Joshua. So Bartimeus in Mark 10, 46.

7. δὲ ἦν σὺν τῷ ἀνδρῷ. "who was then with (i. e. visiting) the Proconsul." Kuinoel renders "in ejus comitatu," and refers to Mark 2, 26. Luke 24, 44. and Acts 4, 13. 7, 2. Beza, Grotius, Hammond, L’Enfant, and others, say that the title ἀνδρᾶς was improperly applied to the Governor of Cyprus, (as they suppose) by way of compliment, while he was only ἀντιστρατηγός. But (as Doddridge rightly observes) Dr. Lardner has with great learning vindicated the accuracy with which St. Luke speaks, and shewn from Dio (L. 53. p. 504 a. and L. 54. p. 523 b.) that they who presided over the Roman Provinces by the appointment of the Senate, (and Cyprus was now of that number, though it had once been Praetorian,) were called Proconsuls, though they had never filled the consular chair; which (as appears by the Fasti Consulares) was the case with the governor in question.

Kuinoel has also, with great diligence, completely justified the accuracy of St. Luke in here using the term.

7. By ἀνδρὶ σωφρός is meant a man of intelligence, abilities; a clever man. So Thucyd. 1, 74. and 3, 37. et sæpe. This corresponds to what Galen, Anat. 1. (cited by Wets.) says of the proconsul here mentioned: τούδε τοῦ ὑπ’ ἔπαρχου τῆς Ῥωμαίου, πόλεως ἀνδρὶς τὰ πάντα προαύων ἐργάζεται καὶ λόγως τοῖς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ, Σέργιοι Παύλου ὑπάτων. And de Prænot. Σέργιος ὁ καὶ Παύλος, ὃς οὐ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνου ἔπαρχος ἦν τῆς πόλεως, καὶ φλάβιος—ἐσπευκως ὃς περὶ τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους φιλοσοφίαν, ἀδερφὰς καὶ ὁ Παύλος. From which it appears that he was well versed in natural philosophy; and probably for that reason (especially as he must have seen the folly of polytheism), was cultivating the
society of Bar-jesus, who, beside communicating information on the principles of natural philosophy, could instruct him in the knowledge of one true God, as contained in the Jewish Religion. His sending for Paul and Barnabas, the preachers of a religion which professed to be an improvement upon Judaism, was what we might expect from so curious an investigator of truth.

8. Luke does not positively say that they gave Sergius the detail of Christian doctrine which he required, but it may be inferred from what follows. This kind of brachylogia is very agreeable to the popular style; and we have already had several instances of it.

8. ἀνθίστατο αὑρῶς, opposed, contradicted them; as in Gal. 2, 11. 2 Tim. 4, 15.

8. Ἤλυμας, ὁ μάγος. Loesner well remarks, that there is here an ellipsis of τον ἔστιν, as Ἄββα ὁ πατή, in Rom. 8, 15. For Elymas (from the Arabic ḥalīmān, wise) signifies magus. And this (as Kuinoel observes) was the name given to the magi in Arabia.*

8. διαστρέψας. Valcknaer would read ἀντιστρέψας. But this conjecture is unsupported by any MSS., and the present reading is confirmed by Exod. 5, 4. (Sept.) ἵστη διαστρέψετε τῶν λαῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργῶν; So the Latin per-verto.

9. Σαῦλος δὲ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος. Henceforward Saul is called by Luke Paul, though before invariably Saul. Some are of opinion that he had from the beginning two names, of which Saul was given him by his parents, at his circumcision; and the other (Paul) was added in illustration of his being a Roman citizen. But (as is well observed by Witsius, Mel. Leid. p. 47.) Luke had hitherto invariably called

* Thus our old word wiz-ard comes from wise, and its termination ard seems to have been an augmentative, like the one of the Italians. There is the same termination also in other words, as Rich-ard (which originally meant a very rich man), dot-ard, and the French veill-ard.
him Saul, and now, no sooner has he mentioned the name of Paul, than Saul becomes so obliterated that we no where find it used again either by Luke, Peter, or Paul in his Epistles.

Others suppose that Saul himself changed his name after his conversion, because it would have been odious to those whom he had persecuted; and that he abandoned the honourable name Saul (which denotes desirable), to take the less honourable name Paul (which signifies little), out of modesty! But, if that be true, why did he not use the name from his conversion? which it seems he did not: for Luke calls him Saul after that conversion; as in 11, 25 & 30. 12, 25. 13, 1. 2, 7 & 9.

Others again (as Hammond), on the authority of Jerom, maintain that he took the name Paul out of deference to the Proconsul, his first eminent Gentile convert. But this is not very consistent with the modesty of the Apostle. Besides (as is observed by Wets.) Luke calls him Paul before he has made any mention of the conversion of Sergius Paulus. (Kuin.) Kuinoel adopts the hypothesis brought forward by Beza and Grotius (as also does Doddridge), that having conversed hitherto chiefly with Jews and Syrians, to whom the name of Saul was familiar, and now coming among Romans and Greeks, they would naturally pronounce his name Paul; as one whose Hebrew name was Jochanan, would be called by the Greeks and Latins Johannes, by the French Jean, by the Dutch Hans, and by the English John.

I would, however, venture to suggest another conjecture, namely, that Saul, finding the inconvenience of his present name, had resolved, on this solemn mission, to adopt that of Paul, which, from its similarity, would suggest itself, and which, as being a Roman one, would be so much the more suitable to one who was a Roman citizen.

9. πάντες Πνεύματος ὁγιοῦ. This expression is
as usual, perverted by many recent foreign Theologians. It must, however, have its full sense; and moreover seems to have been used (as Chrysostom and Æcumenius suggest) to shew that the words of Paul were not dictated by anger, but a sincere desire to convert the Procurator to the truth. For this reason, I cannot approve of the mode of rendering ἀρετίας, adopted by Menochius and others, "iracundis et ardentibus oculis." It merely means, "having fixed his eyes steadily upon him."

10. πληγής παντὸς δόλου — ἁδιωψείας. Schlesner and Breitschneider render δόλος impietas. But there seems no reason to deviate from the common signification, fraud, guile. For he who is called ψευδοπροφήτης, who abused his knowledge of natural philosophy to deceive others by sophistical arts, and who, by calumnies, studied to turn the Proconsul from Christianity, surely well merited that epithet.

'Ραδιωψία signifies properly facility of action; as in Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 94.; and also levity and carelessness (i.e. whether any action be good or evil). Hence it denotes temerity of action, improbity of every kind. (See T. Mag. and Etym. Mag.). That Ælius Dionys. ap. Eustath. on Hom. Od. δ. p. 1506., explains ραδιωψία by ἡ περὶ πᾶν ὀλγωρία καὶ δρασύτης, see Raphel, Munthe, and Wets. (Ruín.)

'Ραδιωψία may be paralleled by our expression to be tight-fingered; and there is a reference to the astutia, or δεξιοτης, described in a powerful passage of Thucyd. 5, 82. 1, 498.

In the above sense the word occurs not only in Diodor. Siculus and Polybius (cited by the Commentators), but in Xenophon, Arrian, and Plutarch. Upon the whole, it corresponds to, and is the same with our word roguery. It was probably often applied to conjurers and sleight-of-hand mountebanks. And this the Apostle may have had in view; since it is very applicable to the character of Bar-jesus. The δόλος will also exactly correspond to the quack or conjurer. So Plato de Legg. (cited by Wets.) δόλον δὲ
καὶ ἐνέδρασεν πλήρης, ἐξ ᾧ πάντεις τε κατασκευάζονται πάλλοι, καὶ περὶ πάσαν τὴν μαγγανείαν κεκινημένοι.

10. οἷε διαβόλου, i. e. like unto the Devil. Now it was usual with the Hebrews to use the expression son of any one, to denote a person like unto another, and who copied his actions. See the note on Joh. 8, 44. Kuinoel thinks there is a reference to the name of the magus. But this seems extremely fanciful; and indeed would have been little suitable to the gravity of the Apostle. Wetstein judiciously observes, that the thrice-repeated πᾶσης is emphatical.

10. ἐχθρῇ πάσης δικαιοσύνης. This may refer to the misrepresentations of the Christian doctrine, by which Bar-jesus had endeavoured to turn the Pro-consul from the faith. And in this view Kuinoel ascribes to δικαιοσύνη here the signification of truth; as in Mat. 21, 32. But this seems precarious.

10. διαστρέφων τὸν ὁδοὺς Κ. τ. ε. These words seem to be added by way of explaining the preceding. On their original sense the Commentators have far too much pressed; and much learning and ingenuity have they abused in thus closely pursuing the metaphor, to which there is, in fact, but a slight allusion; like that of Isaiah, “to make the crooked straight and the rough ways plain.” In one thing, however, they have judged rightly, namely, in seeing that ὁδος has the sense of doctrine, religion; as in many passages of the Old and New Testament. (See Schl. Lex.) Wetstein adduces an example of this signification from Galen de Antidot. 1. εἰῶν δὲ καὶ διαστρε-φόντων, ἀ παρὰ τινῶν ἔλαβον, ἀντίγραφα. He then refers to Hos. 14, 10. Mich. 8, 9. and explains thus: “Viam, quæ recta et plana est, dicis esse confragosam et obliquam.” But this is pressing too much on the primitive sense.

11. καὶ τῶν ἱδου, χείρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐτι σε. A Hebrew phrase denoting preparation for punishment; as in Job. 19, 21. and Ex. 9, 3. (Kuin.)

11. ἔσση τῷφλος, μὴ βλέπαν τὸν Ἐλισ. This is thought to be a Hebraism, since the Hebrews often assert
the same thing, both by affirmation and negation. See infra 14, 8. 18, 9. Joh. 1, 20. 1 Ep. 2, 27. It is, however, occasionally found in the earlier Classical authors, especially the Poets (as Aristophanes, Plut. 494. cited by Valckcn. ἢ μὴ ἐ πλάκων βλέψῃ, καὶ μὴ τυφλὸς ἃν περιμοῦῃ?), and seems therefore to be a relic of the Oriental origin of the Greek language. See the note on Luke 1, 20.

11. παραχέψαμα δὲ ἐνέτεισθ᾽ εἰς αὐτὸν ἄχλως καὶ σκότος, "there fell upon him a dimness and blindness." A sort of hendiadis. Kypke explains the ἄχλως (whose etymology is very uncertain) as denoting a disorder which causes blindness, by bringing, as it were, a skin over the eye. Kuinoel thinks the opinion of Michaelis more probable, that the blindness was occasioned by impellucid stains of the cornea. But all this seems very useless speculation; though far less censureable than the sceptical hypotheses of many German writers, who suspect (why they do not tell us) that the man's eyes were already dim, and disposed to blindness; and that this came on suddenly from the fright occasioned by Paul's threat. It is unnecessary for me to notice the glaring absurdities of this hypothesis, which, like most such, has a tendency to degrade the character of the Apostle almost to that of Bar-jesus himself!

11. περιάγων. This verb has here a neuter sense, and signifies to wander about. The words περιάγων ἑξῆς χειραγαγοῦσα are a graphical description of total blindness.

12. ἐπίστευσαν. Here we are told that, at sight of this (which he at least regarded as a miracle), the Proconsul believed in the truth of Christianity. Kuinoel very unwarrantably limits the sense to, "he preferred the doctrine of Jesus to that of Bar-jesus."

Διδωκαί (Kuinoel observes) is here to be taken, by a metonymy, of the force of the doctrine, of the great events, which it was calculated to bring forth.

13. ἀναχθέντες — οἱ περὶ τὸν Παύλον. On the force of this nautical term ἀνάγεσθαι, to weigh, see the
note on Luke 8, 22. That οἱ περὶ τῶν Παύλου must be explained of Paul and his colleagues, is plain from the context. It is a periphrasis, by which not only the person mentioned is to be understood, but his colleagues, companions, followers, &c., so however that he be considered as head and chief. So Thucyd. 5, 21. οἱ περὶ τῶν Ἰσχαγόραν, i. e. besides Ischagoras, the principal, Menas and Philocharidas, his colleagues. Athen. 554 B. αἱ περὶ Περσεφόνην ἀνδρολογεῖν λέγονται, Proserpine and her maidens. Xen. Symp. 1, 7. οἱ ἄμφι τῶν ΢ακράτην, i. e. Socrates, Critobulus, and Hermogenes. Xen. Anab. 7, 4, 12. οἱ περὶ Χενοφῶντα, Xenophon and his corps.

It appears by this that Paul was already in greater estimation than Barnabas.

13. ἔλθον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας. An idiom in frequent use both in the antient and modern languages, in which there is an ellipsis of city or town. Now Perga was the capital of Pamphyli.a, celebrated for a very antient and holy temple of Diana. See Schl. Lex.

14. παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν τῆς Πισιδίας. So called, to distinguish it from Antioch in Syria. It was, strictly speaking, in Phrygia, but on the borders of Pisidia; so that it was sometimes reckoned to one, and sometimes to the other province. See Strabo Cellar. and Wets. in loc.

14. ἐκάθισαν, i. e. (as Wolf and Kuinoel explain) “occupied the seats of the doctors and lawyers:” thus indicating that they entered the synagogue with a disposition to teach. That the rulers of the synagogue understood this, is plain from their inviting them to deliver instruction to the people. See Vitringa de Synag. 710. & de Archysyn. p. 304.

15. μετὰ δὲ — προφητῶν. Now the Pentateuch was so distributed as to allow of being read through in the course of the year; and to it was adjoined a portion from the Prophets, such as might have some affinity of subject to the passage of the Pentateuch. After the portion had been read, it was explained for the instruction of the common people, either by
the reader, or by some other person present. See Vitringa de Syn. 960 & 985.

It has been, with much probability, conjectured by Bengel, that the portions for this day were Deut. 1. and Is. 1.; since these Chapters are even yet read on one Sabbath, and Paul, at ver. 18., has reference to Deut. 1, 31.

The ἀρχισυνάγωγοι were persons of reputable character, to whom was committed the governance of the synagogue, both in matters of doctrine and discipline. They appointed the readers and expounders, and had the power of administering corporal chastisement, and of issuing excommunications. (See the note on Matt. 10, 17. 23, 54.) The chief of them was called ἄρχον ἀρχισυνάγωγος.

These rulers now sent the ἅπαντης (or clerk) to Paul and the rest, to know whether they would choose to explain and preach upon the portions. (Kuin.)

Doddridge, however, thinks it is a fruitless attempt to ascertain the conditions on which persons were admitted to teach in the Jewish synagogues. But on a point like this I should rather choose to follow the opinion of Vitringa.

15. εἰ εστὶ λόγος—παρακλησις, "If ye have any word of exhortation and instruction." Probably because these explanations, were for the most part, like the Ἁθικο in Chrysostom's homilies; chiefly of practical application, and hortatory. Kuinoel has therefore restricted the sense too much by rendering it teaching.

With the ἐν ὑμῖν Wetstein compares Cic. pro Arch.

1. Si quid in me ingenii.

16. Of this discourse of Paul, the following analytical scheme is given by Schoettgen.

It consists of three parts: the Exordium, the Treatment of the subject, and the Conclusion. In the Exordium the speaker studies to engage the good will of his auditors (ver. 16). In the tractatio the Proposition is dispersed through the whole body, and the purport of it is this: I announce to you Jesus Christ as the true Messiah (ver. 17—59).
The conclusion contains an application, præmonitione constantem (ver. 40, 41). (Schoettg.)

To this may be subjoined the following scheme laid down by Kuinoel, and which seems preferable.

"Of the following discourse of St. Paul the subject is this: God, who conferred many signal benefits on our forefathers (17—22), hath bestowed on us the greatest blessings, by sending Jesus the Messiah, as the Saviour not only of the Jews, but of all who profess faith in him (23—39). Take heed, therefore, that ye despise not this exalted benefit of God, but acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, and admit his doctrine (40, 41)." (Kuin.)

Paul makes mention of the benefits conferred by God on their forefathers, and briefly sums up the early history of their nation, partly because he was addressing himself to Jews, who boasted of their ancestors, and of the benefits bestowed by God upon them (see the note on Stephen's speech, 6, 7.); and partly because the portion of Scripture then read treated of the fortunes of the Israelitish people in the desert. But, intending to show that Jesus is the Messiah, he proceeds to detail the fortunes of the nation up to the time of David, since from the race of David the Jews thought that the Messiah (κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν, ver. 33.) would arise. See Matt. 22, 42. That Jesus is the Messiah he proves by such arguments as he supposed would have the most influence on the minds of his auditors. (Kuin.)

This discourse (as Doddridge observes) seems chiefly intended to illustrate the Divine economy in opening the Gospel gradually, and preparing the Jews, by temporal mercies, for others of a yet more important nature.

16. κατασείσας τῇ χειρὶ. See the note on 12, 17., to which I add an example from Heliodor. 4, 16. κατασείσας τῇ χειρὶ. See also Wets. on this passage.

16. ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ. By the term φοβούμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ (as distinguished from Ἰσραηλῖται) are plainly meant proselytes of the
gate, who, having abandoned idolatry, worshipped the true God, yet did not undergo circumcision; and who, though they attended at the synagogues to hear the word, still occupied a situation separate from that appointed to the Jews. See Deyling's Obs. 2, 357. These are, at ver. 43., called σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι. The same mode of speaking is also used by Joseph. Ant. 14, 7, 2. πάντων κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίων καὶ σεβόμενων. Now those Gentiles who thoroughly embraced the Jewish religion, by undergoing circumcision, were termed proselytes of justice, and were said to have become sons of Abraham. They were therefore numbered with the Jews. See the note on Joh. 3, 8. (Kuin.)

17. ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰσραήλ, "the God of this people Israel (just mentioned in the lesson), whom your forefathers worshipped, and whom you yourselves worship." (Kuin.)

17. ἔξελέξατο. Kuinoel explains this "beneficiis affectit:" Grotius, "beneficiis haud vulgaribus eos affectit." But, however the word may sometimes signify to love, approve, and, from the adjunct, to bestow benefits upon, yet here there seems no reason to deviate from the primary signification. It may, however, be rendered, "chose out as objects for his peculiar blessing."

17. καὶ τῶν λαῶν ἤσυχον. On the interpretation of ἤσυχον Commentators are not agreed. Grotius, Beza, and L'Enfant think it refers to the honour in which the Israelites were held during the ministry of Joseph in Egypt. But this seems ascribing too confined a sense to the term. The same may be said of the interpretation of Heumann, who refers it to the dignity in which the people were placed in the eyes of the Egyptians, by the many and illustrious miracles worked in their behalf by the Almighty.

Elsner, Doddridge, and Heinrichs explain: "raise out of their calamitous state." And of this sense Elsnner produces several examples. But although he has proved that it may have this signification, yet (as
is observed by Kuin.) the subject here treated of is what happened ἐν τῇ πασώκια, and the liberation from Egypt is mentioned in the next words.

The simplest interpretation, and that most suitable to the context, seems to Kuinoel to be, "exceedingly increased the number of the people:" of which significatio we have examples in Is. 1, 1. Gen. 48, 19. Sir. 44, 21. 50, 22. And this interpretation (he adds) is confirmed by Deut. 1, 10. and Acts 7, 17. But all these modes of explanation yield a too confined sense; and I am inclined to think (with Buxtorf, Wolf, and Kypke) that this ἄξωσις is of complex meaning, and may indeed embrace all the above particulars. Wolf refers to Ex. 1, 9 & 10. 12. 37. Among other Classical passages, Kypke cites Polyb. 5, 26., who says that very slight momenta ὡς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ πάλιν ταπεινοῦσι. To omit many others, I will advert to the Virgilian, me quoque tollere humo.

Kuinoel observes that πασώκια answers to the Heb. ἰῆλ, peregrinatio, in Esdr. 8, 84., and is used of the sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt at Sap. 19, 10.

17. μετὰ βραχίων δῆμοι. An oriental and popular metaphor, signifying in great power. See Exod. 6, 1, 6. Num. 33, 4.

18. ἐτραποφόρησεν αὐτῶς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. There has been no little debate among the Commentators respecting the true reading and, as dependant on it, the sense of this passage. The common one ἐτραπο-


The other reading, ἐτραφοφόρησεν, is found in some excellent MSS., and in the Syr., Arab., Copt., Ἑθιοπ., and Slavonic Versions. It is recognized by Athanasius, Cyrill, Macarius, Hesychius, and Const. Apost. 7, 36.; is defended by Pfaff, Casau-
bon, Hammond, Mill, Bengel, Matthiae, Ernesti, Pearce, Morus, Rosenmuller, and Valcknaer; and has been received into the text by Griesbach.

The common reading is, however, advocated by Grotius, Deyling, Wolf, Doddridge, and most English Theologians. The arguments for it are thus summed up by Kuinoel.

1. It is found in the Vulgate.—2. In the passage of Deut. 1, 31. to which Paul refers, for ἑτροφοφορήσει and τροφοφορήσει the Vat. has ἑτροποφόρησεν and τροποφόρησε, which is more agreeable to the Heb. מֹמֶל; as appears from ver. 9. of the same Chapter. This reading is also acknowledged by Origen and Const. Apost. 7, 36. Whereas no unexceptionable example is adduced of τροφοφορεῖν; for as to 2 Macc. 7, 27. τροποφορεῖν is there preferable to τροφοφορεῖν.—3. The letter φ and π are very often interchanged.—4. As to Hesychius, the true reading seems to be ἑτροποφόρησεν, which refers to education and forming the manners. See Fisch. on Plat. Phaed. C. 30., Loesner on 1 Tim. 4, 6., and Lennep on Phalar. Ep. p. 350. Dr. Doddridge, too, observes that “it was very fit to give this oblique intimation of that perverseness and ingratitude which so early began to prevail among them.”

To Kuinoel, however, these reasons seem not convincing: and he thinks τροφοφορεῖν preferable, on the following grounds.

1. Τροφοφορεῖν (from τροφᾶ, nurse, mother, and φορεῖν), which signifies to “carry in the arms like a nurse,” to nurse, support, as being less known to the scribes, was changed into the more obvious τροποφορεῖν.—2. Τροφοφορεῖν is read in 2 Macc. 7, 27. and Macar. Hom. 46. where it is said of the mother of an infant: ἀναλαμβάνει, καὶ περιβάλλει, καὶ τροφοφορεῖ ἐν πολλῇ στοργῇ. And in Deut. 1, 31. (Sept.) ἑτροφοφόρησε is the true reading. So, indeed, the passage seems to have been understood by Aquila and Symmachus. Besides (as Mill observes), that reading is required by the argument and scope of the pas-
sage.—§. Not only in the passage of Deut., but in the present one, ἐτροφοφόρησε is far more suitable to the context. For it is not likely that Paul should have meant to exasperate the minds of his auditors: and, in fact, we do not find that God did patiently bear with the perverse conduct of the Israelites in the desert; nay, the contrary appears from holy writ. (See Ps. 95, 10. Heb, 3, 17.)—§. The reading ἐτροφοφόρησεν is also confirmed by other passages; as Numb. 11, 12. and Deut. 32, 10. seqq.

Thus far Kuinoel. For my own part, though I acknowledge that the arguments for both readings are of nearly equal weight, yet, upon the whole, I am inclined to prefer the common one ἐτροφοφόρησε; 1st, on account of the vast preponderance in point of authority.—2dly, because in almost every passage where τροφοφόρεῖν is found, τροφοφόρεῖν is either the true reading, or, at least, is as suitable as τροφοφόρεῖν.—3dly, it is the more difficult reading, and therefore the likelier to be genuine.—4thly, I suspect that τροφοφόρεῖν is irregularly formed, and contrary to the analogy of the language. On this account I would restore the old writing ἐτροφοφόρησεν.*

19. κατεκληρωμένος. Very many excellent MSS. have κατεκληρωμένος, which, as being the more difficult reading, has been deservedly received into the text by Matthiae and Griesbach. Now κατακληρωμένος not only denotes to possess, obtain, but also, in...

* For though Wetstein produces from Herodot. 7, 183. ἧ τροφᾶ — ἐφόρες αὐτῆς, yet τροφοφόρεῖν can properly only mean to carry the nurse in the arms; and this ratio extends through all the other compounds of φῶρεω; as ἄμφοραιφορεῖς, σαυροφορεῖς, λυκοφορεῖς, ἄποθοφορεῖς, καλαμοφορεῖς, στεφανοφορεῖς, δαμνοφορεῖς, χολοφορεῖς, ἄστραποφορεῖς, στυγματοφορεῖς, στεφανοφορεῖς, σκάφοφορεῖς, δισφοφορεῖς, πυρηνωφορεῖς, δισφοφορεῖς, ραβδοφορεῖς, λυθοφορεῖς, ἄνθοφορεῖς, πλατυφορεῖς, μισθοφορεῖς, ἄθεοφορεῖς, and an hundred other such, to be found in Hoogevien's Analogical Dictionary, from a careful examination of which I am prepared to assert that this would be the only instance of the irregularity (though there seems some approach to it in δισφοφορεῖς): Nor does φῶρεω in those compounds always have the literal sense carry and bear, but sometimes the metaphorical, as in καρποφορεῖς, πληροφορεῖς, διαφορεῖς, δαμαφορεῖς.
a Hiphil sense, to deliver up into any one's possession, as in Judg. 11, 24. 1 Kings, 2, 8. Num. 34, 18. Deut. 3, 28. Zach. 8, 12. From ignorance of this signification, the scribes have also, in other places, made the same charge; as in Deut. 1, 38. 3, 28. 21, 16. Josh. 14, 2. 19, 51. 1 Sam. 2, 8. 1 Macc. 3, 36. (Kuin.)

20. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα — τοῦ προφήτου. This passage has not a little exercised the learning and ingenuity of Commentators. And no wonder: for in 1 Kings 6, 1. "It came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord." Now if these four hundred and fifty years mentioned by St. Paul be added to the forty during which the Israelites abode in the desert, the seventeen years of Joshua's government, the forty of Saul's reign, the forty of David's, the three of Solomon's, before the building was commenced, the sum total will amount to a greater number than is found in 1 Kings 6, 1.; to remove which apparent contradiction the Commentators have devised many methods.

1. According to the opinion of Perizonius, Origg. Egypt., C. 16, p. 321., the years of servitude in which the Israelites, during the time of the Judges, were oppressed by foreigners, and were without native chiefs (1 Kings 6, 1.), are not numbered, since in the public Annals no notice was taken of them, but they were reckoned to those in which Judges ruled over the Israelites. Others number the years of the Judges and of the bondage differently, so, however, as to make out nearly the same number. But all these methods of computation are merely arbitrary; for that the years of bondage were omitted in 1 Kings is only taken for granted, not proved. Others again, as Luther and Beza, alter the common reading partly from MSS., and partly from conjec-
ture. Finally, there are not wanting those who, as Vossius, Michaelis, Vitrinæ, and Heinrichs, regard the whole as a mere interpolation.

Other conjectures and opinions may be seen in Limborch, Bengel, and Heumann. To me it appears that the words are not from an interpolator, but are St. Paul's, who here followed the mode of computation pursued by the Jewish Chronologists of his age, with respect to the years of the Judges and those during which the Israelites were in subjection to foreign nations: and therefore I suspect that the passage of 1 Kings is corrupt.

Kρίται, which corresponds to the Heb. דַּקָּשְׁנָה, may more properly be rendered Duces populi than judices. (Kuin.)

I am so far inclined to agree with the learned Commentator, as to be of opinion that the corruption (if any) rests with the passage of the Old Testament, in the text of which chronological errors, chiefly arising from the use of letters (often very similar) for figures, do occasionally occur.

21. κακείνεν. Ἐκείνεν is properly used of place, but is sometimes, as here, applied to time, like our thence; of which Kuinoel adduces an example from Xen. Hist. 5, 2, 24.

21. τετσαφάκωπα. How long Saul reigned, we are not told in Scripture. Kuinoel is of opinion that in this St. Paul followed tradition. But it is more probable that he rested on the authority of some historical records, such as Josephus tells us were preserved in the Temple, and by which, it should seem, Josephus himself (Ant. 6, 14, 9.) was guided, when he says that Saul reigned eighteen years during Samuel's life, and twenty-two after his decease.

"The years, therefore (continues Kuinoel), during which Samuel ruled over the Jews before Saul was created king, are referred to the above mentioned four hundred and fifty." (See, however, Doddridge.)

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, CHAP. XIII.

Polyb. 4, 23. (Kypke.) Ἐμποτησις is, however, also used of removing by death; and some examples are adduced by Munthe and Raphael: but in them the words ἐκ τοῦ ζην, or similar ones, are expressed: which is not the case here; and therefore I assent to Kuinoel, that it must be understood of removal from office.

22. Eις βασιλεα, for their king, in order to be their king. Ο ζην ἔλεγε μαρτυρήσας. Thaleman and Schott have well rendered this, "quem hoc elogio ornavit." For μαρτυρεῖν τινι signifies to bear witness for any one, in any one's favour; this being what grammarians call a dative of profit.

22. ευον Δαβίδ, &c. There is no passage of the Old Testament which contains precisely these words; which seem to be confounded from Ps. 89, 21. 1 Sam. 13, 14., with some slight alteration and amplification; on which mode of citing from the Old Testament see the note on 7, 7. (Kuin.)

22. ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου. Some Commentators understand this of David's fidelity in the discharge of his regal functions, and his zealous and undeviating pursuance of the plans which God was pleased to have carried into effect. Others confine it to his abstaining from idolatry, and preserving the worship of the one true God, and the laws and institutes of Moses. Kuinoel unites the above particulars.

It must be observed that the words δις ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου are exegetical of the preceding; for καρδία here signifies will, intention, counsel. Nor is this altogether an Hebraism; since I find in Ἀσχηλ. Agam. 9. ὅθε γὰρ κρατεὶ γυναικὸς ἀνδρόθεουν, ἐπιτίθον κέαρ. * Θελήμα is very rare in the

* So I would point this passage, which has been admirably amended by Bp. Blomfield; though, had the profoundly learned Editor recollected the sense of κέαρ just indicated, he would not have affixed to κρατεῖ the arbitrary and precarious sense of jubet, but would have perceived that it denotes simply "has prevailed, has obtained its purpose, and has chosen that it should be so:" a sig-
plural; but so it occurs in 2 Paral. 9, 12. ἔδωκε τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τὰ θελήματα δ' ἡγησαν.

23. ἡγείρε. Griesbach, Matthiae, and Kuinoel adopt ἡγείρε, as being the more difficult reading. Ἄγω is, however, sometimes used for ἡγείρε; as in Zach. 3, 8. Is. 48, 15. Dan. 9, 24. For σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν Mill and Kuinoel read σωτήριον as in Luke 1, 71. Joh. 4, 22.), cancelling Ἰησοῦν.

24. προκηρύξαντος Ἰωάννου. Mention is made of John, since his authority stood high with the people. On βάπτισμα μετανοιας see the note on Matt. 3, 2. and Mark 1, 4. (Kuin.)

Kuinoel thinks προκηρύξαντος is for the simple κηρύξαντος. But the preposition seems rather to have the force of palam, publicly. Thus the sense is, “proclaiming (the necessity of), exhorting to repentance.”

24. Περὶ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ. Εἰσόδου is for εἰσοδεύοντος or εἰσερχομένου, the thing being put for the person; which is very frequent. Or it may be rendered, according to the Hebrew usage (as in our Versions), “before his coming or entrance,” viz. into his office. (Markland.) The latter method is preferable: and thus there is no reason, with Owen, to cancel it as being redundant. It is (as Grotius and Kuinoel observe) an expression corresponding to the Heb. ἀνεῴνεσθαι. See Mal. 3, 1. and Matt. 11, 10. Εἰσόδου is used in the sense of entrance upon office also in Isocr. ad Nicl. p. 41. (cited by Heinrichs.)

25. αἰς δὲ ἐκλήρου Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον, i. e. his ministry, office. A metaphor derived from the race-course. See 2 Tim. 4, 7. and 1 Cor. 9, 24. Ἐκληροῦμαι must be rendered, “when he was finishing.”

25. Τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμί ἕγω. Chrysostom, and most Commentators, both antient and modern, take the former clause as interrogative, and the latter as containing the answer. Thus: “whom

nification not unfrequent in Thucydides. Of καταχείν in the sense of jubeo, i. e. issue an order, I know no example; though it sometimes, in Thucydides and elsewhere, denotes to hold command over.
suppose ye me to be? I am not he (whom you suppose, namely Christ)." This method is, however, pronounced by Kuinoel harsh, and he ventures, with Neibour. ap Wolf, Raphael, and Palaiert, to take τίνα for δειμα, i.e. δν; as in Mark 14, 36: which proof is, however, feeble, since the sentence there is not, as here, interrogative. Palaiert indeed refers to 1 Tim. 1, 7. and cites Callim. Epigr. 30. ὥστε κελευθῳ Χαίρω, τίς πολλοὺς οδός καλ ὧδε φέρει. But in the present passage the position of the clause shows that it is interrogative; and no example has yet been produced of τίς for ὤς, or ὥσ commencing a sentence. It is safer to acquiesce in the common interpretation, which supposes only a popular brachylogia, which may very well be tolerated, and is defended by several others similar to it in the Gospel of St. John, where ὥστε, meaning Christ, is studiously left to be supplied.

Ταχυδείον signifies both to suppose and to suspect; of which Wetstein here adduces several examples.

26. seq. St. Paul now exhorts his hearers to acknowledge the Messiah, and admit the plan of salvation by him. By oi φοβούμενοι τον Θεὸν are meant Jewish proselytes. See the note on ver. 11, 6. In ὑμῖν ὃ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἀπεστάλε there is an hypallage for ὑμῖν ὃ λόγος ὥστε, &c.

27. oi γὰρ κατωκοῦντες ἐν Ιερουσαλήμ. The γὰρ is not, as many have supposed, causal, but the connection is to be thus traced. "The Jerusalemites indeed put to death Jesus; nevertheless, he is the Messiah; for God recalled him to life." Τούτων ἀγοραστεῖς, "not having a knowledge of his person and dignity." So Luke 9, 45, where see the note.

After κρίνωντες must be understood αὐτῶν, and after ἐπλήρωσαν the words τὰς φωνὰς. Nor is ἀγοραστεῖς only to be referred to τούτων, but also to the words καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν. (Grot. Wolf, and Kuin.) So Ssp. 15, 11. ὅτι ἐγνωκ ὑμῖν πλάσαντα αὐτῶν. According to this interpretation there is a dilogia in ἀγοραστεῖς, which is taken in a double sense. For
in respect to Jesus, it signifies, "they knew not who he was, knew him not to be the Messiah;" and in respect to the prophecies of the Old Testament, treating of the fortunes of the Messiah, "they understood them not." Now this mode of speaking is familiar to the writers of the New Testament. See the note on Joh. 1, 38. (Kuin.; chiefly from Grot.)

Other modes of interpretation, involving a trajec-
tio, are brought forward by Hammond and Beza; and Heinrichs proposes a new one, which, however, (as Kuinoel observes,) extorts a sense from the words which does not properly belong to them.

By φανάς τῶν προφητῶν are meant the prophetical effuta committed to writing. Grotius compares them to the Hebr. הֶחָרָה, which denotes the Sabbath lessons from the Prophets, and הָרָשָׁר, those from the Pentateuch. Wolf adduces an example of this sense of φανα (in which, however, there seems a catachrexis) from Polyb. 5, 83: and Kypke produces several, of which the most apposite is from Themist. Ortat. 31. p. 355, τὰς Θεοστοιου φανάς, τὰς πραγμάτων ὑμῶν ἀναγινωθείσας.

Καὶ εἰνείν is here for κατακρήνειν. See Joh. 7, 51.

Thus St. Paul means to say that they, unwittingly, fulfilled the prophecies. In illustration of this Wet-
stein aptly cites the following passage of Joseph. Bell. 4, 6, 3. τὴν κατὰ τῆς πατρίδος προφητείαν τέλους ἔχοντας ἡ γὰρ τις παλαιός λόγος άνδρεὶς ἐνδέχεται τὸ τήν πόλιν ἀλογεσθείη, καὶ καταφλεγήσεσθαι τῷ αγίῳ νόμῳ τουλών, στάσις ἐκ τοιαύτης καὶ χεῖρες διείκεια προμυ-
αιώνι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τέμενος ὡς οὖκ ἀπιστήσατες [lege ἐπιστήσατε] οἱ ἡλικται διακόνεις ἑαυτῶν ἐπέδεισαν.

28—31. See supra, 3, 14. Καὶ is here for καταπερ, although. Ἀθρίᾳ signifies fault, cause of punish-
ment; as in Joh. 18, 38. See the note on Matt. 19, 3, 27, 37. and Bp. Pearce, who causelessly objects to εἰρώτες, and would read εἰρώτα.

29. ὡς δὲ ἐπέδεισαν ἄταντα, &c., "when they had fulfilled all the predictions of the Prophets, respecting the afflictions and death of the Messiah." See 3, 18. (Kuin.)
29. ἐκέλουρες ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξου, ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημεῖον. Since the same persons did not bury Jesus who condemned him, some would take these words impersonally; and indeed sometimes active verbs are taken passively, or even impersonally. But this is a principle whose application must be guided by circumstances; and here it seems inadmissible.

Grotius and Rosenmuller take καθέλουρες for οἱ καθέλουρες, i. e. those who took him down, meaning Joseph and his colleagues. But this seems to be an unwarrantable liberty, by which quite another sense than the one intended is forced on the passage.

Heumann, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, at καθέλουρες subaude Ἰουδαῖοι, i. e. the Jews generally, including Joseph, &c. But this is a very far-fetched and unsatisfactory device. There is, in fact, no occasion to have recourse to so many doublings and windings. The sentence is expressed in a popular manner, and must not be tried by the rules of minute criticism. Besides, those who procured the crucifixion of Jesus, might be familiarly said to bring him to his grave, though they did not bury him with their own hands. Now Paul only means to hint, that when they brought him to his grave, they thought there was an end of him, and that they had done with him. This mode of taking the passage is confirmed by the adversative δὲ, which usheres in the next sentence.

31. τοῖς συνανθίασιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἰεροσαλήμ, "those who proceeded with him from Galilee to Jerusalem;" meaning, besides the Apostles, the women and other followers of Christ. See 1 Cor. 15, 5. seq. Ἀναβαίνειν was always used of travelling to Jerusalem; as it usually was in respect to the metropolis of any country. Thus we say, "go up to London," and "down to the North."

32, 33. ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν—ἐπαγγελίαν. By ἐπαγγελία Rosenmuller and others understand the thing itself promised, the promised benefit. But Bengel, Heumann, and Heinrichs, rightly construe the words as follows: εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, ὅτι τὴν πρὸς τοὺς
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πατέρας γενομένην ἔπαγγελιαν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπετάλῳ, where ταύτην is redundant, by a Hebraism; for there is no other example of εἰσαγγελίσθαι with an accusative of thing as well as of person. (Kuin.) And so Grotius; but this seems a somewhat precarious criticism: neither, however unusual, should it be doubted that εἰσαγγελίσθαι may have two accusatives; since verbs of saying and telling regularly carry that syntax.

32. Ἀναστήσας, "by causing him to rise from the dead."

33. οὗ καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ γέγραπται, i. e. "the words of the second Psalm are to be referred to Jesus." For δευτέρῳ the Cod. Cant. and some Fathers read πρῶτῳ, which, as being the more difficult reading, has been received by almost all the critics. Now the Psalm, which in our editions is the second, was formerly the first; since the preceding was thought a mere preface to the book, and therefore not reckoned.

Beza, however, suspects that Paul simply wrote οὗ γέγραπται. But this is not confirmed by any authority, and is refuted by ver. 35. where we have καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει. Bengel, Morus, and Rosenmuller suspect that both πρῶτῳ and δευτέρῳ are equally false readings, derived from the margin, since the writers of the New Testament, (as also the Rabbinical and Talmudical ones,) are not accustomed to cite numbers or chapters. But to this rule there are a few exceptions; and that this is one, the united testimony of all the MSS. seems to prove.

38. οὐδεις μου εἶ σο, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκά σε. On the author of the second Psalm, the time at which it was written, and its purpose, see the note on 4, 25. where it has been shown that David was the author of it, and that it treats of his fortunes. The formulas, "thou art my son," and "this day have I begotten thee," are, from parallelism of members, equivalent. Compare Jer. 2, 27. Now the kings of the Israelites, because they had received the regal power from Jehovah, the Supreme King of Kings, (the form of go-
vernment being theocratical), were styled vicars of Jehovah, and were said to be *sons of God.* (See Ps. 89, 27. 2 Sam. 7, 14.) Hence also the Messiah, being by God appointed King of men, was named *Son of God.* (See the note on Matt. 4, 8, and 16, 16.) The sense, therefore, is this: “thou art a King appointed by me.” Now the verb γενάω, like the Hebr. יִלּוּ, is to be taken declaratively, so as to denote, “declare any one born,” i.e. (in this passage, from the force of the context,) to “declare or appoint any one king.” See Ps. 110, 4. Jer. 1, 10. Glass. Phil. Sacr. 216. and the note on Matt. 14, 6.

33. σαρκαται. So the Hebr. פָּשָׁח. Most interpreters refer this to the anointing of David (1 Sam. 16, 13.) But it is by Holzapfel, in a Dissert. on this subject, with more probability, referred to the time when David stormed and took the fortress of Sion. As applied to Jesus, the sense is this: “Now, at present, already, have I created thee King, and appoint thee Messiah.”* (Kuin.)

34, 35. The connexion seems to be this. “I announce to you Jesus as the Messiah. For God has declared so at Ps. 2.; and, indeed, that God meant to recall him to life, as Messiah, whom I have affirmed returned to life (ver. 30), the oracles of the Old Testament declare.”

34. “Ort δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, &c. The formula ἀνέστησεν εἰς διαφθορὰν (like the Hebr. תַּפּוּשָׁה, to descend to the ditch, or grave, in Job 33, 28.) denotes to die; and thus ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθορὰν must mean to die again. Now διαφθορὰ properly signifies corruption, and the Sept. express the Hebr. קְדֹשׁ; a pit, grave, or destruction, (from קָדֹשׁ or קֵרֶשׁ, to descend,) by διαφθορὰ, putrefaction, since they referred

* Of the Classical and Rabbinical illustrations produced by Wetstein the following are the most apposite. Plaut. Pseud. 1, 3, 15. *Hodie nate, heus, hodie nate, tibi ego dico; heus, hodie nate. Hirt. B. A. 90. Quibus metu eксanguibus, de vitâque ex suo proritero desperantibus, subito oblata salute—se eodem die demum natos praedican tes. Targum on Ps. 2. Tu Dilectus, sicut filius est patri, tu mihi purus es, ac si die isto cressem te.
it to ἄνεμος, to consume, corrupt. This version Paul has followed; and thus ἵδεῖν διαφόραν signifies to experience putrefaction; but in the formula ὑποστήθηκεν ἐστὶ διαφόραν, the word διαφόραν denotes the place of corruption, the sepulchre.

In the words μηκέτι μελλόντα it is declared that Jesus the Messiah, when recalled to life, will reign perpetually. (Kuin.)

34. διήκω υἱῶ τὸ δούλον Δαβίδ τὰ πιστά. Cited from Is. 59, 3. διαφόρας υἱῶν διαφόρας αἰώνιον, τὰ δούλα Δαβίδ τὰ πιστὰ*, in applying and transferring which words to Jesus, Paul adds διήκω υἱῶν.

The formula δούλα Δαβίδ answers to the Hebrew רְשָׁם רְשָׁם, and indicates the benefits promised to David. For רְשָׁם denotes both benignity and piety. The Sept. however, express רְשָׁם by δούλος even where the subject treated of is not piety, but kindness. Thus they rendered רְשָׁם by δούλος, i.e. benefits. Πιστὰ, sure, firm, certain.

35. λέγει, i.e. God saith, by David. (Kuin.)

36, 37. See the note on 2, 29. Δαβίδ μὲν γὰρ ἵδια γενεὰ, &c., i.e. "David was indeed ὅσιος, a worshipper of God, but to him these promises did not belong." The words ὑποτεθήκες τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλή have the very same sense with those at ver. 22, θεία τὴν πάντα τὰ δεσμάτα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἰδία γενεὰ, in his own age, or time. (Kuin.) Many Commentators join ὑποτεθήκες with ἵδια γενεὰ, and τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλῇ with ἐκμισθήσει. The above interpretation is however con-

* For the sense of these words we must have recourse to what God said of David in 2 Sam. 7, 11, 12. &c. explained by what is said in Ps. 84, 3, 4, 28, 29, 36. where frequent mention is made of a covenant established by God with David, and sworn to by God, that David's seed should endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven, and as the sun, and to all generations. This covenant, and this oath, are the sure and sacred things of which Isaiah in ch. 55, 3. speaks, and Luke in this place. And Paul understood them as relating to the kingdom of Jesus (the son of David), which was to be an everlasting one; and, if an everlasting one, then it is necessary that Jesus should have been (as he was) raised from the dead; and to support this argument Paul in the next verse strengthens it with another drawn from the 16th Psalm, ver. 10. (Bp. Pearce.)
firmed, not only by the context but by several parallel passages cited by Wetstein and Munthe; as Diodor. Sic. p. 67 d. προελεβας ὑπηρετεῖν τοῖς προ-
tησάμην: and 7, 17. εἰκείν τε καὶ ὑπηρετείσθαι τῆς 'Ασφάκης βουλεύσαι.

36. καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς πατέρας αὐτῶν, gathered to his fathers. This metaphor (which denotes burial) is derived from the caves in which the Hebrews used to bury the dead, which were hereditary, and wherein the bodies of many generations were assem
dled together. Hence the Hebrews used the phrase יִהְיֶה לַאֲבוֹותָם or יִהְיֶה לְרֵי
tein either in the sense of die, (as in Gen. 49, 29. ἐγὼ προστίθεμαι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν, πάντας μὲ, &c. and Judg. 2, 10. προσετέθησαν πρὸς πατέρας αὐτῶν,) or to be buried; as in Gen. 25, 8. ἀνέβανεν Ἄ. καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτῶν.

38, 39. The Apostle now makes mention of the benefits and blessings which appertain to those who acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, and have faith in him: and hence he exhorts his hearers to acknow-
ledge him as the Messiah, and thereby be rendered partakers of these blessings. He moreover mentions forgiveness of sins in the place of all the rest of the benefits; and he tells them that by Christ is offered this forgiveness of sins, even of those from which the Law could not absolve any one."

* The Law appointed sin-offerings to expiate smaller offences, so far as that the offender who offered them should be free from all further prosecution on account of them. But this very view of them shows how absolutely necessary to the being of society it was that they should not be admitted in cases of murder, adultery, &c. These crimes, therefore, were made capital; nor was the dying criminal, however penitent, allowed to offer them, which would have been quite inconsistent with the temporal pardon connected with them. But the expiatory sacrifice of Christ takes away the guilt of all sin;
"Ων is put for ἀφιέναι and δικαίωσαι is equivalent to ἔχειν ἀφέσιν ἀμαρτίαν, "to obtain pardon of sins, be liberated from punishment, and obtain the favour of God." See Koppe’s fourth Excurs. on Ep. to Gal. and Storr’s Op. 1, 188.

40, 41. βλέπετε ἐν, &c. “beware therefore lest, by rejecting Jesus as the Messiah, you draw down on yourselves this utter destruction.”

By εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις it is merely meant that the prophecy adverted to is found in that part of the Scriptures which was called by the name of the Prophets; as in Joh. 6, 45. The passage is quoted, with the omission of some words which do not alter the sense, from Habakuk 1, 5. where the Sept. render: ἴδετε οἱ καταφρονταὶ, καὶ ἐμβλέψατε, καὶ βαυμάσατε βαυμασία, καὶ ἀφανίσθητε διότι ἐργὸν ἐγὼ ἐφέραμαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, τῇ ὑπὸ μὴ πιστεύσετε ἐν τῇ ἐκδικηθητί. The Hebr. יָרָב is rendered ἴδετε, καταφρονταὶ, see, ye insolent; whence it appears that they read יָרָב, which is yet found in some MSS., and is confirmed by the Arabic and Syriac Versions: and this reading being also supported by the context, seems the truer one. (Kuin.)

41. βαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε. It is not easy to determine the force of ἀφανίζω in the present passage. Most of the earlier Commentators give it the sense of perish (viz. by the Romans). And so our English Version. But this interpretation seems very harsh: and, aware of this, Beza and Doddridge explain it, “disappear, vanish, as it were, for shame.” Grotius would subaudub πρόσωπα, and take it in the sense of turn pale; which is indeed suitable enough, but not authorized by the Hebrew original. I rather agree with Erasmus and Piscator, and especially and though it by no means affects the manner in which offenders would stand in human courts, (which the Mosaic sacrifices did,) it delivers from the condemnation of God in the invisible world, with respect to which the others could have no efficacy at all, as it was a very supposable case that an impenitent sinner might present them in all their exactest forms. Compare Rom. 8, 3. Gal. 2, 16. & Heb. 10, 4. See Mr. Hallet, vol. 3. Disc. 3. p. 269, et seq. (Doddr.)
those eminent Hebraists De Dieu and Pococke, who
tell us that רָדָה may denote not merely complete
destruction, but (as appears from its use in Arabic)
utter amazement and stupor; which interpretation is
adopted by Heinrichs and Kuinoel, the latter of
whom observes that the Hebr. וֹם, to which ἀφαν-
ζέσθαι more than once in the Sept. answers, has not
only the sense of vasto, but obstupesco.

41. οτι ζηγον εγω, &c. The ζηγον is repeated by
way of emphasis (though not found in the Sept.)
For ὃ ὦ μὴ πιστεύσητε many copies have ἢ ὦ μὴ, &c.
derived, as it should seem, from the Sept. The
words ὃ μὴ πιστεύσητε, εάν τις ἐκδηγηται ὑμῖν have
the air of a proverb. The general sense of the pas-
sage is thus laid down by Kuinoel. “The Prophet
threatens his perverse countrymen that God will
punish them by means of the Chaldeans, and destroy
their State.”

“Now the words of the Prophet (says Kuinoel)
are not a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem
by the Romans, but are accommodated by Paul for
the purpose of warning his countrymen; as if he had
said: ‘Beware lest there fall upon you the calamity
with which the Prophets formerly threatened your
forefathers’.”

It is plain (and has been the opinion of almost all
Commentators, antient and modern) that Paul had
in mind the calamity which hung over the Jewish na-
tion from the Romans. Whether this occurred to
him by observation on the signs of the times, or was
communicated by revelation, we are not told. Most
Commentators fix on the former: but it can hardly
be doubted that, among the other revelations with
which Paul was favoured, would be this, namely, of
the future fortunes of the nation.

42. Here is related the effect of this discourse on
the minds of the auditors.

Now in the interpretation of ver. 42. there are
some difficulties of no very easy solution. The com-
mon reading is ἐξιόντων, scil. αὐτῶν (viz. Barnabas.
and Paul), δὲ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. But that Gentiles were permitted to frequent the synagogues, cannot be proved, and these very Antiochian Jews appear to have been highly indignant at the attendance, on the following Sabbath, of a great number of Gentiles. (See ver. 44 & 48. compared with 45.) Hence most interpreters by τὰ ἔθνη understand those proselytes of the gate who, at 14, 1. are called Ἑλληνεσ, at 17, 4. σεβόμενοι Ἑλληνεσ, at infr. 43. σεβόμενοι προσφηλυτοί. But this interpretation being admitted, ἔθνη will have a different sense here to what it has in 46, 47, & 48. Nor does one see why the proselytes of the gate only should have asked Paul and Barnabas to explain to them the doctrine of Christ, on the following Sabbath: for the Jews had not yet rejected them, and several, at the breaking up of the synagogue, followed Paul and Barnabas home. (Compare ver. 43.) Surprising too it is that Paul and Barnabas are said to have gone out of the synagogue before the conclusion of Divine service. (Compare ver. 43.) Besides, the very addition Ἰουδαίων is here useless, and even offensive, since it is sufficiently clear that it must have been a synagogue of the Jews. [But it occurs again at 14, 1. sine var. lect. Edit.] In order to remove this difficulty, Beza, Schmid, Limborch, and Bengel [as also Doddridge. Edit.] join τῶν Ἰουδαίων with ἐξιότητων, and assign to the words the following sense: "when the Jews had, most of them, left the synagogue; i. e. those to whom the discourse of Paul had been offensive." But this is extorting a sense from the words which is not contained in them. Others again, in order to do justice to the sense, have thought it advisable to alter the reading. Matthæi has edited, ἐξιότητων δὲ αὐτῶν, παρεκάλουν τὰ ἔθνη εἰς, &c.; which is approved by Morus and Heinrichs: Griesbach, ἐξιότητων δὲ αὐτῶν παρεκάλουν εἰς τὰ μεταξὺ, &c., when they (i. e. Paul and Barnabas) had gone out. But whatever reading be adopted, the difficulty cannot be entirely removed. To me it
seems that the whole verse is patched up of various glosses, and is anything but genuine. (Kuin.) This, however, seems cutting the knot, and lopping off the limb which should be healed; and both physicians and critics admit that it is better to heal than to amputate. I cannot but think that the learned Commentator exaggerates the difficulty of the passage. Even if the common reading were retained, it would not follow that we should be compelled to suppose Paul and Barnabas to have withdrawn before the congregation was dismissed. I am not, however, prepared to assert that the common reading is the true one; yet I must maintain that the corruptions are not so inveterate, or incurable, as Kuinoel supposes. The text appears to have been corrupted by the introduction of one or two marginal glosses, which had been noted down in order to explain the sentence, which (by the way) seems to have been written with that want of precision which we find in the popular style of all languages, and such as occurs in our own, when, by inadver- tence, two theys occur in one member of a sentence, relating to different persons; to remedy which inconvenience some resort to the clumsy expedient of inserting the persons meant in parentheses. Now this appears to have been done, in the present instance, by some one who put in the margin τῶν Ἰουδαίων, as referred to αὐτῶν, and ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς, to ἔξιόντων, thus filling up the ellipsis. Finally, τὰ ἔθνη, referring to παρεκάλουν (and so τὰ ἔθνη is used in Rom. 11, 13. and Ephes. 9, 1, 6.), appears to have been introduced after the Ἰουδαίων, and to have been meant to complete the antithesis. It is clear, then, that the reading of Griesbach’s second edition, founded as it is on many ancient and valuable MSS., as also several early Versions and Fathers (especially Chrysostom), is the true one.

By αὐτῶν ἔξιόντων are meant both Paul and Barnabas, and the people: a popular and familiar mode of expression. I would render the passage thus: “as
the congregation were withdrawing, they entreated to have these words again spoken to them (i.e. this subject treated of again) on the following Sabbath.” There seems little doubt but that those who made the request were chiefly the proselytes just afterwards mentioned: and therefore the Glossographer who wrote τὰ ἔσω, had a correct view of the sense.

42. eἰς τὸ μεταξὸς σάββατον, “on the following Sabbath.” This appears to be the true sense of eἰς τὸ μεταξὸς σάββατον, though Scaliger, Grotius, Camerarius, Casaubon, Beza, Tindal, Schmid, Pearce, Schoettgen, and some recent German Commentators take it to signify some intermediate week-day. But although Schoettgen has satisfactorily proved that such week-day meetings for religious worship were in use among the Jews,* yet this interpretation is refuted by ver. 44., where it is said that almost the whole city was collected together on the following Sabbath. The one first laid down is espoused by Erasmus, Glass, the authors of our English Version, Kypke, Krebs, Morus, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel: and so the words were understood by the Syriac, Vulgate, Arabic, and Ἐθιοπικός Translators. Of μεταξὸς in the sense of post there are many instances in the later Greek writers, from whom examples are given by Kypke, Krebs, and Kuinoel.

43. λυθεῖσας, δὲ τῆς συναγώγης. The verb λύειν is, by the best writers, used in the sense of dismiss, and

* So Bava Kama, fol. 82, 1. Decem constitutiones constituit Ezra, ut lectio biblica legatur tempore Minchae in Sabbatho, και πρὶς πνευματικοὶ, et legatur die secundo ac quinto. And a little further, in the words of Exod. 15, 22. Qui hoc mystīce interpretantur, dicunt, per aquas nihil aliud intelligi, quam Legem, q. d. Is. 25, 1. Adento omnis sibi, venite ad aquas. Quando ergo per triduum sine Lege ivertunt, tunc defecerunt; quapropter Prophetæ, qui inter ipsos fuerunt, hoc constituerunt, ut Legem legerent Sabbatho, postridie vero omitterent, die secundo iterum legerent, deinde interposito biduo denuo Legem tractarent, vespera Sabbathi emitterent; ita quidem, ut nullum ipsis triduum sine lectione Legis abiret. Sopherin c. 10, 2. Ezra præcepit Israelitis, ut Legem prælegerent publicè die secundo et quinto, et Sabbatho tempore Minchæ.
is applied to disbANDING troops, breaking up of public meetings, &c. See Kypke and Kuinoel.

43. "Εξειδον αυτούς ἐπιμένειν τῇ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, "exhorted and urged them to persevere in," &c. By χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ is meant the Christian doctrine, so emphatically the grace of God, as revealed by his son Jesus Christ.* Or the expression may mean, "to remain in the state of salvation to which they had been brought;" which comes to nearly the same thing. Now μένειν and its compounds ἐπιμένειν, ἐμμένειν, προσμένειν, &c. are often used in the sense of persevere in.

44. τὸ δὲ ἔρχομενον σαββάτῳ, on the next Sabbath. Many MSS. have ἔχωμενον, which, as being the more elegant term, and the less likely to be introduced by the scribes, is adopted by Griesbach, with the approbation of Kuinoel. And so Luke 19, 33. τῇ ἑκομένην, scil. ἤμέρα, which is added in Acts 21, 26. and 1 Macc. 4, 28. ἔχωμενον ἐναντίων. Kuinoel, however, admits that the words ἔρχεσθαι add ἔχεσθαι are used promiscuously: but I am not aware that any apt example of ἔρχεσθαι can be found in a Classical author; except ἄτως ἐρχομενοι in Thucydides. He, indeed, cites Joseph. Ant. 6, 11, 9. τῇ ἐρχομένην, and Ib. 7, 1, 3. τῇ ἔρχομενην. But Josephus is not, strictly speaking, a Classical author. I suspect that this use of ἔρχομαι is derived from the Hebrew and Syriac: and if so, ἔρχομαι may be the true reading in this passage, and we may account for its being found in a writer like Thucydides, whose work abounds with Archaisms. Now it is well known that alterations are sometimes made by the librarian of rough, idiomatic, and inelegant words into more polished ones.

* Thus Doddridge observes that the Gospel is often called the Grace of God, and the Word of his Grace, with the utmost propriety, as containing the richest display of his grace in the free pardon of our sins by Christ, and the provision he has made for our sanctification and eternal happiness. And he compares Acts 14, 3. 20, 24. Rom. 6, 14. Gal. 5, 4. Col. 1, 6. Tit. 2, 11. I Pet. 5, 12.
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46. ἦσθε δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῶν ὅχλων ἐπιλάθησαν ἐξελεύναντες, "were filled with envy:" especially (as Kuinoel thinks) because the Gentiles had come to the Synagogue, and were taught by Paul. "Here (observes Chrysostom) we see malice struck in the act of striking others; since this abuse rather tended to render the Apostles more illustrious."

46, 47. παράπτωσάμενοι δὲ ὁ Παύλος καὶ ὁ Βαρνάβας, εἶπον, &c. Paul, however, and Barnabas (not deterred by the insults of the Jews) spoke thus freely: "To you was first to be delivered the Divine doctrine; but since ye reject it, and think yourselves unworthy of obtaining salvation by the Messiah, we turn our attention to the Gentiles." It was, it seems, ordered in the counsels of God, that to the Jews should first be delivered the Christian doctrine, as being better prepared for its reception. (Kuin.)

Ἀπαθείονεῖς signifies to push from one, spurn, reject.

46. οὐκ ἀξίως κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ᾑμῶς. Here there seems to be a delicate turn (such as we find in the best Classical writers), which has been illustrated by Camerarius, Beza, Grotius, Priceus, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel.* It is (they observe) a sort of metonymy; since the Jews certainly did not think themselves unworthy of eternal felicity, but, by their obduracy, acted as if they thought so; and by so doing they passed sentence of condemnation on themselves. Thus Doddridge observes that "this text most plainly shows that persons are said to be self-condemned who furnish out matter of condem-

* Of this elegance the following examples, selected from Wetstein’s Collectanea are the most apposite. Arrian, 3, 20. κάθευδε, καὶ τὰ τοῦ σκόλημος ποιεῖ, ἥν ἄξιον ἐκρίνας σεαυτόν. L. Judices Cod. dignitabilibus 12, 1, 12. Nec sibi poshac de eo honore blandiantr, quo si ipso indignos judicaverunt. Cic. Catil. 1, 8. Quam longè videtur a carcere atque a vinculis absesse debere, qui se ipsum jam dignum custodias judicavit? lb. pro Cecina 34. Videutur is, qui, cum liber esset, censeri-noluit, ipse sibi libertatem abjudicasse. Compare Prov. 8, 36. Matt. 23, 31. Rorn. 21, 11.
nation from their own words, though they do not actually pass sentence on themselves."

46. στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, i. e. "regarding you as unworthy of our labour, we turn our attention to the heathens." Priscæus aptly cites the maxim of Seneca Epist. 29. nulli enim nisi auditorio dicendum est; and Quintil. L. 6. Faciunt hoc medici, ut remedia perinde perseverent adhibere vel desinant, prout illa recipi vel respui vident.

Kuinoel observes (after Doddridge) that Paul did not intend this should be understood as said of all the Jews, since he afterwards preached Christianity to Jews (see C. 4, 28, 17, &c.;) but that he had in view, by these words, solely the Jews of Antioch, who rejected the doctrine of Christ. Certainly St. Paul did not intend by the expression, "we turn our attention to the Gentiles," to have it understood that he and the rest abandoned all care about the Jews: but as there were comparatively so few Jews either at Antioch or elsewhere, who would receive their preaching, they would bestow their chief attention on the Heathens, though not to the neglect of the Jews.

47. τεθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνων — γῆς. These words are taken from the Sept. Version of Is. 49, 6. The Prophet is there speaking of his own Divine calling to the prophetical office, and the words are applied by Paul to his own case. Φῶς, teacher,* (See the note on Joh. 1, 4.) Eis σωτηρίαν, "to be the author of happiness," &c. (Kuin.) Grotius, has, however, justly observed, that the words of Isaiah are far more applicable to Christ than to the Prophet; since Christ may be said to have done what he did by means of the Apostles. Indeed I do not see how they can be, strictly speaking, applicable to the Prophet at all.

48. τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαρον. "They rejoiced, because

* Wetstein aptly compares Hom. II. 2. 6. Τρώων ῥῆξε φάλαγγα, φῶς δ' ἑτάροισιν ἔθνε.
they saw that from the Jews, who despised the rest of the world, and thought themselves alone objects of the Divine favour, there had issued teachers who maintained that there was no longer any distinction of nations before God, but that all had claim to his favour. (Heinrichs and Kuin.)

48. ἐφόδιασθην, "acknowledged the excellence of."
(Kuin.)

48. καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. In the explanation of these words Commentators have pursued different courses. The high Calvinists (as Markius) seek a support for their favourite doctrine of absolute election. But to this introduction of the doctrine in this place (even supposing it were true) the more moderate and enlightened of their body seem averse. (See Doddr.) The objections to such an interpretation have been strongly stated by Schoettgen in the following words. "It is surely most unsuitable to the present passage to say that those only took up the faith who had been pre-ordained to eternal life. For among those believers there were doubtless many hypocrites, and evil livers, who eagerly enough embraced the theoretical truth, but never liked the practice. These, therefore, could not be predestined." * Moreover,

* To these remarks may be subjoined the following powerful refutation by Dr. Hammond:

"That this phrase cannot reasonably be interpreted to any sense of Divine predestination, may appear, 1. by the no-reasons that are producible to incline it that way. Those must be produced, if they are any, either from the context, or the propriety of the phrase. From the context no reason is assigned; but, on the other hand, the comparison here lying betwixt the Jews on one side, and the Gentiles on the other, of the Jews it is said, that they contradicted, and blasphemed, and so judged not themselves worthy of everlasting life, v. 46. which surely refers not to any decree from eternity past against their persons, absolutely considered, but only as contumacious unbelievers, incapable of that salvation which was preached to them. And then, in reason, and by laws of opposition, they that did believe of the Gentiles, must be those that were otherwise qualified than those Jews were, and so that qualification of pliable temper, will be the interpretation of the τεταγμένοι, &c. Not that all the Gentiles received the Gospel (which yet if it were true de facto,
we have not προτεταγμένοι, as if equivalent to προορισμένοι, but only the simple τεταγμένοι.

would be no argument against what is now said,) but that as many of them as were thus qualified, received it. As for the phrase, that hath no propriety to incline that way; for, 1. there is no intimation or mention of God in the phrase, which would be necessary to restrain it to that sense of God's predestination; 2. for the word τάξειν, which is rendered ordaining, and seems somewhat favourable that way, and is the only part of the phrase that does so, there is no example of this being any where used for God's eternal decree, but διέλευξιν, or προορίσειν, to determine, or predetermine; 3. there is no preposition answerable to πρᾶξις, before, in any part of the phrase, nor anything else to supply that place, as πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων, or πρὸ καταβολής κόσμου, before the foundation of the world, Ephes. 1. 4. Secondly, this may be resolved on by the reasons which stand in force against it. For, 1. the word διέλευξιν, as many, being an inclusive universal particle, it is not imaginable yet that all of that assembly that were predestined, and so all that could ever believe, or come to life, did believe that day. The believers of a city do not all come in thus, every one at the same time, but καθ’ ἡμέραν, daily, some one day, some another, Acts 2, 47. and some that were now negligent, or refractory, might after repent, and become more pliable, and God's decree certainly would not shut them out, when they did so. 2dly. it is as unreasonable to determine that all that did then believe, and receive the Gospel, were predestined to eternal salvation: those that believed at other times were not all predestined; thus Judas, we know, was not; Hymenæus was not: and believing being here nothing more than receiving the faith, without any consideration of their persevering or not persevering, it is evident of the stony ground, and of a multitude of Christians denoted thereby, that in time of temptation they fall away, and so are not (unless they return and recover) predestined to salvation. 3dly. It is not to be thought that Luke, who wrote this, knew of that whole assembly of Gentiles how many were predestined to salvation, nor consequently could he affirn it of them in that sense, or that none should ever believe which this day did not; whereas, on the other hand, he might by that effect conclude that all that were rightly qualified at that time, did not at that time receive and believe the Gospel preached to them, and all that did then truly believe were so qualified, the obstinate and contumacious Jews and Proselytes opposing and persecuting it. Meanwhile, it must be remembered that these qualifications are not pretended to have been originally from themselves, but from the preventing grace of God, to which it is to be acknowledged due, that they ever are pliable, or willing to follow Christ, though not to his absolute decree of destining them, whatever they do, to salvation." (Hammond.)

Finally, I must lay before my readers the following able remarks of Dr. Whitby, in further refutation of the Calvinistic opinion. "If the reason why these men believed be only this, that there were
But proceed we to notice the principal opinions brought forward on this text. Knatchbull, Priscæus, and others (and recently Heinrichs), refer εἰσίτευσαν to ἔχον αὐτον. This, however, is totally at variance with the ancient interpreters, and, as spoken of conversion, is (as Kuinoel remarks) unexampled. Others, as Hammond, Schoettgen, Maius, Mede, Krebs, Loesner, and Doddridge, closely pressing on the physical and military sense of τὰσω, render, "those who had marshalled, arrayed themselves for salvation, who had put themselves in the ranks for obtaining salvation, namely, by hearing the word of God, and by not resisting the Holy Spirit in its endeavours to operate upon their hearts." They observe, moreover, that the middle and reciprocal form is often expressed by the passive voice, especially in the preterite; and thus they here take τεταγμένοι as equivalent to τέταγαν εαυτούς εἰς ᾧν, viz. by a study of virtue and piety: and that τεταγμένοι is to be so taken, they think clear from the context; since the oi τεταγμένοι εἰς ᾧν αἴανοι are opposed to those who had rendered themselves unworthy of eternal life by rejecting the word of God.

Others, as Morus, Rosenmuller, Schott, and Kui-
men ordained to eternal life; the reason why the rest believed not can be this only, that they were not ordained by God to eternal life; and if so, what necessity could there be, that the Word of God should be first preached to them? as we read ver. 46. Was it only that their damnation might be the greater? This seems to charge that Lover of Souls, whose tender mercies are over all His works, with the greatest cruelty, seeing it makes him determine from all eternity, not only that so many souls, as capable of salvation as any other, shall perish everlastingly; but also to determine that the dispensations of His Providence shall be such towards them as necessarily tends to the aggravation of their condemnation; and what can even their most malicious and enraged enemy do more? What is it the very Devil aims at by all his temptations, but this very end, namely, the aggravation of our future punishment? And therefore, to assert that God had determined that his word should be spoken to these Jews for this very end, is to make God as instrumental to their ruin as the very Devil, and seems wholly irreconcileable with his declarations that He would have all men to be saved, and would not that any man should perish."
noel, render, "who were destined unto eternal happiness." These enlightened Commentators, however, disclaim all thoughts of any absolute or unconditioned decree, which exclude men's own exertions towards obtaining felicity and salvation. They direct the words to be taken simply in the acceptance of common life, without introducing any philosophical or metaphysical refinements; q. d. "quibus, dum fidem doctrinarum divinarum habebant, certa erat felicitas futura." And they refer to similar expressions in 1 Thess. 3, 3, 5, 9. Luke 2, 34. But simple as this sense may be, I see not how it can be elicited from the words as they now stand. In one point, however, I entirely agree with them, namely, that we are to take the words without resorting to metaphysical subtilities, and in a popular sense. In this respect those Commentators seem to have been most successful who, as Thaleman, give it the sense of "were well disposed to, and sought eternal felicity," or, "as many as were disposed for, and determined for," &c. It seems a popular way of saying "as many as were thoroughly disposed to make the requisite sacrifices in this life for the attainment of felicity in another and an eternal life." Nor does the interpretation of Doddridge materially differ from this; though he embraces the first mentioned mode of taking τεταγμένοι. For he observes that all who were deeply and seriously concerned about their eternal happiness (whether that concern began now, or were of longer date), openly embraced the Gospel. And so Dr. Whitby, "as many as were disposed for eternal life, believed." So also Dr. Hammond, who, though he labours to establish the military sense of τεταγμένοι, yet occasionally abandons it, explaining the words generally, "those who were disposed for eternal life." "In this sense (says he) they that are truly pious, sincerely and honestly disposed to do whatever God requires of them towards eternal life (whether that signify Christianity, the present part
of that life which shall end in eternity, or whether the life of glory in another world), may fitly be said to be ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι, enrolled in the number of those that look after eternal life. In short, they that, having renounced the heathen idols of their countries, embraced the worship of the one only true God, and the hope of eternal life, and so were well placed, or disposed in a good posture toward the kingdom of God, are here thus expressed. This is that which is expressed, Heb. 11, 6. by προσερχόμενοι καὶ τῷ Θεῷ, they that come to God, and of all such it is required to believe what is there said, that there is a God, and that he is a rewarder of all that diligently seek him, that is, that Gentiles (other nations besides Jews), if they seek God, may come to eternal life, and consequently as many as put forward to the exercise of piety, which is one part of eternal life in Scripture (this is life eternal, to know thee, that is, live according to thy commandments) and to the expectation of a reward, which is the other part, are distinctly capable of this title here, and there of that. This was acknowledged by Chrysostom, when he explained this phrase by ἄφωρισμένοι τῷ Θεῷ, separated to God, that those that had betaken themselves to his only service.

It is plain that Chrysostom took the passage in the mode above adopted; since he observes, ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι, ἦν δεῖξεν, ὥσ ὧν καὶ ἀνάγκαιον. And to this purpose Bulkley appositely cites Plato de Legib. L. 6. Op. p. 563. ἰ φύσις — εἰς ταυτόν τοῦτο — ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι, (ἀπεργον scil.), a mind disposed to virtue.

That it was a popular mode of expression is confirmed by the Rabbinical citations produced by Lightfoot and Wetstein, which I will now subjoin. Moed Katon fol. 9, 1. Exiit filia vocis, dixitque eis: vos osses ordinati estis ad vitam seculi futuri. Megilla fol. 12, 2. Memuchan Esther 1, 14. i. e. Haman. Cur vocatur nomen ejus Memucan? quia ordinatus est ad poenas. R. Bacchiai in Pentateuch, f. 132, 1. Gentes מֹלֵך ordinate ad gehennam: Israel vero

exivit filia vocis dicens: quicunque non piger fuit ad planctum Rabbi, אספסי ordinatus est ad vitam seculi futuri. & 9, 10. in Hier. Bava Mezia fol. 88, 1. est ex filiis seculi futuri. Berachoth. fol. 8, 2. R. Joseph. docuit, hi sunt Persae, qui præparati sunt ad gehennam; and fol. 61, 2. Beatus R. Akiba quia ordinatus es ad vitam futuri seculi. Avoda Sara, fol. 10, 2.

Katina fol. Saconia ordinatus est ad vitam seculi futuri; and fol. 17, 1. exivit filia voxis, dixitque: R. Eleasar f. Derdia ordinatus est ad vitam seculi futuri, f. 18, 1. R. Chania, f. Tardion et questionarius ordinati sunt ad vitam seculi futuri; and Challa. Teanith f. 29, 1. exiit filia vocis dixitque: Dominus iste ordinatus est ad vitam seculi futuri. Midrasch Mischele 16, 4. Si non facit pœnitentiam, ordinatus est ad judicium gehennæ.

49. διεφέρετο, divulgatus, promulgated throughout.

So Chrysostom, διεσκοµίζετο. Wetstein adduces examples both of the physical sense carry, convey, from Aristides, to which I add Thucyd. 8, 8., and of the moral; as διαφέρειν τὰς ἄγγελιας.

50. παρατέων τὰς σεβοµένας γυναῖκας καὶ τὰς ἐνσεµχηµας. Παρατερίων signifies to excite to. The παρὰ has the same force as in παρατέων, and many compounds with παρα. It is, however, of more importance to turn to the consideration of the αἱ σεβοµέναι γυναῖκες, who (notwithstanding the doubts of some) are, by the most judicious Commentators, supposed to have been the wives of Jewish proselytes. Σεβοµένος must here have the same sense as at ver. 16. & 43, Michaelis thinks they were united to Gentile husbands; which might be the case with some. Be that, however, as it may, they were fired with the characteristic zeal of new converts, and acted from the ardent temperament of their sex.*

* Cornelius a Lapide here remarks, with far more severity than
By γυναῖκες εὐσχήμονες are meant women of respectability, respectable rank. Doddridge render women of figure. The word properly signifies such as maintain a good appearance. See more in the note on Mark 15, 48.

50. ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ τῶν ὅραν αὐτῶν. Perhaps this may only mean, “ procured an order for their immediate departure from the territory; at least we need not suppose that any force was employed in removing them; which, as no resistance was made, would have been unnecessary. This kind of order for departure used to be given in due form, and there were sometimes persons appointed to superintend the execution of it by conducting the person over the borders. So Thucyd. 2, 12. καὶ ἐκέλευσεν ἐκτὸς ὅραν εἶναι αὐθημερόν. Aristid. 1, 250 c. πρὸ ἡλικοῦ δύνοντες ἐκτὸς ὅραν εἶναι. Dionys. Hal. 308, 11. προεῖπον αὐθημερόν ἐκ τοῦ χάρακος ἀπιειναι. Eurip. Phoen. 1695. τῆς δ' ὅραν ἔξω χθόνος & Med. 274. ἐπον (jubeo) γῆς ἔξω περάν πρὶν ἄν σε γαίας τερμόνον ἔξω βάλω. Compare also Eurip. Med. 353—5.

51. ἐκτιναξάμενοι τὸν κοινοτόν τῶν ποιῶν αὐτῶν ἐ. α. By this symbolical action they meant to show that they intended to hold no further converse with those men. See the note on Matt. 10, 14. On Iconium consult Strabo and other writers, as also Wetstein, or Schl. Lex.

52. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπηρεῶσιν χαρᾶς τ. Π. ἀ. i.e. truth, " quae (scil. feminæ) sunt blandiloquœ, pertinaces, illices, zelosec profide suâ, vel perfidiâ, in pietatem vel pietatis speciem pronœ." And Wetstein, as if to confirm and illustrate this notable observation, cites the following curious passage from Strabo 7, p. 456 λ. τὸ δὲ καὶ θεοσθείεις νομίζειν καὶ κατανοῆσαι τοὺς ἑρήμους γυναικῶν σφόδρα ἐναντίονται ταῖς κοιναῖς ὑπολήψεσιν ἀπαντεῖς γάρ τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας ἀρχηγός οἰονται τὰς γυναικας' αὐταὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας προκαλοῦνται πρὸς τὸ πλέον θεράπειας τῶν θεών, καὶ ἑργαῖς, καὶ προνοιασμοῖς. One might have expected that ministers of the religion of Jesus would have been more observant of its charitable precepts, and more mindful of the example of its benevolent founder.
the Christian converts at Antioch were filled with joy at the happy success of the religion, and cheered with the spiritual consolations which it supplies. The recent foreign Theologians, as usual, explain away the force of the term πνεῦματος ἁγίου, as, on the contrary, the earlier ones speculate too much on its nature and efficacy. See Dr. Benson and Bp. Barrington. It may be, perhaps, safest to steer a middle course, and explain it of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, for sanctification, not, as it should seem, for working miracles, since hands had not yet been laid upon them.* Thus the sense appears to be this: "they were filled with the delights and consolations that religion can alone supply, and also with the graces of the Spirit and its effects, leading a life suitable to their holy profession.

CHAP. XIV:

The Apostles now return through Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Pamphylia, to Antioch.

1. κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐσελθεῖν αὐτῶς. On the sense of κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ the Commentators are not quite agreed. Camerarius, Schmidt, Piscator, Böerner, and Wolf, subaud ἔδωσ, and render according to custom, or in like manner. But this seems as unauthorized an interpretation as that of Chrysostom, πάλιν, or that of Beza, itidem. The best founded one seems to be that of the Vulg., Erasm., De Dieu, Wets., Kypke, Rosenm., Heinrichs, and Kuin., "together," like εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ. Indeed, both the phrases are indifferently used by the Sept. to express the Heb. וְ. (See Trommius.) Hesychius explains it ὤμοι; and many examples of this signification are produced by Kypke, from Plutarch, Pausanias, Strabo, Longinus, Josephus, and Diodor. Siculus.

* I entirely agree with that consummate Theologian, the Bishop of Bristol, who, in his learned and judicious illustrations of early Ecclesiastical History, lays down this as a criterion for deciding on the presence, or absence of the power of working miracles.
1. καὶ λαλῆσαι ὀστε. The ὀστε here denotes the effect: q. d. "spoke with such effect, that," &c.

1. Τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Some Commentators (as Doddridge) would here take the Ἑλλήνως to denote heathens. But though that signification sometimes has place, yet (as is objected by Whitby, Kuinoel, and others) it is unsuitable in this passage, since we cannot suppose there were Gentiles in a Jewish Synagogue. They therefore, with Beza, Hammond, Calovius, and others, take the Ἑλλήνως to be here proselytes of the gate. See the note on 13, 42. And this latter opinion seems to be the best founded.

2. ἐκάκωσαν. Some critics here stumble at this word in the sense commonly ascribed to it, namely, "made them evil affected." They object to the construction κακοῦν τινὰ κατὰ τινὸς, and Markland conjectures εἴκακωσαν. But for this alteration there is neither authority nor necessity. The scruples raised by learned men have arisen from not perceiving the true construction, which (as Kypke and Krebs observe) is this: ἐπέγειραν τὸς ψυχάς τῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, καὶ ἐκάκωσαν αὐτᾶς. A construction frequent in the Greek and Latin Classical writers. See Abresch. Not. on N. T.

From not knowing the above signification of κακῶν, namely, exacerbare, embitter, Beza thinks it an ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. But it occurs not unfrequently in the best authors, from whom the following examples are adduced by Krebs. Joseph. Ant. 10, 1, 2. κακοῦν ἐδώματο καὶ τῆς εὐνοίας ἢς ἐγένετο εἰς τοὺς παιδας ἀδαιρεῖν. & 7, 3. ἐκακοῦτο τὸ δὲ ταῖς ὑποψίαις, καὶ γείραν ἀεὶ γενόμενον ἄπασιν κατὰ πάνταν ἐπίστευεν. The word has sometimes this signification in Thucydides, who uses κακῶς for κακόνως. Wolf refers to Starckii Not. p. 120 and compares a similar use of the German plagen. So our plague, tease.

2. ἐπέγειραν, stirred up, irritated. This term, like our instigate, is generally used in a bad sense, to denote exciting any one to anger, revenge, quar
rels, wars, persecutions, &c. both in the Sept. and in the Classical authors. See Schl. Lex.

8. ἱκανὸν μὲν οὖν χάριν, &c. Μὲν οὖν is commonly rendered therefore; by some, for indeed. (See Dodd.) But the reasonings by which these versions are justified seem too subtle. Perhaps the particle may have little more meaning than the Latin autem, vero; or it may be rendered, with Kuinoel and others, however. By ἱκανὸν is meant satis longum; as we say, a good long time.

8. παρθενιαζόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ Κυρίου. This is usually rendered, "being bold in the profession of Jesus," i.e. in his doctrine, or (as Dodd.) in his cause. Others, as Grotius, Piscat., Mor., and Kuin., explain, "in reliance upon;" since ἐκ often signifies per, propter, by; noting the efficient and moving cause. (See Schl. Lex.) And this latter interpretation seems the preferable one. Rosenmuller and Heinrichs join both.

By Κύριος most Commentators here understand Christ. But Kuinoel thinks (as also did Grot.) that it must mean God; since there is added ὅ λογος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ; and Christianity (say they) is called χάρις Θεοῦ, but not χάρις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. And Kuinoel refers to Heb. 2, 4. συνεταμπιρωτεύεται τῷ Θεῷ σημείως, &c.

This reasoning, however, seems not very convincing: nor are the passages compared quite similar. Besides Christ had often promised his assistance to the disciples, in enabling them to work miracles. See Mark 16, 17.

3. μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγῳ, confirming, proving. So Plotin. Enn. 3, 6, 8. (cited by Wets.) μαρτυροῦντας τοῦτο τῷ λόγῳ ἵπτειν τε καὶ τελεῖν. And so Hebr. 2, 4. συνεταμπιρωτείει. The σημεία καὶ τέρατα, which are often joined in Scripture, and by Philo, 617, signify miracles of every kind.

4. ἠχεθεὶ γὰρ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς τύλεως. The verb σχισθεῖ properly signifies to be split, rend, &c.; and
is also frequently used to denote dissent in opinion, though generally with some word answering to opinion expressed, for the sake of perspicuity. The following examples are adduced by Wetstein. Herodot. 4, 119. ἐκαθόρισεν οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔθεων καὶ σφαιραὶ ἐγχρισθήσαν αἱ γνώμαις. Αἰν. 2, 29. Scinditar incertum studia in contraria vulgus. Xenophon. Symp. ἐνταῦθα μέντοι ἐγκριθήσαν καὶ οἱ μὲν εἰπον. Galen. in Hippocr. de Prædict. 8. οἱ δ' ὀν υπόλεπτων ἢ κατάλεπτων γεγραμμένες ἐγχριθήσαν ταῖς γνώμαις. Lucian, Asino, 54. τὸ δεῖτρον εἰς δύο γνώμαις ἐγχριθεῖτο. And he refers to Acts 23, 7. Joh. 7, 43. 10, 19.

But one yet more apposite is produced by Munthe, namely, Diodor. Sic. 294 b. σχισμένων τῶν Σικελιώτων πόλεων.

The phrase στὶς τοις εἰσιν, denoting to be a partisan, is frequent both in the Scriptures and in the Classical writers. Joseph. Ant. 530, 27. elegantly says, διετή τὸ πλῆθος καὶ οἱ μὲν πλείως, &c.

5, 6. αἰς δὲ ἐγένετο αρμὴ τῶν—Ἰουδαίων. 'Ορμαϊ' is by Grotius rendered tumult. But this signification is not agreeable to the context. It is by the Vulgate, Beza, Camerar. Wolf, Wets., Loesner, and Kuinoel, taken to mean impetus animi: in illustration of which sense Wetstein cites Herodian 2, 5, 8 & 7, 8, 8., and Munthe Diodor. Sic. 130 d. ὀρμής αὐτῶν ἐπιστικάσθησα, &c. and 652 b. ἀμετάβλητον αὐτῶν τὴν ὀρμήν ἐφαρμ. James 3, 4. δὲν ἀν ἡ ὀρμή τοῦ εὐθύγραμμος, &c. Hesych. ὀρμή: βουλή, ἐπιθυμία. And they might have added Thucyd. 4, 4. τοῖς στρατιώταις ὀρμῇ ἐπέκεισε ἐκτείχοσα τὸ χαρόν on which passage I shall have occasion to cite many examples.

6. συνίδοντες κατέφυγον, i. e. "coming to the knowledge of the design." A sense of συνίδειν not unfrequent in the later Greek writers. On Lystra and Derbe see the Geographical writers, as also Wets. and Horne's Introduction.

8, seqq. τις—ἐκάθητο, εἰδεβατ, sat. And so ἐκάθητο is rendered by all the Commentators, except Kuinoel, who would here apply that sense of καθημαι de-
rived from the Hebr. אֹ֔זְרַי, by which it simply denotes to dwell, inhabit, &c., and he cites several examples, besides many others which may be seen in Schl. Lex. In those, however, we are compelled to understand dwell; but not so here. Nay, as the subject of the words is a cripple who had never stood or walked, the term seems to have been adopted, to graphically represent his miserable condition.

For περιπετατικεῖ Griesbach has edited (from several MSS.) περιπετατικεῖ, which reading is approved by Valcknaer and Kuinoel; since (as the former observes, in his Schol.) although in pluperfects another ε is usually prefixed before the augment and the re-duplicated consonant of the word, (as in ἐπετοικεῖν, ἐπετύφειν,) yet this new augment was little used by the best writers, especially the Attic ones. And Valcknaer refers to Junger. on Long. Past. 215. Casaubon. on Athen. 2, 15. and other works. But this reasoning would be more convincing, if the style of the book were Attic. As, however, we find in other passages of the New Testament vestiges of this omission of the augment (as in Mark 15, 7 & 10. 16, 9.), the reading in question may be the true one.

'Αδύνατος is rendered by Erasmus debilitis; which version is disapproved of by Beza, who prefers pedibus captus. It is, however, defended by Grotius, who quotes "debilem facito manu; debilem pede, coax;" as also by Priceus, who cites passages from Seneca and Apuleius.

Χωλὸς, a cripple.*

9. oδής ἦκαν τοῦ Παύλου λαλοῦντος, "he was hearing Paul preach, when (suddenly the Apostle) fixing his eyes on him, and perceiving that he felt firmly persuaded that he might be healed as well as others, of whom he had heard, &c." There is perhaps no need to resort to the interpretation of A. Lapide,

* The spelling of this word in Tindal and the old editions of the Bible points to its true derivation, namely, creep, which has been missed by the etymologists, who derive it from καμπτω, κράμπω, to cramp, crimple, which is most egregious trifling.
who understands ἴδων of knowledge communicated by the Divine Spirit. It may very well be rendered perceiving; and the reason of it is, it should seem, (with Bede, Menochius, Beza, Kuinoel, and others,) to be ascribed to the effects of this faith on the countenance of the men: a faith produced, no doubt, both by the words of Paul and the miracles of which he had been told. Kuinoel, however, thinks that ἴδων may be interpreted, "understanding from conversation with the man;" and he accounts this one among the instances of that brachylogia só common in St. Luke. This mode, however, I cannot but consider as far too arbitrary; and as to what Kuinoel observes, that no good reason can be seen why Paul should not have tried the man's faith by conversation, I answer, that this is not applicable to so eminent an Apostle, who was frequently favoured with extraordinary and supernatural communications of the Holy Spirit.

Here Wetstein observes, that greater was the faith of this idolater than of the lame Jew, mentioned in 8, 3.

11. ἐπηραζε γὰρ τῇ φωνῇ αὐτῶν. That this phrase, (which occurs supra, 11, 14. and elsewhere,) is not a mere Hebraism, appears from the following Classical examples produced by Elsner: Demosth. 245. ἐνταῦθα ἐπαρεῖ τῇ φωνῇ καὶ περιφωνικηκὼς ἔσται. Philostr. 1. 5. Vit. Apoll. c. 93. ἀνωθησας δὲ ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον τότε, καὶ τῇ φωνῇ ἐπήρασ παρ᾽ ὀ εἰσέβει ἔφη.

11. Ἀυκαλαντί, "in the language of Lycaonia." The Greek language was indeed used in the regions of Asia; but the ancient vernacular tongue was retained, and especially spoken by the common people.* What precise language the Lycaonian was, cannot be determined. Grotius (on the authority of the antients) supposes it to have been the same as the Cappadocian. Jablonski, in a Dissert. de Lin-

* As is the Welsh in Wales, the Gaelic in Scotland, and the Erse in Ireland.
guã Lycaonicã, maintains that it was a dialect of the Greek, but much assimilated to the Assyrian, and indeed derived from thence. Guhling, in a Dissert. de Lycaonicã a Pelasgis Graecis ortã, contends that that the Lycaonian tongue was of Greek origin, but by migration and coalition with the languages of other nations, by distance of time, by the carelessness of the speakers, and various other causes, had been changed from its original root, and become, in a manner, lost. (Kuin.) Vater refers to the Mithridates, t. 2. p. 413.

Here it is observed by Wetstein (from Chrysostom) that St. Luke mentions this circumstance, in order to show that Paul did not understand what was then spoken; since otherwise he would have anticipated and prevented their designs, and taught them better, nor would he have waited till the Priest brought the bulls for sacrifice. Hence Wetstein infers that St. Luke did not believe that the gift of speaking or interpreting in foreign languages was perpetually in the power of the Apostles. But there seems something precarious in the observation, and especially in the inference deduced from it.

11. κατέβησαν. This was the term used to denote the coming of the gods to the earth by all writers sacred and profane; from whom numerous examples are adduced by Elsner, by which it appears to have been their opinion, that the gods did sometimes assume the likeness of men, and come down to the earth, for the purpose of acquainting themselves with the state of affairs on earth, and sometimes of conferring on men peculiar benefits. *

12. ἐκάλουν τε τὸν μὲν Βαρνάβαν, Διατρήσας τὸν δὲ Παύλου, Ἐρμήν. It has been enquired why the Lystrans

suspected that Paul and Barnabas were Mercury and Jupiter? To this it may be answered, 1st. that the antients supposed the gods especially visited those cities which were sacred to them. Now from ver. 13. it appears that Jupiter was worshipped among these people: and that Mercury too was, there is no reason to doubt, considering how general his worship would be in so commercial a tract of Maritime Asia.2 (Gughling de Paulo Mercurio, p. 9. and Walch Spic. Antiq. Lystr. p. 9.) 2. It appears from mythological history that Jupiter was thought to generally descend on earth accompanied by Mercury. See Plaut. Amphitr. 1, 1. 1. Ovid. Met. 8, 626. & Fast. 5, 493. 3. It was a very common story, and, no doubt, familiar to the Lystrians, that Mercury formerly traversed the neighboring country of Phrygia, and was received by Philemon and Baucis.† See Ovid. Met. 8, 611. Gelpe in Symbol. ad Interp. Act. 14, 12.

But it has been further enquired why they took Barnabas for Jupiter and Paul for Mercury. Chrysostom observes (and after him Mr. Fleming, Chrestol. vol. 2. p. 226.) that the heathens represented Jupiter as an old but vigorous man, of a noble and majestic aspect, and large robust make, which therefore he supposes might be the form of Barnabas; whereas Mercury appeared young, little, and nimble, as Paul might probably do, since he was yet in his youth. A more probable reason, however, and indeed the true one, (as given by St. Luke,) is, that Paul was so named, because he was the leading speaker.

* How then was it that the priest of Mercury did not also appear? This would induce one rather to suppose that there was no temple to Mercury at Lystra. Probably the worship of that god was confined to the sea-coast; whereas Lystra was in the interior and mountainous country.

† Mr. Harrington has yet more appositely, observed (in his Works. p. 380.) that this persuasion might gain the more easily on the minds of the Lycanians, on account of the well-known fable of Jupiter and Mercury, who were said to have descended from heaven in human shape, and to have been entertained by Lycan, from whom the Lycanians received their name.
Now it is well known that Mercury was the god of eloquence. So Hor. Carm. 1, 10, 1. Mercuri fæcundus nepos Atlantis Qui feros cultus hominum recentum Voce formasti catus. Ovid. Fast. 5, 688. Macrob. Sat. 8, 8. Hence he is called by Jamblich. de Myst. θεός δι τῶν λόγων ἠγεμόν a passage exactly the counterpart to the present one, which we may render: "for he had led the discourse."

13. ἱερεῦς. By ἱερεὺς is undoubtedly to be understood the High Priest. So ἱερεὺς for ἀρχιἱερεὺς in 5, 24. and elsewhere. That even among the Gentiles the High Priest was sometimes called ἱερεὺς has been shown by Van Dalen. Diss. Ant. et Marm. illustr. p. 3821. (Kuin.) The student will bear in mind that in this case the article is indispensable.

13. τοῦ Δίας τοῦ ὕπτως πρὸ τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν. It has been rightly observed by Heinrichs and Kuin. that we are to understand by τοῦ Δίας τοῦ ὕπτως, &c. the Jupiter πρόπολος, who was worshipped before the city, as being the πολιοχος, tutelary god, guardian, and preserver.* That the statues of the tutelary gods were formerly placed in the suburbs and before the gate, has been proved by Spanheim on Callim. Hym. on Pall. p. 591., Elsner and Wolf on this passage, and by Potter and Meursius on Lycoph. 356. It was usual, too, for temples of the gods to be built in suburbs fronting the city. See Tzetz. on Lyc. 356. and Elsner in loc. Of a statue of Jupiter placed before the city gate we cannot understand the expression, since, as Valcknaer observes) the statues of the gods, thus placed sub Dio, were not surrounded with a peribolus, and certainly had not priests attached to them. We are therefore to understand, a temple of Jupiter, built near to the city, and must subaud

* It is observed by Walch, p. 22. that Luke subjoins this, since in one city one and the same god often had, according to the different epithets designating singular benefits, different sacrifices and priests; so that (continues he) the words Ζεὺς δι πρὸ τῆς πόλεως may not obscurely show that Jupiter was worshipped by the Lytrans under different names, and that his priests were therefore of different sorts.
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Ibid., as in Arist. Plut. 358. ηκεῖς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ & 653. Herodot. 1, 182. Callim. Epig. 61. and Arist. Plut. 411. There is the same ellipsis, too, in the Latin; as Hor. Serm. 1, 9, 35. Ventum erat ad Vestae, scil. ædes. (Kuin.) Among the passages cited by Wetstein the most important isÆschyl. Sept. contra Theb. 147. (150, Blomf.) εἰς μάχαιρι τε μάκαρ ἰάνασο' ὕγκα πρὸ τὸ λεως ἐπτάυλον ἕως ἐπιρρόου.

13. ταύρων καὶ στέμματα εἰς τ. π. εἰς "bulls were brought, one for Barnabas, as Jupiter, the other for Paul, as Mercury." That oxen were employed in sacrifices to Mercury, we learn from Pers. Sat. 2, 44. Of the sacrifice of oxen to Jupiter the Classical writers are full of examples.

In ταύρων καὶ στέμματα some think there is an hendiadis for ταύρων ἐστεμμένως; as in Virg. Georg. 2, 192. Pateris libamus et auro. See other examples in Glass. Phil. Sacr. 18 seq. and in Munthe. We are told by Lycoiph. Cass. 327. that the bulls were στεφάνοι. An immense number of citations are here brought forward by Wetstein and Munthe, which might, however, have been spared on so trite a subject. Some Commentators, indeed, as Grot. will admit no hendiadis in the words, but understand the crowns as brought to put on the heads of Paul and Barnabas. Valcknaer, too, acknowledges that the passage may be so taken; and he aptly confirms this interpretation by appealing to a passage of the Apocryphal Epistle of Jeremiah, whose style shows it to be the work of an Alexandrian Jew, § 9. κατασκευάζοις στεφάνους εἰς κεφάλας τῶν Θεῶν αὐτῶν. Kuinoel, however, observes, that we cannot prove that antient custom to have had place in the present instance.

* Bp. Pearce, however, by which was, understands, "whose statue was," and observes, that the heathens supposed the deity to be present in his image or statue; and therefore used themselves to say that of the statue which was proper to the Deity only. In illustration of this he cites Ovid. in Trist. 2, 1, 296. Juncta viro altiori stat Venus ante fores. & Fast. 1, 201, Jupiter angustâ stabat vix totus in æde.
The former interpretation is undoubtedly the best founded.

13. ἐν τοῖς πύλαις. On the meaning of these words Commentators are not quite agreed. Some, as De Dieu, explain, "before the gate of the city;" and refer to 1 Kings 17, 10. Others, "before the portals of the temple." But to this it may be objected, that Paul and Barnabas were not in the temple; and as the people thought these strangers were the gods themselves, there was no reason why they should not have offered sacrifice to them in person, rather than to their representative images in the temple. Besides, the temple contained no statues or altars to Mercury. Those Commentators seem most in the right, who (as A. Lapide, Beza, Grotius, Schmid, Doddridge, Rosenm., Heinr., and Kuin.) take the πύλαις to denote the gate of the house in which the Apostles had taken up their abode, and which most of the above Commentators think was in the city, since Paul is afterwards said to have been cast out of the city, and it does not follow that the events, which are recorded here, and at ver. 19. happened at the same time. Kuinoel, however, thinks it more probable that Paul taught publicly in the suburb, there healed the lame man, and from thence repaired with Barnabas to his lodging; and that thither the priests and the multitude went to pay them divine honours.

14. διαρρήσαντες τὰ χιτώνα, "rent their clothes:" an action expressive not only of grief, but detestation on hearing blasphemy. See Matt. 26, 65. Propriety of language, or at least the usage of the earlier and best authors, would indeed require διαρρήσαμεν: but the later Classical writers, and especially the Hellenistical and New Testament ones, used the active. See in Winer's Gr. Gr. a list of verbs, in which a similar change takes place. So Appian 1, 728, 60. καταρρήσασ τῷ χιτωνισκόν, ἐκάστοις προσέπησαν. For εἰσεπήσαν Griesbach has, on the authority of several MSS., and at the suggestion of many eminent
scholars, edited έγερθηκας, which seems the true reading; the two prepositions in comparison are interchanged.

15. καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑποικισθεὶς ἐγέμεν ὑμῖν. I cannot assent to Bp. Pearce and Mr. Weston, that this means, "we are mortals subject to death like as ye are." As to the Vulgate version, on which they found this mode of explanation, it is evidently interpolated (as was long ago seen by Dr. Mill), mortalis being a gloss on similis. The sense is simply this: "we are men like yourselves:" but this is more energetically expressed by the use of the elegant term ὑποικισθεὶς, which, though it sometimes means little more than similis, yet here refers to all those wants and weaknesses, including mortality, "which flesh is heir to."

15. εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ὑμᾶς, exhorting you. And τῶν τῶν μεταίαν. Some Commentators, as Beza, Drusius, Grotius, and Wetstein, take μεταίαν in the masculine gender, and understand by it the statues of the gods, δεικτικῶς: in support of which interpretation they appeal to the following expression, Θεὸς ἡμῶν, which they consider as antithetical. Others, as Erasmus, Cassaubon, Camerar., Priceus, and the authors of our English Version, more properly take μεταίαν to refer to the oxen and garlands; for unless we suppose that the Apostles were in the temple of Jupiter, there could be no statues to point to. It is remarked by Kuinoel, that μεταίας is not only used of idols, but also of idolatry; as in 1 Kings 16, 2. See Joseph. Ant. 10, 4, 1 cited by Wet.

15. Θεὸς ἡμῶν, the living, i.e. the true God. See

* Wetstein here adduces numerous citations from the Greek Classical writers, from which we learn, that by the more antient authors it was used as synonymous with ὑποικισθείς or ὑπολειτοῦς. The most apposite are the following: Galen. ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἐν ὑπολειτού-θείς ἡμῖν. Eustath. on II. e. p. 36. who says, that the heathen gods in many things πάντως ἄνθρωποι ἄνθρωποι, were the like passions with men. Joseph. Macc. 12. εἰς ἡδονήν, ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωποι, τῶν ἄνθρωπων καὶ εἰς τῶν αὐτῶν γεγονότας στοιχείων γλειττομένως. Hom. Od. π. 187. Ovid. Met. 14, 130. Jac. 5, 17. 1 Sam. 7, 3.
the note on Matt. 16, 16. The passage is thus paraphrased by Wetstein: "The empire is not divided between Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto, as you suppose, but one God is all in all." "Thus (adds he) Paul preaches to the Jews Christ (Acts 3.); to the Gentiles God the Father."

16. ἔδασε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Markland and Pearce observe, that this signifies not all nations, which would not be true, but all the Gentiles.

16, 17. ἔδασε—πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ἰδοῖς αὐτῶν. 'Odos, like the Hebr. יָּמִי, denotes metaphorically course of life; but here, as the subject of the words is the worship of God, the sense must be: "God suffered them to follow their own imaginations respecting Divine worship, and had not given them a law, as he had done to the Jews."* Wetstein compares Ter. Andr. 1, 2, 18. Dum tempus ad eam rem tuliit, sivi animum ut expleret suum: Nunc hic dies aiam vitam adsert, alios mores postulat.

17. καὶ τοις ἐν εὐκ ἀμαρτυρον, &c. Καὶ τοι signifies, and yet. So Arrian. Ep. 3, 24. (cited by Elsner). Ἀμαρτυρον denotes that of which no testimony or witness is given, to indicate what it is. Wetstein compares Plut. 2, 975. οὗτε ἀμαρτύρων Ἰουδαῖον ἐπαγγελματίας ἐκ Λευκωνίων ἔχεις· and Thucyd. 2, 41. οὗ δὲ τοῖς ἀμαρτυρον τε γῇν δύναμιν παρασχόμενοι τοῖς τε νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτέλλονται. To which I add Dionys. Hal. 134, 22 & 41. Thucyd. 2, 41. οὐκ ἀμαρτυρόν γε δύναμιν παρασχόμενοι. Proc. Ξεδίφ. 37, 12. Theoph. Συμ. 135 D. τοῖς πάντα Θεω περισσοτέροις, καὶ ἀμαρτυροῦ ἐαυτῷ ἐν οὕτωι χρόνῳ καταλληλότεροι· where for ἐαυτῷ I would read ἐκεῖνοι.

* * * "By this (observes Whitby) it is not meant that God allowed of their manners, or left them without any means sufficient to convince of the error of their ways, and their idolatrrous worship; for this he had done so effectually, as to leave them without excuse, in that they did not worship him as God, neither were thankful for his benefits (Rom 1, 20, 21): but that He so far permitted this, as that He sent them no prophet to instruct them better; and gave them no positive revelation of his will, no written instructions of that way in which He would be worshipped, as He had done to the Jews."
17. οὕρανθεν ἡμῖν ἥτοις—καρδίας ἡμῶν. Grotius compares Aratus: ὤδατος ἐρχομένοιο Δίως παρέ, by which Dr. Bentley's conjecture is entirely refuted. The intent of these words is, "all which blessings are to be attributed to God, and not to your idols." See Ps. 145, 15, 16. Kuinoel here compares Cic. de Nat. D. 1, 2. Et fruges et reliquae, quæ terra parat, et tempestates, et temporum varietates sælique mutationes, quibus omnia, quæ terra gignit, maturata pubescunt, a diis immortalibus tribui generi humano. See other passages in Gataker ad Anton. 7, 70.

17. Ἀγαθοτοιοίν, conferring benefits upon.* So Mark 3, 4. and Luke 6, 9, 33, 35. This word answers to the Hebr. בְּרָעִים, and is often used by the Sept. in this sense. It is explained by Phavorinus, εἰρηγετῶν. For ἡμῖν and ἡμῶν Griesbach (with the approbation of Kuinoel) edits ὑμῖν and ὑμῶν, which reading may indeed be defended, but I prefer the common one, on the score of that prudence and delicacy which characterised the discourses of St. Paul, I find that the taste of Chrysostom failed not to discern this beauty.

The expression ὅτως δίδοις, we may observe, has great simplicity; and is adapted to Oriental notions. As the plural is used, it should seem to refer to the two periodical rains, the earlier, and the latter, called by Jam. 5, 7, πρωϊμον καὶ θυμον. And Philo S90. καὶ ρυμοὺς ὅτους. This word is rare in the plural: but it so occurs in Lucian 1, 104, τῷ ἐπὶ τέ ῥάγδακα καὶ βίαιοι. It must be observed that ὅτως is a much stronger expression than ὅμοιος. There is the same difference between these words as between our rain and shower. See Aristoph. de Mundo (cited by St. Thes.) Wetstein here quotes Taanith.

* Hence the appellative God, from good. There is a beautiful passage to this effect in Synes. 192 A. ἐπὶ δὲ οὐν ἑταῖς γέγονε τὰ κακά, τῆς θείας σοφίας καὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ἐργον ἐστιν, οὐ μόνον τὸ ἀγαθοτοιοίν γύος γάρ, ὡς εἴπειν, αὐτῇ Θεοῦ, ὡς τού πυρὸς τό θερμαλτείν, καὶ τοῦ φωτός τὸ φωτίζειν.

17. καίροις καρποφόρους, i. e. the seasons for yielding fruit, namely, spring, summer, and autumn. Præceps has here poured forth plenam manus the copious stores of his erudition, the most opposite of which are the following. Cyprian. Videmus, &c. Dei nutu tempore obsequi, elementa famulari, spirare ventos, fontes fluere, grandescere copias messium, fructus mitescere vinegarum, exuberare pomis arbusta, &c. Maxim. Tyr. Diss. 25. τὸν καρπὸν ταμίαιν, τὸν καρπὸν τροφέα, τὸν γενέθλιον, τὸν ἑτεριν, τὸν ἑτοράκιον. Lucret. Crescunt arbusta, et foetus in tempore findunt. Findar. 'Εν σχερώ δ᾽ ὅτι αὐτ καρποφόρος ἔσωμαι: Δένθρα πρῶτον ἐθελεί πάσας ἐτέων. Pericles Ἀθηναῖος ἐσόδες φέρειν πλούσιον ἱπτομ. 'Αλλ᾽ ἐν ἀμείβοντι. So also Achmet 201. (cited by Wets.) καρποφόρος ἂν ἡ καρπός, φθινότερον ἂν.

17. ἐργατικῶν τροφῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὸς καρδίας ἡμῶν. Here there is a sort of confusion of literal with figurative phraseology, which has led to some diversity of interpretation. Grotius, Triller, and Schleusner, explain εὐφροσύνης of wine, by a metonymy of cause for effect; and they take καρδία for the stomach; in which sense, I grant, the word is sometimes used; as in Thucyd. 2, 49. ἄρτος ἐστὶν καρδίαν ζητήσας (where I shall treat at large on this signification); yet (as I shall there show) since the signification was confined to the earlier, and especially the medical writers, and it is not likely to have found its way into the popular phraseology, it would here be exceedingly harsh; neither is it necessary. There is a sort of popular dilogia: q. d. “filling our stomachs with food, and our hearts with gladness.” Rosenmuller and Kuin. take καρδίας ἡμῶν to be a Hebraism for ἡμᾶς; since, as they observe, the בָּל has often the force of a pronoun; which is very true
as far as it goes: but here the force of the term is best understood by adverting to the dilogia above mentioned.

Wetstein here compares the following beautiful passages. Xenophon: ἐνεργείατο σάρχις εὐθυμίασι. Cic. N. D. 2, 53. Sed illa quanta benignitas naturae, quod tam multa ad vesceadum, tam variis, et tam iucunda gignit! neque ex uno tempore anni; ut semper et novitate delectemur et copia; perpetua quædam auteminis signatur, propter prævenuntiam autem, cum fruges diversis temporibus percipientur.

18. κατεργασάμεν, repressed. This verb is used in the transitive, as well as intransitive sense, both in the Scriptures and the Classical writers.

19. πείσαντες τῶν ὀχλῶν. See the note on 12, 20. Some Commentators here suppose an hysterologia; which, however, destroys the manifest sense of the passage. Indeed they would not have stumbled at these words, had they perceived that the sentence is couched in the popular, though somewhat inaccurate style, by which two members coalesce into one. The complete sense is this: “And having persuaded the multitude (to permit them to stone Paul), they stoned him, and, having stoned him, they,” &c. Now a Classical author would have written, καὶ πείσαντες τῶν ὀχλῶν, ἐλίθασαν τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ λήσαντες αὐτὸν, ἔσωσαν, &c. So 12, 20. καὶ πείσαντες Βλάστην, ἠτῶντο εἰρήνην.

Their vengeance, we may observe, was especially directed against Paul, because he was ὁ ἴγνωρον τοῦ λόγου (ver. 12.) From the construction and complexion of the sentence, there is no reason to suppose that the Lystrans participated in the stoning of Paul, otherwise than by giving the Jews their permission so to do; and thus there is less need, with some Commentators, to moralize on the levity of the ignobilis vulgus.

19. ναυσάρας αὐτῶν τεθνάσε. Wetstein here pours forth, ἔλευ ἄτρ θυλάκιοι, a heap of passages (chiefly
derived from Priscæus, namely, Athen. H. A. 5, 54. 6, 54. Curt. 8, 1, 24. Plin. 3, 14. Lucian Asin. 44. Diod. Sic. p. 536. Flor. 4, 11. Avien. Fab. 9. Apulejus, L. 9.) on the subject of persons pretending to be dead, in order to avoid death: whence we may easily collect his opinion, which indeed was also that of Priscæus. But there is no shadow of proof that Paul did so pretend. He was most probably in a deliquium, and senseless; and we are, I think, authorized to ascribe this to Divine interposition, since we cannot surely fail to recognise that in his sudden cure; so instantaneous, that after having been stoned almost to death, he walks home, and, what is still more wonderful, goes the next day to Derbe, when (as Doddridge observes), in the common course of things, he would scarcely have been able to turn himself in bed. I entirely agree with that judicious and pious Commentator, that we are authorized to here recognize a miracle. Nor can I help censuring the indiscreet, and, to say the least, irreverent remark of Wetstein (taken at second hand from Wolzogen, and which is quoted, with seeming approbation, by Whitby), that as Paul had consented to the stoning of Stephen, so now he expiates this old offence.

22. καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν βλέψεων, &c. These words seem to have nothing whereon to depend. Hence Beza would expunge καὶ. But I assent to Krebs and Kuinoël, that no change must be made, since there is here an idiom, not unusual in the best writers, by which we are to subaud λέγοντες, taken from the preceding παρακαλοῦνται. So Joseph. Ant. 5, 1, 18. (cited by Krebs.) τοῦ Θεοῦ δ’ ἔξωνειδίσαντος αὐτοῖς τὸν φόβον, καὶ εἰ πλέον τῆς παρ’ αὐτοῦ βοήθειας πολοῦσιν’ where at καὶ εἰ is to be supplied λέγοντες from ἔξωνει- δίσαντες. On this idiom, by which another verb of cognate notion is to be supplied from one that has preceded, Krebs refers us to the learned illustrations of Abresch on Λ. Eschyl. p. 30 seqq. See also Raphael Obss. in loc.

22. Διὰ πολλῶν βλέψεων. Morus, Heinrichs, and
Kuinoel, tell us that this sentiment [which often occurs; as in Matt. 10, 38. and Luke 9, 23. 14, 27. and elsewhere*] is not to be taken as a general position applicable to all in every age, but was said with a reference to those times, and those peculiar kinds of tribulations which the Disciples had to undergo, and of which they were thus apprised, that they might not be afterwards surprised, but be prepared to bear them with Christian fortitude. Still I must maintain that, to a certain degree, it applies to all ages; and the words of our Lord, "in the world ye shall have tribulation," will (I imagine) be found to hold universally true at all times. This caution (necessary indeed in those times) was often repeated by the Apostle. Thus, 1 Thess. 3, 4., "we told you that ye should suffer tribulation." See the judicious and beautiful remarks of Chrysostom.

23. ἡμιστηριασμένος δέ αὐτοῖς προσβατέρους. Some Theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza, and indeed the Presbyterian Commentators in general, keeping close to the primitive sense of ἡμιστηριασμένος, render, "ordained them elders by the votes of the people." But this interpretation has been rejected by the most eminent Greek scholars, and may be considered as long exploded; insomuch that Dr. Doddridge's arguments, added to those of Knatchbull, Raphael, and Harrington, have not produced much effect. Indeed, there is no point on which learned men, for the last century, have been more agreed than on this, that ἡμιστηριασμένος here simply denotes to appoint, constitute, ordain. And so the ancient Versions. In proof of this, I must be content to refer my readers to the very learned and able illustrations of Dr. Hammond, Selden de Synedr., Vitringa, Wolf, Pfaff, and Kuinoel, into which, from their length, my limits will not permit me to enter. Dr. Doddridge, indeed,

* It is also found in Vajickra R. (cited by Wets.) Dixit David ad Deum S. B. quænam est porta ad vitam futuri sæculi? ex mente R. Judan Deus Davidi respondit: si debes iti vitam ingredi, debes etiam afflictiones tolerare S. D.
acknowledges that the above signification is well founded, but he can see no evidence that it is so to be interpreted here. With the Doctor's inability to see it we have nothing to do, but far more learned men have long seen that the sense of χειραποτειν, for which the Presbyterians so stiffly contend, involves such a harshness as to be inadmissible. Indeed, we may throw the onus probandi on them, and require an example of χειραποτειν in the sense of "appoint any one elected by another." Even those Commentators do not question that imposition of hands accompanied this solemn ordination. It is not, however, to be denied that the Apostles would shew deference to the opinions and wishes of the people on such an occasion.

23. παρέθεντο αὐτῶς τῷ Κυρίῳ, "they commended them to the Lord." I can by no means agree with Kuinoel, who considers this as a mere valedictory formula. Certainly the passages to which he appeals will not prove it; and, at all events, the solemnity of the business connected with this expression must require the strongest sense that the words admit. The other passages classed by Schleusner, in his Lex., under this head (as 1 Tim. 1, 18. 1 Pet. 4, 19.), are not to the purpose, since there the sense is merely commit, recommend. Of this signification Kypke gives examples from Joseph. Ant. 16, 13. p. 570. παραθησομένος Ἀντίπατρον τῶν υἱῶν παρεληλείθει ᾿Καισαρι. & Bell, p. 769. ὁς σωτῆρα τοῦ πατρὸς παρεθέ- 

μην. Ibid. c. 17. p. 750. παρατίθεται τὴν γυναίκα.

25—26. Πέργη. See the note on 18, 13. On Ἀντάλεια see the Geographers.

26. Ὡθέν ἰσαν παραθησομένοι. With the Ὡθέν Commentators have been not a little perplexed. There seems an incongruity in rendering, as our translators have done, "from whence they had been recommended." Hemsterhusius and Valcknaer for ἰσαν conjecture ἰσαν, "from whence they had gone recommended. But of that form, in this sense, I know no example in the New Testament. I am therefore more inclined to agree with those who (as Rosenm., Schleus., and Kuinoel,) take Ὡθέν for ὣς; as
in Matt. 25, 24 & 26., and Exod. 30, 36. Indeed, I remember to have met with several passages in which are similar changes between adverbs of place, as ὅτως and ὅτι, especially in Thucydides. In most of these there appears to be an ellipsis, occasioned by two clauses coalescing into one. Thus the sense here seems to be as follows: “departing from whence, or from the place where they had,” &c.

Παραδεδομένος is evidently synonymous with the παρέδοντο just before, and signifies recommended.

27. ἀνήγγειλαν δια ἑποίησαν τοῦ Θεοῦ μετ’ αὐτῶν. Beza, Piscator, and Heinrichs, render μετ’ αὐτῶν “per ipso.” But this interpretation is not sufficiently authorized, and is little suitable to the context. I prefer, with the Arabic version, De Dieu, Grot., Rosenm., and Kuin., to take μετ’ αὐτῶν for αὐτοῖς, “what God had done to them.” It appears to be a popular idiom, and is exactly similar to one in our own language. De Dieu, Grot., and Kuin. account it a Hebraism, and refer to a similar use of יָעַשְׂרָנָה and יָעַשְׂרֶנָה in Gen. 26, 29., Deut. 10, 21., and Jud. 8, 35. And so Tob. νὸν κατὰ τὸ ἄριστον ἑποίησαν σου ποίησαν μετ’ ἐμαύ (for ἐμοί), and 8, 16. κατὰ τὸ τολμά ἔλεος σου ἑποίησας μεθ’ υμῶν. Judith 8; 26. The expression adverts to the benefits which God had vouchsafed to them, the deliverances He had sent them, and the success with which He had blessed their labours.

Θύρα (whence our door) signifies figuratively occasion, opportunity (see Palairct); as in 1 Cor. 16, 9. where see Elsner and Wetstein. So the Latin fores and janua; of which many examples are given in Facciolati’s Lexicon. In illustration of this Wets. has the following references. Infr. 15, 4. Luke 1, 72. 10, 37. Gen. 21, 23. 24, 12. 26, 19. Jud. 11, 27. 15, 3. Ruth 1, 8. 2 Sam. 2, 6. 3, 9.

CHAP. XV.

Now the Church of Jerusalem had, after the conversion of Cornelius, perceived that it was agreeable to the Divine will that Gen-
tiles not circumcised should be received into the Christian society (c. 11.) ; and from that time the doctrines of the Gospel were more widely propagated among the Gentiles (11, 20 seq.), especially by the aid of Paul and Barnabas (see 13, 1 seq. and 48, 14, 1, 27.), under the stipulation, that they should not impose upon them the necessity of circumcision. Now those who had become Christians from being Jews, whether natives or foreigners, without any prohibition on the part of the Apostles, constantly observed the ritual Law. (See the note on 21, 20.) But on Christians converted from Gentiles was not enjoined the obligation of conforming in all respects to the ceremonial Law, but only, as proselytes of the gate (see Lev. 17, 10, 11, & 13. compared with Exod. 34, 15. Lev. 18, 24 & 26. and consult Nitzsch de sensu Decreti Apost. Act. 15, 29.), to abstain from fornication, and all things which were by the Jews referred to idolatry, such as eating of meats offered to idols, the flesh of things strangled, and food compounded with blood; the use of which was always held in abhorrence by the Jews, since they thought it involved idolatry, or at least was an indication of a mind not far removed from it.

That it was not enjoined by the Apostles on the Gentile Christians, that they should accommodate themselves to all the institutes of the Ceremonial Law, and yet that they did not give them any such licence as could reasonably offend any religionist, is plain, both from the thing itself, the discourses of Peter and James, in the Council at Jerusalem (of which we read in this Chapter), and especially from the Epistles of St. Paul: for all these plainly show that the Apostle manfully asserted for the new Christians a freedom from the Mosaic Law, and studiously removed from them the necessity of obeying its precepts; so, however, as never to offer any violence to the Religion of the Jews; and he was particularly careful not to let the Jews have cause of offence at actions which seemed to involve idolatry, and the use of foods which the Mosaic precepts interdicted even to proselytes of the gate. See Noesselt de vera Vi et Ratione Decret. Hieros. Acts 15.

In the congregation, too, at Antioch, which was composed of Jews and Gentiles, the Jewish Christians observed the rites of the Mosaic Law; but (for the sake of avoiding offence and maintaining concord,) the Gentile Christians were forbidden the use of meats offered to idols, the flesh of suffocated animals, and food compounded of blood: and thus the Jewish Christians lived in perfect concord with companions who had before been idolaters. For in the observance of those precepts the Gentile Christians assumed, as it were, the character of Jewish proselytes; so that the Jewish Christians were bound by their own Law to account them as fellows and friends. 'See Levit. 19, 33 seq. But while Paul and Barnabas abode at Antioch, the peace of the Church there was troubled by certain Christians who had been formerly of the sect of the Pharisees. These, hurried away by an intemperate zeal for the Mosaic Law, and a blind partiality for their sect, falsely alleged the orders of the Apostles at Jerusalem, and maintained that Christians of the Gentiles were all of them to be circumcised, and bound to the ob-
servance of the Mosaic Law, if they would hope to be made part-
takers of the benefits to be conferred by the Messiah on his faith-
ful followers. An heresy which often afterwards broke out anew.
Now since these sturdy defenders of complete Judaism drew over
many to their party, much schism was thereby generated. And
when it could not be suppressed by the authority of Paul and Bar-
nabas, it was determined, by the common sentiment of both parties,
that the controversy should be referred, for decision, to the Apos-
tles and Presbyters dwelling at Jerusalem. On the arrival, there-
fore, of Paul and Barnabas at Jerusalem, together with some other:
Antiochian Christians, who had accompanied them, the Apostles
and Presbyters met together to decide this controversy. There
then arose no little discussion (see ver. 7). Those who were zealous
for the observance of the Mosaic Law, and averse to any association
with Gentiles, stiffly maintained their opinion: and among other
things, for the purpose of exciting a greater odium against a union
with persons unincircumcised, and rendering no obedience to the
Mosaic Law, they urged that there were among the Gentile Chris-
tians persons guilty of gross immorality, and who ate of meats
offered to idols, the flesh of animals suffocated, and food com-
pounded of blood; and who did not hesitate to accept invitations
to the sacrificial feasts of Gentiles, and eat flesh offered to idols,
when exposed to sale in the market: (so that the reason is obvious
why James particularized these things as what was to be avoided,
namely, because they had been prohibited by the decree at Jerusa-
lem). That there were among the Christians those who abused
the liberty accorded to them by the Apostles, and thus offended
every religious person, we learn from 1 Cor. 6, 8, 1, seqq. and 2
Petr. 2, 19. To those rigid defenders of the Mosaic Law it was
doubtless replied, that Christians were, and would still continue,
on every synod, to be admonished to abstain from all incohabitity,
and the use of the above-mentioned kinds of food; and that the
impiety of some could not justify the exclusion of the Gentiles in
general, nor on that account ought the entire observance of the
Ritual Law to be enjoined on Christians. Hence also we may
easily perceive why Peter, in his discourse, has made no mention of
that impiety. Peter (we find), after there had been long disputa-
tion, rose, and gave it as his opinion that the Gentile Christians
ought not to be burdened with the injunctions of the Mosaic Law,
since it was manifest, from the case of Cornelius, that God had des-
tined Christian salvation and felicity even to Gentiles unincircumcised,
and indeed made no distinction between Jews and Gentiles. Now
Peter's discourse, which was listened to in deep silence by the whole
multitude, gave to Paul and Barnabas an occasion of diluting on
the miracles which God had exhibited by their means among the
Gentiles, whom however they had burdened neither with obliga-
tions to circumcision, nor observance of the Mosaic Law. Then
rose James, and gave his opinion agreeably to that of Peter, Paul,
and Barnabas, that the Gentiles converts were not to be molested.
It seemed to him, however, not superfluous or unnecessary to
solemnly, and in the face of the whole assembled Church, admonish
these Christians to henceforth abstain from eating of the residue of meat offered up to idols, or the flesh of suffocated animals, or any food compounded of blood, and to abstain from all illicit venereal connection. To this opinion all present assented, and an Epistle worded to that effect, and approved by all, was returned by the hands of Paul and Barnabas to the Christians at Antioch. (See ver. 30 seq.)

"The decree itself (observes Nitzsch), which was conceived in the shortest form, named only the meats from which they were to abstain. Why they were to be avoided, and how far, could better be taught in each congregation, as time, place, and occasion should admit or require such explanation. Thus Paul to the Romans 14. and 1 Cor. 8, 10. gives them to understand that the use of all meats was in itself free. But since he knew that to many this liberty as yet seemed licentious and illicit, and as he wished no one to act against the dictates, however mistaken, of his own conscience, he orders all to abstain from those meats by the use of which others might be offended, or be impelled to act against their private persuasions. For there is no discrepancy whatever between the admonitions of St. Paul and the decree itself, except that the former more exactly defines this duty of abstinence, by indicating both its causes and limits; and shew that by this duty no portion of Christian liberty was abridged; by this means counteracting the abuse of that decree, and providing against its being thought that such abstinence was in itself necessary."

From all that has been thus far argued on the nature, occasion, and intent of this Apostolical decree, it appears quite evident that the precept respecting abstinence from the above articles was not given with the intent that it should be of perpetual obligation (as many have imagined), but is to be numbered with precepts of temporary obligation. See Noesselt ubi supra, and Michaelis in loc. (Kuin.) and Nitzsch de Decreto Apost.

1. ἔδιδασκον τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. These persons are supposed, by Lightfoot and Grotius, to have been Jews of Antioch, Christians indeed, but zealous for the Mosaic Law, and who had formerly been Pharisees. Epiphanius and Beza think they were Cerinthus and his partizans; which is, however, devoid of proof, and even of probability.

Kuinoel is of opinion that the brethren did not treat on this subject before Paul and Barnabas, who they foresaw would be hostile to their views, but with the Christians generally, whom if they could draw over, they thought that the Apostles would grant what it was not in their power to withhold. This may seem at variance with the words of the
next verse; but the truth seems to be, that in disseminating these opinions they avoided Paul and Barnabas, who, however, on hearing of these secret counsels, sought them out, in order to confute their reasonings by argument.


1. τῷ ἔθει Μωσέως, "i.e. "according to the institutions of Moses." These were, indeed, more ancient than the time of Moses, but they were commanded by him. Σωθήναι, i.e. "to be partakers of the felicity to be expected by the Messiah."

2. γενόμενης ὡν στάσεως καὶ συζήτησεως. Στάσις here, as often, denotes only disagreement of opinion; of which sense Munthe cites an example from Diodor. Sic. 678 Εὐμένης φοβούμενος μη Δία τὴν πρὸς αὐλής τῶν στάσεων, ἐγγείρωσεν κατασταθῶσιν "Ἀντιγόνῳ συνεβουλευσε. I add Ἀeschyl. Pers. 744. λόγος κρατεὶ σαφῆς! τῷ γ' οὐκ ἐν στάσις. Schol. in Eurip. Phoen. 412. edit. Valcknaer. Bp. Pearce observes that here στάσις, being predicated of Paul and Barnabas, ought not to be understood in the sense of tumult or sedition, as Luke elsewhere uses the word. "Even the word dissention (continues he), which the E. T. here uses, seems to be too strong a word to be used when applied to Paul's behaviour. I would therefore understand στάσις in its primary and most literal sense, a standing or standing up. He who is going to speak in any assembly commonly stands up before he begins. Thus Gamaliel stood up before he spoke to the council (C. 5, 34.), and Paul when he spoke to the Jews. (C. 13, 16.)

Συζήτησις, a disputaition.

2. ἐταξάων, they determined, viz. the brethren, the united members of the Church; not the Praeptiti Ecclesiæ, as Hammond supposes; still less those
Jerusalemite teachers, as is thought by Beza. In forming this determination (since, as Doddridge observes, it was important and necessary that these Jewish impositions should meet with timely and formal resistance,) they seem, as usual, to have been guided by the custom which had prevailed in the Jewish Church; namely, (to use the words of Gro- tius,) when any question arose amongst the Jews, which afforded occasion for schism, of appealing to the Sanhedrim to decide the controversy. For Jerusalem then was, what Rome afterwards became, the resort of learned persons, both residents and sojourners, who repaired thither from all quarters of the world; so that the Roman Synod (which was often consulted by the Bishops of other countries,) was nearly equivalent to a general council.

Beza well remarks that some others of the brethren were added, lest Paul and Barnabas should seem to make it their own cause, or to dissent from the Antiochian council.

3. οἱ μὲν οὖν, προεπιφέρετες, &c. Προεπιφέρετες is by some, as Menochius, Bois, and Schleusner, rendered præmissi, delegati, deputati. By most Commentators, however, as Grot., Camerarius, Schmid, Wolf, Rosenm., and Kuin., it is taken to denote "honorable deducti," "honourably set forward." It was, indeed, customary both among the Greeks and Romans,* as well as Jews, to show respect to guests by going part of the way forward with them. And this seems to have been always done to the Apostles; and, indeed, such previous arrangements were made as should secure them hospitable reception during their journey.

It is therefore an undue limitation of the sense to explain προεπιφέρετες præmissi, or (as Morus and Heinrichs do,) take it to denote providing all viatici or provisions for their journey; which, indeed, would

---

not be requisite, since all necessaries were, no doubt, provided by the hosts, who, at each stage, were prepared to receive their guests with hospitality; as may be inferred from what follows.

3. ἐποίον τοὺς ἁραν ἡγάλην πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, “they occasioned great joy to the brethren.” This is not a mere Hebraism or Hellenistic phrase; since it occurs in Aristot. (cited by Wets.) ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐποίησε μοι χαρὰν ὑπεμεγέθη.

4. ἀποδέχθησαν. This term denotes not merely receiving, but receiving with hospitality (as ὠδόκοικος in the Classical writers). So Luke 8, 44. ἀποδέχομαι αὐτῶν ὁ ἄγγελος and Acts 18, 27. 28, 30.

4. ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησε μετ’ αὐτῶν, “what God had done to them.” See the note on 14, 27.

5. ἐξανέστησαν δὲ τινες. There would seem to be a sort of harshness in these persons rising to answer to the query proposed before Paul and Barnabas had mentioned the difficulty; to solve which many Commentators, as Beza, A. Lapide, Franck, Bois, Pearce, Limborch, Munthe, Wakefield, and Heinrichs, subaud ἐλεγον, and render, “but (said they) certain have risen up.” And they remark that the transition from oblique to direct is not unusual; as in Luke 5, 14. Acts 1, 4. 17, 3. The far greater part, however, of the Commentators maintain (and, I think, more rightly) that the words are those of St. Luke. And certainly the ellipsis would here be very harsh, neither would ἐξανέστησαν be suitable; nor is that method agreeable to the context. Kunoel has well observed that it is frivolous to urge that these Pharisaical Christians would not answer to the query before it had been made, since St. Luke speaks with his accustomed brevity, and the words “told what God had done with them,” may denote a detail of what had happened to them in the exercise of their Apostolic office, especially of late; which would include a statement of this controversy. And he refers to a similar breviloquentia in 11, 8.

The words ἐξανέστησαν, &c. are not to be un-
derstood as if pronounced in the public assembly; but in some private conversations which preceded it, and in which certain Pharisaical Christians avowed the same sentiments with those zealots at Antioch. "This opinion (observes Kuin.) the Apostles did not choose to authoritatively suppress, but wisely called an assembly, that the reasons for and against that opinion might be carefully weighed, and determination made accordingly.

That this assembly, though it may be called a council in one sense, yet was very different from those held after the second century, which were composed of the Governors of the Church, and were properly called councils, has been shown at large by Mosheim Comm. de rebus Christianis ante Const. Maj. 169. seqq. and Heumann on ver. 2.

6. συνήχθησαν δὲ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ Πρεσβύτεροι ἰδεῖν π. τ. λ. τ. On the Πρεσβύτεροι there has been no little discussion among Commentators. Heumann takes them to be Bishops of different Churches in Judea. Whitby thinks they were of the number of the hundred and eight on whom the Holy Spirit fell. The point is not a little perplexed, and one on which it is easier to speculate than prove. To the elaborate annotations of the above eminent Commentators I can only refer my readers. Most recent ones understand Pastors of the different congregations at Jerusalem: which, indeed, has most probability.

It has been, moreover, supposed that the people were admitted: an opinion founded on the expression ἐσίγασυ δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος. But πλῆθος is a term of middle signification, and often denotes an assembly, without reference to number; as seems to be the case here. There is, indeed, reference made at ver. 22 & 23. to others besides the Apostles and Presbyters, who are, in the former verse, called ἡ ἑλλ. ἱκκλησία, and in the latter the ἄδελφοι. It is therefore unquestionable that some, and that not a few, were called in besides the Apostles and Pres-
byters. I assent to Mosheim that it is impossible all
the Christians should have been assembled on this
occasion, since no building large enough to accom-
modate so great a number could have been procured
by the society. And I entirely concur in the opi-
nion of that Commentator and Kuinoel, that the
persons in question were some select individuals
of the laity, of most knowledge, influence, and credit;
perhaps delegated from the whole body. Grotius
says these persons stood up, while the Apostles and
Elders sat; but on what authority the assertion rests
I cannot conceive. Vitringa de Syn. 598. seqq.
thinks we may compare this assembly, or council,
to that of the Jerusalem Sanhedrim. Many treatises
have been written, illustrating the nature of this
Synod, whose titles may be seen in Wolf's Curæ.

Τὸ ἀνάθεμα has here the sense of consider. There is an
exactly similar idiom in our own language.

7. πολλαὶ δὲ συγκύρισε ἡ γενομένη, "after there
had been much disputation or discussion:" not (as
we may fairly infer from circumstances) between the
Apostles themselves. Though, had that been the
case, it would not have furnished any cogent argu-
ment against their inspiration. For (as Doddridge
well observes,) there seems no reason to conclude
that their inspiration was always so instantaneous as
to supersede any deliberation in their own minds, or
any consultation with each other.

The dissent was doubtless between the Apostles
and those persons who had, before the meeting,
avowed their opinion of the necessity of circumcision.

7. ἀναστὰς Πέτρος. Kuinoel observes that Peter
first rose and delivered his opinion, since his own
cause was in question, inasmuch as he had first ad-
mittied Gentiles into the Christian congregation,
without previous circumcision. In this, however,
I cannot assent to him. It should rather seem that
Peter spoke first, from precedence being conceded to
him; as, indeed, it appears to have been on other
occasions; and certainly this was a mark of respect.
to which that Apostle was, on many accounts, fully entitled.

The plan of Peter's discourse is thus laid down by Schoettgen.

"It consists of two parts, the Antecedent and the Consequent. The Antecedent is: That the Gentiles, although not circumcised, and not observing the law of Moses, have yet received the Holy Spirit. (7, 8 & 9.) Consequent: therefore they are not now to be compelled to embrace it.

7. ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων, "a great while ago." E. V. Doddridge renders, "some considerable time since." Yet it had not been a good while, or considerable time since the period mentioned, namely, the commencement of their Apostolic mission, the lapse of the Holy Spirit, and the conversion of Cornelius. Neither, however, can I approve of the version of Piscator, Beza, and Casaubon, jampridem, by which all the meaning of the phrase evaporates. The Vulgate Translator renders word for word; and so leaves the difficulty as he found it. The Ἑθιοπικ a principio is preferable. Of all the Commentators, De Dieu and Grotius have been most successful in indicating the sense. Thus the former quotes the Heb. מַלְכֵי מִשְׁכָּב in Ps. 79, 8. where the Sept. render ἡμέρας ἀρχαίας, a few years before. And he might have cited Thucyd. 2, 15. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου, from ancient times.

7. ὃ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο. With the words ἐν ἡμῖν the Commentators have been not a little perplexed. The Vulgate Translator, as often, renders word for word, and thus decides nothing. Most of the ancient interpreters, including De Dieu, render "inter nos." And so the authors of our English Version and Doddridge. But this is so harsh as to be scarcely admissible. Others render ex nobis, and subaud εἰμε. But this is too arbitrary an ellipsis. The best founded interpretation seems to be that of Grotius, Vorstius, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, who regard the phrase as a Hebraism. For the Hebrews
(they observe) are accustomed to put the preposition ἐν, after the verb ἐξελέξατο, choose; as in Neh. 9, 7. ἐξελέξατο ἐν οἷοι — εἶναι βασιλέα — ἐξελέξατο ἐν Σολομώντι τῷ νιῷ μου καθίσαι (αὐτῶν) ἐκ τῆς βριόνος, &c.

8. καρδιογνώστης. See the note on 1, 24. Peter thus suggests that God can best determine who are worthy of being admitted into the Christian society, and who are unworthy. (Kuin.)

8. ἐμαρτύρσεν. The verb μαρτυρεῖν with a dative signifies to praise, literally to bear testimony in favour of. Schoettgen cites Rasche on Gen. 12, 1. who renders ἔγερσαι, vade tibi, for your utility and advantage.

8. δοῖς αὐτοῖς τῷ Πνεύμα τ. α. See the note on 11, 15 seqq. and 10, 44.

9. καὶ οὕδεν διέκρινε, "and made no distinction between us:" as far as may depend upon the benefit of gratuitous favour to be bestowed upon believers. (Rosenm.) Τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν, "turning them from errors, vices, and sins, so as not to be accounted impure, but to belong, equally with ourselves, to the people of God, and participate in the blessings of the Christian Religion." (Kuin.) Thus sanctifying them much more effectually than any external rite could have done. (Dodd.) With the expression καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν, Wetstein compares Lucret. 6, 23. Veriçius purgavit pectora dictis. Xenoph. Sympos. init. ἀνθράσιν ἐκκαθάρισεν τὴν ψυχήν, ὥσπερ ὑμῖν. Liban. Ο. 10. p. 272 Β. τῇ γὰρ ἐπιφύσει τοῦ κέρδους ὁ σοφιάτατος ἐκεῖνος ἐκάθευ τὰς ψυχὰς τῆς διελείας.

10. τῷ πετράζετε τῷ Θεῷ, ἐπιθείμας, &c. There is some difficulty involved in the expression tempt God, as connected with the following words put a yoke, &c., which has induced Bengel, Beza, and Pearce, to cancel Θεῶν, on the authority of a quotation in an Epistle of Jerome. But to this there are two serious
objections. 1. Jerome might quote from memory: and, at all events, such an authority cannot have any weight against the concurrent testimony of all the MSS. and Versions. 2. We do, indeed, obtain an easier reading; but, on that account, the more suspicious. The difficulty, such as there is, in πειράζετε may be removed by comparing this phrase with parallel ones in the New Testament. "Now they are said to tempt God (observes Rosenm.) who act as if they wished to see what God can and will do, who require new proofs of his divine will and power; when the most unexceptionable ones already exist. Kuinoel, too, remarks, that they are said to tempt God who call in question his attributes, and require further proofs of them; thus resisting God. And this sense is assigned to the word by Schleusner, in his Lex., who compares Ex. 17, 2, 7. Ps. 78, 46. Judith 8, 12. 1 Cor. 10, 9. καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν, rebelled. Heb. 3, 9. οἱ ἐπείρασαν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν. See Pott's Excursus on the Epistle of James.

10. ἐπιθέων. Here there is an ellipsis of ὅστε, by a sort of Hebraism. A Classical writer would have used ἐπιθέοντες. By λόγος is evidently meant the Mosaic Law, often represented as a heavy burden. See Gal. 3, 1. and Matt. 23, 4.

3. ὅν οὖν οἱ πατέρες, &c. i.e. "which neither we nor our forefathers could well bear." For (as Grot. observes) men are said non posse, not to be able, to do what is only difficult.

11. ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς — κακεῖνοι. These words have something awkward about them. The sense which appears on the face of the words is not agreeable to the context and scope of the passage. By κακεῖνοι many Commentators understand our forefathers; and supply by the Messiah. But this has been completely refuted by Whitby, Morus, and Rosenmuller.

12. ἐσίγαγε τῇ παν τῇ πλῆθος, "then the whole assembly acquiesced." Καὶ ἵκουν Βαρνάβα, &c. It must be observed that Paul and Barnabas recounted the miracles which God had worked by their means
among the Gentiles, for the purpose of confirming, by examples, what Peter had said at 7—9. For unless God had intended that the Gospel should be propagated among the nations, he would not have attested the Divine legation of Paul by miracles. (Rosenm.)

13. 14. See the introduction to this Chapter. ἀνέφροη, addressed (them), viz. the assembly. Ἀκούσατε μου. Kuinoel considers this as a form of requesting attention, usual to orators on commencing a speech. Heumann, however, explains it, “attend to my advice and counsel.” But the view of the subject adopted by Kuinoel seems the most agreeable to what follows.

Of James’s discourse the following analysis is given by Schoettgen.

"It consists of three parts: Exordium, Narration, Proposition. In the Exordium the speaker uses a form of expression calculated to conciliate the good will of his auditors. (ver. 18.) Then comes the Narration, together with a confirmation of it from the Prophets (ver. 16, 17.), and, in ver. 18, the reason. The Proposition is: The Gentiles are not to be compelled to Judaism, but are only to abstain from certain things (ver. 19.); since Judaism cannot be entirely abolished all at once.” (ver. 20.)

14. Συμεών. By Simon is meant, not Simon the Canaanite (as Wolf supposes), but Simon Peter. Συμεών (observes Kuin.) is the Greek for שמע in Gen. 29, 38.; but the Greeks generally used instead of it the similar Greek name Σιμών; as in Sir. 5, 1. Luke has followed the Hebrew inflexion; as has Peter, in 1 Ep. 1, 1. Luke 2, 25.

14. ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν, “hath vouchsafed to receive, hath kindly received.” Here we must subaud ἀποτε; for ἐπεσκέψατο τινι often signifies to visit any one for good, as for assistance, &c. See the note on Luke 1, 68.

14. Λατεί τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ, for his name, i.e. in order to bear his name, to be called his peculiar...
people. Kuinoel here recognizes a Hebraism, and refers to Dan. 9, 19. "forgive them, for the city and people are called by thy name."

15—17. καὶ τῶν αἰματευόμενων αἰ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, "and with this agree all the sayings of the Prophets." See Is. 2, 1. seqq. & 60. and Mich. 4, 1. The passage here quoted is from the Sept. of Amos: though it deviates from the Hebrew text. Compare the Hebr. and the Sept. which has followed another, but, as it seems, an inferior reading. The Prophet is there describing the felicity of the golden age, and declares, that the Jews will subdue their enemies and all nations, and that all will worship Jehovah. Now this James accommodates to the present purpose, and applies to the propagation of the Gospel among the Gentiles, and their reception into the Christian society. (Kuin.)

16. Μετὰ ταῦτα—Δαβὶδ. In the Hebr. we have הַרְשֵׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל: but ὁμοστρέφω has the force of an adverb; as often the verb ἐπέστη. So Mal. 1, 4. Σκηνή answers to the Hebr. הַרְשֵׁה, which properly signifies a hut, or booth, formed of boughs of trees and reeds, such as were in use among shepherds. But it also denotes any habitation (see Luke 16, 9.), and here signifies house, family. It is, too, a figurative expression for David's kingdom; as elsewhere Mount Sion, where was David's palace, is put for the Jewish state. (Kuinoel.)

17. κατεσκαμμένα, destroyed. Now κατασκάστω, which simply signifies to dig down, was frequently used of destroying buildings, cities, &c. To the examples adduced by Kypke and others I add Thucyd. 4, 109. 5, 63. 6, 7. See also Bp. Blomf. Gloss. on Αἰσχυλ. Θεόν. 46, who gives examples from the Dramatic writers. One particular seems to have been omitted by all critics, namely, that it sometimes only signifies to dismantle a fortress; ruin and destroy, as spoken of a city; or ravage, as spoken of a country. So Αἰλιαν. V. H. 12, 54. κατεσκαμμένη πατρίς.

.... *From the Ang. Sax. bogen, to bend. So that booth signifies a hut of bent twigs, or boughs.
Acts of the Apostles, chap. xv. 481

Ἀνορθῶν, to upraise, and ἀνοικοδομῶν, to rebuild, are equally frequent. Examples may be seen in Wets. and Kypke. Both words are used by Thucydides, and are here figurative expressions, denoting the restoration of the kingdom of David.

17. ὅπως ἀν ἐκκυτήσωσιν. "Ὅπως here, as often, denotes event. Ἐκκυτήσει τῶν Κύριων, by a Hebraism, signifies to worship the Lord. So ἱερατεύμαν σαρ in Ps. 24, 6. See Hebr. 11, 6. and Acts 17, 27. At τὰ ἔθνη repeat ἐκκυτήσωσιν με. (Kuin.)

17. Ἐφ' οὖς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς. Here we have a sentence on which are strongly marked the characteristic of Hebrew idiom. In ἐπ' αὐτούς we have a pleonasm; and in the rest of the phrase there is an hypallage for "who are called by my name, are called mine, and worship me." Of this idiom Schoettgen adds an example from Is. 4, 1. The student will also remark the construction, called the κατὰ τὸ σημαίνομεν, in ἔθνη and αὐτούς. Κατάκλισις is a word used only by the later Greek writers and the Alexandrian translators.

18. γυναικὶ ἐκ' αἰῶνος ἔστι τῷ Θεῷ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Commentators have found some difficulty in determining the purport of these words, which, taken in the sense they would seem to express, are so abrupt as to require many words to be supplied, in order to unite them in a chain of reasoning with the preceding. To remedy which harshness many methods have been devised. Some, as Thaleman and Schleusner, explain γυναικὶ dear, beloved, and urge that γυναῖκα has sometimes this sense. But any proof in a primitive will not be valid as respects its derivatives. Besides (as Kuin. remarks) the subject of the passage is not the creatures, but the illustrious works, of God in the propagation of religion. And he assigns to the words this sense: "God is immutable; He hath decreed from all eternity to found a kingdom, into which not only the Jews, but also the Gentiles, without the observance of the ritual law, shall be received. He hath chosen that not only the Jews,
but also the uncircumcised Gentiles, should have part with his peculiar people."*

To avoid, however, the difficulty which this sense involves, Griesbach and Heinrichs would cancel ἔστι,—ἀγων, on the authority of some MSS., and unite γενωτὰ ἡ ἀνάωσ with the preceding. But there is nothing corresponding to such words in the Hebrew, neither are they of any assistance to the sense; otherwise I should have been inclined to agree with these critics. As the matter now stands, we must either receive the whole version, or reject the whole verse, and this latter course is pursued by Matthiae and Kuinoel; which, however, I cannot think judicious. Suppose the words away, something is manifestly wanting; and yet something which would never have been supplied in such a manner by scribes. These words evidently supply an important link in the chain of reasoning; and the harshness with which the sentence is expressed, is nothing new in Hellenistic and Oriental phraseology, which delights in such laconic axiomatical dicta. Besides, the small number of MSS. in which the omission is found (about ten) is but as dust in the balance, when weighed against the MSS. and Versions which have them. But how (it may be asked) will you account for the

* In the same light, too, the passage is viewed by Dr. Doddridge, who maintains that the subject must be "the dispensations of God towards men." And he justly draws the following inference. "Now these dispensations the Almighty could not know without knowing the characters and actions of particular persons, on a correspondence to which the wisdom and goodness of those dispensations is founded. Thus, for instance, He must have known there would be Gentile idolaters, a thing as dependent on the freedom of the human mind as any thing that we can imagine, or He could not have known that He would call them into his church. This text, therefore, must remain an unanswerable proof, amongst a thousand more from the word of God, that He certainly foreknows future contingencies. (Doddr.)

Priceus here appositely citet Cic. de Divin. Neque enim ignorant dii que ab ipsis constituta et designata sunt. Senec. 4, 32. de Benef. Nota est illis operis sui series; omnium illis rerum per manus suas iturarum scientia in aperto semper est, nobis ex abdito subit: et que repentina putamus, illis prævisa veniunt ac familiaria.
omission? To this I answer, that omission, when it is found in only a few MSS., may usually be ascribed to accident; but here it may be attributed to misapprehension of the construction. Some early critics (I suspect) took the words γνωστὰ ἀν' ἄλωνος with the preceding; thus leaving the following words useless, which, therefore, were gradually omitted. And let it be remarked that only one antient MS. omits them: the others are modern, and in them there would be more scope for the progress of corruption. As to the variation of reading in the words, it is not such as to afford just reason for suspecting the clause. Chrysostom evidently read it, and saw the true construction; as is plain from his excellent remark upon the words: Εἰτα τὸ ἀξίοπιστον τοῦ λόγου, ἄτι οὐδὲν καὶ νὸν, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς ταῦτα προτετύπωτο—καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα πάλιν.

19. διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω. I cannot agree with some Commentators, (as Hammond,) who recoginize in κρίνω the determination of James as Bishop of Jerusalem. The best Interpreters, both antient and modern, agree that it has merely the force of the Latin censeo, "my opinion or sentiment* is." Grotius, too, remarks that ita censeo, "this is my opinion," was generally the concluding phrase with the Latin orators. See Cic. Philipp. 9d, 5th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, and 14th. This is also confirmed by Wetstein's citation from Thucyd. 4, 60. τότε ἐγὼ κρίνω, where the Schol. explains, ἐγὼ ἀποκάλει. And he might have added Thucyd. 1, 21. τὸν παρόντα ἄνελ μέγιστον κρινόντων, thinking the present was the greatest. In this sense, too, it often occurs in Xenophon. See Sturzii Lex. Xen.

The passage is thus paraphrased by Wetstein, who lays a stress upon ἀν' ἄλωνος: "God hath not recently taken and manifested this counsel; but he hath long ago determined it in himself, and signified it by the Prophets. It will, therefore, remain immutable; and whosoever contravenes it, resists God." See Sir. 23, 30. and Senec. de Benef. 4, 32.

* In justification of the E. V. sentence, it must be observed that the word had formerly the same meaning with sentiment.
19. μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς, &c. The word ἐνοχλέω literally signifies to give trouble to another, by throwing oneself, or any impediment in his way. Now the παρά has an intensive force, and has reference to the obstacle thrown by or near the person. Several examples of this word are given by Raphel, Kypke, and Wetstein. The only entirely opposite one is that of Arrian. Epict. 1, 9. μηδὲ παρενοχλήσης ἡμῶν τοῖς νέοις μηδὲ τοῖς γέροισιν. where the word is also, as in the present passage, used in a moral sense, as ἐνοχλέω in Heb. 12, 15. It may be observed, that this expression has the air of a popular phrase, to which there is one parallel in our own language. We may also compare that in Matt. 26, 10. τί κατούς παρέχετε τῇ γυναικί;

20. ἐπιστείλας αὐτοῖς, i. e. “to order them by letter.” For ἐπιστείλαω signifies not only to send to, but to send a letter to, to send mandates by letter; as here, and often in the best Greek writers, especially Thucydides, Xenophon, and the other historians.

20. Ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἁλιγμάτων. The word ἁλιγμός is entirely an Hellenistic one. It comes from ἁλίγη, which (from ἁλέω and ἁλίω, cognate with ἄλθαι, to roll, or wallow; see 2 Pet. 2, 22.) is found in the Sept. and signifies to pollute. It is used both of physical and moral defilement. See Dan. 1, 8. Sirach 40, 33. and Mal, 7, 2. Here it has the latter sense, and signifies the pollutions of idols, i. e. meat offered to idols, which forms the subject of the passages of Daniel and Malachi.

The Gentiles (it appears), after the sacrifices were concluded, and a portion of the consecrated victim had been assigned to the Priests, used to hold a sacrificial feast in honour of the god, either in the temple or at private houses, and then ate the residue of the flesh;* or even, from avarice, or poverty, salted and laid up the remnant for fu-

ture use, (see Theophr. Char. c. 10.) or even gave it to the butchers to sell in the shambles. (See Schoettg. Hor. Heb. on this passage.) This flesh, being offered to idols, the Jews were taught by their religion to hold in abomination; and they considered not only those who were present at such feasts, but also those who ate of the flesh which had been offered up, when exposed for sale in the shambles, as infected by the contagion of idolatry. Therefore James thought it necessary to enjoin the Christians to refuse all invitations to such feasts, and abstain from the use of all immolated meat, when publicly offered for sale; that no offence might be given to those Christians who had been Jews. (Kuin.)

20. τοῦ πνικτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ αἵματος.

The term πνικτὰ was applied to all animals put to death without effusion of blood; as wild animals, or birds caught in traps, or slain by the hands. See Leviticus 17, 13. Spencer de Leg. 719. 739. & 742. and Schoettgen on this passage. To idolatry, and things offered to idols, were also referred πνικτὰ and αἵμα: and thus abstinence from such food was enjoined on the Jews and proselytes. The drinking, or other use of blood obtained in the sacrifices of the antients, in treaties, covenants, and magical rites; they used to drink it, in order thus to bind themselves by a closer covenant to their gods. See Schoettg. Obs. 3, 10. Freinsh. on Flor. 4, 1. Elmenhorst on Minuc. Fel. c. 30. Spencer de Leg. 736. and Michaelis on the Mosaic Law, t. 4. § 206.

He who would abstain from eating of blood, was obliged also to abstain from eating of any animals suffocated, (i.e. slain without effusion of blood), which were also offered up to idols. See Spencer de Leg. 719.

The words καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ are omitted in some copies, as if superfluous. But in Lev. 17, 10. the Jewish proselytes are likewise forbidden both πνικτὸν and αἵμα; and it is here mentioned, in order that the Christians might understand they were prohibited not only from blood, but also from the food of suffocated animals, and even of those which had died of themselves [such being sold in the markets. See Schoettg. Edit.], since in them the blood cannot be separated from the flesh. See Wolf on this passage. There is moreover added in some MSS., “and what they would not have done to themselves, not to do unto others.” But the words are manifestly suppositious, and added by those who thought the precepts too few; forgetting that here the subject is not so much moral laws, as ritual observances. (Kuin,) “The Apostle (observes Grot.) thought it unnecessary for the pious among the Gentiles to be enjoined to do what they had sufficiently learnt, namely, that they were not to worship false gods, but the one true God, and to him pay the utmost reverence; that they were to abstain from murder, rapine, injuries, adulteries, and incests, and other offences forbidden even in the Gentile laws; that to every one was to be rendered whatever might be his due. But he rather admonished them concerning things which might admit of dispute, would be a stumbling-block to the Jews, and hinder the pious Gentiles from uniting with the pious Jews, so as to form one society.
Here, therefore, we are not to seek for a complete summary of the precepts of the Gospel, since no mention is made of the worship of one God in Christ, self-denial, crucifying the lusts, &c. &c. The sole purpose (I repeat) was to specify from what things, besides known sins, the uncircumcised Christians ought to abstain, in order that they might, without any offence to the Jews, coalesce with them, so as to form one Church. (Grot.)

Schoettgen observes that why Christians were forbidden to approach the Heathen feasts was, 1st. that the sacrifices were offered to idols, nay, to the Devil himself (as says St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 20). "Now every sacrifice (continues he) is not a simple ceremony, but a federal rite, by which the sacrificer, and the Being to whom he sacrifices, are (so to speak) closely united. (See Spencer de Leg. 575. and Jos. and Mede de Christianorum Sacrificis.) Maimonides, in More Nevochim 3, 46. tells us that the Zabians thought blood a demon, and suppose that he who ate it had communion, and might hold familiar intercourse with demons. The same opinion, too, was held by the Gentiles. See Jamblich. de Myst. Egypt. c. 27, 30 & 33.; as also R. Cudworth's Discourse concerning the true nature of the Lord's Supper, and Salmas. de Foen. Trapez. p. 444.

Thus much for the idololothya. Now for the blood. This the Gentiles used to eat with the flesh, or carefully draw it from the part where the incision was made, and convert it to nourishment, either by mixing it up with flour and oatmeal, and drinking it in a liquid state, or by mixing it with other food [as is done with us in the preparation of what are called black puddings. Edit.]. See Paul Egin. 1, 85. Of this kind of food mention is made in Hom. Od. 18, 25. Γαστέρας αι δ' αλκυων κεαρ' εν τυρι τας δ' ετι δόρσῳ Καρθήμεθα, κνίσος τε καλ αίματος ἐμπλήσατο. So Apicius de Arte Coq. 3, 8. Ex sanguine et jecinore et pulmonibus leporinis minutal [which seems little more than a receipt for making giblet pie. And that black-puddings were in use among the antients, we may infer from what Tertullian says, in his Apoleg. c. 19. where he tells us, botulos crucere distentos Christianis admodos suisse. Edit.]

Of the πνευτῶν, it must be observed, there were among the Gentiles two kinds. The first, a sort of dish, called by Athen. 1, 9. πνευτῶν χροα. And Hesychius explains it γένος ὑπθομέω. Of this we have a description in Reines Var. Lect. 1, 6. πνευτά vero χρεάτα, carnes suffocata, a modo parandi sic dicuntur, quando sci. ollae incluse in succo proprio coquantur, vaporibus qui in liberæ elixaturæ asæturæve exhalant simul retentis; nostrates appellat gedamset [which seems to correspond to our stew. Edit.] Now it is not likely that such a πνευτῶν was forbidden by the Apostles, since the animal might be properly butchered. That the antients did not reject the food of animals that had come to a death which produced no effusion of blood, is plain from Horace, Sat. 2, 4, 17. Si vespertinus subito te oppresserit hospes, Ne gallina malum respondent dura palato, Doctus eris vivam musto men-sare Falerno. Hoc teneram faciet. It was thought (it seems) to make the flesh tender. That fowls were usually killed by suffocation Bentley has shown from Cic. pro Mu-
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rena, c. 29.; and birds, hares, rabbits, and other game, were usually caught in snares. That these were eaten by many, we may infer from the prohibition in the Apostolical canons, § 63. κρέας ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς αἰτών (referring perhaps to Gen. 19, 4. where κρέας ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς signifies flesh in which any blood remains), ἡ θηράλωτον, ἡ θηραλω-


tον. And Spencer has shown that some Gentiles did not butcher, but suffocated the victims. So Strabo says of the Indians, οὐ σφάτ-


ρονοι τὰ λεπίδα, ἄλλα πνίγουσιν. (Schoettgen.)


Here Doddridge very judiciously remarks that, though neither things sacrificed to idols, nor the flesh of strangled animals, nor blood, have, or can have, any moral evil in them, which should make the eating of them absolutely and universally unlawful, (compare 1 Cor. 8, 1, 8 & 9. Rom. 14, 14. et seq. 1 Tim. 4, 4. Matt. 15, 11.) yet they were here forbidden to the Gentile converts, because the Jews had such an aversion to them, that they could not converse freely with any who used them. "This (continues he) is plainly the reason which James assigns in the very next words, ver. 21. and it is abundantly sufficient. This reason has now ceased, and the ob-


ligation to abstain from these things ceases with it. But were we in like circumstances again, Christian charity would surely require us to lay ourselves under the same restraints."


In this view of the subject Schoettigen coincides, observing that even then the decree was not general, but particular and for partic-


ular purposes; so that what did not bind all in those times cannot bind any in the present times, when the occasion of the decree, namely, the scandal, has ceased to exist. "Hence (he concludes) any Christians may, with a safe conscience, eat blood and the flesh of strangled animals. St. Paul, in his Epistles, never urges this decree, but often gives it as a general rule that they are not to be scrupulous in respect to meats; though, in a case involving scandal, he enjoins the caution of conceding to the consciences of weak brethren. Surely then, when the scandal ceases (as it does in our own times), we may safely enjoy the full liberty obtained for us by Christ."


20. καὶ τῆς πορνείας.


At this particular interdict most Commentators have stumbled exceedingly; being at a loss to account for the mention of illicit venereal connection among things of themselves free and con-


ceded, but from which the Gentiles were to abstain lest the Jewish Christians should be offended; though certainly whoredom was ne-


ver thought ἄδικορος. Nor do they see why, if greater offences are mentioned with smaller ones, this alone should be mentioned. "The unavoidable conclusion (observes Michaelis), that follows from the common translation of πορνεία is, that it is as great a crime to eat blood, things strangled, or meats offered to idols, as to commit forni-


ation: an opinion which many divines have maintained from this passage." To remove this difficulty many methods have been devised. Omitting the conjectures of Bentley, and the harsh interpretation of Heinius, some Commentators, as Selden and Schleus., understand it (as I myself formerly did) in a figurative sense, of spiritual whore-


dom, i. e. idolatry. Heringa takes it to mean matrimonial connection with idolaters. But this interpretation is liable to well-founded objec-
tions, which have been stated by Ernesti, Noesselt, and others. Michaelis, in his introd. 1, 190. maintains that it signifies meat sold in the publick shops or open market. That interpretation, however, has been completely overturned by Bp. Marsh and Nitzsch. Indeed to the above, and other solutions brought forward in Wolf and Deyling, Obs. 2, 288., it is rightly objected by Nitzsch and Noesselt, that in public edicts words are and ought to be employed in their usual sense. And if (as Kuinoel observes) the Apostles had used this word in any rare or recondite sense, how could the Gentle Christians, even if they had been acquainted with all the various significations of the word, have known whether the Apostles meant to express this rarer in the place of a more frequent signification. Now it is frivolous (continues Kuinoel) to urge that Paul and Barnabas were at hand to remove the obscurity, for why, in settling so important a controversy, and laying down a law, should the Apostles have so neglected perspicuity, that the very words themselves should require an interpreter. It is, therefore, most reasonable to suppose that the Apostles by this term meant illicit venereal connection.

Besides the above reasons, however, for retaining the common signification of ἁπάντα, there are others also. For the Gentiles accounted fornication, or whoredom, as a thing lawful and indifferent (so Terent. Adelph. 1, 2, 21 seq. Non est flagitium, nisi crede, adolescetulum scortari); and they committed it in the temples, &c. (See Spencer de Leg. 743. and Alberti on Rom. 13, 13.) Notorious are their Bacchanaia, Lupercalia, the rites of the Bona Dea, &c., in which the Gentiles indulged with impunity, to the honour of Bacchus, Bona Dea, &c. Thus, too, in Numb. 25, 1 seq. the Midianites are said to have invited the Jews to their sacrificial feasts, in order to allure them to fornication. And the author of the Book of Wisdom 14, 16., reckoning up the various crimes committed at the festivals and mysteries, makes mention of μυστικα, ἀστέρια, γάμες ἄραια. See also Syrach. 6, 42 seq. Moreover in 1 Pet. 4, 3, we have ἀστέρια, ἐνθυμία, ἅμαρι, joined with ἀθέμιως εἰλειφοντες. Since, therefore, fornication was so usual among the Gentiles, and was accounted lawful; and since such opinions and actions increased the hatred and abomination in which the Jews held them, and were a great impediment to their union with Jews, it was very necessary, on this peculiar and solemn occasion, to enjoin the observance of chastity: And ἁπάντα is meant to include illicit venereal connection of every kind.

Now since from what has been said it is clear that this recommendation of chastity was highly necessary, the scruple may also easily be removed, which might arise from the placing of this virtue among the media, ἀδιάφορα, and uniting a duty of common and perpetual obligation with local or temporary ones: for the abstaining from ἱδολοθυτικα, &c. was not a thing ἀδιάφορο, but a most holy and necessary duty, which would be incumbent on the Gentle Christians throughout their whole life. What, therefore, should hinder this local and temporary duty from being united with such as are common and of perpetual obligation? Besides, we must not
overlook the difference between the scholastic and the popular mode of instruction. Such an union of duties so different could not well be excused in a scholastic teacher, who ought to lay down Christian duties in systematical order, and indicate the mutual connection and different relations which they bear one to another. But this is by no means the case with popular exhortation, which altogether regards practice, and is propounded for certain persons, in certain cases, and for a certain end; and must, therefore, conjoin all points that pertain to that end, whether they be local, or common.” (Nitzsch and Kuin.)

In the same light the passage is considered by the ablest Commentators of the last century, as Wets., Valckn., Schoettgen, and Bp. Pearce, the last of whom truly observes, that idolatry (especially idol feasts) and fornication were almost inseparable in the minds of the Jews. “Thus (continues he), on the subject of things offered unto idols St. Paul says, in 1 Cor. 10, 7 & 8. ‘Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them: neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed it.’ Here he joins the sins of idolatry and fornication together, for the reason (most probably) above given. So in Ephes. 5, 5. he says: ‘No whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, (rather lewd man: see Locke’s note on Ephes. 4, 19.) who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ.’ Again, in 1 Cor. 5, 11. ‘If any man, that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous (rather a lewd man) or an idolater, with such an one do not eat.’ And so close was the connection then between those two crimes, that Paul, in Coloss. 3, 5. says, that ‘covetousness (or rather lewdness) is idolatry.’ To all which must be added what the writer of the Book of Revelations says in c. 2, 14, 20. where he joins in both places the committing fornication with the eating things offered and sacrificed unto idols. See also 1 Pet. 4, 3. and particularly Wisd. Sol. c. 14, 25, 26, 27. where it is said: ‘There reigned in all men — disorders in marriages, adultery, and shameless uncleanness: for the worshipping of idols not to be named is the beginning, the cause, and the end of all evil.’ So in 3 Macc. 6, 4. it is said: ‘The Temple was filled with riot and revelling by the Gentiles, who dallied with harlots, and had to do with women within the circuit of the holy places.’ From these texts, it appears that the places above cited speak of fornication chiefly in view of the relation which it had to the sacrifices offered to idols, the feasts upon which were commonly attended with much uncleanness.”

See Valer. Max. 2, 6. Strab. 8, 12. Bayle’s Dict. in the article Laos, Laurent. de Adulteris et Meretricibus, in the 8th vol. of Gronovius’s Thesaurus, a summary of whose matter may be seen in Schoettgen. Finally, I must lay before my readers the following lucid and masterly defence of the above interpretation from the pen of the very acute and learned Bp. Marsh, on Michaelis 1, 454. to which Nitzsch has evidently been much indebted:

“The difficulty of the passage, which our author has attempted to explain by the discovery of a new meaning for ἐπονήτης, consists in the seeming impropriety of forbidding in the same sentence for-
communication, and the eating of things strangled, with meats offered to idols. But is no instance to be found of moral and positive precepts enumerated in the same catalogue? The celebration of the Sabbath is assuredly a positive command; for though the will of the Deity, whether made known by revelation or the light of nature, is equally binding, yet no one would refer an abstinence from labour every seventh day to the class of moral obligations. If we appeal then to the sacred Decalogue, we find the moral command to abstain from adultery, united with the positive command to celebrate the Sabbath. By the Law of Moses it was as strictly forbidden to partake of the flesh of a strangled animal, as it was strictly commanded to rest on the seventh day: and since it appears from the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of Paul, that the precepts of the Pentateuch were abrogated only by degrees, it seems by no means extraordinary that the Decree of the Council in Jerusalem should contain a mixture of moral and positive commands.

21. Μαθητής γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων — ἔχει. In these words it is not very easy to trace the connection with the preceding. There is, as usual in sentences commencing with γὰρ, an omission (by grammatical ellipsis) of some words to which the γὰρ refers, though there is no foundation for Bp. Pearce's suspicion that something is lost out of the text. The words left to be understood can only be determined by a close attention to the context and the chain of the argument. Some ancient and modern Commentators supply, "on you especially, who are of the converted Gentiles, this is to be enjoined. To the Jews it were needless to inculcate any such precept, for they learn these things from their law." There is, however, a harshness in supposing so much meaning to be left understood. Others, as Kuinoel, determine the sense to be as follows: "The Gentile Christians are not to be burthened with the observation of the ritual law, but since the Law of Moses is well known to the Jewish Christians, and is by them most religiously observed, it behoves the Gentiles to avoid giving offence to them, and thus preventing the union of Jews with Gentiles, or to observe, at least, those precepts which would have been binding on them, as proselytes of the gate." In nearly the same manner Doddridge understands
the passage. Grotius thinks there is an answer to a tacit objection, namely, "there is no innovation meant, nor abolition of the Law of Moses, nor any contempt of his Law intended; since in our meetings, as well as in the Jewish synagogues, the Law is read, as of old, every Sabbath day." But this sense cannot, I think, be elicited from the words. Wetstein would paraphrase thus: "There is no innovation intended, nor abolition of the Law had in view; let its authority continue valid, as respects those who are Jews born; let the books of Moses be read by all, so that those persons be not subjected to his Law whom he never intended to come under it; or more be required of them than Moses intended."

The last interpretation seems, upon the whole, the best founded. Grotius, however, was right in supposing that there is here a tacit meeting of some objection, and that this observation was meant to conciliate the Jewish Christians.

By ἔναγγελλον are here meant the Christian assemblies, which still retained the name appropriated to religious meetings in the Jewish Church, from which they had not yet separated, since they still continued in communion with it.

Grotius has here some instructive observations, shewing that, for some time, both the Sabbath day and the Lord's day were observed by Christians. (See Clem. Const, 7, 24. 8, 33 & 67.) And this was, in after ages, approved of by many Fathers, as Asterius, Gregor. Nyssen., and Balsamon. Thus Constantine extended the prohibition of law-proceedings equally to both days; and for a long time afterwards equal marks of respect were shewn to both days.

By κηρύσσειν is here meant read aloud and publicly. Grotius has shewn that this reading of the books of Moses was continued in the Christian churches up to the council of Laodicæa, when, by
the 19th Canon, it was ordered that the Gospels should be also read.

22. τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἁπαστόλοις — ἐκλεξαμένως. The irregularity of the construction of this sentence has not a little exercised the ingenuity of Commentators. See Wolf, Elsner, Raphel, Kypke, Krebs, and others. Certain it is that neither ἐκλεξαμένως nor ἡγάσατο exactly correspond to the rules of grammatical propriety, which (as Elsner and Krebs think) would require ἔδοξε τοῖς ἁπαστόλοις ἐκλέξασθαι ἄνδρας, καὶ πέμψαι. “But Luke (say they) has written after the manner of those Greek authors who are fond of changing the Infinitive into the Participle: and although ἐκλεξαμένως is properly required, yet it was not unusual to adopt the accusative case, even though the noun preceding, to which it refers, should have been in a different one.” So Joseph. Ant. 15, 6, 5. ἢν δὲ κακείνως ἑντολή — μαθόντας δια-χειρίσασθαι. Kypke and Rosenm. think the Accusative is here put with the Infinitive, as in the Latin, for ινα ἐκλεξαμένωι πέμψαι. For my own part, I am of opinion that ἐκλεξαμένως is to be referred to πέμψαι, and that it is put for ἐκλεξάθαι; aorists middle having often a passive sense in the best writers. Γράψαντες is put for γράψασι. Nor is this anacolouthon unusual in the best writers. So Thucyd. 3, 96. ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς — ἐπικαλοῦντες. Id. 4, 42. καὶ τοῖς μὲν Συρακοσίοις — κατάπληξις — ἐγένετο — ἄρωτες, as if there had preceded οἱ Συρακοσίοι καταπλάγησαν. Id. 1, 98. παρῆνε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, καταβάντες, ὧν κατα-βασί. Id. 6, 24. τοῖς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ — εὐελπίδεισιν ὄντες, ἕνεκεν δὲ ὡσί. (Kuin.)

To me the method adopted by Kypke and Rosenmuller seems the simplest and truest: and the construction, in that respect, appears to be quite Hellenistic. The anacolouthon in γράψαντες may be justified by the example of Thucydides and some other writers, who, like him, are fond of long and involved sentences.
Silas is said to be contracted from Silvanus, a Roman name of frequent occurrence. This Silas was Paul’s companion in his journeys through Asia Minor and Greece. See 1 Cor. 1, 1. Acts 17, 1. Thess. 1, 1.

22. ἀνδρας ἡγουμένους, leading men. Kuinoel gives as an example, Joseph. Ant. 11, 4, 4., of the patriarchs ἡγεμόνες τῶν Ἰσραηλίτων. He might far more aptly have cited Thucyd. 1, 5. ἡγουμένων ἄνδρων ὦ τῶν ἀναματώτατων. Other passages of the same kind may also be seen in that author.

23. γράφαντες, “having sent, written as follows.” Γράφειν, as Glass and Kuinoel observe, is a vox praegnans, (see Markland,) and they account διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν as a Hebraism for δι’ αὐτῶν. But, in truth, it occurs in the best Greek writers.

23. Τοῖς κατὰ τῶν Ἀντιοχείων καὶ Σωρίων. It is plain that, though only the Antiochians, Syrians, and Cilicians are specified, it was meant to be equally binding on all Gentile Christians. Now the Antiochians are mentioned, since among them the controversy arose; and Syria and Cilicia, since they were bordering countries, and in them probably there were many Christian converts; as we may suppose from St. Paul’s making so many journeys thither.

At χαίρειν some verb is plainly left to be understood; as λέγουσι or ἐρχονται. Grot. thinks that St. Luke meant by this to express the Heb. הֲלוֹא. But χαίρειν is a frequent term in the Greek writers, especially the later ones; though it is sometimes used by the earlier. The origin of this word the Greek Grammarians (as Mæris, Thomas, and some Scholiasts) trace to the Demagogue Cleon, who, they say, first prefixed it, in the place of the usual πράττειν, to his letter announcing the victory at Pylus. But it was used a very short time after by one not at all likely to have imitated him, namely, Xenophon, Cyr. 4. in a letter of Cyrus to Cyaxeres: Κύρος Κυαξαρές χαίρειν, which, if the historian had any Oriental do-
cument in view, would confirm Grotius's conjecture. It had grown so common by the time of Artemidorus, that he says, 3, 44. ἐιον πάντος ἐπιστολῆς τὸ καὶ εἴρρωσον λέγειν. Hor. Epist. 1, 8, 1. refers both to the καὶ εἴρρωσον and εἴ πᾶττειν. "Celso gaudere et bene rem gerere refer." Lucian tells us that Plato censured the word as μαχθρόν (mean and low): yet he himself uses it in his 3d Epistle to Dionysius, by an inconsistency not unfrequent in Critics; insomuch that that prince of Hyper-critics, Dionysius Halicarn. sometimes employs the very words whose use he so harshly censures in Thucydides. For the above examples I am indebted to Wetstein. Kuinoel refers to Barnes on Eurip. El. 1357. and Alberti Obss. Nov. Test. 444.

24. ἐτάραξαν.* See the note on Matt. 2, 3.

24. ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. These words are (as Kuinoel thinks) intended to more exactly determine the meaning of the former expression. Now the verb ἀνασκευάζειν properly signifies to pack any thing up for removal (as in Thucyd. 1, 18. and elsewhere), and also to remove; as in Xen. An. 6, 2, 5.†

* The verb ταράσσειν comes from τάρω and τέρω, and properly signifies to stir (as applied to liquids): which word I am surprised our Etymologists should not have seen is derived from the Greek etymon, through the medium of the Ang. Sax. The s inventive is not unfrequent in our language; nor indeed in the Greek and Latin. It may seem strange, but it is nevertheless true, that our word turn comes from the same source, namely, from τάρω, to stir up, or round, whence torus, a wheel, and torno, to make turnery.

† And this is the sense of the word in Thucyd. 4, 116. where the Commentators on that passage, and those on the present one (including Schleusner), take it to signify destroy. The words are, καὶ τὴν Ἀκεχολον καθελὼν καὶ ἀνασκευάσας, τέμενος ἀρέσκειν ἄταν: where ἀνασκευάζειν cannot have the sense assigned to it by the Schol. Valla, Portus, and Bauer, rebuild, since that is a signification not suitable to the context; any more than that of Acacius, Hudson, Duker, and the Commentators on the present passage, destroy, since that is such a foolish pleonasm as can no where be found in Thucydides. The true sense therefore is having removed the materials. So Xenoph., above cited, and Hesych. ἀνασκευάζειν. μεταθέναι, scil. τὰ σκεύη. And so Chrysostom, who explains: καθάπερ ἐπὶ ὀλοκληρία τὰ ὑπ’ ἑκείνων γεγενημένα μετατιθέντες.
edly, from this packing up and removal easily arises the sense of sacking, carrying off, plundering; though this signification is not very well supported. I am therefore inclined to think it may mean, "removing and perverting you from the truth."

24. λέγοντες περιτέμνοντες, "bidding you be circumcised." Now λέγειν, like εἴπειν, has often the sense of command. To the examples produced by the Commentators, I add Æschyl. Eum. 535. edit. Schultz. ἐς τὸ πᾶν δὲ τοι λέγω Βασιλεὺς αἰδεύεσθαι δίκαιος.

25. γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν. These words (which are omitted by our English Translators) signify "assembled together." Ὑμοθυμαδόν has this sense elsewhere; as in 2, 1. ἦσαν ἄναρτες ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ. See 18, 12, 19, 29.

Others render, "with unanimous consent." But this is supposing more unanimity than would be likely to exist, considering the difference of opinion that had just before subsisted. Besides ὁμοθυμαδόν with γινομένοις, in the sense of unanimously, is, as far as I recollect, unexamined.


27. καὶ αὐτῶσ διὰ λόγον ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτὰ, "tell the same things by word of mouth, more fully and explicitly." It was not unusual among the ancients to send letters by such persons as were able, and had authority, to give further details of any business, and communicate circumstances beyond what were adverted to in the letter. Thus Thucyd. 7, 10. says of those who bore Nicias’s letter to the.
Athenian people, ἡμοιοτέρος ἐστὶν Ἄθωςα—ὅσα τε ἀπὸ γλάστρας εἴρητο αὐτῶς ἠκού, καὶ η ἀρετὴν ὑπερκύννυτο. Sometimes, however, this was expressly forbidden by the writer; as Arrian. Ex. Al. 2, 14, ὅ. συμπέμπτει Θ. παραγγέλας τὴν ἐπιστολήν δῶναι Δαφείῳ, αὐτῶν δὲ μὴ διαλεγόμεθα ὑπὲρ μηδένος.

28. τῷ ἄγιῳ Πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν. This is an expression not unfrequent in the Gemara, and it is found in contracts where there are several parties to an agreement. Chrysostom and Camerarius observe, that the Holy Spirit is mentioned in order to show that the business is superhuman; and ἡμῖν, in order to indicate their obedience to, and co-operation with, the Spirit. Lapide, Grotius, Piscat., and Heinsius, think there is here an hendiadis, and render, "visum est nobis per sanctum Spiritum." I most approve of the mode of interpretation adopted by Kuinoel, "to us who are aided by the Holy Spirit, which shews its efficacy in us." See the note on 5, 3, 7, 51. It is strange that Bp. Pearce should not here recognise any assertion that they had the assistance of the Holy Ghost. He renders: "to the Holy Ghost, and therefore to us." See Whitby.

28. μὴ δὲν πλεῖον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος. There is no occasion to stumble at βάρος, since it appears to have been an Oriental idiom to call all laws, orders, and injunctions by the terms βάρος, ἔγχυς, &c. whether these laws were heavy or light. So Apoc. 2, 4. οὐ βαλὼ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἄλλο βάρος. The idiom is fully unfolded in Matt. 23, 4. δεσμεύωσι γὰρ φορτία βαρέα—καὶ ἐπιθέασιν, &c. It is a judicious remark of Chrysostom, that they say these words as unto persons (being new converts) yet weak and fearful of undertaking any thing irksome.

28. τῷ τῶν ἐπάνωγκες τούτων, "with the exception of these necessary things." Πλην is properly a noun in the Accusative, from πλην; as ἄρχην, &c. At ἐπάνωγκες many Commentators have stumbled; and Salmasius, Bentley, Heumann, and Pearce propose various conjectures, which are, however, un-
sanctioned by the MSS., and, indeed, unnecessary. The truth is, that ἐπαναγκέω comes from the old adjective ἐπαναγκὴς (formed from the phrase ἐπ’ ἄναγκης), which is now found only in the Nominative, or Accusative neuter. In the Nominative it occurs in Demosthenes, Plutarch, and Plato, cited in St. Thes. 1995 B. Of the Accusative, examples are produced by Wets. and Kypke. Indeed, that it did once exist, we may infer from the adverbial use of ἐπαναγκέω here, and in other passages cited by Wolf, Palairet, Wets., Kypke, Valcknaer, and Abresch. For the adverb was but the Accusative, with the ellipsis of some preposition. Here, however, by a harshness of which I know no example elsewhere, the adverb is used adjectively, there being an ellipsis of ἐν αὐτῷ.

29. See the note on ver. 20. Ἐξ ἀν διατηρεῖτε. The phrase is Hebrew; for in that language the verbs ῥῦσαι and ῥῦσαν, with the addition of ἂν ἔρθη (which have the force of the pronoun reciprocal), are used to denote abstain from, beware of any thing: and the Sept. expresses both by τραίνειν in Prov. 7, 5. and διατηρεῖν in Gen. 37, 11. Ps. 12, 8. The Hellenistic phrase διατηρεῖν ἑαυτὸν ἐκ τινὸς answers, therefore, to the Classical φυλάττεσθαι τι. (Kuin.) The Classical term occurs in 1 Joh. 5, 21. Φυλάξετε ἑαυτῶν

* Nitzsch supplies eis σωματα. “For (says he) the Apostolic Decree was an answer to a controverted question; the Judaizing Christians having said, ‘Ye cannot be saved unless ye undergo circumcision, and observe the Mosaic Law.’ The Decree, therefore, had to define what to the Gentiles was necessary to salvation, and what not so. Now as to the above-mentioned sorts of abstinence, which the Apostles called necessary duties, no other necessity must there be understood than moral necessity. This necessity would not otherwise arise than from a common precept, by which we are enjoined to abstain from things in themselves indifferent, but which have the effect of bad example, or which in any way injure the piety of others, unsettle their minds, and impede the advancement of truth.” But surely the learned Commentator ought to have excepted πορφυρα, since it cannot be thought included among the ἀδιάφορα.
απὸ τῶν εἰδώλων. Compare 2 Cor. 11, 2. Jam. 1, 27. Ps. 34, 13.

29. εὖ πράξετε. I am surprised that Rosenmuller should consider this as a mere form of concluding a letter: it would not be suitable, nor did the ancients so conclude. Far preferable is the interpretation of Tertullian, Grotius, Kypke, Heumann, and Heinsius, "ye will do right, do your duty." This sense, however, is not significant enough, nor worthy of the occasion. Much more suitable is that laid down by Wolf, Elsner, Krebs, Doddridge, and Kuinoel, "félices eritis:" for examples of which Wolf refers to Menag. on Diog. Laert. 3, 61. Kuinoel considers the formula as equivalent to σωθήσεσθε. The sense may rather, however, be expressed by, "it shall be well with you:" a kind of meiosis signifying, "it shall tend to your salvation."* So Eccles. 9, 12. "Verily I know it shall be well with them that fear God." Is. 3, 10. "Say to the righteous it shall be well with him." Jer. 42. 6. "That it may be well with us when we obey," &c. Nitzsch observes that all moral precepts, whether of temporary or perpetual obligation, are equally valid, necessary, and tending to salvation.

29. Ἐφησοῦσθε, farewell. A common conclusion to epistles. So Artem. On. 3, 44. (cited by Valck.) ἰδιον πάσης τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῷ χαίρε, καὶ ἔφησον λέγειν. 30. ἀπολυθέντες, "having been dismissed" (as infr. 88. ἀπελεύθησαν μετ' εἰρήνης, &c.); or simply, "having departed;" as in 28, 25. Examples are given by Gatak. in Anton. 319. and Raphel Obss. Polyb. 408. (Schlesner.)

* Doddridge, with his usual good taste, remarks on the gentleness of this conclusion, which, he observes, was worthy the Apostolical wisdom and goodness. "Too soon (continues he) did succeeding Councils of inferior authority change it for the style of anathemas; forms which have, I doubt not, proved an occasion of consecrating some of the worst passions of the human mind under sacred names, and which, like some ill-adjusted weapons of war, are most likely to hurt the hand from which they are thrown."
30. ἔπεσακαν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, "delivered the letter." This verb was used of any thing reached out to a person; as in Luke 24, 30 & 42. Joh. 13, 26. But it was especially applied to delivering books, letters, or papers, both by the sacred and profane writers; as Luke 4, 17. Diodor. Sic. 14, 47. Herodian 7, 6. cited by Wets.

31. ἔχαρισαν ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει. Translators and Commentators are not quite agreed on the sense of παρακλήσει. In the Vulgate, and some other Versions, it is rendered consolation. And this interpretation is adopted by most Commentators, as Grotius and Rosenm.; and it is at large defended by Wolf. Some, however, as Beza, Piscator, Kuinoel, and Schleusner, take it to mean instruction, exhortation; which interpretation I prefer, because the other would require ταυτή to be added, and is harsh, on account of the many words necessary to be supplied. Of the above signification there are many examples in the New Testament. See Schl. Lex. Heinrichs fluctuates between the two interpretations, and is inclined to think that both meanings may have been had in view. But this would make the sentence a mere enigma or riddle.

32. προφητεύει* See the note on 11, 27.

* The word προφητεύει is undoubtedly often used in Scripture for one who, by Divine assistance, declares things which are to happen at some future time: but the word has other significations likewise, both in the Old and New Testaments. The things which such a προφητεύει speaks are chiefly relating to Religion, or to the Divine commands. In this sense our English Translation seems to have used the word prophesies, in Prov. 30, 1. and 31, 1. where the words of Agur, and those of Lemuel, are called prophesies, though they contain only religious and moral reflexions, and rules for the conduct of life: and thus the praising God by spiritual songs is called a prophesying in 1 Sam. 10, 5. and 1 Chron. 25, 1. and so when Paul, in 1 Cor. 11, 4, 5. says praying or prophesying, he means praying or teaching Divine truths; agreeably to which, we find God saying to Abimelech in a dream (Gen. 20, 7.) concerning Abraham, he is a Prophet, and shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live; i. e. he is a teacher of my will, and therefore his prayers shall prevail for thee. The word προφητεύει is used likewise for him who speaks instead of another, and is therefore said to be to him instead
32. Did λόγον πελλοῦ παρεκάλεσαν, "exhorted and taught them;" namely, what was suitable to the present occasion; stating the grounds and reasons on which the determination of the Synod was founded, by showing why the whole ritual was not enjoined, and why a part was retained; and withal defining the cause, nature, and extent of the duty of abstaining, in certain cases, from things naturally lawful.

of a mouth. Exod. 4, 16. This was the case of Aaron to Moses; for in Exod. 7, 1. God said unto Moses, I have made thee a God to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet: which is explained in the next verse thus, Thou shalt speak (70. to him) all that I command thee, and Aaron thy brother shall speak unto Pharaoh, &c. Now if he, who spoke instead of one only, may be called a prophet, well may he or they be called so who speak in the name of many, as teachers do in religious assemblies. To these passages of the Scriptures I add, that Josephus, in his Tract. contra Apion, 2, 39. uses the word in this sense, when he says, that the Jews cannot be charged with acting absurdly, when they are honouring their lawgiver (Moses), and believing what he has taught them concerning God, καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἠκούσει προφητεύσεις περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πεπιστευκότες. (See the note on Luke 1, 67. and latter part of the note on 24, 44.) Nor are instances wanting of the same use of the word προφητής, and its derivatives, to be found in Heathen authors: for in Diod. Sicul. l. p. S. L. 65. edit. Wesselingii, in Præm. says, that History is προφητής τῆς ἀληθείας, the teacher, or declarer of truth: Aristotle de Mundo, vol. 1. p. 601 a. ed. Du Val. Lat. Paris. 1629. represents Philostratus ὅσ τις ἐγνώκας ἐδοκίμασε τὰ θεῖα καταλάβοντα, τοῖς τε ἀνθρώποις προφητεύοντας, comprehending Divine things by means of the Divine eye of the soul, and teaching them to mankind. Plato is still more explicit on this head, and in his treatise called Timeus, p. 1074. E. Edit. Fic. he distinguishes between the prophets and the expounders of prophecies; the former he calls μάντεις, προφήται δὲ μαντευομένων, and concerning the latter he says, προφήται δὲ μαντευομένων δικαιομενα δομαζομένα ἀν, non sunt vates, sed rectissime dici possunt prophetæ vaticiniorum; i. e. interpretes pronunciatores eorum. In the same sense of teaching, and not of prophecy, Ovid gives the word vaticinor, in Met. 15, 174. where he makes Pythagoras say:

"Parcite, vaticinor, cognatas oede nefandæ
Exturbare animas."

And to quote no more instances, though Epimenides is styled a prophet in Titus 1, 12. yet Aristotle, in Rhet. 3, 17. says of him, ἔκεινας περὶ τῶν ἐσομένων ὡς ἐμαντεύοτο, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν γεγονότων μὲν, ἀδήλων δὲ, that he did not teach concerning future things, but concerning things past, and obscure. (Bp. Pearce.)
33. τοιχεστάντες δὲ χρόνον, "and having staid here some time." For τοιχεῖον, when it relates to time, is equivalent to διατρίβειον, and of this signification many examples are produced by Elsner, Wets., Kypke, and Raphel; as also of the same use of facere in the Latin. So Demosth. de falsâ leg. 392, 17. οὐκ ἀνέμειναν τὴν κήρυκα, οὐδὲ ἐποίησαν χρόνον οὐδένα. Plato Ep. ἄμας δὲ ἀναγκαίον ἵσας ἐνιαυτὸν γ' ἐτὶ ποιήσατο. Prov. 13, 23. ποιήσωσιν ἐτη πολλα, and Tob. 10, 7.

33. ἀπελύθησαν μετέ εἰρήνης, "they departed, with the expression of every good wish and prayer for their welfare and prosperity." For all this is included in the expression, which corresponds to the Heb. יִבְשָׂשׂ. See the note on Joh. 14, 27. Kuinoel thinks it nearly equivalent to παραδόθησαν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ, "commended to the favour of God."

34. ἔδοξε — αὐτοῦ. These words are omitted in some very ancient MSS., Versions, and Fathers; and in others there are added the words μόνος δὲ Ἰουδας ἐπορεύθη, which seem to have been inserted to remove a fancied contradiction between this verse and ver. 33. But Silas might either have remained at Antioch, and there have been chosen by Paul as companion of his journey; or he might have departed to Jerusalem, and have been sent for from thence by Paul. Such minute circumstances are usually omitted by St. Luke. The words are therefore deservedly expunged by Mill, Griesbach, and Matthiae. (Kuin.)

It seems most probable that Silas departed to Jerusalem; nor do I see how the term ἀπελύθησαν will permit us to suppose otherwise. There would be time for Silas to go thither and return to Antioch before Paul's departure: for the formula μετὰ τινὰς ἡμέρας is plainly a very indefinite one: though Wets. cites a passage of Ptolemy Geogr. 1, 14. from which it would appear that, in the Classical writers, it denoted a few days. Yet I remember to have met with
instances in those writers (and especially Thucy-
dides) of this phrase in the sense of not a few.


36. Κατὰ πάσαν πάλιν ἐν αἷς. The relative pronoun αἷς is put for the plural, in accommodation to πάλιν, which is a collective noun. See Glass Phil. S. 166. (Kuin.) This may rather, however, be attributed to the force of κατὰ, which, though distributive, involves the idea of many, in accommodation to which the relative is put in the plural: an irregularity, indeed, but scarcely greater than some which are met with in Thucydidcs.

36. Πῶς εἶχομεν. Kuinoel understands cognituri, as if from the context. I would rather, however, repeat σκεφόμενοι, from the preceding επισκεφώμεθα. Sometimes a verb of seeing or knowing is to be thus supplied, when nothing had preceded; as in Virg. Æn. 1, 577. (cited by Kuin.) "Demittam et Libye lustrare extrema juvebo Si quibus ejectus silvis aut urbibus errat.

The words επισκεφώμεθα πῶς εἴχομεν are a popular phrase, which must be every where interpreted with accommodation to the circumstances. Here it must signify "inspect the progress of the Christian religion."


37. ἔβουλεύσατο. This may signify either "gave counsel" (as in 2 Sam. 16, 25.), or took counsel, decreed, resolved. The reading ἔβουλευτο is a gloss. See the note on Acts 5, 38. (Schl. & Kuin.)

38. Πᾶς οἶκος δὲ ἦλθον, τῶν ἀποστάντων. Many Commentators, following the Vulgate, render ἦλθον rogabat, and produce numerous examples, to which I could add others from Thucydidcs: but I assent to Kuinoel, that this signification is unsuitable, and that the sense is best represented by the Syriac and
Arabic Versions, *volebat*: a signification found in the best writers, as Xenophon. Examples may be seen in Sturzii Lex. Xen. Of the examples adduced by the Commentators, the only ones quite apposite are those where the verb is united with a negative; as Joseph. Ant. 10, 7, 1. οὐκ ἦξιον τὴν πόλιν κινδυνεύουσαν δι' αὐτῶν πειρατῶν. I add Thucyd. p. 285, 46. Duiker. οὐκ — ἦξιον γε ἐργεῖσθαι 288, 97. οὐκ ἀξιῶ υποτείσθαι 195, 76. οὐκ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς, &c. 38, 17. οὐκ ἀξιῶ φεύγωντα τιμωρεῖσθαι. In such passages, however, there is not merely the sense *volo*, but several kindred ones; so that οὐκ ἀξιῶ signifies, "I think it not right, fair, proper, advisable," &c. Thus it is clear that the most elegant position is when the negative immediately precedes the verb, and is not left to be inserted towards the end of the sentence.

It is of more consequence, however, to advert to the cause and nature of this dispute between Paul and Barnabas, as arising out of the departure of Mark from them in Pamphylia. The opinions of the best Commentators on this subject are thus reviewed by Kuinoel.

"It is thought by Benson that Mark departed because his presence was required by the Apostles for converting the Jews of Palestine. But why then should Paul have expressed indignation at his departure. The same objection will apply to the conjecture of others, that he departed on account of ill-health. The most probable opinion is that of Grotius, Wets., Bengel, Heumann, and others, that Mark was, at that time, somewhat averse to labours and dangers; this, indeed, is clear from the words καὶ μὴ συνελθώντα αὐτώς εἰς τὸ ἔργον. Thus ἄφιστημι is used of *defection* in Luke 8, 13. 1 Tim. 4, 1. It should seem that Mark had now repented of his inconstancy (and, as Bengel thinks, new ardour had been infused into him by the Decree of the Synod at Jerusalem, and the free admission of the Gentiles); and hence his kind-hearted and obliging relation Barriabas wished to take him as a companion of
their present journey. But Paul, who had "no respect of persons" (Gal. 2, 11.), and thought that disposition rather than relationship should be consulted, distrusted the constancy of Mark, and was therefore unwilling to take him. This severity of Paul, however, rendered much service both to Mark and to the cause of Christianity. For Mark profited by the well-meant admonition, and was, for the future, more zealous and courageous: and the Gospel, being preached in different places at the same time, was the more widely propagated. Nor were the bands of amity between Paul and Barnabas permanently separated by this disagreement. See 1 Cor. 9, 6. Nay Paul afterwards received Mark into his friendship. See Col. 4, 10. 2 Tim. 4, 11. Phil. 28. (Kuin.)

Nearly the same view of the subject is taken by the Fathers. Thus Chrysostom says: ὁ Παῦλος εἴη τῷ δικαίῳ, ὁ Βαρνάβας τῷ φίλανθρωπῷ. Among these may be also included Jerom.

Παροξυσμός signifies properly (from παροξύνω) a whetting, incitement, irritation; and also what is consequent upon it, namely, indignation, disagreement, contention.* It occurs in Deut. 29, 28. Jer. 32, 37. and Demosth. 1105, 34. Reide.

CHAP. XVI.

1. κατήντησε δὲ εἰς Δέρβην. Κατανάλωσις signifies properly to go opposite to, or towards any thing, "to proceed thither; and simply to go down to, go to:" and in this sense it occurs frequently in this book (as 16, 1. 18, 19 & 24. 20, 15. 21, 7. 25, 13. 27, 12.

* I here desiderate the usual good sense and good taste (if not learning) of Dr. Doddridge, who substitutes for the common version, contention, a sharp fit or paroxysm of anger, "since (says he) it is a medical term." True; but not primarily or properly; and if it were so, to apply that sense here would be injudicious, not to say irreverent; and unjust it certainly must be to these eminent Apostles to ascribe to them the rabid fury which paroxysm, in that sense, would imply.
29, 13.) as also in 2 Macc. 4, 44. and the later Greek writers.

Here we have the first mention of Timothy, the faithful companion of St. Paul's journies, to whom he addressed two Epistles; and of one or other of the places here mentioned he is commonly supposed to have been an inhabitant; though in determining which the Commentators are not agreed; nor are their arguments conclusive. The present passage would seem to favour the notion that he was a Lysistræan; that of 20, 4. that he was a Derbæan, which is the opinion of Schleusner. Though the arguments are on neither side quite conclusive, yet to me the former opinion seems the best founded: for the passage of 24, 4. will not prove him to have been a Derbæan, since the punctuation may be, Παύς, Δερβαῖος, καὶ Τιμίδεος: but it will make it probable that he was not then a Lystræan. Indeed, as there is no certainty from the present passage that he was an inhabitant of Lystra, so the best mode of reconciling both the above passages may be, to suppose that he resided in the country, and, as Iconium is mentioned with Lystra, probably in the mid-way between those places.

1. ὁ δὲ γυναικὸς τίνος Ἰουδαίας πιστὴς, "the son of Jewess who was a believer (viz. in Christ)." The complete phrase, (in the place of which we have here, as often, the elliptical one,) is found in Eph. 1, 1. Grotius and Kuinoel observe that, according to the Law of Moses, Jewesses were permitted to marry a foreigner of good character, (as may be seen in the story of Esther,) but Jews were forbidden to marry Gentile women. (See Esdr. 9, 10.) This circumstance, they remark, is mentioned on account of what follows respecting the circumcision of Timothy.

2. ἐμαρτυρεῖτο, "a good testimony was borne him," "he was praised;" viz. on account of his great knowledge of religion, and his ardent zeal in the support of its interests.
3. καὶ λαβὼν περιτέμευται αὐτῶν. Now Timothy had not been circumcised, since his father was a Gentile, and mothers had no right to circumcise a child without the father's consent (as we learn from the Rabbinical writers, of whom some are here quoted by Wetstein): nor had Timothy supposed that there was any need of circumcision, to become a Christian. But Paul, who intended to take him as a companion, to do the work of an Evangelist* (see 2 Tim. 4, 5.), aware that unless he should be circumcised (as indeed he might, without violation of Christian liberty, since he was of Jewish origin; see introd. to c. 15.), many among the Jews would spurn his doctrine and instruction, and thus the business of teaching have less success among them, prudently accommodated himself to the prejudices of weak brethren (see 1 Cor. 9, 19.), and caused that rite to be administered to him.† On the con-

* The name Evangelist was, in the age of the Apostles, given to those who were assistants to the Apostles in propagating Christianity, and in establishing and regulating the Churches, and who took care that proper persons should be set over them, and in various other ways watched over their welfare. See Suic. Thes. on this word.

† In order to judge rightly of Paul's conduct in this affair, which some have censured (as they do other things in Christianity) because they did not understand it, we must recollect that he always openly avowed 'that the Gentiles were free from the yoke of the Mosaic ceremonies, and that the Jews were not to expect salvation by them:' and he also taught, that they were not in conscience obliged to observe them at all, except in cases where the omission of them would give offence. But because his enemies represented him as teaching people to despise the Law of Moses, and even as blaspheming it, he therefore took some opportunities of conforming publicly himself, to shew how far he was from condemning it as evil; an extravagance into which some Christian heretics early ran, and with which the Apostle himself has been most unjustly charged of late by a writer too contemptible to be named. This is the true key to his conduct, here and Acts 21, 21—24. And though, when the Jewish zealots would have imposed it upon him to compel Titus, who was a Greek, to be circumcised, even while he was at Jerusalem, he resolutely refused it (Gal. 2, 3—5.); yet here he voluntarily persuaded Timothy to submit to that rite, knowing the omission of it in him, who was a Jew by the mother's side, would have given offence; and being the more desirous to obviate any
trary, he did not permit that Titus (who was by both parents a Gentile) should be circumcised, since the false teachers who demanded this, maintained that circumcision was necessary to salvation (see Acts 15, 1.) and wished to burthen the Gentile Christians with the Mosaic rites. Compare Gal. 2, 2 & 3. and Koppe. (Kuin.)

3. γινέσαν γάρ, &c. "for all knew that his father was a Greek." On this Graecism see Kypke in loc. and Raphel. (Kuin.)

4. παρέδειδον αυτοῖς φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα, "commended to their observance." Δόγμα signifies edict, decree, &c. It occurs in Dan. 6, 8, 9, & 10. in the sense of royal edict; and in Polyb. 1, 18. Diodor. Sic. 522 c. of a Senatusconsultum. See Koppe on Eph. 2, 15. Καρμένα, decreed, appointed. See the note on Acts 3, 18. (Kuin.) Wetstein adduces two examples from Dinarchus and Demosth.

5, 6. ἐστερεωτὴν τῇ πίστει, &c. "were confirmed in the faith, and increased daily in number." See the note on 15, 32. On Γαλατικῆ χώρα see the Geographical writers, and Koppe's Prolegomena to Gal. p. 1.

6. καλυβέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγιου Πνεύματος λαλήσαι — Ἀσία. Since all the other regions here mentioned were in Asia Minor, by Asia must undoubtedly be understood Ionia; as in 2, 9. (where see the note.) and 20, 16. For what reasons and by what means Paul was hindered by the Holy Spirit from preaching the Gospel in Mysia, Bithynia, &c. whether by

prejudices against this excellent youth, whose early acquaintance with the Scriptures of the Old Testament (2 Tim. 3, 15.) might render him peculiarly capable of preaching in the synagogues with advantage, which, had he been uncircumcised, would not have been permitted.—Grotius observes, that this was probably the beginning of Luke's acquaintance with Timothy, though Paul knew him long before. (Doddridge.)

The above remarks are partly founded on Grotius; who moreover observes that Paul was, in deciding on most points, far more enlightened than his fellow Apostles. Such comparisons are invidious, not to say irreverent At least, Peter ought to be excepted.
dream (see ver. 4.), or by some instinctive impression, or (as in 21, 10.) by a prophet portending to him the little success he would there meet with, and the great peril he would encounter, cannot be determined. (Kuin.) I see not how the last-mentioned hypothesis can be maintained from the words. The first and second are undoubtedly the best founded. Certain it is that the Apostles, who enjoyed a plenary inspiration, knew how to distinguish the instinctive notions of the Holy Spirit from their own ordinary thoughts and determinations.

Kuinoel observes that the Bithynians were a rude and uncivilized people, Thracians who had colonized this part of Asia, and occupied no towns, but lived in villages, κωμοπολεῖς (see Strabo, p. 566.); and as to the Mysians, they were a most abject race, degenerate to a proverb.*

7. κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν. Valcknaer (after Wets.) maintains that κατὰ, after verbs of coming, means, not to, but over against, to the borders of:

After Πνεύματος many MSS. have Ἰησοῦ, which is approved by Griesbach, Mill, and Wets., and is admitted by Griesbach. Kuinoel, too, approves of this reading as being the more difficult. "For we nowhere (says he) meet with πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ, but πνεῦμα Κυρίου." This reason, however, seems to rather prove the contrary.

9. ἀνὴρ τις ἡν Μακεδον, i.e. "a person whom he knew to be a Macedonian, either by his dress, or rather from his words." Βοσθισσοῦ ἦμιν. This must be understood in a moral sense of assisting them to attain a knowledge of true religion. And to this

* So Cic. pro Flacco, C. 27. Namque, ut opinor, Asia vestra constat ex Phrygida, Mysida, Carida, Lydida. Utrum igitur nostrum est, an vestrum, hoc proverbium, Phrygum plagis fieri solere meliorem? Quid de tota Carida? nonne hoc vestra voce vulgatum est, Si quid cum periculo experiri velis, in Care id potissimum esse faciendum? Quid porro in Greco sermone tam tritum atque celebratum est, quam si quis despicatui ducitur, ut Mysorum ultimus esse dicatur? Nam quid ego dicam de Lydiâ? quis unquam Graecus comediam scripsit, in quâ servus primarum partium non Lydus esse?
signification alludes Arrian Epict. 2, 15. cited by Wets. Doddridge is mistaken in supposing the τις to denote “some certain Macedonian.” It is here pleonastic.

10. ἐξητῆσαμεν. St. Luke, who had hitherto spoken of Paul and his companions in the third person, now proceeds to use the first: whence it is clear that he, on that journey, became their companion. (Kuin.) Doddridge remarks on the oblique manner in which St. Luke intimates his attending on the Apostles; and observes that he does not, throughout the whole history, once mention his own name, or relate any one thing which he said or did for the service of Christianity, though Paul speaks of him in most honourable terms (Col. 4, 14. 2 Tim. 4, 11; and probably 2 Cor. 8, 18. as the brother whose praise in the Gospel went through all the Churches). The same remark (he observes) may be made on the rest of the sacred historians, who, every one of them, shew the like amiable modesty.

10. συμβιβάζοντες δτι, &c., collecting, conjecturing. On the force of the word see the note on 9, 22. Wetstein adduces an example from Aristot. de Alex. 4. χρή δὲ καὶ εἰκάζοντα συμβιβάζειν, καὶ ἐποικοδομῶντα το ἑτέρων ἐπὶ το ἑτέρων αὐξεῖν and of συμβάλλειν in a similar passage of Joseph. Bell. 3, 8, 3. He has also the following interesting quotation (illustrating the thing rather than the word), from Philo 2, 176, 1. εὐδοκεῖν, δτι, καὶ αἱ τοιαῦται εἰκαστευ ὑπογενεῖσ προφητείας εἰσι. Ὁ γὰρ νοῦς οὐκ ἀν οὔτως εὐσκόπως εὐθυμόληγεν, εἰ μὴ καὶ θείον ἢν πνεῦμα τὸ ποιητεύον πρὸς τὴν ἀλληλειαν.

11. εὐθυδρομῆσαμεν eis Σ., “we took a right course to,” “sailed direct to,” “came to, Samothracia.”* Valcknaer observes that eis makes εὐθυδρ. a verbum

* The word was properly used of men or horses running in a strait course: but as, like τρέχω (parallel to our run, which is also a nautical term), it was employed to denote sail; so it became synonymous with εὐθυναλὼν or ὑφωδρομέω. Similar is the expression used by our sailors, “to run before the wind.”
praegnans, by which the same is signified as in 21, 1. εὐθουσίας τὶς ἡλιομεν.

On Samothrace and Neapolis see the Geographical writers, including Wets., Schl. Lex., and Horne's Introduction.

12. εἰς ἔστι πρῶτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις. There are not a few difficulties connected with the interpretation of this passage. How we are to understand πρῶτη may seem doubtful. It cannot mean first in situation, or that to which they came first (though of that sense there is an example in Thucyd. 6, 55.) since it is only true of Neapolis just before mentioned. It must therefore signify first in rank: yet Livy, Diodorus, and others, assign that dignity to Amphipolis. They tell us that when P. Æmilius, by order of the Roman senate, formed Macedonia into a republic, he divided it into four μέρη or provinces, and that he gave the name Provincia prima to the territory between the Strymon and Nessus, and made Amphipolis its capital, and the seat of the council of state.

To remove this difficulty many methods have been devised. Castellio, Le Clerc, Mr. Pierce, Doddr., and Markland (from Chrysostom), read πρῶτης, whence they elicit the following sense, "which is a city of the first division of Macedonia." But this has been rejected by many eminent critics, and (I think) justly; for the sentence thus read has an odd appearance; just such as passages botched up by slashing critics assume. We may enquire, too, (with Bp. Pearce,) why Luke here characterizes Philippi as a city of the first part of Macedonia, when Neapolis and Amphipolis were so too? Besides, it were strange that the mistake should have crept into all the copies.

The most learned Commentators for the last century have come to the conclusion, that the common reading must be retained: though on what principle it is to be defended, they are not agreed. It has been conjectured by Wetstein, Pearce, and others, that, after the battle of Philippi, that city was raised
to the dignity of capital, in the place of Amphipolis, which was then on the decline. And we are told that it was the policy of the Romans to make their colonies the capitals of the countries in which they were situated. But all this is mere assertion, and unsupported by proof. Far more probable is the opinion of Bp. Pearce, that πρωτη may here denote chief; most important in trade, riches, and population (though not in dignity). And this there is reason to think it was. But as we have no proof, it may be safer to adopt the mode of interpretation proposed by Michaelis and Kuinoel, a first or principal city, a primary city of the province. We have, too, a similar idiom in our own language. There yet, however, remains one difficulty, namely, that the article before μεγεδος would seem to require πρωτη to be taken in its full sense, metropolis: though even then there would arise a very frigid sense. Some Commentators, indeed, maintain that it is for ταυτης (or rather ταυτης της); and appeal to της 3, 2. της ιδεω (namely, Christianity). But the idiom may there better be tolerated than here. Besides, St. Luke writes, a little after, ταυτη τη πολις, where τη πολις might have done as well as της μεγεδος here.

Markland has rightly seen that this could not be tolerated; but his remedy is worse than the disease, which may be cured by a less violent method than amputation. Two very antient MSS. and the Syriac Version omit the first της, and the latter is not found in several excellent MSS. and Chrysostom. Now all these evidences I consider as uniting to show, that of the two της one only has place. If the first της be omitted, there will arise the following unexceptionable sense, "which is a principal city of a province of Macedonia, and a colony." Kuinoel appeals to Eckhel. Doctr. Veter. Numm. p. 1. vol. 4. 282. in proof that πρωτη was sometimes so applied, namely, to principal and celebrated cities, though not capitals.

12. κολανα. See Schl. Lex. That Julius Caesar

13. ἔξω τῆς πόλεως. I agree with Kuinoel, that πόλης, the reading of many antient MSS., is the true one, and that πόλεως is a marginal scholium.

13. παρὰ τοῦτον, οὐ ἐνομίζετο πρὸσευκρῆ εἶναι. The Commentators have found some difficulty in the interpretation of this sentence, arising from the ambiguity of the words πρὸσευκρῆ and ἐνομίζετο. Some earlier ones, as Chrysostom, the Vulgate Translator, Erasmus, Wolf, Beza, Piscator, Knatchbull, and Gronovius, take πρὸσευκρῆ in the common sense. So our English Version, "where prayer was wont to be made." This, however, seems not definite enough; nay, it appears to be unauthorized phraseology. The most eminent critics and commentators have been long agreed that πρὸσευκρῆ must here have the sense of oratory (as it was also taken by the Syriac Translator). And it was likely that St. Luke should use the word in this signification, since such places were in use, and had that name. In this sense, too, it occurs in Josephus, Juvenal, Philo; as also in a Decree of the Halicarnassians (cited by Elsner), shewing that the Jews are allowed παντὰς πρὸσευκράς

* So also Digest. Leg. 8, 8. In provinciâ Macedonìà Dyrracheni, Cassendrenses, Philippenses juris Italici sunt. Now these were, it must be remembered, colonies with different species of civil rights. Some were called Romanæ, which, however, had not the complete jus civitatis, but only the private rights of Quirites, without the privilege of suffrage, or of bearing offices in the state. Others were styled Latinae, which had not the rights of Quirites, but the Jus Latii. Now those who enjoyed it might bear suffrage at the popular assemblies for legislation, if summoned thereto by the Roman magistracy; and when they had held magistracy in a Latin city, they thereby obtained the Roman citizenship. Others again (as were most of those out of Italy) were Juris Italici; a privilege inferior to the Latinitas, and which consisted in immunity from tribute, whether land, or capitation tax. See Spanheim Orb. Rom. p. 50. and Hegn, Progr. 1 & 2. de vet. coloniorum jure, in his Opus. T. 1, 290. (Kuin.)
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ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τῷ βαλασσίᾳ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος *, which illustrates and confirms the words παρὰ τὸν πόταμον. So Philo. c. Flacc. Διὰ τοῦ θυλαμοῦ ἔκχυσθεν εἰς τοὺς πλη- σίον αἰγιαλοῦ, τὰς γὰρ προσευχὰς ἀφήγηστο, οὗ ἐνομί- ζεται προσευχή εἶναι.

But the words οὗ ἐνομίζεται do not seem very favourable to this interpretation of προσευχή. Hence Bos, Madus, and some others regard them as put pleonastically for οὗ ἐν. This pleonasm, however, has not been satisfactorily established; and to resort to it here, would be too arbitrary: neither, indeed, is it necessary. Νομίζεσθαι may retain the sense “to be customary” ascribed to it by the early Commentators; of which numerous examples are adduced by Elsner, Wetstein, Munthe, and Loesner.† Wolf, therefore, assigns to the words this sense, “where it was the custom to erect such buildings.” But there is surely some harshness in this; as if the custom did not yet exist: and indeed that sense would rather require

* The proseuchæ of this kind, in which the sacred books were read, the Jews had out of those towns where there were no syna- gogues, either from the fewness of the Jews, or because the laws, or their administrators, would not permit any [which was probably the case in Roman cities or colonies, since Juvenal speaks at Rome of Proseuchas, not synagogues. Edit.]. These proseuchæ were not always edifices [though sometimes, as we find from Joseph. Ant. 14, 10, 23. they had such edifices, and very large ones; so that, as Vitringa de Synag. Vet. 119. tells us the name was occasionally applied to a synagogue. Edit.], but, for the most part, places in the open air, in a grove, or in shrubberies, and even under a tree; though always (as we may suppose) near to some water, for the convenience of those ablutions, which, with the Jews [and also the Pagans, nay even, as we find from Elsner, the early Christians, Edit.] always preceded prayer. (Kuin.)


The only deviation here from Classical use is in the employing of ἐνομίζεται: though in the use of νομίζεται in the above-mentioned sense some verb must be understood. Sometimes it is expressed; as in Herodot, 1, 302. ἐσθῆτι δὲ νομίζονται χρᾶσθαι Φωκῶν.
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προσευχαῖ, and (perhaps) νεοφόρα. I, therefore, would not refer the words to the general custom, but the local one, in the following sense: "by a river side, where it was the custom for a proseucha or prayer-meeting to be held:" for that, after all, appears to be the meaning of προσευχαῖ, and the words seem to hint that the place where they met was not a building, but a grove, or something of that sort; and that the meeting, though ordinarily and customarily held at the place here mentioned, might have been removed to any other.

13. ἐκκλησία τοῖς συνελθόντεσι γυναικῖ. It is strange that they should have addressed themselves to the women only. Doddridge supposes that most of the congregation were of that sex. It may have been so; but that does not remove the difficulty. If I might be permitted to hazard a conjecture, I would say that, as in the synagogue the sexes were carefully separated (as was probably the case also in such proseuchæ as were regular buildings), so in such as were mere tabernacles, booths, or groves, this would not be practicable; and therefore we may be allowed to conjecture that the sexes attended at the proseucha separately.

The custom of sitting to teach has been treated of in the Gospels.

14. καὶ τῆς γυνῆ ὄνοματι Λυδία—Θεοτιτών. The Commentators are not agreed whether Λυδία is to be regarded as an appellative noun, or a name of country; since Thyatira was in Lydia; and for the word in this latter use there is sufficient authority; as Max. Tyr. Diss. 10 & 40. Achill. Tat. 1. p. 17., besides other examples cited by Wetstein. But the term ὄνοματι should seem to determine it to be the former, and the name was a common one. Even a schoolboy will remember the "Lydia, dic, per ommes," &c. of Horace. Wetstein has several other examples, which, however, rather illustrate the manners of the Lydian women, which were proverbially depraved. So Herodot. 1, 98. τοῦ γὰρ ἐν Λυδῶν δήμοι αἱ θυγατέρες τορνεύονται πᾶσι.
14. πορφυρόπωλις. This is the feminine form of πορφυρόπωλις, explained in the Gloss. Vet. purpuraceus, by which we are to understand, not a seller of the purple dye, but of purple vests, for the dying of which the Lydians were famous;* and that this art was especially exercised by the Tyrians, we find from an incipient dug up at Tyre, and to be found in Spon's Collection. It is as follows: ἡγαθὴ τοῦ Τυρηνίου καλ. Ἀλφιᾶν Ἀριγαντοῦ κράτιστον ἐπίτροπον τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ... τὸν καλ. σεβαστὸν λεγέα τοῦ προκατόρθω θεοῦ Τυρηνίου οἱ βασιλεῖς. The next words, σεβομένη τοῦ Θεοῦ, are a periphrastic designation of a Jewish proselyte.

14. ἔστι Κύριος διηνοῦσε τὴν καρδίαν, i.e. (says à Lapide, Menochius, and Calvin,) “enlightened her intellect, and moved her will:” for in vain does the ‘water strike the ears, if the Deity does not unlock the heart.” By Κύριος, however, some (as Kuinoel) understand Christ; and they compare ver. 15. On the fact itself Grotius observes, that actions and words are sometimes so taken as to tacitly include the effect, although that effect be, in some measure, within human power. “Thus (says he) God opened her heart, when she suffered it to be opened; nay, even opening it in her own manner. See Apoc. 3, 20. So he is said to be drawn, who willingly follows him who draws him; and that is said to be given which is received.” Wolf remarks, that the same phrase occurs in the Jewish prayers.† And so 2 Macc.

† The following illustrations of this expression are derived from Morus: “The mind is said to be closed against exhortation or admonition, which either cannot know the truth, or will not admit the admonition. Hence to open the mind or heart denotes, to render it more intelligent, to cause that any one shall better perceive the truth, and more readily yield assent to it: and, withal, this involves the making any one prompt and prepared to embrace the doctrine of Christ. In the present instance, God or Christ opened the heart of Lydia to Paul's doctrine.” See also the excellent note of Whitby.
1. 14. διανοήσαι τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς προστάγμασι. Wetstein here cites the following beautiful passage of Themist. 2. p. 29 ἐν ἑνὶ ἀτεχνῷ ὑπομένω καὶ ἀριστον πάθος. Αἰτιολόγεται γὰρ μοι τὸ στῆθος καὶ ἡ καρδία, καὶ διανοεῖται γίνεται ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὰ ὄμματα ὄξυτα τῆς διανοίας ὁρῶ γοῦν, ὡς μακαριοῦ, ὡς προέρευν ὧν ὁλοὶ τὸ ἦν.

15. εἰ κεκρίκατε με πιστὴν τῷ Κυρίῳ εἶναι, “if ye regard me as a true Christian.” Chrysostom explains thus: ὡς ὡς τὸ ἐγχειρίζασθαι μοι τοιαῦτα μυστήρια οὐκ ἔν ἐγχειρίζασται, εἰ μὴ τοιαύτην ἐκρίνατε.

16. καὶ παρεβίασαντο ἡμᾶς. This word (like ἀναγκαζων in Luke. 14, 22, where see the note) is used of moral compulsion, namely, such urgent entreaty as, in a manner, compels the person to grant the request. See Chrysostom, Pricæus, and Elsner, the last of whom, among other examples, has the following: 1 Kings 28, 23. καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη φαγεῖν, καὶ παρεβίασαντο αὐτοῦ οἱ παιδες καὶ ἡ γυνὴ. Ἀελιαν. V. H. 15, 32. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁρτὶν ἥκειν βιάζομαι. Petron. Sat. c. 8. p. 518. Nemo invitus audit, quum cogitur aut cibum sumere aut vivere. So Gen. 19, 3. where Lot κατεβιάζετο, constrained the angel to come in. The παρέβιασαν signifies “præter,” and hints that the thing is involuntary.

16. ἐγένετο δὲ, παρενεμένων ἡμῶν εἰς προσευχὴν. It is not clear when this circumstance took place; whether on the same day with the preceding, or on some other. Many Commentatortes fix on the latter, which is by far the more probable opinion; perhaps it was on the day of baptism. Heinrichs and Kuinoel are of opinion that what has just been narrated took place before divine service in the proseucha, and at the place where the women used to wait till the commencement of the worship. There is, however, something hypothetical and precarious in this.

16. παρενεμένων ἡμῶν εἰς προσευχὴν. I see not how the common interpretation of these words “going unto prayer,” can be defended. It seems quite inconsistent with any view of the story as there narrated. Nay, even Wolf and Vitringa, who just before explain
prayer, acknowledge that here it must have the sense of proseucha, or praying place. Moreover, I must observe that of such a phrase there seems to be no other example in Scripture. Besides, the expressions at ver. 14. going out of the city to this proseucha, and here, going to the proseucha, are exactly similar. The above interpretation has also the authority of the Syriac Version, and is adopted by most modern Commentators.

16. ταύδισκην. This word, rendered in our Version damsel, must (as appears from what follows) signify a maid-servant, or female slave; as in several other passages both of the New and Old Testament.

16. ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα Πύθαιων, i. e. agitated by a spirit of Pythia, or a (pretended) prophetic spirit. This word is to be derived from Ἰ Πύθαιων,* (whence Πύθαιως), a common epithet of Apollo. Now since the Pythia, or priestess of Apollo, predicted future events, so the name Πύθαιων came to be applied to every demon by whose inspiration, or at whose suggestion, future events were supposed to be predicted. Thus Hesychius explains it δαμόνων μαντικῶν. Hence it was at length transferred to the men themselves who were believed to be able to predict future events by their divine or diabolical aid. So Plut. 414. τοῦς ἐγγαστρίμωδους Εὐρυκλείας πάλαι, νῦν Πύθαιων προσαγοχωρεύομενος. Hesych. Πύθαιων, ὁ ἐγγαστρίμωδος ἡ ἐγγαστρίματις. Id. Εὐρυκλῆς, ὁ ἐγγαστρίμωδος, ήν δὲ γένος μαντέων, οὐς ὁμονύμους Εὐρυκλεῖς ἐλεγον. Suidas: ἐγγαστρίμωδος. ἐγγαστριμάτις, ἐν ἰωυτίνες Πύθαιων, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ στεριμάτινι,

* This name is commonly derived from πνοστηθαι, to consult (which reminds one of the famous derivation of lucus a non lucendo), or from πνοστηθαι, to putrify, or from Put, son of Ham! (Gen. 10, 6.); which is indeed tracing it ab solo. It ismanifest that to confess ignorance is here the greatest wisdom. The word probably came from the Eastern languages (perhaps the Sanscrit); but the origin and circumstances which led to the appellation are lost in the grey mists of early antiquity. So that even in the age of Cicero it was as much unknown as at the present day. For in his Treatise de Divinatione 2, 57. (cited by Wets.) he thus writes: Evanaisse ajunt vetustate vim loci ejus, unde anhelitus ille fieret, quo Pythiâ mente incitata ederet oracula.
The name ἐγγαστρίμυθων was also applied to those conjurers, or jugglers, who possessed the faculty of speaking with closed lips, and of conveying the sound in such a manner as to seem to come from the belly. So Galen. Glossar. Hippocr. ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, οἱ κεκλεισμένοι τοῦ στόματος φθεγγόμενοι, διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν ἐκ τῆς γαστρᾶς φθέγγεσθαι. On these see Dickinson in his Delph. Phæn. C. 9. p. 91., Selden de Diis Syr. 1, 2., Suic. Thes. 985., Hammond on this passage, and, above all, Walch Diss. 4. de servis veterum fatidicis.

Now whether the girl in question were a ventriloquist (as many Commentators think), or a prophetess, who uttered oracles with a clear voice, cannot with certainty be determined. For Πίθινος is, as we have seen, a generick name applied to those who were formerly termed ἐγγαστρίμυθοι. Very probable, however, is the opinion of Deyling, in his Obs. Sacr. 2, 200. Wolf, on this passage, and Walch, in the above mentioned Dissertation, p. 18, think that the woman is not to be reckoned in the number of ventriloquists, since Luke ascribes to her words distinctly pronounced, and says that she followed Paul and his companions; and therefore prophesied in the course of walking through the streets: whereas the ἐγγαστρίμυθοι used to pronounce their words in some fixed place, whether sitting or standing.* Under these circumstances, therefore, the phrase must denote a girl who had the spirit of a Prophet. (Kuin.)

I entirely assent to the learned Commentators that there is no proof that the girl was an ἐγγαστρίμυθος (though Augustin seems to have so thought): nor

* So the ventriloquists of our days (I believe) require a certain, and perhaps purposely adapted, or at least favourable, piece in some room: nor am I aware that any have ever pretended to exhibit their art walking about in the open air.
do I see any probability in the opinion, except on the hypothesis, laid down by Farmer and others, that she was a mere impostress, which is, however, utterly untenable, and at variance with the whole complexion of the story. Yet I do not agree with Benson, Michaelis, Hezel, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, that she was an hysterick, or lunatick person, or, as they say, in the language of that time, daemoniack, and was hurried away by her disorder to fancy herself a Pythia, and that what she uttered was from the inspiration of some god. Indeed, this hypothesis lies open to many objections, and among others this, that the words in which she is described are not suitable to a lunatic, or demoniac. In short, it involves many more difficulties than the common one, which is alone reconcileable with the words of St. Luke. It is plain that St. Paul and St. Luke both thought it a real possession by some spirit, which (by the permission of God) enabled her to utter divinations, tell fortunes, &c.


16. τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς, her masters. Some Commentators have stumbled at the plural, which Fischer would take for the singular. But enallages of number were confined to certain cases; and this is not

* Wetstein appositely cites Demosth. c. Neseer. ὡς αὐτῇ ἦ ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἔργασια αὐτῆς παρείγεται. Aristot. Eth. 4; 3. oi τὰς ἀνελευθέρους ἔργασιας ἔργαζόμενοι. So also Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 1. (cited by Kuin.) τὰς τέγνας ἐχοντων καὶ τῆς ἔργασις ἑκατο χρωμένων. Wetstein, too, has the following humorous passage from an antient Roman Comedian: "Non habeo denique nucem Marsum augurem, non vicanos aruspices, non de circa astrologos, non Issacos conjectores, non interpretes sonnium; non enim sunt in arte divini aut scientiae. Sed superstitiosi vates impudentesque aroli, aut inertes, aut insani, aut quibus egestas imperat; qui sui questus causâ fietas suscitantium sententias; qui sibi semitam non sapient, alteri monstrant viam; quibus divitiis pollicentur, ab his drachmam petunt; de his divitiis sibi deducant drachmam, reddant casta." Ennius.
one of them. Grotius observes that there might be many masters to one slave; but not in solidum, which I leave to the civilians to explain. Walch, however, who has, in his Dissertations, entered into an extensive examination of the subject, shews that this common possession of a slave was not unfrequent: and he traces the cause of this to the property itself, which often remained common to several heirs, as also to the high price of those slaves from whom any great gain was to be expected.

17. κατακολούθησα. Valcknaer shews that the preposition κατὰ has an intensive force; which is very frequent, both in composition with verbs and with nouns; of which Valckn. adduces several examples.

17. ἐκρατεῖ, λέγουσα: Οὗτοι — υψίστου. The appellation δωλοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ had been applied to the prophets; and was given to, and assumed by the Apostles. (See Rom. 1, 1.) The term was applied with reference to their being especially devoted to God. See Joh. 1, 1. 12, 6. 2 Kings 9, 7. Jud. 2, 8. And, even among the Gentiles, those who had been dedicated to God as priests were called δωλοὶ θεῶ. See Eurip. Ion. 309., Iph. T. 132., Phæn. 218., and Ovid. Fast. 3, 45. (Kuin.) More examples may be seen in Elser, to which I add Diodor. Sic. 8, 346. καλούντας οἰκέται τοῦ Δίω.

Various reasons have been devised by the recent Commentators why the girl made use of this exclamation, each adapted to the general hypothesis maintained respecting her. But there is no greater difficulty in accounting for them on the common hypothesis, of a real possession, than on any other. Indeed, I would seriously deprecate the too curious and prying spirit with which speculations on questions scarcely, if at all, determinable, are at the present day pursued, and against which students cannot be too much on their guard.

18. διατονθέτεις δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, wearied out, thoroughly wearied. On διατον. see the note on 4, 2. Paul did
not, it seems, chuse to have such a testimony; and proceeds, without further delay, to expel the demon; or rather, as many recent Commentators tell us, cure the disease; in doing which, he speaks (say they) suitably to the popular opinion and the fixed idea of the lunatic. But this view of the subject, specious as it is, is liable to strong objections, which my limits will not permit me here to state. The remaining words are sufficiently perspicuous.

19. ἰδόντες— distância ἔξηλθεν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς ἔργασιας. Valckenaer, in his Schediasm. 384. has observed that ἔξηλθεν is nowhere else used of the "vanishing of hope," nor would it here, but in order to form a paronomasia with the preceding ἔξηλθεν. To this latter position I assent, especially as the figure is elsewhere found in the New Testament; but that ἔξηλθεν is nowhere else applied to the vanishing of hope, is too bold an assertion for even so profoundly learned a Philologist to make, considering the vast extent of Greek literature, and the limited powers of the human memory. The word is often used of the passing away of time, both in Xenophon and Demosthenes. It is well rendered in our version gone.

19. ἐπικαλούμενοι. See the note on 9, 27. The words ἔλκειν and σύρειν, it must be observed, are, like the Latin rapere, used of the leading any one away, whether violently or not, to trial or prison. The ἔρχυστες are the same with those who are, in the next verse, called στρατηγοὶ. The former seems to have been the general appellation given to all the magistrates of the Philippians (i.e. κριτῶν), and στρατηγοῖ a more special definition of the persons. (Kuin.)

20. καὶ προσαγαγόντες αὐτῶς τοῖς στρατηγοῖς. The senators in the municipia and coloniae were styled decuriones. (See Cic. pro Sext. 4. and Epist. Fam. 6, 18.) Now of those who discharged in them the office of chief magistrates, the name varied with the number of persons to whom that function was committed. In some it was committed to two, in others to four, or sometimes to six; hence called either du-
umviri, quatuorviri, or seviri. See Sigon. de antiqu. Jure Italici 2, 4. As to στρατηγός, it properly signifies a commander of troops. But as στρατός was also used of the great body of the people (see Soph. El. 752. and Spanheim on Julian Or. p. 75. and de usu Numism. p. 697.); so στρατηγός was modified, and thus the word came to denote a civil magistrate. Even among the Romans there were prætors, both military and civil, which latter used to hear and decide causes. Now these, by the Romans called præiores urbani, were by the Greeks styled στρατηγοὶ. So Diodor. Sic. 2, p. 898. ὁ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν στρατηγός. This title of Prætor the municipal and colonial duumviri used especially to take to themselves, [which had, perhaps, at first, been given them by courtesy. Edit.] since the coloniae and municipia used studiously to imitate the form of the Roman republic. So Cicero Agrar. 2, 34. (speaking of the Duumviri of Campania,) "Cūm in caeteris coloniis Duumviri appellantur, hi se Prætores appellari volebant." Hence these Duumvirs were, in Greek, called στρατηγοὶ, and to the class of such Duumvirs belonged those whom Luke has here called στρατηγοὶ. See Spanheim de usu Num. 697., Heinsius Exerc. Sacr. 805., Krebs ad Decret. Athen. p. 22., Walch de strategis Philipp., Casaubon on Athen. p. 373., and Munthe on this passage. (Kuin.)

Of other significations of στρατηγός several examples are adduced by Wetstein from Achil. Tat. 449. Artem. 4, 51. 5, 36. Arrian Epict. 2, 1. Thus in the Latin Version of the Cod. Cant. we have praetoribus, and in the Vulgate magistratibus. Nay, Wetzer remarks, that the appellation still subsists at Messina, where the mayor of the city is called the Stradigo. See Dorvill. on Charit. 447. and Otto de ædilibus coloniarum p. 356. seqq.

20. ἔκταφασσομεν ἤγεραν τήν πόλιν. It is judiciously observed by Doddridge, that, though the masters of the girl had not only lost all the gain they might have made by the practice of the arts she professed,
but likewise what they might have sold her for in consequence of those extraordinary qualities, which were now ceased, yet as the laws made no provision for an event of this kind, they thought proper to ground their accusation on an attempt to introduce a new religion, which was indeed forbidden by the laws. Kuinoel, too, remarks, that it was not allowed among the Romans to worship any God, or recommend the worship of any, but such as were ordered by public authority: * and though indeed (as Walch observes) they permitted foreigners to worship their own Gods in the city, yet it was only to be done in private, secretly, and, as it were, by stealth, and in such a manner as should not interfere with, or be any hindrance to, the rites of the established religion, or give any occasion to civil dissensions. "It was therefore not lawful (continues he) among the Romans to recommend a new religion to the citizens, or even attempt to detach them from that which had been established by public authority. Now taking all these things into due consideration, together with the hatred of the Romans towards the Jews and their religion, and bearing in mind that it was the primary duty of the provincial, colonial, and municipal magistrates to severely punish all seditious persons, or those who in any way stirred up the minds of the people, and to extinguish, by whatever means, rising sedition or tumult, we shall easily

* So Serv. on Virg. Aen. 8. 187. (cited by Wets.) Caustum fessisset et apud Athenienses et apud Romanos, ne quis novas introduceret religiones: unde et Socrates damnatus est, et Chaldae vel Judei urbe depulsi. Jul. Paulus Sentent. V. 21, 2. Qui novas et usus vel ratione incognitas religiones inducant, ex quibus animi hominum moveantur, honestiores deportantur, humilliores capite puniuntur. Thus also Augustus (as we learn from Sueton. Vit. Aug. C. 98.) studiously adhered to the religion of his forefathers, and held foreigners in contempt, mindful of the advice of Maecenas, recorded by Dio Cass. p. 492. τὸ μὲν θείον πάντως αὐτὸς τε οὐδὲν, εκατὰ τὰ πάντα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τμῆσιν ἀνάγκαζε, τοὺς δὲ ἐνίκησεν τι περὶ αὐτὰ καὶ μιθα καὶ κόλαζε. The same is narrated of Tiberius by Sueton. V. Tib. c. 36., Valer. Max. 1, 3., and Livy 39, 15 seq. (Kuin.)
see the reason why the accusers resort to the charge of turbulence and sedition, and why they add the circumstance ἱσώδαις ὑπάρχοντες, which suggests an aggravation of the offence, as having been committed by those who were bound to show a very different conduct. Moreover, we shall see why they insinuated an attempt to proselyte Romans, who were not to admit any foreign religion. They craftily, too, omit all mention of their loss, lest their impartiality might be suspected, and their accusation be ascribed to malice.” (Walch.)

Ἐκταρράσσομαι is by Kuinoel supposed to be put for the simple. But I see no reason why the ἐκ should not be thought intensive;* a force which it has in many verbs and adjectives. The ἐκθεί may denote customs of any kind; but the context must here limit it to religious rites.

22. καὶ συνεκτέτη ὁ ὀχλος, i. e. “the people co-operated with the accusers, and rose up impetuously against (the Apostles).” So Num. 16, 3. συνεκτέτησαν ἐπὶ Μωυσήν.

23. περιτρήθηκαντες, i. e. “having ordered them to be stripped (for scourging).” On which Kuinoel gravely proves, by several Classical citations, that criminals of antient times were stripped previous to being whipped! It is, I think, of somewhat more importance to attend to this idiomatical use of περιτρήθη-νομι (similar to what obtains in the Latin scindere, discindere), by which it signifies not tear (as Erasmus supposed), but tear off; and it is used of violently and hastily pulling off clothes. There was, indeed, little occasion for Grotius to have proved the prevalence of this custom among the Greeks,

* That it is a very strong expression, is plain from Wetstein’s Classical illustrations, among which is the following curious passage from Aristoph. Equit. 863. ὅταν μὲν ἡ χλινις καταστῇ, λαμβάνοντας οὐδὲν εὖν ὃ ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω τῶν βορσοφον κεκέω, αἴροντε καὶ σὺ λαμβάνεις, ἵν τὴν πόλιν ταράττεις. Which passage confirms and illustrates my derivation of ταρασσεῖν, supra 15, 24., and, what is more, suggests matter of serious reflection to the politician.
Romans, and Jews; but it is curious that we find the very expression in Xenoph. p. 742. τὴν ἐσθήτα περιφήκατε: and Diodor. Sic. 17, 35. οἱ τὰς ἐσθήτας περιφήκαντες. We are not, however, to suppose, with Bengel, that the magistrates themselves tore off their clothes, but the action is, by a figure frequent in all writers, and all languages, ascribed to them, as being done by their orders.

"Many Commentators (says Kuin.) suppose the scourging to have been quaestionis ergo, to extort confession of guilt; and they appeal to Tacit. Hist. 4, 27. and Acts 22, 24., where, however, ἀνετάξεσθαι is expressed. Here everything seems to have been done with tumultuous irregularity. The insurrection of the people is mentioned, but nothing said of any regular trial, or opportunity given to the accused to defend themselves. It seems, therefore, more probable that the prætors ordered the scourging as a temporary punishment, to satisfy the people; and directed Paul and Barnabas to be imprisoned, in order that time might thus be given them to make further enquiry into the affair on some other day."

22. ἰαβαδίζεν, to beat with rods. An Hellenistic word, used also in 1 Cor. 11, 25. τρις ἐφραβαδίσθην. It occurs in the Sept. and answers to the Hebrew שָׂרָן, to thrash (corn), in Judg. 6, 11. Ruth 2, 17. Is. 27, 12. That the antients used to thrash out some kinds of corn, has been shown by Schoettgen, in Antiq. Tritur. § 18. (Schleusner.)


24. On παραγγελία see the note on 5, 28. Ἐβαλ- λεν αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακὴν. Jails were not, it seems, so strongly built at the front, or outer part, as in the interior, to which the access was by many gates, and where the prisoners were more closely confined, and treated more harshly. (Walsh, Diss. de Vinc. Petr.) On the jails of the antients see Scipio Gentilis on the Epist. to Philemon, and Witsius Melet. 182. Ἐσωτέρα φυλακὴ signifies the
inner, and safer custody, which writers express by various names; as has been shown by Pet. Faber Semest. 2. p. 92. (Wolf.) I would add a very similar expression of Livy 34, 44. Pleminius in inferiorem demissus carcerem est.

24. των πεδας αυτων ψαφαλισατο εις το ξυλον. The ξυλον was a wooden (and sometimes ironbound) machine (as in Herodot. 9, 37. ξυλον σιδηρωδετων), by which any member, and especially the neck, was so confined down that it could not be raised (see Aristoph. Nub. 592. Lysistr. 681.); or into which the feet were thrust and constrained, as here, and in Herod. 6, 75. 9, 37. Aristoph. Ep. 366, 398 & 1046.; also called the καλον, ευλασθη, ποδοκατη, and ποδοστράφη. So the Hebr. תון, in Job 13, 27. 38, 11. (see Michael. Suppl. ad lex. Hebr.) Or finally, one in which the person was held by all the members, neck, hands, and feet; and which, having five holes, or foramina, was called πεντασύργος. See Aristoph. Ep. 1046. This machine was by the Romans called the nervus (probably from the machine being originally composed partly of ropes). So Plaut. Capt. 3, 5, 71. Nam noctu nervo vinctus custodiebatur. (Kuin.)

For most of the above matter the learned Commentator is indebted to Elsner (whom see); and almost all his Classical citations are derived from that writer and Wetstein. Both, however, have omitted a curious expression to be found in Plaut. Pæn. 5, 6, 28. Ne sis apud me in ligned custodid: which I have cited principally for the purpose of indicating the origin of Samuel Butler's very happy periphrasis for stocks, namely, The wooden bastille. For that, and some other expressions of the same nature, which occur in his Hudibras, the witty buffoon seems to have been indebted to the notes of Grotius and Princeps, who had anticipated most of what Elsner could meet with on the subject; as, indeed, has been the case with many of my own collections. I can, however, subjoin the following gleanings. Thémist. 289 b. et το γυλον ην: and 11 b. δει άτυχεστερος

25. προσευχόμενοι όμοι ό τον Θεόν, i.e. "they returned thanks to God that they had been thought worthy of suffering in the cause of Christ and of religion. See 5, 41. and Matt. 5, 11 & 12. Now the circumstance of the "prisoners hearing them" is recorded, in order to show how courageously they bore this testimony of faith in God, insomuch that their fellows were witnesses of that fortitude. (Grot. & Kuin.) This was, indeed, joy in the Holy Ghost: in a prison where they could neither bend their knees, nor raise their hands! (Wets.)

26. ἀρ νω δὲ σεσυμπέρ ἐγένετο μέγας. That earthquake, in the usual sense, must be understood, is plain from the circumstance of the doors being forced open. That lightning should have caused them to open (as some recent Commentators imagine) is utterly incredible.

When the jailor had awakened, and found the doors open, he might well suppose that the prisoners had found means to effect their escape. Therefore it was natural that he should (knowing the heavy penalty to which the laws adjudged him; see 12, 7.) think of seeking death in a milder form than that which he would otherwise expect to meet at the
hands of the executioner. On this earthquake, it has been remarked by Priceus, Grotius, Elsner, and others, that the presence of the Deity, or of an angel from him, was usually denoted by such a phenomenon; as in 4, 31. See Ex. 19, 18. Heb. 12, 25. Ps. 103, 32. This, too, was the constant opinion of the Heathens; in illustration of which, Elsner, amongst many other passages, cites Ovid. Fast. 3, 329. Constat Aventinæ tremuisse cacumina sylvae, terraque subsedit pondere pressa Jovis. See also Longin. § 9. Eurip. Bacch. 591. The same remark will also apply to doors opening of themselves, which was always thought to indicate the presence of the Deity, or of an angel.

26. καὶ πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ ἀνέβη. By this most Commentators understand that the chains of all the prisoners were loosed, or relaxed; though not so that they were quite at liberty. But this is difficult to conceive, and, from the use of the word in the Classical writers (see the examples cited by Wets.), ἀνέβη can only signify freed from chains, as if the chains had fallen off; as in the case of Peter 12, 7. But as the doors were at the same time opened, it would be wonderful that they should not have made their escape; which is, by many, attributed to extreme astonishment. The reason assigned by Grotius for it is Divine interposition, and for this cause,—that the Apostles might know that they were useful to others as well as to themselves, and that by them the chains of the mind were loosed. All this, however, seems little satisfactory. I cannot help suspecting (which I am surprised should not have occurred to the Commentators), that for πάντων we should read πᾶσων, as referred to θυεῖ, or rather take πάντων for πᾶσων, by a very frequent enallage, in which an adjective is made to agree not so much with the antecedent as with some kindred word, as here, θυεῖτρων. Now chains are applicable to doors as well as to persons. It seems probable that Chrysostom so read or understood the words, since at
812. 16. he closely unites ἡνειξεν καρδίας τας θυρας with ἑλετε δεσμὰ διετλᾶ.

27. ἐξυπνος. The words occur in 3 Esdr. 3, 8.

28. ἐφαίνησε, &c. Doddridge and Kuinoel think that Paul understood the man's intention from the uttering of some desperate words that declared it. Here Wets. compares Xen. Ephes. 1. ἐδεδώκει γὰρ, μὴ τι ἐκποίη ἐργάσηται δεινῶ. It is remarked by Grötius that suicide was frequent among the Greeks and Romans, and was not disapproved of by the philosophers. Nay, even among the Hebrews, it was a doubtful question whether it might or might not be tolerated; as appears from the interesting narrative; which many of my readers will recollect, found in Joseph. de Bell. Jud. in which is related the mode by which the life of the Historian was (as it seems, by the hand of Providence) preserved, when he had fallen among a band of most sanguinary desperadoes.

29. αἰρήσας δὲ φῶτα, i. e. “having sought a light.” Wets. compares Phil. 2, 311 Α. φῶς ἡποτευ. and Phaedr. 3, 10, 24. Dum quærunt lumen. Doddridge, very improperly presses on the plural of this word, from which he makes some groundless inferences; not aware that there is here merely an idiom, by which the plural is put for the singular; as in the Latin epistola.

29. ἐντομος γενομενος, trembling. This is, by Kuinoel (not without reason), ascribed to his regarding them as Divine legates, and this opening of the doors, as an evidence of the presence of the Deity, by his angel. He falls at their feet, too, in token of respect to those whom he accounted Divine legates. The custom was an Oriental one.

30. καὶ προαγαγὼν αὐτῶς ἐξω, i. e. out of the dungeon, or inner prison, to a place sub dio, say the Commentators; which, however, is uncertain.

With respect to the words of the jailor’s address, τι μὲ δεῖ ποιεῖν ίνα σωθῶ, I am surprised that any competent judge of phraseology should have thought...
them of uncertain sense; * as denoting either, "how may I escape the punishment of the magistrates, who well suppose that these things happened with my privacy," or, "how may I escape the punishment of your Deities for imprisoning such holy persons?" Now to the former interpretation it may be sufficient to answer, that the earthquake could not be the jailor's fault, and the captives had not effected their escape; and as to the latter, the fault again was not his, but the magistrate's! Therefore the only interpretation (as Kuinoel and Heinrichs acknowledge) at all agreeable to the context is the common one, "how shall I attain eternal salvation?" The jailor had doubtless heard that they professed to be Divinely commissioned to show men the way to eternal salvation. That commission was, to the jailor, confirmed by the awful event he had just witnessed; and therefore it was natural for him so to address them.

Κύριος was, observes Wolf, among the Greeks an usual form of address to those whose names any one was ignorant of. True; but this cannot be applicable in the present instance; since the jailor must have known the names of his prisoners. It is therefore far more reasonable to here consider it as a mode of respectful address. And so it was not unfrequently used. See the note on Matt. 8, 2. "embrace the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and obey its precepts."† Grotius explains: "believe with that faith which sways the mind to obedience." Kuinoel

* Markland thinks it probable, considering who it is that asks the question, and under what circumstances, that the jailor meant no more than, What must I do to be safe? Which signification, he says, the language will bear as well as the other. Ζωθήσῃ, in St. Paul's answer, he takes to be of much greater extent than it was in the jailor's question; as signifying not only thou shalt be safe, but likewise thou shalt be saved; which last, says he, the jailor perhaps little thought of at that time. But this is a very precarious; not to say absurd, criticism.

† In this connexion, believing in Jesus Christ would immediately
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remarks (from Doddridge) that we are not by this to understand that, if the jailor thus believed, his whole family would be also saved; but that we have here a breviloquentia (examples of which figures may be seen in Glass. Phil. S. 620, 640.) for, "thou shalt be saved and all thy house, if they believe and obey in like manner."

32. ἐξάλησαν αὐτῶν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, i.e. "made known to him such fundamental truths of the Gospel as suitable to his ignorant state."

33. καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτῶν, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ. So I would point; taking ἐν ἐκείνῃ, &c. to mean, "at that very hour, unreasonable as it was." Ἔλουσεν ἀνὰ τῶν πληγῶν. There is something strange in this expression. Hence Grotius supposes it to signify that the jailor took them to a bath within the precincts of the prison, and bathed them. He probably was of the same opinion as Dr. Campbell, who (on Joh. 9, 7.) takes it to mean, "bathed their whole bodies, for the sake of cleansing their wounds." So Piscator takes ἔλουσεν as a vox prægnans for ἔλουσε καθαρίζων. The ἀνὰ Κυρίκε and Kuinoel think may signify propter; as in Sirach 31, 25. 29, 27. and Lucian p. 744. ἀνὰ τῆς νύσσης ἐξορίσατο. Thus it will be necessary to understand σώματα. Among other passages produced by Wets. tending to countenance this interpretation, is one from Achill. Tat. p. 321. τὰ νύστα διαγεγραμμένα δείκνυσιν—αὐτήν παραδίδουσι διαπαινοὺς κελεύοντας λαύσαι. Certainly if the distinction laid down by Campbell were invariably true, that νύστα always signifies to dip, and λαύω always to bathe, there could be no doubt as to this interpretation, which (after all) may be the true one. Most Commentators, however, following the Vulgate, interpret, "washed their wounds." Thus there will imply, submitting to the further instructions of these his special ambassadors and authorized messengers: and it always includes a desire to be delivered from the power of sin, and a disposition to comply with his scheme of salvation, which is to purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works. (Doddridge.)

2 M 2
be a sort of *metonymic synecdoche* of member, or *hyperpallage* for ἀπέλυσε τὸν ἀνθρώπον. As in Longin. Past. p. 62. (cited by Wets.) ἡ χλόη—ἀπονιστεῖ τοῦ πρῶτου γνωριμεῖν. And so the Latin abluere is used in some passages of Virgil and Ovid, quoted by Priscæus. The Onomasticon, too, has *exgrumare, ἀποθρομβεῖν*. This latter mode of taking the phrase, though not the easier, is perhaps the truer one.

34. ἀναγαγαίνει τοὺς εἰς τὸν ὅλον αὐτοῦ, “and having conducted them up to his house.” For the ἀνα implies as much. The jailor’s house was, it seems, higher than the rest of the prison, for obvious reasons. So Acts 9, 39. ἀνῆγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον.

34. παρεθηκε τράπεζαν, “set out a table.” In this phrase, which often occurs in the Scriptures, and sometimes in the Classical writers, τράπεζα signifies the food placed on the table: and παρατιθέμαι, like the Latin * opponere*, is often used of placing or setting anything παρὰ before a guest.

Πανοικία is explained by the antient lexicographers ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ τῷ ὅλῳ: who, however, prefer the more Classical *πανοικία*. Yet the other is used by good authors, though later ones; as Ἀeschin., Socr., Philo, Josephus, and Diodor. Siculus. Kuinoel thinks, from ver. 36 & 39. that the jailor then conducted them back to the dungeon. But this is far from certain; nay, it is not *probable* that he should have been so anxious about guarding such prisoners, as not to be content with the security which his house might afford, where they might be held in what was called *libera custodia*. Doddridge rightly supposes that they remained in his house that night.


35. ἀπολύει τὸν αὐρατίους ἐκείνους. Priscæus remarks on the *contempt* implied in ἐκείνου. But perhaps such a feeling was not meant to be shown on that occasion. These magistrates would feel, it
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should seem, too much respect for the Apostles, and too much shame at their own conduct. Reflection had probably shown them the irregularity of the whole procedure, especially as, upon enquiry, they would find nothing but what was innocent, nay even laudable, in the conduct of the Apostles. Thus far I agree with Grotius, Limborch, Rosenmuller, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, the last of whom further thinks, that the earthquake had inspired them with fear, and that it is probable the jailor had told them of what had happened in the prison during the night: Had this, indeed, been the case, they might have been induced the more readily to order the release of the prisoners; but how far fear co-operated in producing this we are not enabled to determine, since we know not how far they might have been induced by enquiry, and the intelligence of the jailor, if he really conveyed it, to so change their opinion of the men, as to suppose that they might be Divine legates.


37. δειψαρεσ ημᾶς, &c. One cannot but observe the spirited, brief, and withal natural air of expression thrown over this sentence, so characteristic of the temperament of St. Paul, in which each word forms, as it were, a head of accusation.

Δημοσία. On this and such like words Wolf refers to Praehen de Stylo N. T. § 96; and on public scourging, as a most disgraceful punishment, to Corn. Adami. in Exerc. Exeg. p. 321.

On the Apostle's conduct Markland offers the following judicious observations:

"St. Paul knew what he was about; and he thought it concerned (as it did) the innocence and reputation of Silas and himself, as God's envoys, that this public amends should be made them by the Duumviri, who he knew had greatly exceeded their authority, in publicly scourging, and then committing to prison, Roman citizens, without any legal process. He would not have been so touchy had it not been to
vindicate innocence and character, and to humble those insolent provincial magistrates, in order to make them more cautious for the future, though he had a right to have them severely punished, as they themselves very well knew.” (Markland.)

37. ἀκατακρίτους. This word here, and in 22, 25, signifies not merely uncondemned, but untried, and thereby, in a legal sense, uncondemned; what the Latins call indefensus, or inauditus. So κατακρίνω is often used for κρίνω. Instead of ἀκατακρίτος the Classical writers use ἄκριτος. (Schleusner.) It has been fully shown by Grotius, Wets., and others, in loco, that it was strictly forbidden by the Roman laws for any citizen to be condemned or punished unheard. (See Acts 25, 16.) So Cic. (cited by Grotius and Wets.) Causá cognitá possunt multi absolvì: incognitá nemo condemnari potest. Tacit. Hist. 1, 6. Inauditī atque indefensi tanquam innocentes perierant. This was indeed the common law of all nations. And in illustration of this, Grotius aptly cites Hesiod: Μηδὲ δικὴν δικάσῃς πρὸν ἀμφοῖν μῶδον ἄκολον.

It has been asked by what right Paul calls himself a Roman. Some, as Hammond, Beza, Doughty, and Pearce, have supposed it was on the ground that Tarsus, his native place, was a Roman colony, or at least a municipium. See Wit., Melet. § 1. C. 6. On the colonies, and the difference between them, we have treated supra, ver. 12. Now the municipia were properly Italian towns, on which had been conferred the jus civitatis, by which the citizens of those places had the public and private rights of Quirites, and moreover made their own laws, and elected their own magistrates. That they had also the right of offering themselves as candidates to the honours at Rome, we find from the case of Milo, whose birth-place was Lanuvium, a municipium, and who proposed himself for the consulship. (See Cicero’s Orations pro Milone 41., pro Murena 41., and pro Sylla 7 & 8.) There were, however, municipia which had not the right of suffrage; and so possessed not the full jus civitatis. (See Liv. 38, 36., Sigen. de antiquo jure Ital. 2, 6., Turneb. ad Cic. Agr. 1, 5., Arntz’s Dissert. de Civitate Pauli, p. 133., Wastæau’s Dissert. de jure Municip., and Roth. de re Municipal. Rom. 1801, 4to.) But Tarsus (Paul’s birth-place) was neither a colony, nor a municipium, but merely an urbs libera. See Plin. 5, 97. Now these free cities lived under their own laws, had their own magistrates, were independent of the jurisdiction of the Roman president, and were not occupied by Roman garrisons. Yet they were held bound to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Roman people, and send them auxiliaries against all their enemies. (See Polyb. Exc. Leg. 1110., Gronov. on Liv. 33, 33., Cic. Verr. 3, 6., Spanheim on Julian, p. 37. & de usu Num. 676 & 691., Orb. Rom. p. 97., Deyling, Obs. 3, 304 seqq.) With this freedom the Tarsians had been presented by Augustus, as a compensation for the damages they had sustained in the cause of Julius Cæsar, under various calamities attending the Civil War. So Appian, p. 1077. and Dio Chrys., in Tars, posteriores: τοιαυτον ἐν τοι εν φίλου καὶ συμμόχου, καὶ τηλικαῦτων προθυμιάν ἑπιειδημένων, κακεῖνον ὑμῖν παρέχει, χώραν, νόμους, τιμὰς, ἑυνειαν τοῦ πολιτοῦ τῆς τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς καὶ αὐτὴν, where by την ἡτομ is meant, either the dignity of metropolis, or that of αὐτοῦ, the having its own laws and magistrates, or being of the antient form of the republick, and being independent of the Roman president. [So Dio Cass. 506. (cited by Pearce,) who tells us that, for the affection which the people of Tarsus bore to Julius Cæsar, and afterwards to Augustus, the latter caused their city to be called Juliaopolis, ὅπως προσλημα αὐτοῦ Καλλιμαρι προτέρῳ, καὶ δι’ ἑκάινων τῆς δευτέρῳ, οἱ Ταρσιοί ἐλον, ἄστε καὶ Ἰουλιαπόλιν σφᾶς ἄντων μεγαρύμας. Edit.] That the Tarsians had not the jus civitatis Romanae is also hence apparent, that the Roman Tribune, though he knew Paul to be a Tarsian (see 21, 39.), yet ordered him to be scourged (22, 14.), though he desisted as soon as he understood that he was a Roman citizen. (See 22, 27 seq.) Therefore there seems reason to prefer either the opinion of those who (as Calvin and Cellar. Diss. 14. P. 2. p. 925. de Pauli Apost. Rom. Civit.) maintain that some one of Paul’s ancestors had this freedom given him for some service rendered to Cæsar in the civil wars; or the
opinion of others (as Wassenberg in his Diss. de Juriprudencia Pauli, Gronovius on Joseph. Decret. pro Jud. p. 42., Deyling, and Bishop Pearce,) that he had purchased that right by money. That Julius Caesar did give the *jus cividatis* to many foreign cities, we learn from Dio Cass. p. 333. And most of the principal persons of the Gallia Comata were also, about that time, presented with this freedom, though unaccompanied with the suffrage, or right of being candidates for honours. (See Lips. on Tacit. Annal. 11, 23.; Sueton. Cas. 76, and Spanheim Orb. Rom. 83 seq.) It was moreover in the power of the presidents of provinces, and those who held any high office in government, to give this *jus cividatis* to whom they pleased. So Cic. Varr. 2, 7. "Hic est dio, judices, nunc beneficio Q. Metelli civis Romanus factus." Now Metellus was the praetor of Sicily. See also de Orat. C. 3. Hence rapacious presidents of provinces used to set this freedom to sale. And the Jews were accustomed to purchase the titles and rights of Roman citizens, in order to have free access, by virtue thereof, to all the cities of the Roman empire, to carry on a safer and readier traffic, and moreover have the privilege of living free and unmolested even in those cities which had not the *jus cividatis*. (See Deyling ubi supra.) So Joseph. Bell. 1, 2, 14. "ὢ ἐν καὶ τὸ γένος Ἰουδαῖον, ἄλλα τὸ γ' ὅν ἄνωμα Ῥωμαίον ἦν."

Paul therefore appealed to this *jus cividatis*, and, with reason, claimed to be honourably conducted out of the city. "To make this claim (observes Wets.) was due to himself. For if he had departed secretly, a report might have been circulated that he had escaped by breaking the prison; which would have tainted his reputation, and been injurious to his Apostolic authority, both among the Philippians and elsewhere. He was moreover bound both by civil and natural right, to maintain his privileges, and Roman-citizenship. For what are privileges and immunities, if we neglect, or suffer them to be torn from us. It is the part of a good citizen to so act that others with whom he lives, and especially his children and grandchildren, may not be in a worse condition than they would have been without him." (Wets.) "He seems, however, to have had (as Doddridge observes) especial regard to the interests of Christianity in this place, though not indifferent to their civil rights as men and Romans; for such a token of public respect from the magistrates would undoubtedly encourage the new converts, and remove a stumbling-block out of the way of others who might not have discerned the true lustre of the characters of Paul and Silas, amidst so much injury as they had before suffered."

But why, it may be asked, did not Paul urge the privilege, and take shelter under its defence, when the Duumvirs ordered them to be scourged? To this it may be answered, in the words of Mr. Biscoe ap. Dodd., that the hurry and noise prevented him.

This is far more satisfactory than the conjecture of Wolf and Deyling, that he did not choose to escape by pleading his privilege, but was willing to give this evidence of his firmness in the cause of truth, and especially as he would obtain the opportunity of gaining over to Christianity the jailor and his family. Bp. Pearce:thinks the reason was, that Silas not being a Roman (for it does not ap-
pear, he says, that he was one,) would then have been beaten alone; and this might have discouraged Silas from going on as Paul's companion in a work where Paul had a hope of escaping from punishment, which Silas had not. But such hypothetical modes of interpretation are especially to be deprecated, since, even when employed in defence of the truth, they often injure the cause they are intended to serve.

37. ἡμᾶς Ρωμαίους. As it does not appear from any other passage that Silas was a Roman citizen, most Commentators, as Grotius, Pearce, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, would take the singular for the plural, by a synecdoche, and, as Walch thinks, dignitatis gratid. But, however either, or both those principles may be applicable elsewhere, yet surely they are out of place here. It is not easy to see how the veracity of the Apostle can be cleared by any such rhetorical or grammatical hocus pocus. Neither, indeed, is there any need to have recourse to it; for the very argument on which our Critics establish the assertion that Silas was not a Roman citizen, is utterly unfounded: "because (say they) he is no where else so called." True; but is it anywhere else asserted that he was not so? No where. Since, then, St. Paul here evidently calls him a Roman citizen, and as there is no evidence to the contrary, we are authorized in considering him such; though we are not told how he acquired the jus civitatis, which was, however, (as we have above seen,) not so very difficult to obtain. Indeed his very name, as has been supposed, Silvanus, would make us conjecture as much, if St. Paul had not told us.

37. ἐκαλον εἰς φυλακὴν. Here there is another ground of complaint. For, before confession or conviction, prisoners were held in custodid libert, either by the magistrate in his private house; or in that of others to whose care he committed them, (see Liv. 89, 14., Sallust, B. C. 49., and Cic. Catil. Or. 3, 6.): and it was only after confession or conviction that they were thrown into public prisons. See Sigon. de Judiciis Rom. (Kuin.)

This may be very true, as applied to the custom
at Rome; but it will not, I imagine, hold good of the inhabitants of the free cities of the provinces, like Tarsus, and seems at variance with the genius of Oriental policy.


37. Ἀλλὰ ἐλάχιστον αὐτοῖς ἡμᾶς ἐξαγαγόμενοι. This would be an unequivocal acknowledgment of their own flagrant injustice, and the innocence of the Apostles; would tend to wipe away public ignominy by public acknowledgment, and thus repair the injury done by them to the Gospel. (Meuschr.) This demand was not only just, but very suitable to the place where it is made: for, as we learn from a passage of Lucian, Asin. T. 2, 116. (cited by Wolf), it was, especially among the Macedonians, thought a mark of innocence if any one should be publicly set free by the magistrates. The place spoken of is Thessalonica, and the words are these: καὶ τούτῳ με ἀρχαν ὄνουσας, πάνταν ἀκούσας ἀξιωσί. Kuinöel adds Lucian, Toxar. T. 2, 55. Nay the custom seems to have extended to their neighbours the Thessalians: for Kuin. produces a story from Apuleius L. 3. p. 134., of a person who was falsely condemned by the magistrates, and afterwards had made from them them the amende honorable by their going, in form, to his house: Ecce illico (says he) etiam magistratus ipsi, cum suis insignibus domum nostram ingressi, talibus me monitis delinire gestiunt, neque tue dignitati, &c.

38. ἐξοφθήσατε ἀκούσατε ὅτι Ρωμαίοι εἰσί. How happened it that the Duumvirs so easily yielded credence to Paul's assertion? It was because they
knew to pretend to the *jus civitatis* falsely was a capital offence; as appears from Sueton. C. 25. “ci-
vitatem Romanam usurpantes in campo Esquilino
securi percussit.” Afraid the Duumvirs might well be,
lest they should have to stand a trial at Rome on
a charge *læwæ majestatis*. For in the injury of any
private citizen the majesty of the Roman people was
thought to be involved: and how severely such an
offence was punished, we learn from Dionys. Hal.
p. 725. τιμαρίαι δὲ προσέκειν τοῖς καταλύοντις ἢ παρα-
βαίνοντι τὸν νόμον, ἐὰν ἀλώσι, θάνατος καὶ δήμευσις τῆς
σιδῆς. See also Dio. Cass. p. 785, Α. August de
legibus T. 2, 1263, Thesaur. Græv., & Sigon. de
judiciis L. 3, 2. p. 445. (Kuin.)

39. παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοῖς. Παρακαλεῖν must, in this
connexion, signify (as it does in some other passages,)
pacify. So 1 Cor. 4, 15. βλασφημούμενοι παρακαλοῦμεν,
literally, give good words. The nature of these pa-
cificatory words may be easily imagined: and they
are, indeed, expressed by the interpolator of the
Cod. Cant. The magistrates, doubtless, professed
their ignorance of the Apostles’ characters, and their
persuasion of their innocence; at the same time ex-
pressing all due sorrow for their mistake.

40. εἰσηλθὼν εἰς τὴν Δοδίαν. At this expression
many Critics and Commentators have stumbled; of
whom some have sought to alter the reading, either
from conjecture, or from a few MSS. Adopting
the former method, Piscator proposes τὴν Δοδίας, subbaud
ἀλκω. But, though they have proved that that
syntax is employed by the best writers; yet they
cannot show that the present one was not also in use.
Indeed, it has been, I think, fully proved by Alberti
and Wolf on this passage, Bengel on Aristoph. Plut.
237, and Heumann in Pæcil. p. 12. that εἰσερχεται
εἰς τὴν is used as well as εἰσερχεται εἰς τῶν.
So Aristoph. there cited: εἰς θειᾶλών εἰσελθὼν, and a
little after: ἣν ὡς εἰσερχαίτα τὴν αὔρατων εἰσελθαί τὴν.
Lys. Orat. 2. incit. p. 24. εἰς ὑμᾶς ὡς εἰσελθὼν ἀπείρα
τῶν δικαιων τεύξεσθαι, & Orat. 33. init. οὐκ ἂν τότε εἰς
Paul, having passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, proceeds to Thessalonica (1—10.), and from thence repairs to Berœa (10—14.), from whence he departs to Athens (15—fin.).

1. Ἀμφιπόλις. On Amphipolis see the Geographical writers, Thucyd. 1, 100. 4, 102 & 103 & 104., and Herodot. 7, 117. Ἀπολλονίαν. There were several cities of this name in Macedonia. Here, undoubtedly, we are to understand the one situated between Amphipolis and Thessalonica, which
Ptolemy, Geograph. L. 3., calls Apollonia in Macedonia.

1. Διαδεσσαντες, having passed through. This verb answers to the Heb. יָעֲשִׂי in Ps. 89, 41. It appears that Paul and Silas merely went to Amphipolis and Apollonia, as being in their nearest way to Thessalonica; but made no stay there. Now Thessalonica was the metropolis of the second province of Macedonia, and the seat of the Roman President and Quæstor. See Liv. 45, 29. compared with 44. and 10, 45. It was formerly called Θερμαί (see the Schol. on Thucyd. 1, 61.); but its name was afterwards changed, either by Cassander, in honour of his wife Thessalonica, daughter of Philip (according to Strabo, Ttetzas, Zonaras, and Diodor. Sic.), or (according to Steph. Byzant.) by Philip himself, in order to commemorate his conquest of Thessalia. [which, however, seems far less probable. Edit.] Its inhabitants consisted chiefly of Greeks and Romans; but there were also many Jews resident there. So Plin. H. N. 4, 10. (Kuin.)

1. έξον ἦν ἡ συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Our English Translators render, "a synagogue," following the opinion of Beza and Piscator, who treat the article as pleonastic, or used for τις. But there seems reason to suppose, with Grotius, Wets., Heumann, Rosenm., Heinrichs, and Kuin., that it is emphatic, and hints that this was the only Synagogue in Macedonia; though there were (as we have reason to think from the preceding Chapter) several Proseuchæ.

2. κατά δὲ τὸ εἰσαγγέλλειν. Paul was, in all his journies, accustomed to attend on Divine worship at the Synagogues, and first to deliver his doctrines to the Jews, before he preached them to the Gentiles. See 18, 46. 14, 1: 17, 10. 18, 4 & 9. (Kuin.)

2. Διελέγετο αὐτοῖς. Διελέγεσθαι is a term of very general sense, and denotes to discourse in any way, and especially to harangue. Thus it signifies to deliver orations, whether civil or military, and also disserere, maintain diaputations, or bring forward discourses, as Philosophers or teachers used to do to
their scholars. So Athenaeus. 19. ή θεωρητικὸς ἄκουσας παραχρῆμα ἤκε πρὸς Πλάτωνα, καὶ καταλαβὲ διαλεγόμενον τοῦ σεν ἐκεῖνο. So that it might apply to such discourses (or sermons) as St. Paul delivered. The sense of the passage, however, cannot satisfactorily be determined without settling the punctuation; and on that Commentators are not agreed. The ancient ones, (as Chrysostom,) and earlier modern, (as Beza and the authors of our English Version,) put a comma after γραφῶν, and at the words διαλογίων καὶ παρατιθέμενος suband αὐτὰς, ērē being for ἐκ, as often: and they render, “docebat e scripturā, explicans eam et demonstrans.” So Luke 24, 32. διαλογίων τὰς γραφὰς. But most recent Commentators, from the time of Grotius to the present day, place the comma after αὐτὰς, so that the following words ἐκ (for ἐκ) τῶν γραφῶν διαλογίων, &c. may be read in continuity: and they appeal to Acts 28, 28. παρατίθησαν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τὰ τερί τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου Ματθαιοῦ. And Klosius (cited by Kuinoel) maintains that διαλογίων ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν is equivalent to διαλογίων τὰς γραφὰς in Luke 24, 32. Kuinoel, too, confirms this construction from Acts 28, 28., and offers some reasons, which, however, seem not very convincing; for, after all, the common construction, as it is the more natural and easy, so is it the more suitable to the simple and popular style of the New Testament; and therefore it ought (I think) to be retained. There is, however, no material difference in the sense, whichever construction be adopted.

2. Διαλογίων, opening out, explaining them. Παρατιθέμενος. The word properly signifies to “place any thing before” another; as food; but it is often used, in the Classical writers, in a moral sense, for proponere, exponere, ostendere, “to lay any considerations before one;” of which examples are adduced by Elsner, Kypke, Wets., and Valcknaer.

3. ὅτι τοῦ Χριστὸν ἔδει παρεῖν. In this he followed the example of his Divine master. See Luke 24, 28. The transition which we now have, from the
oblique to the direct, is very frequent both in the sacred and profane writers. See Acts 1, 4. (Kuin.)

4. ἐπεισόδιασαν, were persuaded (to believe): equivalent to ἐπιστέγων. To these are opposed, at ver. 5, the ἀπεικόνισεν. Προσεκληροῦσαν τῷ Παύλῳ. The verb προσεκληροῦσαν signifies to apportion to any one by lot, to allot, and generally adjoin, conjoin. In the passive, too, it has, like many other verbs, a reflected sense, namely, to join oneself to; as in the present passage, and in many others adduced by Loesner and Markland. See also Valcknaer. Σε-βορένων Ἐλλήνων, i.e. proselytes of the gate. See the note on 13, 16.

4. γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρεστῶν οὐκ ἀλγεῖ. By these we are to understand, as in 13, 50., honourable matrons, wives of the respectable inhabitants who had the Jewish religion. They are, infr. ver. 12. (as in 13, 50.) called εἰσγχόμενοι. See the note there. Priscus cites Achill. Tat. 5. γυναίκα Ἐφεσίων πρώτην, and Apulej. L. 2. feminas primatas.

5. προσλαμβάνειν τῶν ἄγοραίων τινὰς ἄνδρας π. The word ἄγοραίος denotes what is connected with a market place or a forum; and carries various significations in reference to the different kinds of business accustomed to be done there. Thus in 19, 38. ἄγο-ραίας ἡμέρας are “days on which business is done in the forum.” As applied to persons, it denoted those who keep the market. Wets. has illustrated the various uses of the word by a vast number of passages from the Classical writers; ex. gr. Herodot. 2, 141. and Xen. Hist. 6., where it signifies market people. But it also denoted not merely buyers and sellers in a market, but those idlers who (like the Lazzaroni at Naples) almost lived in the market, and even slept by night under the porticoes and other places of shelter.* Hence it came to denote,

* These seem to have been had in view by Horace, when, in his Ars Poetica 245, he speaks of the innati trivis ac pene forenses. Such are called by Cicero, in his Epist. Fam. 8, 1. subeotranis, by Plaut. Cap. 4, 2, 35. subbasslicani, and by Cicero the fax and sentina urbis.
persons of the lowest and basest sort, the very dregs of society,* a sense very frequent in the Classical writers; and most of Wetstein’s examples tend to illustrate this last signification, which is noticed by ancient Lexicographers, as Suidas, Hesychius, and others. Kuinoel refers to Casaub. on Theophr. C. 6.; Valcknaer on Ammon. p. 10., Græc. Lect. Hes. C. 1., and Suic. Thes. in v.: and Schlesusner refers to Gronov. Obs. 3, 22., Puttman’s Misc. 13, 25., and Arnuet’s Dissert. on the use of this word in the New Testament.

Most Commentators agree in giving the word the

figurative sense: but as πονηρος is added, I prefer, with Beza and others, circumforanei.

5. ὑλοποιηταις, “raising a mob.” Ἐθορῶθων, “threw the city into a disturbance, set it into an uproar.” So Thucyd. 6, 61, 3, 78. and elsewhere. Αγαγειν εἰς τὸν δῆμον. By the δῆμος are not here meant the people, or the mob (as Doddridge renders), but the popular assembly in the forum, or elsewhere. So infr. 19, 30. βουλομένου εἰσελθειν εἰς τὸν δῆμον. Schlesnner takes it for the forum, or place where the popular assembly was held; which comes to the same thing. Kuinoel interprets it concio populi; which seems very harsh and far-fetched.

6. ξυνω — εἰς τοὺς πολιταρχας, i.e. the city magistrates. This word has the same sense as πολιταρχας, which occurs in Æneas Polior. C. 26. (Schlesusner) Βοώτες, shouting, bawling, vociferating. See 8, 7, 21, 34. This verb is often used in Thucydides, as here, of the shouts and clamours of the populace; ex. gr. 7, 48. ὁ νῦν βοώσων ᾧς ἐν δεινοῖς ἄντες, ἐκείνε ἄφικομένους ταναντία βοήσεθαι, 6, 28. et sepe.

* Valcknaer observes, that this use of the word is to be traced to the abhorrence in which the market rabble were held by the respectable citizens, and the notoriously lying and fraudulent character of the petty huckstering traders; as also to the market-place being the usual resort of those scurra in the Grecian cities who spent the day in utter idleness.
6. Oi tîn oikoumênhn ἀναστατάσαντες. Most Commentators agree that this expression must be confined to the Roman empire; and Markland thinks that even thus that is overcharged, and savours more of malice than truth. But we need not be so nice in scanning the meaning of an expression, which (like the corresponding one in our own language) is perpetually used in a popular sense, and by no means in any extensive signification.

6. Ἀναστατάσαντες. This is formed from the more Classical expression ἀναστάτως ποιησάντες, which occurs in Thucyd. 6, 76. 6, 5. 8, 24. There, however, it is used in the full sense of destroying and expelling any people from their country; but here, and in 21, 33., it is employed like our turn upside down, to denote "perverting, exciting to tumult and insurrection." So ἀνασελίν in Luke 23, 5. The word is only used by the Translators of the Old Testament (see Schl. Lex. Vet. Test.); and is therefore considered as belonging to the Alexandrian dialect. See Sturz.

7. οὗ ἰππόδεκται, "hath received as guests and friends." In this sense the word occurs in Luke 19, 6., and James 2, 25.; as also in the best Classical writers. Kuinoel cites Xenoph. Mem. 2, 8, 13., to which I add 3, 111. 6, 22. 3, 12. Doddridge takes the οὗ to denote secretly. But this seems an unfounded refinement. Neither, however, is the οὗ in this sense of ἰππόδεκται quite pleonastic; as will appear from the kindred expression "come under my roof," which occurs in Gen. 19, 8. Matt. 8, 8. and elsewhere.

7. ἄπέναντι τῶν δογμάτων Καίσαρος πράττοντι, "act contrary to," &c. ἄπέναντι properly signifies over against; but sometimes contrary to; as here and in Sirach, 37. 4. καὶ ἐν καιρῷ βλέψεως ἐσται ἄπέναντι. So the Heb. עָקַל in Num. 21, 23. and 1 Paral. 19, 17. (Schleusner.) We may render, "transgress the decrees of Caesar." In preferring this charge of sedition, these accusers (we may observe) took ad-
vantage of the ambiguity in the sense of Κύριος, the name given by the Christians to Christ, which was also that applied to kings and emperors; and resorted to the same craft as that evinced by the chief Priests and Pharisees, namely, confounding the temporal and the spiritual acceptance of King.

9. λαβόντες τὸ ἰκανόν. This is a mere translation of the Latin law phrase satis accipere, satisfactionem accipere, receiving security; the opposite to which is ἰκανόν δίδωμι, satis dare, to give security. What was here engaged to be done does not clearly appear. Grotius and others think it was, to have Paul and Silas forthcoming for trial. But they immediately departed. Therefore it rather appears to have been (as is the opinion of Heumann and others) "that Paul and Silas should depart forthwith."

11. οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν εὐγενέστεροι τῶν ἐν Θ. The sense is, "these (Jews) were of better dispositions than those in Thessalonica." I am surprised that so many critics, as Erasmus, Vatapl., and Camerarius (followed by our English Translators), should take εὐγενέστεροι in the literal sense, which is little suitable to such kind of persons as the foreign Jews, who were mostly traffickers. Besides, the words following, δὲ εἴδοσαν, &c., which give an example of this εὐγενεία, shew that it must be taken, not in a physical, but moral sense. This, indeed, was seen by Chrysostom, who explains εὐγεν. by ἐπιεικέστεροι, and has been fully established by Grotius. "They were (says he) of less hard hearts; they were more patient hearers, and employed thought and enquiry on what they heard. They were therefore τεταγμένοι πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν αἰώνιον, were better prepared to do the

* That Chrysostom, when he so explained εὐγενέστεροι, had in view the sense above assigned to this word, namely, well disposed, is plain, since in this signification ἐπιεικής occurs in the best authors; as Xen. Hist. 1, 1, 21. The Scholiast, too, on Lucian 2, 737., explains τὸ ἐπιεικὲς by τὸ τῶν τρόπων ἀγαθὸν. But there is a yet more apposite example in Thucyd. 8, 93. ἐπιεικὸν οὖν ἰδοὺν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιεικές, αὕτως τὸ ἡμὺν δίκαιον, καὶ τῶι διὸν παρακάτεχεν, where ἐπιεικεῖς evidently signifies well disposed.
will of the Father, and so they better knew of the doctrine." (Joh. 7, 17.)

Both εὐγενῆς and the Latin ingenuus have a metaphorical sense applied to the mind, and denote "ingenuus, liberal, of good disposition and manners." As examples of this signification, Grotius cites Joseph. Ant. 12, 7, οί δὲ δοκιμαστατοί τὰς ψυχὰς εὐγενεῖς οὐκ ἐφέτως εὐγενεῖς ἀυτῶν. Plut. Hom. Quest. it is the opinion of Philosophers καὶ τὸ διδακτοῦ εἶναι τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἔχοντα μὲν ἀρχὴν τῆς εὐγενείας, ὁμοὶ δὲ παιδείας τὰ τὸ τέλειον προαγομένην. Kypke, Loesner, and Wets., produce other examples, of which the most apposite are the following. Philo de nobilitate 904. ἐπείδη τοῖς τῇ εὐγενείᾳ κεκαθαρισθένης διανοιαῖς καὶ καθαραίοις τελείοις κληρον οἰκείοις, μόνος χρὴ λέγειν εὐγενείας τῶν σαφῶς καὶ δικαίως. Ovid de Ponto 1, 2, 1. Maxime, qui tanti mensuram nominis æquas, et geminam animi nobilitatem genuisset. Wets. also quotes Aristot., who notices this metaphorical use of both εὐγενῆς, and γενναῖος. Of the latter there is a remarkable example in Thucyd. 3, 88. καὶ τὰ εὐφέρεια, οὐ το γενναῖον πλείστον μετέχει. Other examples are found in Soph. Æd. Col. 8. Polyb. 2, 55, 9. το γενναῖον καὶ φιλελεύθερον. Xenoph. Ages. 4, 5., where σὺ το γενναῖον μειονκτεῖν is opposed to σὺ τῶν ἀδίκων πλεύσχειν. Soph. Æd. Col. 1042. το το γενναῖον χάριν, i.e. γενναῖοτός χάριν. Dionys. Hal. 436, 85. μετὰ το γενναῖον, generosè.

Hence it is plain that we may very well dispense with the conjecture of Markland and others, εὐμενεστεροῖ.

11. μετὰ πάσης προθμίας. Of this phrase Wets. adduces examples from Polyb. p. 447., and an Inscription from Chishul, and Priceus brings forward one from Diodor. Sic., from which it appears to have been of the common dialect, instead of which the Classical writers used a periphrasis; as Herodot. 7, 6. πάσης προθμίας παρεχόμενοι. On Berea see W. on Thucyd. 1, 61.

11. τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφὰς. It is not easy to see what the article has here to do;
which, indeed, is not found in some very ancient, and several more modern MSS., and some Fathers, as Chrysostom. Yet it is still less easy to conceive how it could creep in; and when we consider the exuberant variety of Greek phraseology, the most prudent course seems to be to retain it. How to account for it is another affair. Now it is well known that καθ' ἡμέραν is often, in the Classical writers, used in the sense of daily; and sometimes even without a substantive; as Χενοφ. Hier. 4, 9. τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν. And so Thucyd. more than once. In such cases a substantive must be supplied, such as is suitable to the subject and the context. Here ζητοῦσα, or some similar word, is to be understood. We may render, therefore, “in their daily custom.”

11. Ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφὰς. The verb ἀνακρίνω signifies properly “to use judicial interrogation and examination” (as in Luke 23, 14.); or generally “to examine diligently, scrutinize with judgment.” Hence it is explained by Chrysostom ἀναθέματα. And it is used in the sense of percontari, perscrutare, in 1 Sam. 12, 12., where the Hebrew term is נַעַר. Beza paraphrases thus: “diligently and with judgment weighing every thing, abandoning all prejudices, and yet not catching up any thing lightly and inconsiderately.” “Not that they doubted (observes Grot.) of the veracity of Paul and Silas, but in order that, by comparing the prophetical writings with their words (especially respecting the death and resurrection of the Messiah), they might be more and more confirmed in the truth, and derive arguments wherewith to convince others.”

* * * It does not, however, follow (observes Doddridge) that Christianity cannot be proved otherwise than from the prophecies of the Old Testament. It might be demonstrated from various topics of external and internal evidence to those who never heard of any former revelation. Another very important additional argument does, indeed, arise from the accomplishment of prophecies; and when it has been asserted (as we know it has) by the authorized teachers of the Gospel, not only that Christ is a Divine Messenger, but also that his appearance was foretold to the Jews, then
12. ἐνσχημόνων, the respectable. See the note on 13, 50.

13. ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης, “Jews of Thessaly.” Now ἀπὸ often denotes country or residence, like the French de, the Welsh ap, the German von, the Dutch van, the Italian da, &c. See the note on 15, 1.

13. κατει, thither. See the note on Matt. 2, 22. and Valckn. in loc. Σαλεώντες τὸν ὄχλον, “stirring up the people.” This verb (from σάλος, the sea surge, or waves of the sea,) signifies to wave, move, agitate.* I am not, indeed, aware that so strongly metaphorical an expression can be found in the Classical writers; but they have frequent allusions and comparisons of civil commotions to a troubled sea; and from them Elsner has learnedly illustrated the force of the metaphor. Thus Dionys. Hal. 319. νάσωσα ἡ παρίς καὶ ἐν πολλῷ

it is impossible to vindicate Christ’s mission without showing that it was so. But, in examining the particular texts in question, we are not only to inquire whether the sense given by the Apostles be, in itself, considered most easy and natural, which is generally the case; but (especially on account of the obscurity which must of course attend prophecy) we are to consider whether the improbability of the sense they give in any particular instance, or in all instances, be sufficient to balance the other proofs they produced of being under a Divine guidance, before we can draw any conclusion to the prejudice of their plenary inspiration; so far should we be from concluding, without such an overbalance, that Christianity is false.” (Dodd.)

* Hence our sea (which etymologists have, most improbably, derived from βυω or ἄλοι) I would derive from σελώ. There is the same allusion in σάλος. The Latin mare signifies literally a collection of salt water (from the Hebr. יָם, salt, bitter). From these words most of the terms denoting the sea are derived. The Hebr. יָם is by the best Hebraists thought to literally signify tumult, motion (in which there is the same leading idea as in sea). The Arabic יָם denotes properly, “the astonishing, or wonderful water.” The Greek βάλασσα comes from θλάω, to shake, to toss, break, &c. Whence it has given to it by Homer the epithet πολύβαλασσα. It cannot be derived (as Boé and Schmidt tell us) from ἄλασσα, since one of its significations, and, I believe, the primary one, is sea-coast (which occurs in Thucyd. 2, 96.): now the sea is not saltier at the coast, nay perhaps otherwise, but it is in greater agitation; especially when the coast is rocky.
14. ἔξοπεστεῖλα — ὁς ἐν τῇ βάλασσῃ, ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. "To what sea (asks Markland), and to go whither?" He then resorts to conjectures, and for βάλασσαν would read Θεσσαλίαν; and in support of this reading appeals to an interpretation in the Cod. Cant. But this, though a very ancient conjecture, (for such alone it is,) cannot be received without the addition of the words immediately subjoined by the interpolator, for which, however, there is no authority.

With respect to the ὁς, critics, both ancient and modern, have stumbled at it, assigning to it the common sense as if. But that compels them to suppose that this going to the sea was only a ruse de guerre, or stratagem, to deceive the enemies, and make them suppose that he was going to take ship, when, in fact, he meant to take his journey by land, through Macedonia and Thessaly, to Athens. They take the trouble to formally justify this procedure. But all this will not soften the harshness of the interpretation, which, in fact, is not necessary; for we may have recourse to a Greek idiom, by which the difficulty may be easily removed. Now ὁς sometimes, especially with ἐν and a verb of motion, expressed or understood, signifies usque ad, ἐκπρος, right to. Of this signification numerous examples are adduced by Wets., Loesner, Munthe, Raphel, and others; as Diodor. Sic. 14, 49. πλεῖν ὁς ἐν Ἔλαι Ὁρακινίων. Pausan. Corinth. 25, καταβάντας δὲ ὁς ἐν τῇ βάλασσαν. I forbear to give more examples, and will only add to those already produced, Thucyd. 1, 48, 5, 17, 6, 67. It is, indeed, very frequent in that author. A distinction must, however, be made between the sense it should have, when the noun following is a name of place, and when it is a common noun; as ναυμαχίαν. In the passages where
the latter use prevails it is almost pleonastic; in the former the ἀς εἰτὶ perhaps answers to the primitive sense of our to-wards; and this seems to be the sense in the present passage. It certainly best agrees with the word preceding, which is not προέκειται, but ἐξαπέστειλαν. The journey seems to have been made secretly; and some of the brethren accompanied Paul, we may suppose as guides.

But we must not neglect to satisfy Markland's enquiry, "to what sea?" Now in places situated as Berea is) between two seas, the expression εἰτὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (to the sea) must denote the sea nearest to them, that sea-port which they most use. Thus in Thucyd. 1, 137. Admetus, king of the Molossi (a country between the Adriatic and Ægean seas), is said to have sent Themistocles εἰτὶ τὴν ἐτέραν θάλασσαν, which, as Molossia was nearer to the Adriatic, must mean the Ægean sea. By way of explanation, too, Thucydides adds, ἐστι Πύδναν; which (by the way) was very probably the place where St. Paul took ship for Athens, and was about thirty-five miles from Berea: for Alorus, though near, seems not to have been a port; and as to Diium, it is much further off than Pydna, and is itself not a port. So that there can be no doubt but it was Pydna.

14. ὑπέκεισα—ἐκεί. See the note on 16, 40. It has been, not improbably, conjectured by Koppe, in his Prol. on Thess. p. 4. that Paul departed alone, leaving Silas and Timothy at Berea, in order that the latter might set off to the Thessalonians, who were deprived of their Apostle, and bring them tidings of Paul, at the same time also confirming them in Christian doctrine. (1 Thess. 3, 4;) while the former should wait at Berea till Timothy returned from Thessalonica, and then both follow the Apostle. (Kuinoel.)

15. καβιστώντες τῷ Παύλῳ ἔγαγον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἂν Αἰθήναν. Καβιστῶνα is not (as Kuinoel tells us) synonymous with προέκειται. The latter signified only to set any one forward on his way, by accompanying him part
of it: the former rather denoted to take charge of any one, (as guide, or defender,) so as to set him down either at the end, or at some stage of it.*

The αὐτὸν is omitted in some MSS., and put in brackets by Vater; but, though inelegant, it seems genuine.

15. καὶ λαβὼντες ἑντολὴν—ινα αὐς τάχιστα ἐκδοσι χρείας αὐτῶν. Now Silas and Timothy returned to Paul when he was at Corinth (see infr. 18, 5. compared with 1 Thess. 3, 6.); though it seems he expected they would have joined him, while yet at Athens, by the words of ver. 16. ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐκδεχομένου αὐτῶν τοῦ Παύλου. And this they probably would have done, had he staid there as long as he originally intended. Dodd. observes, that “Paul perhaps expected some considerable success would attend his labours at Athens, and was therefore desirous to engage the assistance of these pious and excellent persons; though God did not see fit to answer these hopes.” Markland too thinks it apparent from this message to Silas and Timothy, that Paul intended to have made a longer stay at Athens, expecting, probably, as he might not unreasonably do, a large harvest there; though he soon perceived that he was mistaken, finding that the Religion of the place was Superstition, and that the city, so famous for piety, learning, and knowledge, was over-run with idols. “Now this (continues he) would have a very discouraging look.

16. ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις. I have before (on this book) given some illustrations of the origin of those

* Of this signification examples are given by Raphel and Wetstein; as Polyb. 1158. καὶ τα βυθα καθοριστῶσαν εἰς Ρώμην. Thucyd. 4, 78. The earliest authority for this use is Hom. Od. ν. 274. τοῖς μ’ ἐκλείσαι Πύλονδε καταστῆσαι. The construction is generally with an εἰς or ἐπί. I know of no other example with ἐκδοσι: but one cited by Wetstein from Arrian Ind. 271. comes very near to it. It is as follows: καταστήσειν αὕτως μέχρι Καρπανίας. Of this, and some kindred phrases, I shall adduce many further examples on the passage of Thucyd. which is the most important towards understanding the true force of the expression.
names of antient cities which were expressed in the plural. In addition to what is there written, I must observe, that the reason seems to be, they consisted of more than one town, (as Syracuse, London and Westminster; and also Sparta,) or, a high town and low town, as Athens, or any old town und new town. That in the second class we are to reckon with Thebes, is clear from Pausan. 10, 5, 3. τὸν δὲ ἑβασιλευσάν, τὴν πόλιν τὴν κατα, προσφίκισαν τῇ Καδμείᾳ, καὶ Θῆβαις ὄνομα ἐδεντο κατὰ συγγένειαν τὶς Θῆβαις. & 9, 7, 4. σφισῶν ἡ μὲν κάτω πόλις πάσα ἐρήμος ἦν ἐν ἐμοῦ πλην τὰ ἵππα τὴν δὲ ἀκρόπολιν οἰκούμεν, Θῆβαις, καὶ οὐ Καδμείας, καλομέμνη. The Cadmœa, it seems, its Acropolis, was originally called Thebe, and when the lower town was added by Zethus and Amphion to the Cadmœa, then the plural number was assumed, and grew afterwards into general use. The above observations are even yet more applicable to Syracuse, as being composed of four towns, and to Sparta. And the same may be said of Mycænæ, Tarsus, Thebæ Egypt., Clazomenæ, Megare, Cumæ, and many others.

16. παραξίερον τὸ πνεύμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. When the Apostle was perambulating this most magnificent city of Greece, so famed for perfection in the arts both of war and peace,* he might well expect to find some vestiges of pure religion: but his spirit, we are told, was vehemently moved within him, viz. with indignation and grief.† So by a still stronger He-

* So Cic. de Orat. 1, 4. Athenæ omnium doctrinarum inventrices, &c. And, what is inter omnium, Pericles in his Fun. Orat. ap. Thucyd. 2, 40. where, in the course of a long and elaborate panegyric on Athens, he says: καὶ ἐν τα τούτοις τὴν πόλιν ἄξιαν εἶναι θεωμάτικον, καὶ ἑκάτον φιλοκαλοῦμεν γὰρ μὲν ευτελεῖα, καὶ φιλοσοφοῦμεν ἄνευ μαλακίας. And, further on, ἐννέα τε λέγω τὴν τε πάναν πόλιν τῆς Ἑλλάδος παιδευσίν εἶναι.

† Dr. Doddridge has, with less than his usual learning and taste, expounded, thus: "a sharp edge was set upon his spirit, and he was wrought up to great eagerness of zeal." Such is the consequence of pressing too strongly on the etymology of a term, without attending to the usus loquendi. Hence the Doctor's remarks, founded
braism, Gen. 6, 6. "it grieved him at the heart." Dan. 7, 15. "I was grieved in spirit in the midst of my body."

16. κατειδίαλον οὕτως τὴν πόλιν, filled with idols. So the Syriac. This sense is expressed by the κατά; for in composition it has an intensive force; as κατάθεσις, κατάμπτελος, κατάγραφος, κατάκοψμος, and many more words, some of which may be seen in Valckenaer's Schol. 1, 587. As to κατειδίαλος, it seems to be an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, for it has, as yet, been no where else found.

That this city was wholly enslaved to idolatry, has been abundantly proved by our philological illustrators, especially the indefatigable Wetstein, from whose collectanea I select the following passages. Pausan. Attic. 1, 24. 'Αθηναίοις περισσότερον τι η τοις ἄλλοις ἐστὶ θεία ἐστὶ σπουδής. Strabo 10. p. 472 c. 'Αθηναίοι δὲ οὗτος περὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλοξενούντες διατελεῖσιν, οὗτος καὶ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν ξενικῶν ιερῶν παρεδέχετο, οὕτως καὶ ἐκκοιμήθησαν, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ θράκια καὶ τὰ φρύγια. Lucian. t. 1. Prometh. p. 180. ἀπαντάχω ἐὰν βαρμὸς καὶ υπνίας καὶ ναοὺς καὶ πανηγύρεις. Liv. 45, 27. So also Pausan, in Attic. c. 17, 24. (cited by Pearce and Doddridge,) who tells us, that Athens had more images than all the rest of Greece: and Petron. Satir. c. 17. who humourously says, "It was easier to find a god than a man there." To which I add, Thucyd. 2, 38. καὶ μὴ καὶ τῶν πόλεων πλείστως ἀνακαύλας τῇ γνώμῃ ἐκφεμίζει, ἀμφότερος μὲν γε καὶ θυσίας διεσπᾶτος νομίζοντες, ιδίαι δὲ κατασκευαῖς εὐφέτεστος, οἷον καὶ ἠμέραν ἡ τέρψις τοῦ λυπηροῦ ἐκπλησσεὶ.

on this notion, though they do credit to his head and heart, yet appear to little advantage.

Had our Apostle been (as the infidels tell us) a fanatic, we should have now seen the sure marks of that spirit; "yet here (says Doddridge) we do not see him thrown into any sallies of rage, but only engaged courageously to attempt stopping this torrent of popular superstition, by the most serious and affectionate, yet, at the same time, manly and rational remonstrances."

* Which had been, if I remember, applied by some more antient writer, and with great probability, to Egypt.
On this subject, Doddridge has the following judicious remark: “The prevalence of such a variety of senseless superstitions in this most learned and polite city, which all its neighbours beheld with such veneration, gives a most lively and affecting idea of the need we have, in the most improved state of human reason, of being taught by a divine revelation.”

17. διελέγετο ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, &c. “discoursed to the Jews and proselytes.” That it was the Apostle’s custom first to address himself to them, has been before observed.

17. καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. Of the market-places at Athens, of which there were many, the most celebrated were the Old and the New Forum. The former was in the Ceramicus, a very ample space, part within, and part without the city. See Meurs. Dissert. de Ceramico Gemino, § 46. and Potter’s Archaeol. 1, 8, p. 30. The latter was outside of the Ceramicus, in a place called Eretria. See Meur. Ath. Attic. i. 1. c. 6. And this seems to be the one here meant. For no forum, except the Ceramicus and the Eretriacum, was called, absolutely, ἀγορὰ, but had a name, to denote which was meant, as Areopagiticum, Hippodamium, Piræum, &c. In process of time, and at the period when Paul was at Athens, the forum was transferred from the Ceramicus into the Eretria; a change which, indeed, had been introduced in the time of Augustus; and that this was the most frequented part of the city, we learn from Strabo 10. p. 447. Besides, the Eretriac forum was situated before the στοά, or portico, in which the Stoics, of whom mention is just after made, used to hold their public discourses. It was moreover called κύκλος, from its round form.

17. πρὸς τοὺς παρατυχάνωτας, “with any whom he met with, who were inclined to hear him discourse on Christian doctrines.” It is well observed by Harmer, that though in our country the carrying on religious disputations in the markets would be thought improper, and the effect of intemperate zeal; yet it
would, even now, not be strange in Arabia, and other parts of the East, where people meet in such places for conversation. And, what is most to the purpose, it may be remarked that this was (as St. Paul found) not unusual at Athens: in illustration of which Wetstein, among other passages, cites Dio Chrys. p. 577 c. who says of Socrates: περὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν τὰ πολλὰ διατρίβων—εἶ τις ἄρα ἐθελήσει πυθόθαι τι καὶ ἀκούσαι τῶν νεωτέρων ἡ τῶν πρεσβύντερων: and Themist. p. 318 B. of the same: τοὺς λόγους τούτους οὐκ ἐν ἀπορρήτω εἴπειτο, οὐδὲ πρὸς μόνου τοὺς μαθητὰς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ὡς τοῦ αὐτὸς φήσαι, ἐκκεφαλεῖας, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζῶν καὶ τῶν ἐργαστηρίων, καὶ ἐν τοῖς παλαίστραῖς, καὶ περιέβαλον αὐτὸν κύκλῳ οἱ κηρυκταῖοι, καὶ οἱ χαλκοτύποι. Diog. Laert. Socrat. 21. τὰ ηθικὰ φιλοσοφεῖν ἀρέσκει ἐπὶ τῶν ἐργαστηρίων καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. See Bp. Pearce's annotation.

18. τινὲς δὲ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων καὶ τῶν Σταῦκων.

There were then two other sects at Athens, namely, the Academic (or Platonic) and the Peripatetic. But of these there is here no mention, either because the Platonic dogmas seemed, for the most part, to make nearer approaches to Christianity, inasmuch that those of that sect (as Valcknaer thinks) would probably listen to Paul with some interest, when he discoursed, as was his custom, on the immortality of the soul, while the Peripatetics were, in that age, of far less celebrity; or, because they did not attend Paul's discourse, which indeed is not improbable, since their places of philosophical discussion, the Academia and Peripatus, were out of the city, and far removed from the Eretriac forum.

The Epicureans were, in fact, Atheists, maintaining that the world was not created by God, nor had any care been bestowed on it by him. They accounted pleasure as the summum bonum; and therefore they directed that virtue was to be cultivated for the sake of the pleasure, but not for itself. They maintained that the soul would, after its departure from the body, perish together with it, and that thus there was nothing to be either hoped or feared after death. See Cic. Fin. 2, 31. Tusc. 5, 31. Seneca de Benef. 4, 4. Plutarch de Plac. Phil. 4, 7, 7, 3., Diog. Laert. 9. § 138., Lucret. 3, 437 seq. 842 seq., Clem. Alex. Protrept. p. 20., Brucker, Hist. 1, 948 seq., and Bornier's Dissert. de Disputatione Pauli cum Epicureis et Stoicis.

The Stoics were of opinion that the nature of God was fiery, and that it was diffused throughout all parts of the world. See Stob. Ecl. Phys. 1. p. 43., Plutarch de Plac. 1, 7., Cicero N. D. 1, 28., and Senec. Epist. 92. They acknowledged that the world was created by God, but maintained that all things were bound by a kind
of fatalis necessitas, to which they imagined even the Deity himself to be subject. See Plut. de Rep. Stoic. p. 1056, Gellius 6, 2, and Senec. de Provid. 5, and Epist. 77 & 88. They denied that the wise man in any respect yielded to Jupiter. Su Senec. Epist. 53. Est aliquid quo sapiens antecedat Deum. Ile naturæ beneficio non timet, suo sapiens, ecce res magna, habere imbecillitatem hominis, securitatem Dei. And Ep. 73. Jovem plus non posse quam bonum virum; Jovem diutius bonum esse, et sapientem nihilo minores se aestimare, quod virtutes ejus spatio breviori claudantur. They denied the immortality of souls; though, on the condition of souls after death, they varied in opinion. Cleanthes maintained the existence of all souls until the burning of the world. See Laert. 7, 156, and Cic. Tusc. 1, 31, 32. Chrysippus, however, limited this to the souls of the good and wise. See Plut. de Plac. 4, 7, and Laert. 7, 157. Others maintained that the soul, when released from the bonds and imprisonment of the body, immediately returned to the celestial fire, namely, to God himself.

Since, therefore, even from what has been hitherto said, it clearly appears that the dogmas, both of the Epicureans and Stoics, were as opposite as possible to the doctrines of Christ, it is not to be wondered at that what was propounded by Paul should have been very unaccountable and unacceptable to those philosophers. See v. 18 & 22. (Kuin.)

To the above accurate account of these antient sects a few particulars may be added from our own Theologians. “The Epicurean notions (says Doddridge) came near to those of our gay world; and as to the Stoics, though different writers, according to their fondness for, or prejudices against, the philosophy of the Pagans, and of this sect in particular, have represented their doctrines in a very different view; and indeed the notorious inconsistency between some of their own writers and some of the ancients, in their account of them, has greatly perplexed the matter. But I think Dr. Benson has expressed himself, on the whole, in a very impartial and judicious manner. Among other remarks, he has the following: ‘Some of them exempted the human will from fatality; and maintained that virtue was its own sufficient reward, and vice its own sufficient punishment. As to their belief of future rewards and punishments, they exceedingly fluctuated; though they had some expectations of a future state of existence, as well as of the conflagration and renovation of the world, with relation to which several of them seem to have expected a continual revolution of exactly similar events at equally distant periods of time’.” (Doddr.)

Bp. Pearce has with equal brevity, spirit, and truth observed: “The Epicureans acknowledged no gods, except in name only, and they absolutely denied that they exercised any providence over the world: and while the Stoicks professed to believe both the existence of the gods, and their providence in the world, they attributed all human actions to fate; and so destroyed the foundation of all religion, as much as the atheistical Epicureans did.”

I must be permitted to subjoin a very fine passage of Max. Tyr. on the Epicureans, D. 314. T. 2, 105. οὐδε γὰρ τῷ Κιμμερίῳ
deiγῆσαυθαι δὲνατάτω τι τοῦ ἥλιον καλλοῦς, ὅπερ τῷ ἡμερότητι τῆς δόλατας· ὅδε Ἐπικοῦρη τοῦ Θεοῦ· where for Ἐπικοῦρη I conjecture Ἐπικοῦρη.

So much at variance were all their dogmas with the pure and humbling doctrines of Christ, that it is no wonder many of these philosophers should have thought Paul unworthy of any serious attention. Though others (more, it should seem, from a love a novelty than a desire for truth, and perhaps with the view of indulging their cavilling spirit) led him to the Areopagus, to give further opportunity for examining his doctrines, and holding them up to derision.

18. συνέβαλλον, “engaged in discourse with him.” Here we must subeaud λέγουσι. The complete phrase occurs in Eurip. Iph. in Aul. v. 880. ἄισχρων δὲ μοι γνωιεῖν συμβάλλειν λέγουσι. (Schleusner.)

18. σπερμολόγος. This word is properly used of those little insignificant birds which support a precarious existence by picking up seeds scattered by the sower, or left above ground after the soil has been harrowed. See Max. Tyr. Diss. 19. p. 183., Harpocr., Aristoph. Av. 292., and the Scholiast, and Plutarch, T. 5, 50. edit. Reisk. It was metaphorically applied also to paupers who prowled about the market place, and lived by picking up any thing which might be dropped by buyers and sellers; and likewise to persons who gleaned in the corn fields. See Eustath. on Hom. Od. ε. 241. Hence it was at length applied to all persons of mean condition, who, as we say, “live on their wits.” Thus it is explained by Harpocrates εὐτέλης, mean and contemptible. And so Philo 1021 c. χρυσάμενος—δοῦλω σπερμαλόγῳ περιτρίμματι. See Kypke on this passage. Finally it was applied to parasites, who, by flattery and buffoonery, contrived to pick up a living from the provisions of other men’s tables. Furthermore, as sparrows and other such minute birds as live by gathering up seeds are especially noisy and garrulous, so the term was applied to insignificant praters and chatterers. See Hesych., Suid., Philostr. Vit. Ap. 5, 20., Casaubon on Theophr. Char. C. 6., and Suic. Thes. 2, 994.; as also Priscus and Wets. on this passage. (Kuin., Schl. & Kypke.)
Doddridge renders σπερμαλόγος “retailer of scraps,” which version is founded on the Syriac; and may, indeed, have place, but not to the exclusion of the two other notions above detailed.*

18. ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεῖσ εἴναι. Various are the significations of δαίμων and δαίμονιον, which are generally applied to any god or deity. So Hom. II. a. 222. ή δ’ Οὐλμπόντ’ ἐβεβήκει Δάματ’ ἐς αἰγόχοιο Δίως μετὰ δαίμονας ἄλλους. Ἐλιαν, Β. Η. 3, 18. καλῶς τὸ δαίμονιον ἐπὶ τριγονίων τυραννίδας μὴ ἄγον. Thus δαίμων is used of Jupiter by Callim. Hym. in Jove 44., and of Apollo by Palæph. 47, 3. And the gods of the Gentiles are styled δαιμονία in 1 Cor. 10, 20., and Deut. 32, 17. Not unfrequently, however, δαίμων and δαίμονιον are discriminated from gods and heroes, So Jambl. Vit. Pyth. C. 21. p. 84. Kuster. peri toû theion, kai peri toû daímónion kai peri toû ἀρχαῖον γένους ἐφημένων τοι καὶ ἀγαθὴν ἔχειν δαιμονίαν. Athenag. Apol. pro Christ. p. 28. πρῶτος Θεός διαρεῖ, ος οἱ τὰ ἐκεῖνον διαρόώσες ἀκριβοῦντες μνημονεύουσι, εἴς θεῶν, εἰς δαίμονας, εἰς ἄρως. Finally, by the name δαίμονες are designated all the dìi minores of every kind, including the heroes. Now heroes and demigods were names given by the Greeks to those who were descended partly from gods, and partly from men, with extraordinary endowments of body and mind, and, after death, to be put on the list of the Deities.*

* Kuinoel, indeed, would confine the sense to logucity; which he thinks is supported by the context. “For Paul (says he) disputed with the Stoics and Epicureans. Now the Greek philosophers used, in disputations, to bring everything to the test of reason; and they thought the greatest excellence of reasoning consisted in conciseness of thought and brevity of diction. (See Quintill. Inst. Orat. 10, 1. and Walch ubi supra, p. 9.) But Paul’s Oratory was not placed in περὶ διὸς ἀνθρωπίνης σωφίας λόγοις (1 Cor. 2, 4.) but consisted chiefly in the ubertas et copiosa dicendi vis. Hence some of those Stoics and Epicureans, to whose doctrines Paul’s were at variance, thought him a tricer and babbler.”

† The distinction between δαίμονες and Θεοὶ is clearly stated in Max. Tyr. Diss. 24. p. 276. (Davis.) καὶ τίθεν θεὸν μὲν, κατὰ τὸ ἀναθές καὶ ἀθανάτον· δαίμονα δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἐμπαθῆ, ἀνθρωπὸν δὲ, κατὰ τὸ ἐμπαθῆ καὶ θητον. And Jambl. Vit. Pyth.

Such a hero, or inferior god, undoubtedly those philosophers thought was preached by Paul, when they heard him teaching that Jesus was the Son of God, the Saviour of men, who had been a mighty benefactor to the human race, and after death had been received up into Heaven. (Kuin.)

18. καταγγέλεναι. This word properly denotes a messenger or herald; and here an announcer, or preacher. The verb from which this word is derived is frequent in the Old Testament. So Acts 4, 2, καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἱσσοῦ την ἀνάστασιν τῆς ἐκ

p. 42. Edit. Kuster. εἰτε Θεὸς, εἰτε δαίμονα, εἰτε θεὸν τινα ἀνθρώπων. So also Dionys. Hal. 1, 499, 4. πάντας τε Θεοὺς καὶ ἱρων καὶ δαίμονας. See Hp. Blomf. on Ἑσχυλ. P. V. 85. Gloss. There is a curious passage on this subject in Eurip. Helen. 1151. δεῖ Θεός, ἢ μὴ Θεός, ἢ τὸ μέσον, τις φαίη; utrum planē Divinum, aut humanum, aut ex Heroum Daemnonumque medio inter Deos et homines genere. So also Max. Tyr. Diss. 14, 1, 266. εἰτο δ' αὐτοῦ φῶς εἰς ἄδανατοι δεύτεραι, θεοὶ καλοῦμενοι δεύτεροι ἐν μεθορίῳ γῆς καὶ οὐρανοῦ τεταγμένοι Θεοὺς μὲν ἀθεονετοις, ἀνθρώπους δὲ ἵσυχοιροι Θεοὺς μὲν ὑπηρέται, ἀνθρώπους δὲ ἐκτιστάται Θεοὺς μὲν πλησιαταιτοι, ἀνθρώπους δὲ ἑπιμελεστοι. Id. Diss 15, 3. ult. 1, 275. ἐκ δ' ἀγαθαθα κοινωνεί Θεοὺς μὲν δαίμονα κατὰ τὸ ἄδανατον, δαίμονων δὲ ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ ἑκπαθεῖ, ἀνθρώπως δὲ θηρίῳ κατὰ τὸ αἰολογικῷ, θηρίον δὲ φυτῷ κατὰ τὸ ἔμφυτον. Id. 11, 1, 1. 187. ult. λαμβάνειν τοῦ Σάτυρου—δαίμονα φιλοινοι: where Heinsius ill renders "vine-sus Deos." The right word would have been daemon. So also Lib. Orat. 545 ο. καὶ Θεοὺς καὶ θηρίους, καὶ τὸ τρίτον αὖ γένος. And so also in a beautiful passage of Plutarch, Vit. Romul. 28. ἀλλὰ τάς ἀρετάς ἀσκηταὶ ψυχάς παντασιαν ὀλεθαί κατὰ φύσιν καὶ δίκην Θείαν, ἐκ μὲν ἀνθρώπων ἤς ἱρων, ἐκ δ' ἱρων ἤς δαίμονας, ἐκ δ' δαίμονων ἐς Θεοὺς αναφερομεν: where the student will observe a fine climes. Aristid. T. 3, 294 ο. ἄνα δαίμονα ἄλλα δαίμονας ἀλλὰ δαίμονας καὶ. From the words which precede and follow, it appears that daímones and ἱρων had, in this view, nearly the same significations as that assigned to them by the Greeks. Diogenes Laert. 823. among the dictys of Pythagoras records this: Θεοὺς μὲν daímònów προτιμαν, ἱρων δὲ ἀνθρώπων. And so Pind. Ol. 2, 2. τίνα Θεόν, τίν' ἱρων, Τίνα δὲ ἄνδρα κελήθησομεν: imitated by Horace.

This distinction, however, though generally, is not always observed by the earliest and best authors. One of the most remarkable deviations from it occurs in Eurip. Phoen. 614. where he makes Eteocles exclaim: δ' — θεοῦ τῶν λευκοκόλων δαίμονα. See the Schol. on Eurip. Hec. 164.
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νεκρῶν & 16, 21. καταγγέλλειν ἔθη. The Classical writers expressed this by εἰσάγειν δαίμόνια, or εἰσφέρειν, or εἰσηγεῖσθαι, of which Wets. adduces numerous examples; as Varius: καὶνὰ δαίμονα εἰσηγεῖτο. Χε-

νοφ. de fact et dict. Socratis. ἀδικεὶ Ζακράτης, οὗ μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς, οὐ νομίζαν, ἕτερα δὲ καὶνὰ δαι-


υντομεῖν, and καὶνὰ διδαχῇ.

18. τὸν Ἱησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ εἰσγελί-

ζετο. These (as appears by εἰσγελίζειν, not εἰσγε-

λίζεται) are the words of St. Luke: for Paul would not have used an expression in this sense unknown to Grecians.

Ἀνάστασις belongs not only to Christ, but to the resurrection of all the dead by Christ. [q. d. “preached Jesus, and the resurrection of the dead through him.” Edit.] Of both these Paul had spoken. Hence the word is here used in a general sense. [which seems to be hinted at by the article. Edit.] Compare ver. 31, 32 & 33. where there is added τῶν νεκρῶν. These doctrines, it must be observed, were usually conjoined by the Apostle. See 4, 2, 24, 15, 1 Cor. 15, 12. (Kuin.)

I agree with the learned Commentator in retaining the common interpretation of these words; but I can scarcely think him justified in giving the unquali-

fied censure he does to the opinion of Chrysostom and ΟΕcumeneus, and several eminent Commenta-

tors of modern times, as Selden, Rous, Hammond, Spencer, Morus, Valcknaer, Doddridge, and Warburton, whose arguments are not so futile as Kuin.

(after Bentley and others, esteem them), that the Athenians took ἀνάστασις for a goddess. The mis-

take may seem, indeed, too gross for such enlight-
ened persons, but (as Selden and others urge) since they were accustomed to deify virtues and vices, and many of the powers of nature, it is the less surprising. As to the argument, that if so, Paul must have spoken with blameable obscurity, that seems not very conclusive; for many expressions of Christ himself are far from clear and perspicuous. And if Paul applied to Jesus what he says in Joh. 11, 25. ἐγώ εἰμι η ἄναστασις καὶ ζωή, they might mistake him; and, indeed, at ver. 20., they say, ξενιγομένα των εἰσόφεισι τὰς ἄκος ἤμων. Besides, we are to bear in mind that there was so much the less chance for them to understand St. Paul, since to them his strong Hellenistic phrases and harsh Hebraisms would be little intelligible, especially as we have no reason to suppose them to have been very attentive hearers, or anxious enquirers into his meaning.

After all, however, there is no necessity to abandon the common interpretation, which is not liable to any serious objection; for as to the one which would naturally occur, namely, that the plural in ξένων δαμωνίων requires us to suppose two gods in the corresponding member of the sentence, it is sufficient to answer (with Wolf, Adami, and Bp. Pearce) that the plural is used for the singular; as in ver. 28. ὡς τινες τῶν καθ Ἱμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰσόχασι, meaning Aratus. As in addressing them Paul would speak not only of God, but of Jesus, the Son of God, they would easily suppose him to speak of two gods.

19. ἐπιλαβόμενοι τε αὐτῶ, &c. Many Commentators, as Beza, Piscator, and Schleusner, infer from this expression, that Paul was forcibly apprehended, and taken before the court of Areopagus, since that was a tribunal for the trial of great offences against morals and religion; and to introduce the worship of foreign gods was, by the law, a capital offence. But there is no proof that they apprehended him violently. It is probable that the court of Areopagus had, since the time of Socrates (like the courts of Inquisition for the last half century) gradually
abated much of its ancient severity in that respect. Besides (as Kuinoel observes) it does not appear that ἔνα δαίμονα were so odious at Athens; nay, it seems that unknown Deities were introduced there;* (see the Commentators on ver. 16.) and Socrates was condemned not so much for introducing new gods, as for despising and setting at nought those that were already worshipped: which may be illustrated from indictment, as it is recorded in Xen. Mem. 1, 1, 1. ἰδίως Ἀθηναῖοι, οὐ μεν ἡ τοῖς νομίζετε δήμος, οὐ νομίζετε, ἦτερο δὲ καὶδαίμονα εἰσφέρον. It is probable that their curiosity was strongly excited, and that the better inclined brought Paul before the Areopagus, in order to obtain a fuller explanation of the doctrines propounded by him; while others might only have in view an occasion of ridicule. Nor is there any thing in the whole narration that indicates a trial: we have neither the indictment of accusers, nor the interrogatories of judges. Paul does not address them as judges; neither does he attempt any exculpation of his conduct. Indeed, I suspect that Paul was not brought to Areopagus, as before the court of Areopagists, but that the place was selected as a proper one for such a public enquiry, and the Areopagists who sat there, sat, not ex officio, but as Philosophers. In short, the whole seems to be an affair with philosophers, and not judges. Hence it is certain that ἐπιλαμβάνω will admit the sense above assigned to it, which also occurs in Matt. 14, 31., Luke 9, 47. 14, 4., Acts 23, 19. There seems to be an ellipsis of χειρὸς, which is expressed in Mark 8, 28. Xen. de Republ. 1, 18., and often.

The words, "may we know," also confirm this

* And this appears from the following passage of Athen. 9, 373. speaking of the Athenians: τούτου ἐπάρχει ταῦτ' ἐκείνῃ τοὺς θεοὺς σέβοντες ἀντίλαμβαν ἄρα σέβοντες ὦμας ὡς ἐν φε' τι ἢ τι Λαμπρον αὐτῶν τὸν πόλιν πεποίηκαί ἐντ' Ἀθηνῶν which passage has been given up by Bentley so irretrievably corrupt. It may, however, be very well emended by reading, for τι, τίν', and, for πεποίηκας, πε-ποιηκας i.e. πεποίηκας.
interpretation, which the best critics, for the last two centuries, have been, (upon the whole,) agreed in adopting.

19. "Αρείον πάγον, Mars' Hill. Πάγος signifies properly a high situation. This was a hill opposite to that of the citadel on the West; as we learn from Herod. 8, 52. [See the passages produced supra, to which I add Liv. 26, 44. Tumulum quem Mercurii vocant. Edit.] It was so called, either because it had been consecrated to Mars (as the Campus Martius at Rome), or because (as Pausanias relates, Att. C. 28.) Mars, when he had slain Halyrrothius, son of Neptune, was the first who there pleaded a capital cause, which took place before the twelve gods. The judges used to sit by night, and sub die; and whatever was done was kept very secret. [whence the proverb 'Αρεσπαγήτων σιωπηλότερος, to which may be compared ours, "as grave as a Judge." Edit.] They gave their judgment, not vivē voce, but in writing. Nor were any admitted into the number of Areopagists but persons of noble birth, of unspotted morality, and eminent for justice and equity. See more in Meurs. de Areopago. (Kuin.) The Areopagus, too, was the most dignified court at Athens; * and amongst its other functions was that of inspecting religion, and holding a Holy Office or

* In proof of this Wetstein adduces a great number of Classical citations; ex. gr. Isocr. Areop. την ε Αρείον πάγον βουλήν ἐκέπε- τησαν ἐπειδή ήστησαι τῆς εἰκοσιάς, ήν όν νόν τ᾿ ἐν μετασχεῖν πλὴν τοῦ καλοὶ γεγονοῦ, καὶ πολλὴν ἄρεθν καὶ σφοροῦνην ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἐνδεδειγμένοις, ὅτε πάντων αὐτὴν εἰκότως διενεκεῖν τῶν ἄλλων ἐν τοῖς ἔλησα δικαιστηρίων. Lycurg. in Leocrat. Κάλλιστον ἔχοντες τῶν ἄλλων παράδειγμα τὸ ἐν Αρείῳ πάγῳ συνέδριον, διόσοτον διαφέρει τῶν ἄλλων δικαιστηρίων, ὅτε καὶ παρ᾿ αὐτοῖς ὁμόλογοί οἴδεῖν δικαιάν τοις τοιαίας τὴν κρίσιν. Eschyl. Eumen. 776. ἐρωμένα τε χάρα, καὶ πόλεως σωτηρίου—κερδῶν ἄδικον τούτω βουλευτήριον, Ἀδιόν, ἐκθέμον, εὐδύνων ἐπερ ἐγγυηθοῦσα, φιλο-ρήμα γὰρ where the Scholiast says that the number of the Areopagists was thirty-one. That they used to hold their judgments by night, we learn from Lucian. Herm. 64. In nothing did this Court more differ from the abominable Popish Inquisition than in this—that the accuser and the accused were brought face to face, and a patient hearing given to both sides. See Lucian. de Gymn. 19.
Court of Inquisition; from which, as a model, the Roman Catholics, I suspect, derived their justly detested tribunal. 

19. ἑυομέθα γνῶναι, &c., "may we know what is the nature of this new doctrine promulgated by thee." I cannot assent to the opinion of some Commentators, as Heinrichs and Kuinoel, that these words are ironical; though I grant that the Athenians were sufficiently prone to irony, jeering, and derision. Nor is there any occasion, with Toup, to read οὐ ἑυομέθα in the Indicative mood. That consummate critic of Classical writers stumbled (I imagine) at this use of ἑυομέθα, may be permitted, which does, indeed, seem unlike the Classical use; but an example of ἑυομέθα in this sense is adduced by Palairet from Herodian, L.3 p.185. It may, however, be justly considered as Hellenistical; though in the same manner, too, the Latin possum is employed: and indeed our own language supplies an exactly correspondent idiom.

20. ἐπιφησα γαρ τινα εἰςφέσεις εἰς τὰς ἁκοὰς. Ξένος denotes primitively a foreigner, or perhaps traveller (as in Matt. 25, 35). Now since foreign travellers passing through any country seem strange to its inhabitants, and are therefore termed strangers (see Heb. 11, 13.), so the term came to mean generally strange, surprising, unusual, new, unheard of; as in Aristot. Polit. 7, 17. δεὶ τοῖς νέοις πάντα ποιεῖν ξένα τὰ φαινα· and 1 Pet. 4, 12. ὁς ξένω οὐκ ἐσμαι συμβαίνοντος. Diodor. Sic. 3, 5. ἀνδρόιος καὶ ἑλπι ἱστορίᾳ. See Schl. Lex. § 4. Thus ἐπιφησα signifies not only to be a traveller, or stranger, but also to be strange, new, unheard of, &c. So that the participle present is synonymous with the adjective ξένος.

The words εἰς τὰς ἁκοὰς ἡμῶν seem added by way of fixing the otherwise indeterminate sense of ἐπιφησα.

20. ἁκοᾶς, ears. The signification of ἁκοῆς is rare in the Classical writers, and in the plural it scarcely ever occurs, as here and in Luke 7, 1., Mark 7, 35.

21. ἐπίθημοντες ξένοι, "the strangers who sojourn there." Some Commentators (including Doddr.) think that this term refers to the young nobility and gentry who were sent from all parts to study at Athens. But this seems limiting the sense too much. Priscæus is of opinion that it has reference to that numerous order at Athens called the μέταλλα. "And this distinction (says he) between the ἀστός and ξένοι was there very frequent. The ἀστός considered themselves as alone possessing any rank. All the rest were included indiscriminately under the name ξένοι. They called themselves the first inhabitants, the αὐτοκόυνα; the rest they styled new comers. On this subject there is a very instructive passage in the Panathenaica of Aristid., where he says: Ξένοι καὶ πολίται μοιῆς τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ τρέψοντι διερήσατο. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι, καθάπερ θέας καταλαβόντες, οὔτε ταύτα κρίνουσιν, οὐ τὸ μάλλον ἐκείτως προοιμίσθην τῶν χαρίων τοὺς άλλους ἀφορίζοντες, ἀλλὰ τῷ φθόνῳ καταλαβόντες καὶ ξένους ὑπομικθεῖν τοὺς δευτέρους ἐλένθησαν ἐγνωσόντες οτί πάντες ἴματος εἶναι ξένοι, μάλλον δὲ αὐτἶς πρατοῦν νέοι καὶ τουσκόν τῶν δημοσίων εἰς αὐτὸ πείναντα διαφερόμενοι, οὕς οὐ κρίνοντες ἔχοι τῆς πολιτείας, ἀλλ' ἐνεμβαθικόντος προμετέλευτο τὴν πατρίδα, ἀφετέρου δὲ λοιπὸν ἀπερίφοτοι τὰ φαινόντα χρόναμεν μᾶκας οἱ ὅμως ὅμως (Atheniensibus) ὑπάρχει καθαρὰν εὐγενείαν τε καὶ πολίτειαν αὐχέναι καὶ διὰτον ὑπομαίνειν, ἐκάτερον κύριον ἔστι τῇ χαρῇ διὰ τὸ ἔτερον, ἐκόμισαν: οἱ τὲ γὰρ ξένοι διὰ τῶν άλλων παίζεισι νοησίως ὑπάρχοντες ἐνεχόμενοι τῷ προμετέλευτῃ, οἵτε πολύτατοι θεολογοῦν τὴν ἐνακμήν τοῦ καθαροῦ ξένων οὕτω τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς. This passage exceedingly illustrates the true force of ἐπίθημοντες, to which the following bear a strong affinity." Lucian Ver. Hist. τῶν ξένων ἐπίθημοντος. Simplic. C. 37. Epicteti. τῶν ξένων τὸν ἐπίθημοντα ἀρίτμ. Athian. Var. 3, 14.
The inhabitants of Athens were divided into πολίται, μετοίκοι, and ξένοι. (See Demosth. adv. Aristocrat. p. 432.) Only the πολίται (i.e. the ἄστοι) and the ξένοι are opposed in a more extensive sense; by which the letter comprehended both the μετοίκοι and the ξένοι. Hence the question arises whether the ἐπιθυμοῦντες ξένοι are to be taken in this more extended sense, as denoting all the ξένοι, viz. who had not the jus civitatis, or only those who had their fixed habitation at Athens; as opposed to sojourners. I find the phrase used only in the stricter sense; as in Theophr. (above cited), Demosth. in Neaer. p. 522. ξένον δ' οὖ πάνω ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡν αὐτόθι. Lycurg. adv. Leocrat. p. 126. οὐ μόνον πολίτης ἄλλα καὶ ξένος ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθέν χένοις ἐπιθυμημένος. Lucian dial. mar. Dor. et Gal. p. 189. τῶν ἐπιθυμοῦντας τῶν ξένων. & Ver. Hist. above cited. Xenoph. Mem. p. 450. τῶν ἐπιθυμοῦντας ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ξένως. It seems, therefore, that the word Ἀθηναῖοι is here to be taken in a more extensive sense, as including the μετοίκοι. (Kypke.)

Of the numerous passages produced by Wets., the most apposite (except those already cited) are the following: Pausan. Lacon. 22. ἐφόνευσε μὲν τῶν ἔξι-
The opinion of Priceus is supported by J. Gronov. and others: but most Commentators for nearly a century have espoused (and I think more rightly) the view of the subject taken by Kypke. See Adami Obs. 264, Raphel in loc., Wolf's Curæ, and Kuin. on 2, 10. I will only add, that the reason for the immense concourse of strangers from every part of the world arose from the boundless liberality of the Athenian government towards them. Thus Pericles, in that most consummate of all antient orations, preserved by Thucydides, 2, 39. sub init. says: τὴν τε γὰρ πολίν κοινὴν παρέχομεν, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ὁτὲ ξενισταῖς ἀπείρομεν τίνα ἡ μαθήματος ἡ διάματος, ὥς κεφαλὴν ἀν ἄρτις τῶν πολεμίων οἰδαν ὑφεληχθῆναι. And c. 37. sub med. speaking of the private life of the Athenians: καὶ ἐς τὴν πρὸς ἀλήθειας τῶν καὶ ἡμέραν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὑποψίαιαν, οὐ δὲ ἀγὼς τὸν πέλας, εἰ καὶ ἰδονὶ τι ὄρα, ἔχοντες, οὐδὲ ἄνημοιος μὲν λυπηὰς δὲ τῇ ὑπεί ἀχθηδῶνας προστιθέμενοι.

21. eis oüdein eteçoi euçaiρou. This seems to correspond to the Latin, “nulli rei magis vacant.” Eu-kaîrein is a word unknown to the earliest and best writers (who use in this sense σχολάζω), and only occurs in the later ones; as Polybius, Plutarch, Philo, &c. See Kypke and Loesner. It is by Fischer and Sturz reckoned among the words of the Macedonian and Alexandrian dialect.

21. ἡ λέγειν τι καὶ ἀκοῦειν καίντερεν. On the loquacity and rage for novelty of the Athenians, and of their busy and prying curiosity into both public and private affairs, in which the enquirer could have no concern, all antient writers coincide with St. Luke.*

* Of this the Philological illustrators, especially Wetstein, supply us with abundant examples, of which the following are the most apposite: Demosth. ad Epist. Philippi, &c. Philipp. 1. ἡμεῖς δὲ, εἰ-ρησάτω γιαρ ἁλθὲ, οὐδὲν ποιοῦντες ἐνθάδε καθῆμεθα, μέλλοντες
Their love of gossiping and news is evident from the fact that there were at Athens places called νεωτερον, i.e. gossiping houses (corresponding to our coffee-houses) devoted to the reception of persons who met together to hear and tell news. Of these Meurs. Ath. Att. p. 158. tells us there were 360. The more respectable inhabitants used to resort to the ἰατρεία (shops of the surgeons), and κουρεία (shops of the barbers).*

'22. It must be remarked, that καινότερον is for καινύ, the comparative for the positive.

22. In this discourse (so eminently characterised by depth of thought, solidity of sentiment, and energy of diction,) it must be observed, the Apostle wisely accommodates himself to the circumstances of his hearers. In the first place he treats of the existence of one true God; then enjoins a purer mode of worshipping him; after which he maintains the truth of the doctrine of Jesus.

The plan of the discourse is thus laid down by Schoettgen: “The Exordium contains the occasion which led to his addressing them; namely, their δεσίδαιμον, and worship of an unknown God (ver. 22 & 23). The Proposition is this: I announce to you who that unknown God is (ver. 23). The Confirmation contains, 1st, an announcement of the true doc-

* It may be permitted, in passing, to observe the strong resemblance between the Athenians and the modern French, who are little altered from the ancient Gauls, as they are described by Strabo, Diodorus, Caesar, and other writers.
trine (ver. 24—28): 2dly, an indirect exhortation to his hearers to regulate their lives according to its precepts (29, 30); with the reason added (ver. 81).

Kuinoel, and some others, think that we have only a part of what St. Paul said: in which, however, I cannot agree with them. They seem to forget (as they also did in the case of Stephen) that the Apostle was interrupted; otherwise, he would undoubtedly have proceeded much further.

22. σταθείς, i.e. "being set up to speak." So Lycoh. 470. ἐν ᾐτρῆσι δημοτῶν σταθείς where Tzetzes explains ἐντρῆσι by δημηγορίας. On this idiom I have before treated; and for further illustration of it must refer the reader to Wolf in loc.

22. κατὰ πάντα ὁ δεισιδαιμονεστήρως ἤμως θεωρῶ. The best critics, for the last two centuries, (and of the antient ones Chrysostom,) have been pretty much agreed that δεισιδαιμονίω must here have the good sense: for it is a word of middle signification, and susceptible of two senses. Many examples of both are produced by the Philological illustrators (especially Wets.) from writers of every age. This, indeed, is here so manifest from the very complexion of the whole sentence, that no one competently versed in Greek literature can doubt it. Had the meaning commonly ascribed to δεισιδαιμονεστήρως been the one intended by the Apostle, he would not have used either κατὰ πάντα, nor θεωρῶ. Besides, before so august a court, the Apostle would surely not have thus glaringly violated decorum; whereas, according to the mode of interpretation first mentioned, he opens his discourse in a conciliatory manner, rather commending their attachment to religion, as far as they were informed of its true character.* See Cudworth ap. Bulkley.

* That this commendation was not altogether unmerited, has been abundantly proved by the Philologists; to whose citations I add the following. Polemo ap. Schol. on Soph. Ο. Ed. c. 100. Ἀθήνην τε γὰρ ἐν ποιοτοῖς ἑπεμελεῖς ὄντες, καὶ τὰ πρὸς Θεοῦ δοσιν. Soph. Ο. Ed. Col. 260. εἰ τὰς γ' Ἀθήνας φαιν θεοφεβεστάτας Εὐρυ. & Ο. Ed.
For a detail of the true force and various applications of the word ἰδεῖταίμων, I must the reader to the masterly Dissertation (for such it is) of Dr. Hammond; as containing by far the most complete account ever yet given.

It has been by some thought that St. Paul might purposely employ a term of doubtful meaning. But this seems refining too much; and moreover is inconsistent with the frank and open character of the Apostle. It is probable that he was not acquainted with the bad sense of the word; while, on the other hand, the good one would be so similar to certain Hebrew phrases as to be more likely to be chosen. It is remarkable, however, that the word occurs in no other passage of the Old or New Testament.

23. διαφέρομεν, "passing through up and down your city." 'Αναδεωρών τὰ σεθάσματα ὑμῶν: the ἀνά seems to be intensive.

23. Τὰ σεθάσματα ὑμῶν. The Syr. renders, "temppla vestra;" and the Vulg. and Æthiop., "simulacra vestra." Some modern Commentators, as De Dieu,


Volkamer, too, in his Schol., renders δεισιδαιμονετέους valde religiosos; and observes, that there is a passage much to the purpose in Plato's 3d Alcit. t. 2. 148 ʃ. Sophocles (he remarks) wrote, at a very advanced age, a whole drama in praise of the piety of his country, called the Οἰδ. in Col. in which, at v. 1187, he, under the person of οἰδιπουσ, bears the honourable testimony: τά γ′ εὐσεβεῖς Μόνος παρ’ ἑμῖν, εβρου ἀνθρώπων ἐγώ. To these passages Volkamer also subjoins the following: Aristoph. Nub. 300. ἰδομενει λιθωτάρι χθώνα Παλλάδος, εδώρον γὰς Κέρκυρας ὅφοιμαι πολύφρατος. Οὐ σέβας ἀρρήτων ἵνα Μυστοδόκου δόμου ἐν τελειάς ἄγιας ἀναδεικνύς, Οἰδιπῶι τε θεοὶ δεικόμεναι, Ναοὶ θ’ ὑπερεθεῖναι, καὶ ἀγάλματα, καὶ πρόσοδοι μακάρων ἱερώτατα, Εὐθείας καὶ τε θεοὶ θεουία, θαλαῖ τε, παντοδοκαὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. Where the Schol. explains παντοδόκας ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπερεθεῖναι καὶ διακοσμεῖν τε θεοὶ, καὶ παντοδοκαὶ οὐ θεοὶ, διευλογεῖν διὰ τοῦτο λεγόμεν ἔνως ὑμῖν, θεοὶ διακοσμεῖν καὶ διακοσμεῖν which (I would observe) exactly corresponds to what Pericles says in his Orat. ap. Thucyd. 2, 39. cited supra on ver. 16. Athen. 373 Ṗ. where the gods are introduced saying (after having enumerated all the good things which Athens produced at every season of the year), τούτῳ ὑπέρχει, ταῦτ', ἐπειδὴ τούτο Θεοὺς σέβοναι.
and also the Æthiopic Translator, take σεβάσματα for θεά; as in Sap. 14, 20. 15, 17. Hist. Dru. 27. By our English Translators it is rendered devotions; which is certainly the farthest from the sense; and indeed it is rather a version of Erasmus's interpretation, culturas. That of Beza and Piscator, namely, sacra, has been, with reason, adopted by most modern Commentators. For σεβάσμα, as Schleusner and Kuinoel remark, (from Koppe,) though it may not denote any object of religious worship, yet in this context must signify generally (and by metonymy) the worship itself and every thing connected with it, as temples, altars, sacrifices, images, &c.

23. εὗρον καὶ βαυμὸν, ἐν τῷ ἐπεγέγρατο τοῦ Ἀγνώστου Θεοῦ.

This altar, dedicated Θεῷ Ἀγνώστῳ, remarked by St. Paul at Athens, has exceedingly exercised the learning and ingenuity of Commentators and Critics. See Fabric. Bibl. Antiq. 296. and Wolf's Curæ on this passage. Now the principal difficulty which it involves, is this, that the Greek writers, especially such as illustrate Athenian antiquities, and are consulted by the Commentators for the illustration of this passage, make mention of many altars dedicated ἀγνώστου Θεοῦ. And as to the passages of Lucian in Philip., to which some (as Grotius, Olearius, and Witsius Melet. L. p. 84.) have appealed, in order to prove that at Athens there existed an altar dedicated ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ, they are little to the purpose. For, though Critias, in the former passage, ironically swears, εὖ τῶν ἀγνώστων εὖ Ἀθηναῖς; and in the latter, another speaker thus concludes the dialogue: ἥμεις δὲ τῶν εὖ Ἀθηναίς ἀγνώστων ἐφευρόντες, καὶ προσκυνήσατε χείρας εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐκείνατε, τούτῳ εὐχαριστήσαμεν: yet, as Eichhorn and Niemeyer (in his Interpr. Orat. Paul. Ath. in Areop. hab.), and others remark, Lucian, in those passages, only turns to ridicule (according to his custom) Paul's expression; and there is not a word of assertion that he really saw any such altar at Athens. And, as to the other passages of Greek writers brought forward, we can only conclude from them that there were altars dedicated by the Athenians to many unknown gods. Thus Pausan. I, 1. edit. Kuhn. says, that there was in Phalerus (a port of the Athenians), βῶμοι θεῶν τε ὁμολογημένων ἀγνώστων, καὶ ἱρών. And Philostr. Vit. Ap. 6, 3. writes: σωφρονεστέροι περὶ πάντων θεῶν ἐν λέγειν, καὶ ταῦτα Ἀθηναῖς, οὐ καὶ ἀγνώστων θεῶν βωμοὶ ἱρωναί. The subject, therefore, of both passages is many gods; neither from the words cited does it clearly appear whether the altars were inscribed ἀγνώστου Θεοῦ or ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ. The above Commentators also cite another passage, no more to the purpose than the rest, from Diog. Laert. I. 10. p. 71. where D. relates that Epimenides removed the plague at Athens in this manner: λαβὼν πρά-
Acts of the Apostles, Chap. XVII.

Now, since the antient writers tell us that there were *many* altars at Athens dedicated *agnostai Theoi*, Erasmus, Le Clerc, Brodeus, and many others, have maintained that St. Paul changed the plural number into the singular, in accommodation to his purpose. Of the same opinion too was Jerome, who, in his Comment. on the Ep. to Tit. 1, 12. testifies that this inscription (which, he says, had been read by him,) was as follows: *Theoi Asiae kai Euboeis, kai Ligiae, Theoi agnostoi kai enoin.* It is, however, justly objected by others, that this interpretation being admitted, the whole strength and weight of the Apostle's arguments is taken away; nay, his assertion might by his adversaries have been convicted of falsity. They therefore think that the good Father was imposed upon, and they maintain that there were altars at Athens inscribed in the plural number, and also one in the singular. Eichborn conjectures that there were *many* altars at Athens originally with no inscriptions, from the art of writing having been, at the period of their erection, unknown or not generally received; and that these, in a later age, the Athenians did not destroy, but, since they knew not to whom they were dedicated, inscribed on them *agnosis Theos*, to a (some) unknown god: and that of several altars so inscribed St. Paul only saw one: and, since he knew not that more were so inscribed, made mention of this, in order to shew that he proposed nothing unusual or unheard of, but that *his one God* was found in the number of the *Gods already worshipped* by them. To which opinion Niemeyer accedes. For my own part, I think that there were at Athens several altars on which this inscription was written in the plural number, as in the passages of Pausan. and Jerome above cited. And Pausan. 5, 14. tells us, that in Elis, where the Olympic games were celebrated, there were placed near the altar of Jupiter Olympus *bomos agnosisuos.* But I am of opinion, that at Athens there was also one altar with the inscription *agnosis Theos*; although it does not appear that any other writer has recorded it. For no argument can be deduced from their silence, to the discredit of any writer, like St. Paul, of unimpeached integrity. The altar in question had probably been dedicated *agnosis Theos* on account of some remarkable benefit received, which seemed attributable to some God, though it was uncertain to whom. See Torkill. Baden Diss. *Are Deo ignoto dicitur causas ex antiquissimis religionis naturae probabiliter esse repetendas,* Hahn. 1787, who supposes the inscription to have originated in the superstition of the early ages, which filled all nature with Deities,
25. οὐδὲ — προσδεόμενος τινος.* This verb properly signifies to want something over and above what one already possesses; of which Wets. produces examples. This distinction, however, is seldom observed.

Wetstein here remarks that Paul, with consummate art, so tempers his discourse, that at one time he contests on the side of the vulgar against the Philosophers: at another time with the Philosophers against the vulgar; and sometimes against both.

"Now the Stoics (continues he) believed in the existence of one God, but the vulgar, thinking that all things could not be governed by one Being, divided the governance amongst many. The Stoics ascribed the origin of the human race to God. The common people of Athens thought that their nation had existed from all eternity: while the Epicureans ascribed the origin of men to fortuitous chance. The Stoics believed those only to be virtuous who had attained perfection. Paul teaches them that a conversion, or change for the better, is necessary for them also. The Stoics, moreover, taught that all


We are to remember that Plutarch, Seneca, and other Philosophers, who lived after the Christian æra, had probably read the Scriptures: and there is reason to suppose that they borrowed from them several of their doctrines.

Paul seems to have had in view 3 Mac. 2, 9. (cited by Kyrke), ἡγίασας τὸν τόπον τούτον εἰς σὸν ὅνομα σοι τῷ τῶν ἀπάντων ἀνεσθεί.
things were bound by a *fatalis necessitas*. Paul, on the contrary, maintains that the actions of man are to be imputed to *themselves*; so that they may be rewarded or punished for having done those things which it was in their power *not* to have done."

25. *διὸς οὐκ ἐστὶν καὶ πνεῦμα, i.e. "the breath of life."* So Gen. 2, 7. See the note on Joh. 3, 5: (Grot.) Ἐκ τῶν, "all things necessary to the sus-
tenance of that spirit which he hath infused." (Pric.)

26. εἰς ἔνας αἵματος. Αἷμα and the corresponding words, in almost all languages, designate *seed, race, parent,* &c. See the note on John 1, 13. Paul now goes back to the origin of the human race; and teaches that it is to be derived from *one man*, in order thereby to oppose the vain conceit of the Athenians, who called themselves *αὐτόχθονες* and *γηγενεῖς*: in illustration of which, numerous passages are cited by Wets.; ex. gr. Aristoph. Vesp. 1071. ἐσμέν ἡμεῖς — Ἀττικὸ μόνοι δικαίως εὐγενεῖς αὐτόχθονες. Herodot. 7, 162. ἄρχαιοτάτων μὲν ἔθνοι παρεχόμενοι, μόνον δὲ ἔστω τις ἡ μετανάσται ἐλλήνων. Eurip. Erechth. 68. ἄργιδομαι δὲ πολλα πρῶτα μὲν πάντων σῶς ἰεὶ τοῖς ἄλλην τῆς ἡ Βελτίον λαβεῖν. Ἡ πρῶτα μὲν λέον σῶς ἐπακός ἀλλοθυ, αὐτόχθονες δὲ ἐσμέν. Eurip. Ion. 29. ἐλθὼν λαθο ἐκ αὐτόχθονα κλειναὶ Ἀθηνα. Wetstein has, however, omitted the most opposite one, namely; Thucyd. 1, 2. where we may plainly see that the Historian (and probably most other sensible men of his time) did not entertain the *common notion* of the Athenians being *αὐτόχθονες*. His words are these: τὴν γοῦν Ἀττικήν, διὰ τὸ λεπτόγειον, ἀστασίας-
tων ὄνομα, ἀνθρώποι ἄκοιν οἱ αὐτῶν ἄδει. And so Pericles ap. Thucyd. 2, 36. τὴν χάριν ἄδει οἱ αὐτῶν ἐκοινών. The two following passages, cited by Wets., are very opposite. Anthol. 3, 31, 6. "Ἀστεά καὶ δ' ἀλλος ἐνὸ
αἵματος, αἰς λόγοις ἐστὶν. Virg. Æn. 8, 142. Sic genus
amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno.

* The force of the word is thus expressed by Justin 2, 16. "Non
advenere, sed eodem innati solo, quod incolunt, et quae illis sedes,
eadem origo est."
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I must not omit to compare the τῶν έθνων ἀνθρώπων with Philostr. Vit. Ap. 8, 18. έθνη ἀνθρώπων, another imitation of the Scripture by that not ineloquent Sophist.

26. ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς. An Hebraism for ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς (as in Luke 21, 35.), i.e. ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν γῆν. Paul seems to have had in view Gen. 11, 3. διέσπειρεν ἀνθρώπους ὁ κόσμος ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς. So also Deut. 32, 8. διεμέρισεν ὡς κρίνος ἱνα, οἵς διέσπειρεν αὐτὸς Ἀδὰμ, καὶ ἐστησεν ὧνια αὐτῶν. (Kuin.)

In answer to the objection, that no principle of reason could prove that all mankind were descended from one original pair, Doddridge observes, that it was not necessary for the Apostle separately to prove every article of his doctrine, of which he here gives a summary account; though, had they heard him out, he would no doubt have given them proper evidence that he had a commission from God to teach it, and that therefore it was to be received on the authority of the revealer.”

26. ὄρθασ προτεσταγμένος καίρως, “determining certain times, and certain boundaries of the regions which they should inhabit.” Critics are generally agreed, that for προτεσταγμένος, we are to read προσταγμένος, as being the more difficult reading, and supported by many MSS. Their testimony, however, in such a case as the present, is of no weight. For προ and πρὸς in composition are perpetually confused. Indeed I doubt whether προστάσω can mean constitute, appoint. There is no authority for that sense in Scripture; and, I think, none in the Classical writers: whereas προτάσω is frequently so used; as, for instance, in Thucyd. 3, 52. προτάσων — Ἀστώμαχων. And so 2 Macc. 8, 36. προτεσταγμένος νόμος. See also Ps. 59, 8.

This is evidently levelled against the Epicurean dogmas. De Dieu, Priceus, and others, take the προτεταγμένους καιρούς and ἰροθείας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν to mean "the limits of human life." But, as Kunoel observes, this would be both tautological, and not agreeable to the context.

27. ἢτεῖν τῶν Κύριων. Paraphrase thus: "God hath pleased that there should be these evidences of His existence and providence, that all nations may recognize in him the Creator and the Governor of the universe." See Rom. 1, 19, 2. Sap. 13, 4 seq. At ἢτεῖν subaud ὅστε or εἰς τὸ. The formula ἢτεῖν τῶν Κύριων denotes, to study to attain a knowledge of the true God, by a diligent consideration of the proofs of His Divine Providence.

27. Εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτῶν, "if haply they might feel after, and find him; i. e. if they can possibly attain a right and certain knowledge of God.* Now ψηλαφᾶν signifies to feel, handle, and is used not only in a physical, but moral sense, to denote handle, try, investigate, enquire. So Plutarch 589. (cited by Elsner): τὰς μὲν ἀλλήλων νοσίεις ὁμον ὑπὸ σκότῳ διὰ φωνῆς ψηλαφῶντες γνωρίζομεν. There is also an hendiadis for ψηλαφήσαντες εὑροίμεν. (Kuin.)

27. καίτοιγε οὐ μακρῶν ἀπὸ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἥμιῶν ὑπάρχοντα, "and yet he is not far," &c. The participle is used for the indicative. We have, too, a litoles; and the sense of οὐ μακρῶν, &c. may be thus ex-

* Bulkeley appositely cites Plat. Phaed. § 47. who severely con-
pressed: "for he is near, since these are manifest indications of the Creator and Governor of the world." So Simplic. on Epict. C. 38. autós ἐν τῷ πάσιν πάστερι. Dio Chrys. p. 201 B. (cited by Wets.) ἅτε γὰρ οὐκ ἦλθαν οὐδὲ ἔχασ τοῦ θείου διώκσιμον ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ μέσῳ περικότες ἑκεῖνο, καὶ προσέχομεν πάντα τρόπουν, οὐκ ἐδύναντο μέχρι πλείονος ἀξίωσειν μένειν. He also quotes a witty passage from Duris the Samian ap. Athen. 253. (speaking of Venus): ἀλλ' ἂν μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσι θεοί, οὐκ ἦχουσιν ἄτα· οὐκ εἰσίν' οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἐν· σε δὲ παρόντ' ὀραίμεν οὐξ ἔχων, οὐδὲ λιθινόν, ἀλλ' ἀληθινὸν where observe the paronomasia.

It is truly observed by Michaelis and Niemeyer, that this is not to be referred to the philosophical, or theological, doctrine of God's omnipotence, but to the power which he affords to every one of knowing him and contemplating him in his works.* Elsner cites the following interesting passage of Joseph. Ant. 6, 2., which, I add, has been imitated by Procopius: Τούτων δὲ σοι κατασκευάσας τὸν ναὸν ἐκάρημαν, αἰς ἀν ἄπτ' αὐτοῦ σοι τὰς εὐχὰς βούντες καὶ καλλιεργώντες ἀναπέμπομεν εἰς τὸν ἀέρα, καὶ πεπεσμένοι διατελούμεν, τοῖς παρ' καὶ μακρὰν οὐκ ἀφετηρίας οὐδὲ σαυτό τ' ἂν μὴ γὰρ πάντα τέ εἴρων καὶ πάντα ἀκούειν, οὐδὲ νῦν ἕπεσον σοι βέμις οἷκεν ἀπολείπεις τὸς πάντας, μᾶλλον δὲ πάσιν ἔγνυτα εἶναι· καί ἠκάστῳ καὶ διὰ νῦκτος καὶ ημέρας συμπάρη.

28. ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ἡ βίωμεν, &c. The ἐν here corresponds to the Hebr. 2 (whence our by), through. Many Commentators suppose here a climax: but as they are not agreed on its progression, whether from the more perfect to the less perfect, or vice versá, it is evident that the principle is precarious, and of unsafe application. (See, however, Kypke in loc., Storr's Opusc. 3, 35., and Kuin.) It rather seems a strong (and popular) expression, in this sense:

* And so Grotius remarks: "Neque enim ad subtiles disputations de presenti aessentiali Dei, de quia varia fuerunt et Philosophorum, et Judaeorum, et Christianorum sententiae, Athenienses vocat Paulus, sed ad ea quae rebus sentiebantur."
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, CHAP. XVII. 581.

"To him we owe life, and every faculty connected with it: by him we are what we are." Numerous parallel passages are cited by Priceus, Elsner, Wets., and Gataker on Anton. 4, 28. & 5, 27. The most apposite are the following: Aristot. Rhet. 3, 11. εν τασι τω εχθειαι ποιεις έδοκιμει — κινούμενα γαρ καλ δωντα ποιει πάντα. Plaut. Pœn. 5, 4, 14. Jupiter, qui genus colis alisque hominum, Per quem vivimus vitalem ævum, Quem penes spes vitae sunt hominum omnium. Soph. Æd. Tyr. 322. εν σοι γαρ ἐσμεν. To which I add Eurip. Alc. 290. εν σοι δε εσμεν καλ δην καλ μη. Soph. Phil. 963. εν σοι καλ το πλειν — εστι, καλ, &c. Soph. Æd. Col. 247. εν υμιν κειμεθα: and 392. εν σοι τα κεινων φασι γλυγεσθαι. See the Schol. on Soph. Aj. 34. and Valckn. on Eurip. Phœn. 1256. On the sentiment Doddridge observes: "No words can better express that continual and necessary dependence of all derived beings, in their existence and all their operations, on their First and Almighty Cause, which the truest philosophy as well as theology teaches."


28. τω γαρ καλ γενως εσμεν. The words occur both in Arat. Phænon. ver. 5. and in a Hymn of Cleanthes on Jov. 5. * We may observe that what is there said of Jupiter, Paul applies to the one true God, since the wiser Greeks by Jupiter understood the one Supreme Being.

With respect to the Hymn of Cleanthes, it is by Doddridge justly pronounced to be, beyond comparison, the purest and finest piece of natural religion extant in all Pagan antiquity; and also contains (he

adds) nothing unworthy of a Christian, nay, he had almost said, an inspired writer.* Whether Paul alluded to this passage, or to that of Aratus, Commentators are not agreed. Most of them fix on one or the other; and they remark that the plural is used for the singular; as in Matt. 27, 44. Mark 14, 4. 15, 32. Luke 23, 39. But there seems no occa-

* As it is somewhat rare, being only to be found in any tolerable state of correctness in the expensive edition of Stobæus (to whom we owe its preservation), Edit. Heeren. T. I. p. 30. I shall here subjoin it, for the benefit of my younger readers.
sion to resort to any such principle here; especially as St. Paul, who in his Epist to Tit. 1, 12. cites a verse of Epimenides, brings it forward as the composition of one poet. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that he here alluded to both the above poets, since he had very probably read both.

20. γένος οὗν ὑπάρχουσιν, "since therefore we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Deity is like unto silver, or gold, or stone carved," &c. The sentence is thus paraphrased by Markland.

"If, then, man be God's handy-work, or creation, as your own Poet says; sure it must be absurd to imagine that God can be man's handy-work, or creation." And, more solidly, by Kuinoel thus: "Nos nature viventes et intelligentes, a Deo creati cique similis, praestantiores sumus pretiosissimis et absolutissimis artis ingeniique humani monumentis, quanto igitur praestantior iis est Deus, qui ut pater et creator noster, nos ipsos natura et dignitate antecellit, neque adeo statua inanimata, ab artifici confecta, pro Deo coli potest ac debet."

The materials for statues, both marble and silver, were in Athens most abundant; as we learn from Xenoph. de Vectig. and Strabo 218 b. & 613 a. cited by Wets., who also-adduces numerous passages in illustration of the sentiment; as Cic. de Nat. D. 1, 27. Quid igitur mirum, si hoc eodem modo homini natura praescripsit, ut nihil pulchrior quam hominem putaret, eam esse causam, cur Deos hominum similis putemus? Xenoph. ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. εἷς ὄς ἐν τε θεωσι καὶ ἀνθρώποις μέγιστος, οὐτε δὲμας ἄνθρωπων ὁμοίος, οὐδὲ νόημα. Joseph. c. Apion. 2, 22. Tacit: de mor. Germ. 9. cæterum nec cohibere paretibus deos, nec in ulla humani oris speciem assimulare ex magnitudine cælestium arbitrantur. Herodot. 1, 28. Plut. Num. 65 d. I forbear to mention such later writers as might have taken the sentiment from Scripture, as, for instance, Philostratus.

For χαράγματι Markland conjectures χειρουργίματι, but without cause. Schlesner observes that χαράγμα properly denotes a sculpture, or stamping;
yet, by metonymy, signifies the thing sculptured, carved, or engraved, a piece of sculpture, or statuary, as a statue, stamp, or coin, &c.; and therefore it is here to be rendered "a statue chiseled by human art," &c. It may, however, be taken in its primitive sense, as a verbal, to denote any thing sculptured; and as verbals formed from passive verbs often take after them a genitive dependent upon ὑπὸ or ἀπὸ, so we may account for the genitive being here used. An example of this occurs in Sap. 3, 11. τέχνη ἐμπελέτημα.

Ἐνθυμήσεως is for ἐνθυμήσατο.

30. τοὺς μὲν οἷς γράφων τῆς ἁγιότης ἄφερόν. We may paraphrase thus: "But although God was pleased to give so many and undoubted tokens of his existence and providence, and cannot be worshipped under any figure of human art; yet, for a long time, men did entertain erroneous opinions of him, and did not worship him aright. These errors, as long as they arose from ignorance, God overlooked, and bore with."

30. χ. τ. ἁγιότας, "ignorance of the true God and Divine worship." ἄφερέω properly signifies overlook, pass by; and hence, from the adjunct, denotes to neglect, not care for; (as Tob. 4. 3. Sir. 35, 14. Deut. 8, 26.) and also to despise; as in Xenoph. Ages. 8, 4. Anton. 5, 51. Philo 1096. Levit. 26, 40. [of both these last mentioned significations there are examples in Thucyd. 4, 62. 5, 6 & 43. 6, 11. Edit.] But it is likewise used of those who purposely pass by, and look aside from, any thing, and make as though they saw it not (as in Deut. 22, 3 & 4. Lev. 20, 4. Ps. 54, 1.), dissemble, knowledge, connive, &c. Hence it signifies to bear with, patiently suffer, παρακαταλείπει. So Acts 14, 16. εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐμὲ ἀρέσκεσθαι τοῖς ὑδαίς αὐτῶν. (Kuin.) All the above significations Wets. has copiously illustrated with examples.

30. ταῦτα παραγγέλλει τ. ἀ. π. μεταφείν. Doddridge, with his usual good taste, observes "that there is a dignity in this latter expression becoming one who was conscious to himself that he was indeed
ambassador from the King of Heaven." "This universal demand of repentance (continues he) declared; in the strongest terms, universal guilt, and admirably confronted the pride of the haughtiest Stoic of them all; and, at the same time, bore down all the idle pleas of fatality; for who could repent of doing what he apprehended he could not but have done? I would add that this "demand of repentance," this ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well, was agreeable to the dicts of the Philosophers. So Hierocl. in Aur. carm. Pyth. 9, p. 126. Edit. Needham. η δε μεταμεταφθανειν Φιλοσοφιας δρκη γινεται.

31. "And because God hath now vouchsafed men a clearer light, despise not (I entreat you) these warnings afforded to you. For God will require strict and solemn account of the use they may make of the better knowledge vouchsafed to them. He will, indeed, appoint a day in which he will judge the world," &c. By ημερα is meant (as is evident from the words following) the last and general judgment, both of dead and living. Ἐν δικαιοσύνην. An adverbal sentence in the place of the adverb δικαιώς. οδ άριστοi, for ὅν ὁ. There is a nervous elegance in this antithetical assemblage of πάντες and πανταχώς; of which Wetstein adduces many examples from the best Greek writers.

31. πίστιν παρασχον, &c. The formula πίστιν παρέχειν has been learnedly illustrated by Raphel, Kypke, Krebs, Loesner, and Fischer, by whom it has been satisfactorily proved to have no reference to what Theologians call the "saving word" by which God operates faith in those who obey it, but merely to signify "produce faith" by bringing forward arguments sufficient for the proof of any thing; and thus confirm and establish its truth. So Polyb. 4, 33. Ικανήν αὐν παράσχεν πίστιν τοῖς υἱοῖς ἡμῶν εἰρημένοις. Joseph. Ant. 2, 9, 4. τοῖς μέντοι προκαταγγελμένοις ύπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πίστιν ὅ τοι κεῖτος τῆς γυναικὸς παρέδεχε.

The above critics have, moreover, shown that πίστις often signifies the arguments serving to esta-
blish any truth; to whose examples I add Appian 2, 804, 43. ἐς τε πίστιν τῆς ὑποκρίσεως τοὺς θεράτων- τας ἐσταύρων. Wetstein also cites examples from Thucyd. 5, 112. τοὺς προφυλαξὶ πίστιν παρεχομένους, & 6, 17. ὁργῇ πίστιν παραχωμένη ἐπεισε. Strabo 42 a. Theophr. C. P. 5, 7. Dionys. Hal. de Dict. Thucyd. 1. πίστεως παρέχομαι, besides a considerable number of other passages.

32—34. ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, οἱ μὲν ἐχ- λεύσαντες. It is plain that the Apostle was here interrupted in his discourse by the derision and mockery of at least one class of his hearers; * and by the indifference of others. For I cannot accede to the opinion of Beza and others, that the words ἀκοῦσα- μέθα σοι πάλιν περὶ τούτου indicate a mind undecided, and a wish to hear more. Had that been the case, they would have chosen the time present. But as Paul’s discourse was interrupted by the sneers and laughter of one part of his audience, so was it equally by the exclamation of others, ἀκοῦσαμέθα σοι πάλιν περὶ τούτου, which was, I imagine, a civil way of saying, “we will hear no more of this at present.” And probably some suited the action to the word, and turned upon their heel while he was speaking. “And thus (says Doddridge) the indifference of some, and the petulance of others, cut short the Apostle’s discourse: so that they went down to righteous condemnation, under the guilt of having rejected a Gospel, the proof of which they might

* These are generally supposed to have been the Epicureans, and the others the Stoics: an opinion which seems too formal and systematical to be much relied upon. We are not to imagine the disgust to have arisen solely from the mention of a resurrection of the dead. The declaration that repentance was necessary to all of them, and that a judgment would be held over their nation, must have been unaccountable to all parties, especially to those who held the doctrine of perfectibility. And the scoffers (particularly in so jocular a people as the Athenian) would, I imagine, be found among all classes. Indeed the extreme levity of that nation, and their proneness to ridicule, is remarked by many antient writers, from whom citations may be found in Wetstein.
have learnt in one single day, but would not give themselves the trouble of examining; and this is the condemnation among us."

33. ἔξησθεν ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν. This simply signifies "departed from them." See 2 Cor. 6, 15.

34. τινὲς δὲ ἄνδρες κολληθέντες αὐτῷ εἰ. On κολλήσθαι see the note on 5, 13.; and on Ἀρεσκαγίνης the note on ver. 19. By γυνὴ cannot be meant, as many suppose, the wife of Dionysius; for that would have required ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ. It signifies a wife, or matron; and the Cod. Cant. adds ἐυσχῆμων, which is, however, a gloss; though not undeserving of attention. The author of it was thinking of the expression γυναῖκας τὰς ἐυσχῆμονας, respectable matrons, at 18, 50. The word τίμια, added in Cod. E., is also a gloss.

As to the name Δάμαρις, since it no where else occurs, Grotilus, Hemsterhusius, and others, would read for it Δάμαλις, a name by no means uncommon. But Olearius, Wolf, and others, rightly reject this, very truly observing that the ρ and λ are perpetually interchanged. Possibly, too, the name was a Doric one.

34. καὶ ἐτραχαι σὺν αὐτοῖς. For ἐτραχαί Markland conjectures ἐτραχαί: which is, however, unnecessary, not to say solecistic; since as the αὐτοῖς indicates that persons of both sexes are meant, so propriety of language requires that the pronoun following should be in the masculine, as being (so the Grammarians tell us) the worthier gender.

CHAP. XVIII.

Paul, after having departed from Athens, repairs to Corinth, and there meets with Aquila, who, on being expelled from Rome, had, with his wife Priscilla, retired to this city. To Aquila, who was a tent maker, Paul, being of the same trade, joins himself, works in his shop, and lodges in his house (ver. 1—5). Silas and Timotheus come to him from Macedonia (ver. 5). After having staid a year and a
half at Corinth (ver. 11.), and (though amidst the pertinacious opposition of the Jews) preached to the Gentiles with success the doctrine of Christ. Paul takes a journey through Syria; repairs to Caesarea and Jerusalem (21 & 22.); afterwards traverses Galatia and Phrygia (ver. 23.); and, at length, returns to Ephesus, where he had left Aquila and Priscilla (ver. 23.), who had accompanied him into Syria (ver. 18.). Meanwhile, at Ephesus, Apollos, being accurately taught the Christian doctrine by Aquila and Priscilla, had there preached it (25 seqq.) (Kuin.)

1. Κόριθως. A celebrated city with two ports; whence it was called bimaris, the metropolis of Achaia, called by Cicero totius Graeciae lumen, and by Florus Graeciae decus; and of which Strabo says (L. 8. p. 263.) η μεν οὖν πόλις τῶν Κοριθίων μεγάλη τε καὶ πλούσια διακατόρθωμεν ὑπήρξεν, ἀνδρὶ τε ηὐπόροικῃ ἀγαθῶν εἰς τὰ πολιτικὰ καὶ εἰς τὰς τέχνας τὰς δημοσκευόμενα. See also Arist. Orat. in Nept. Opp. T. 1. p. 28. (Kuin.) The Commentators have, however, omitted the most important passage respecting this city to be found in any antient author: namely, Thucyd. L. 1, 18. οἴκουντες γὰρ τὴν πόλιν οἱ Κοριθίων ἐκ τοῦ ἱσημέρου αἰεὶ δὴ πότε εμπόριον εἶχον, τῶν Ἐλλήνων τὸ πάλαι κατὰ γῆν τὰ πλέον ἢ κατὰ βάλασταν, τῶν τε ἐντός Πελοποννήσου, καὶ τῶν ἕξω, διὰ τῶν ἑκείνων παρ' ἔλληνωσ ἐπιμυγώντων, χρηματί τε δυνατοὶ ἦσαν, εἰς καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ποιητάς δευτηραστεῖ αἱθείων γὰρ ἐπαναµε- σαν τὸ χαρίον ἐπειδὴ τε οἱ Ἐλλήνες μᾶλλον ἐπλαίζον, τὰς ναοὺς κτησάμενοι, τὸ ἄριστον καθέσου, καὶ εμπόριον παρέχοντες ἀμφότερα, δυνατὴν ἐσοχὴν χρηματίων προσθηκὸς τὴν πόλιν.

2. Ἡσυχαίου ὀνόμασθαι Ἀκόλου. This is the Latin name Aquila, with a Greek termination. For the Jews of those times resident among the Gentiles used to assume Gentile names, or assimilate their Jewish ones thereto. See Grot. on Acts 18, 9. Barth. Adv. 7, 4. That this Aquila is not (as some say) the same with the Greek Translator of the Old
Testament (though he was his fellow-countryman), still less the Chaldee Paraphrast Onkelos, has been shown by Koppe on Rom. 16, 3. Michaelis conjectures that he had been resident at Rome on commercial business; and that he was rich, may, he thinks, be collected from the circumstance that the Christians of Rome and Ephesus used to meet at his house. See Rom. 16, 5. 1 Cor. 16 & 19. (Kuin.) These seem, however, somewhat precarious conclusions. Whether he was yet a Christian when Paul met with him, or not, St. Luke does not say; and it has been thought uncertain. But St. Luke often omits minute circumstances, which may very well be supplied: and this probably is one of them; especially since the expression προσηλθὼν αὐτοῖς implies a sort of connection, which was probably that of identity of religion. Now there had been a congregation of Christians at Rome, from the earliest period of the Gospel, which originated (as some think) with certain of those who had been present at the feast of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was imparted; and was doubtless fostered and promoted by those Jewish Christians who had occasion to repair to that city on commercial or other business.

2. Ποντικοῦ τῶν γένεων, i.e. "by country one of Pontus;" in which province there were many Jews settled. (Kuin.) Probably on account of the considerable commerce which was carried on from thence with most parts of the civilized world.

Προσφάτως, recently. This would properly signify recently slain, from the old word φάω, cognate with σφάζω. Thus a corpse is called πρόσφατος νεκρός by Phrynichus 164. See also Hom. Il. 11. 757. Hence πρόσφατος was applied generally to what is recent, new, &c. See Suid. and Hesych. So Pind. Pyth. 4. ult. πρόσφατον Θήβαν ἐκείνους: where the Scholiast explains ἄρτιας. And in Sirach 9, 10. it is opposed to ἄρχαιος. Other Classical examples may be seen in Alberti and Kypke.

Πρισκίλλα. A diminutive from Prisca, as she is
called in 2 Tim. 4, 19. and which some think ought to be read here: but without reason; for, in antient times, names of persons, especially of females, were sometimes pronounced in the simple, and sometimes in the diminutive form; as, for instance, Terentilla, Catullus, &c. See Casaub. on Sueton. Aug. C. 69.

2. δία τὸ διαταγέναι Κλαύδιον, “had issued a διάταγμα, or order.” This is noticed by Sueton. Claud. C. 28. in these words: “Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assiduè tumultuantes Româ expulit.” By the Chrestus, mentioned by Suetonius, some recent interpreters, as also Archbishop Usher and Van Dale, understand a certain Hellenistic Jew, or freedman, who had excited the Jews to rebellion. But the earlier Commentators, more rightly, maintain that by Chresto we are to understand Christo: and in this opinion Kuinoel acquiesces. “The words of that writer (says he) are to be understood of dissensions between the Jews and Christians, and other disturbances, to which Christianity had given rise.” “From the Acts of the Apostles (continues he) it sufficiently appears that the Jews frequently excited tumults in the cities of Greece, for the purpose of throwing impediments in the way of those who were promulgating Christianity. And this they seem to have done at Rome; which accounts for those turbae assidue, or frequent tumults, to which that suspicious tyrant Claudius chose to put an end by this edict of expulsion, which, no doubt, extended to Christians also; for they were, as yet, confounded with Jews. To call Christus Chrestus was, indeed, a mistake likely to occur, especially as the name Chrestus was very common; whereas that of Christus was by no means so. And that, in point of fact, the mistake was often made, we learn from Tertullian, Apol. ad Gentes, C. 3. and Lactant. Institut. 4, 7, 5. (Kuin.) There is no reason to wonder that Suetonius, a Gentile, should confound Christus and Chrestus, or account Christ as the author of these disturbances [which in a certain sense he was: nay
he himself said (Matt. 10, 84.), “I come not to send peace, but a sword.” Edit.] He knew not, (is it likely that he should have done?) the true cause of the tumult; and he followed uncertain rumour. It happened to him, as it has done to other Heathen writers when treating of Jewish affairs, especially such as concern religion, qui non tam loquentur quàm balbutiunt. (Wassenburg ap. Valckn. Schol.)

3. διὰ τὸ διάτεχνον εἶναι. Ὑμάτεχνος is properly an adjective of two genders (see the examples produced by Raphel and Wets.); but it is here, as often, used substantively, and may be paralleled by our common expression, “a brother-trade,” and others yet more vulgar. Kuinoel remarks that Paul had planned and purposed to stay at Corinth for a considerable time; since in that populous city, and highly frequented mart of commerce, he might expect favourable opportunities for disseminating the doctrines of Christ: but, lest he should be thought burthensome to his new converts, determined to support himself by his labour at the trade which, according to the custom of the Jews,* he had been taught, and probably had hitherto occasionally exercised. See Thes. 2, 9. 2 Thes. 3, 8.

3. Ἰσαυ καὶ σκηνοποιός τὴν τέχνην. Subaud κατὰ. On the import of σκηνοποιός Commentators are by no means agreed. The general opinion is, that it signifies a tent-maker. But Luther, Morus, and others, take it to mean a weaver of tapestry. Others, a maker of mathematical instruments. Others again, a saddler. All these modes of interpretation, however, lie open to particular exceptions, which my limits will not permit me to state; and to one general objection, namely, that these occupations would require too much skill and experience for a person so differently employed, as Paul had been, to have gained a creditable living by.

Kuinoel, after a laborious examination of all the opinions, acknowledges that the simplest and most probable is the common one, which supposes St. Paul to have been a tent-maker, in the common acceptance. And in this I must myself acquiesce. But I see no reason why we should not include the hypothesis of Schurzfeisch, Dindorf, Rosenm., and (as it seems) Schoettgen, who supposes that he made those portable tents, formed of leather, or thick cloth, which (from a scarcity of inns, and from the heat of the sun) travellers still use in the East. Such he might surely manufacture, as well as military tents. After all, however, as Schoettgen has rightly remarked, the question can scarcely be positively determined, without a more accurate acquaintance with the antiquities of the trades of the antients. He freely confesses that he could make out nothing certain from Talmudical and Rabbinical antiquities.

Wetstein tells us that St. Paul had before exercised this art among the Arabians, because some were named Σκηνιταί, as dwelling in tents. But this is utterly improbable, since those people used to themselves manufacture whatever they had need of.

4. διελέγετο δὲ — καὶ Ἑλλήναις. Here we find the Apostle pursuing his usual plan; namely, that of addressing the Jews first. (Kuin.) "Exegete is rendered by most recent Commentators docebat; which, however, seems too arbitrary an interpretation. Still less can I approve of that adopted by Reichard, and commended by Kuinoel, studebat praeparare. Without wandering so far from the primitive sense, we may render it, "persuading them (to believe and embrace Christianity)." So 19, 8. πέιθων τὰ πέρι τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. And 26 & 28. πέιθων αὐτίνος τὰ πέρι τοῦ Θεοῦ. But the most opposite passage is that of 2 Cor. 5, 11. εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνθρώπου πέιθομεν. It is strange that all the above are by Schlesner, in his Lex., classed under the head doceo, trado. Now it is evident that in this use of πέιθω some word corresponding to believe, &c.
is left to be supplied. And therefore it supposes
the use of arguments calculated to convince the un-
derstanding, and thus sway the will to obedience.

The Ἐλληνες are by almost all modern Comment-
tators regarded as proselytes of the gate. Dod-
dridge, however, as usual, take exceptions to this
interpretation, though, as it should seem, on insuffi-
cient grounds.

5. οὗ δὲ κατήλθαν, &c. See the note on 17, 14.

5. συνέχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος, &c. The common
reading is συνέχετο τῷ πνεύματι. Now since συνε-
χεσθαι, among other significations, denotes angi,
maiere coepiri (see Luke 12, 50. and the note on
Matt. 4, 24.), many Commentators, as Hammond,
Mill, and Wolf, explain, “angebatur Paulus animo,
dum docebat Judæos, Jesum esse Messiam;” viz:
“since he could produce no effect among them.”
And they compare ver. 6. But this interpretation
is at variance with the context.

Now συνέχω also signifies to incite, urge; as in 2
Cor. 5, 14. Hence Beza, Princeus, and others,
explain: “intus et apud se æstuebat præ zeli ardores;”
which interpretation I should admit, if there were
not reason to suppose, from the authority of MSS.
and Versions, that the true reading, (though the more
difficult one,) is λόγῳ, of which the best interpre-
tation, and that most suitable to the context, is the
one found in the Vulg. “instabat verbo.” For
συνέχεσθαι denotes also to be held, occupied by any
thing; as in Sap. 17, 20. κόσμος ἀνεπτυγμένος συνε-
χετο ἐργοῖς. Herodot. 1, 17, 22. συνεχόμενος ἤδοναις.
Ælian, V. H. 14, 22. συνέχεσθαι ὄνομα. This signi-
fication of the word being admitted, the sense will
be: “When they had approached whom Paul (who
knew that combined strength is most efficacious) had
expected as his assistants in promulgating the
Christian doctrine, and of whom, in so large and
populous a city there was need, then he applied him-
self closely to the work of teaching.” (Kuin.)

VOL. IV. 2 q
Most Commentators for the last century prefer the reading λόγῳ; and our English Critics have contended for it with ability. "Luke seems (says Bp. Pearce) to have intended to express something relating to Paul, which was the consequence of the coming of Silas and Timotheus; and that was rather his labouring with them more abundantly in preaching the word, than his being pressed in spirit."

Markland professes that he does not understand the common text, unless συνέχεσθαι διαμαρτυρήμενος can signify συνέβη διαμαρτυρήσθαι. "The version, was pressed in the Spirit and testified, cannot (says he) be right, is quite different from ἄπελθων ἀνέγαρο, he went and hanged himself, or λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνεκρυφε, a woman took and hid, and the like. One might think something had been wanting in the present copies, there being seemingly no reason, why Paul should be συνεχόμενος τῷ πνεύματι (as some copies read) after the arrival of Silas and Timotheus, any more than he was before. The Vulgate, translating it instatbat verbo, pressed, or urged, the word, seems to have read ἐνεκρυφε τῷ λόγῳ, which makes good sense." I cannot, however, assent to the learned Commentator, that we are to read ἐνεκρυφε, since for it there is no authority whatever. And the testimony of the antient Versions, in such a case as the present, is of little weight. Certainly there are difficulties attending either reading; but fewer (I think) connected with λόγῳ. Indeed the two readings are so different they could not have been accidentally interchanged: and one of them must be a παραδιάφορος. Now the question is which could have most easily arisen ex interpretatione? I do not hesitate to say πνεύματι. The phrase συνέχεσθαι πνεύματι seems to be the easier: but even on the interpretation of that Commentators are not agreed. The earlier ones, as Casaubon, Grotius, and Heinsius, take it to denote the Holy Spirit. But, as Doddridge remarks, the phrase would seem rather to refer to the effect which that agency produced. And he renders, "borne away by a strong impulse in his spirit:" which interpretation (adopted also by Luther and Schleusner) is indeed suitable enough; but of this sense of the verb no example has been adduced. Our common version, pressed in spirit, seems more correct, but (as has been before observed) is unsuitable. Besides the difficulty mentioned by Markland, with respect to the participle, cannot be got over; for in such a case it will not admit of being taken for the infinitive. As, therefore, the present reading is not only not the less difficult, but is inconsistent with any rules of legitimate interpretation, and yields no sense to our purpose, we must (I think) choose the other, λόγῳ, which, though somewhat obscure, admits of a satisfactory explication. Now the verb συνέχεσθαι denotes properly to be held or occupied with or about, distineri negotio; as in the passages of Sirach and Herodian above cited; to which I add, Thucyd. 3, 98. τῷ αὐτῷ σάννυ συνεχόμενος. Polyb. 1, 7, 9. συνέχεσθαι τοῖς πολέμοις: and 4, 17, 4. στάσαι συνεχήσθαι. Eurip. Heraclid. 634. συνέχεσθαι φρόντις. J. Chrysost. συνέχεσθαι προθυμ. Demosth. 396, 22. Edit. Reisk. πράγμασι συνεχόμεν.
Whitby endeavours to explain πνεύματι. But there is more of subtility than truth in his method of treating the term. Wetstein addsuces a passage of Strabo where συνέχειν is found in the same sentence with πνεύμα. But the verb is in the active voice, and πνεύμα in the accusative; and the sense is, draw in, or hold, the breath.

6. ἀντιτάσσομένων αὐτῶν, “opposing themselves to him.” Now ἀντιτάσσειν is properly a military term, and signifies to draw up in order opposite to an enemy: but is often, as here, used in a metaphorical sense, to denote opposition of every sort, even by words; and thus may be rendered contradict. Of this signification Elsner has adduced two examples from Isocr.; and Munthe one from Diodorus Siculus. I add a very elegant passage of Thucyd. 3, 83. τὸ δὲ ἀντιτετάχθαι ἀλλήλοις τῇ γνώμῃ ἀπίστως ἐπὶ πολὺ διῆνεγκεν; on which obscure passage the Commentators, with their usual wisdom, or prudence, have chosen to say nothing.

6. ἐκτιναξάμενος τὰ ἰμάτια. This shaking the garments seems to bear a close affinity to the custom mentioned in 13, 51., and was, like it, a symbolical action, implying that we desire to have no longer any communion with another. (See the note on 13, 51.)

The next words, τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν, are strongly metaphorical, and in them there is an ellipsis of τρέψεται (see Aristoph. Nub. 39.) or τρέπουσα. See Aristoph. Acharn. 833., Muret. Lectt. Var. 12, 4., Kuster on Aristoph. Plut. 526., and Bos Ellip. By αἷμα is here meant, not slaughter, but destruction in a figurative sense, i.e. perdition in another world. The sense therefore is: “For your perdition you can have no one to blame but yourselves; it is to yourselves alone that you must impute it.”* See Vorst. de Hebr. 416. (Kuin.)

Acts of the Apostles, Chap. XVIII.


6. εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύομαι. This must be understood (as at 18, 46.) as not implying desertion of the Jews, but a greater attention to those Gentiles who listened to his representations.

7. μεταβὰς ἔκειθεν. It is surprising that Commentators, both antiquit and modern, including Chrysostom, should interpret this of Paul's leaving the house of his host Aquila, to go to that of Justus. Luke has, indeed, not mentioned the place in which the above words were spoken; but this sort of brevity is usual to him. From an examination, however, of what went before, there is no reason to doubt but that the place was the synagogue, where Paul had made such earnest persuasions and exhortations.

But if ἔκειθεν be admitted to have this meaning, it will follow that ἥξις εἰς οἰκίαν must have some sense accommodated to it, namely, to enter in, for the purpose of preaching: and this seems to be confirmed by the following words, οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἡν συνομορώσα τῇ συναγωγῇ; for in any other view that would have been a circumstance not worth recording. I can, therefore, by no means think, with many recent Commentators (as Heinrichs and Kuinoel), that he changed his lodgings; and thus there is no need to trouble ourselves with enquiring why he did so.

In this view of the subject I have the support of Dr. Doddridge and Bp. Pearce, the latter of whom remarks, "that this Justus seems to have had a large origin of the phrase is, by Elsner, Dindorf, and others, derived from the custom of the Hebrews and Egyptians, namely, of putting their hands on the heads of victims, and imprecating on them the evils which hung over the sacrificer, or the people. See Levit. 16, 21. So Herodot. 2, 39. (speaking of the Egyptians): καταρέωνται δὲ, τάδε λέγοντες τῷ κεφαλῷ εἰς τὰ μέλλοντα ἡ σφαίρα τοῦ ἁθουα, ἡ Αλάγια δὲ συναπάσῃ κακῶν γενέσθαι, εἰς κεφαλὴν ταυτὴν γραπέσθαι.
room in his house, fit for Paul’s preaching to his disciples when he left the synagogue. And he refers to 19, 9. where Paul is said to have done the same thing on the same occasion in another large room, called the school of Tyrammus. So too the passage was taken by Dr. Hammond; since he renders οἶκον a private house: a sense which the absence of the article, I think, requires.

7. συνομορόσα τῇ συναγωγῇ, "contiguous to the synagogue." The word συνομορέα is, I believe, an ἀπαξ λεγομένον: though συνομορός is found in Gloss. Vett. We may, however, compare συνορέα, which is used in this sense by the Classical writers; as Polyb. 1, 8, 1. & 5, 55, 1. συνορώσα καθα: and also συνορήσα, which frequently occurs in Diodor. Siculus. (See Schc. ap. Steph. Thes. p. 6966. Our two most antient MSS. (the Alex. and Cantab.) read, says Wets. συνορώσα: but as Griesbach tells us, συνομο- ρόσα. Now one of these statements must be wrong; and, probably, both. The scribes, I think, wrote (or intended to write) συνορόσα, which is indeed more classical than the common reading, but (like many readings found in the Codex Cant.) is a παραδιώρθωσις.

By σεβομένος τῶν Θεῶν is here meant, as usual, a Jewish proselyte. He was doubtless also a Christian convert.

8. ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος. It must be observed, that there were several persons who bore office in a Jewish Synagogue (like the Ruling Elders in the Scottish Church), of whom the chief was simply called the Archisynagogus. (See the note on 18, 15. and Matt. 9, 18.) The conversion of Crispus is mentioned, on account of his rank, and to show that the labours of the Apostle were not utterly fruitless; and this seems implied by the δὲ, which here may be rendered but, however.

The same dignity is at v. 17. ascribed to Sosthenes; though whether both were simply ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, or each in succession ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, cannot be determined. (Kuin.) It seems, however, very improbable
that Sosthenes should have succeeded Crispus in the
dignity of ά ό ρ χ ω τ ο μά γε ρες, which we cannot suppose
he would be allowed to hold after having become a
Christian. St. Luke habitually omits such minute
circumstances as these, which may very well be sup-
plied from the context. And though Sosthenes did
himself become a Christian, (see 1 Cor. 1, 1.) yet
that was probably not till afterwards.

8. πολλοί τῶν Κορινθίων ἀκούοντες εἶστε εἰς τοὺς. It is
strange that Markland should have taken the ἀκούο-
ντες for ἀκούοντας, hearers; which would require ἀκού-
νται δυνατές. He adds, indeed, that had Luke meant
otherwise, he would written ἀκούοντας. But it is so
written in many MSS. and Editions; and so the Sy-
riac Translators read. Yet the common reading may
have the same sense. There is an ellipsis of λόγον
τοῦ Κυρίου, which words are sometimes expressed; as
in Matt. 13, 22; but oftener omitted, as here, and in
Joh. 6, 43. 8, 26. Rom. 10, 14. 15, 21. in which
cases the sense of ἀκούοντας is, being taught; a sig-
nification noticed both by the ancient and modern
Lexicographers. See Suid., Hesych., and Schl. Lex.
in voce, § 3.

9. Paul, on seeing himself pertinaciously rejected
by the Jews, and perceiving that there was reason to
fear for his personal safety, seems to have meditated
a departure: but was prevented from carrying his
design into execution by a vision sent from on high.

9. μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει, “speak, teach, preach
the word.” A frequent sense of λαλεῖν; as in Matt.
13, 3. Acts 4, 17. &c. The mixture of the impera-
tive and subjunctive savours of Hebrew idiom.

10. ἔγω εἰμι μετὰ σοῦ, “with thee, to help thee.”
See the note on Matt. 28, 20.

10. Οὐδεὶς ἐπιθύμεται σοι τοῦ κακοῦ ὑπερεῖ σε. The verb
ἐπιθύμεται τινι answers to the Hebr. יִּתְנָה, and is
used either with the addition of τέχνης (which forms
the complete phrase); as in 2 Kings 11, 17; or ellip-
tically; as here, where it is synonymous with τέχνη-
ρεῖν, either in the sense of undertake a business (as in
Thucyd. 7, 42. Herodot. 1, 1. and elsewhere), or (as almost always) in that of attack; in which it occurs in the best Greek writers, from whom examples are produced by Kypke, Krebs, Wetstein, Munthe, and Loesner. And I must add, that it is frequently found in Thucydides.

Τοῦ κακοσιεῖς is for ὁστε, or εἰς τοῦ, κακοσιαι, and signifies, “so as to hurt thee.” On this sense of κακοῦν see 7, 6, 12, 1.

10. λαῖς ἐστι μοι πολὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταυτῆ, “there are many disposed to embrace my religion, and who very soon will be my worshippers.” It must be observed, that the speediness with which this should happen is hinted by the use of the present tense, “there is (as it were) already.” These, the Commentators remark, are called Christ’s people by prolepsis, or anticipation; just as the Gentiles, who should afterwards embrace the Christian religion, are in Joh. 10, 16. already called the flock of Christ.

11. ἐκατοσεῖ, “abode, sojourned.” This verb corresponds to the Hebr. בָּשׁ in Is. 9, 1. and Jer. 38, 7.; and is used by the Sept. to express רֵב sojourned, in Jer. 49, 32., and בַּשׁ in Exod. 16, 29. So Luke 24, 49. υμεῖς δὲ καβισαι ἐν τῇ πόλει. (Schleusner.) Here we have plainly a Hebraism; though the Commentators appeal to a similar use of the Latin sedeo in Cic. Epist. Fam. 16, 2. But there sederemus has merely the sense of sitting still and doing nothing, as opposed to active business.

It is thought that Paul here wrote his Epistles to the Thessalonians; as he probably did also those to the Galatians.

12. Γαλλίωνος δὲ ἀνθυπατείους τῆς Ἀχαιας. After the Romans had conquered Greece, they divided it into two provinces, Macedonia and Achaia, each to be governed by a president. The former comprehended Macedonia Proper, Illyricum, Epirus, and Thessaly; the latter, Greece Proper. See Cellar. 1. 1170. 1022. Achaia was first governed by Proconsuls sent by the Senate. (See D. Cass. p. 704.) But, in the
time of Tiberius, it was added to those provinces over which Presidents, or Proconsuls, were placed by the Caesars. (See Tacit. Annal. 1, 76.) By Claudius, however, the province was again restored to the senatorial government; and thus became Proconsular. See Suet. Claud. c. 23. and Dio Cass. 961. [which shows the exact propriety with which St. Luke expresses himself. Lardner.] On ἀνθυπατος see the note on 13, 7. (Kuinoel.)

The Gallio here mentioned was the younger brother of Seneca the Philosopher, who, in his Quæst. Nat. I. 4, praises his comitatem et incompotam suavitatem, and says: "Nemo mortalia uni tam dulcis est quam hic omnibus." See Fabric. on Dio 974. and the Commentators on Stat. Silv. 2, 7, 32. and Lipsius on Senec. Ep. 104.

The words Ἐλληνος δε ἀνθυπαττεύοντος ought to be rendered, with Heumann, Walch, Antiq. Corinth. p. 35., and Reichard, (as indeed is required by the context,) "when Gallio had been made Proconsul," or "on Gallio's entering on the Proconsulship." (Kuin.) In the same sense it was also taken by Beza and Piscator; and this appears to be the true one. The Jews, it seems, waited for the arrival of a new Proconsul to make their request, as thinking that they should then be less likely to meet with a refusal.

Κατεψιστημι is, as far as I know, used in no other passage than the present. Though we may compare κατεταλμαθαι and κατεπίστευω.

13—16. λέγοντες ὅτι παρὰ τον νόμον, &c. The meaning of these words is as follows: "It was by the Senate and Roman people and by your Emperors permitted us, in Greece, to worship God after the rites of the Mosaic Law (see Joseph. Ant. 14, 40. 16, 2. and the note on Acts 24, 6): but this fellow teaches things contrary to our Law, and excites disturbances among the Jews." That the accusers added more; nay, even made mention of Paul's opinions, is clear from Gallio's answer. Now Paul taught that salvation was to be attained, not by cir-
cumcision, nor by the observance of ritual laws (see Acts 15, 9, 11, 19); and that even the Gentiles might, without being circumcised, hope to attain felicity by the Messiah.

'Ἀναπελθεῖν here signifies to recommend, persuade, &c. (Kuin.) And τῶν ἀνθρώπων, meant "the persons who are his partizans," or, as Owen thinks, the Jews.

14. μελλόντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα, "as Paul was about to speak in his defence, Gallio interrupted him, and declared to the Jews that though he was sent as Proconsul of Achaia, in order to maintain the public quiet, and to repress and punish all such misdemeanors as should disturb it, yet, since they had brought before him a question concerning religion, he could not determine that controversy, nor did such questions belong to him." (Kuin.)

14. Ἀδίκημα τί ἡ ῥαδιουργία. It is difficult to exactly define the sense of these words, since they are both terms of extensive use. The former is by the best Commentators supposed to mean any violation of the law of the city; and the latter they render flagitium. But I should be inclined to think that there is here a climax; and that ῥαδιουργία πονηρὸν signifies less than ἀδίκημα, and merely answers to our misdemeanour, including such petty arts of knavery, trickery, imposture, larceny, &c. as do not amount to felony: this is, I think, plain from the use of this and the cognate word, ῥαδιουργία. Thus Lucian. 3, 151, 77. conjoins ἀπάτη καὶ τὸ ψεύδος καὶ ἐπιρροκαὶ—κολακεία ἐστί. And Diodor. Sic. 3, 272. speaking of the misdemeanours committed by soldiers, says: ἐξεσάντο τῇ συνῆθει ῥαδιουργία τε καὶ τόλμη. And so 9, 162. where it is applied to the truly Buonapartean design of Agathocles to desert his troops, τῷ πληθεὶς τῇ ῥαδιουργίαις ἐξῆθηκαν. Polyb. 12, 10, 5. τῇ τῶν ῥακετῶν ῥαδιουργίᾳ. Hence is established the emendation of Camerarius and Sylburg on Dionys. Hal. p. 68. καταφρονεῖν, αἰς ἀνθρωπίνοις διοιουργημάτωι—εἰς Θεοῦ ἀναφερόμενον where, for διοιουργημάτωι read ῥαδιουργημάτωι.
The mistake seems to have arisen from some contraction. Thus *rachionvgein* signifies to act indecently, in Plut. Opp. Moral. 7, 79, 1. edit. Reisk, and *dolose et fraudulenter agere* in 8, 375. 9, 297. 10, 436. And *rachionvyma* is used to denote a crafty fraudulent action in 9, 415. Now the cognate term *rachionvlyia* has been before treated of in the note on 13, 10. where I have shown that the word signifies properly *facility of action*; as in Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 34., and, from the adjunct, negligence, slipperiness, and specially levity and carelessness (viz. whether an action be good or evil); and hence denotes *temerity* of action, and *improbability of every kind*. It is by Ælius Dionys. ap. Eustath. on Hom. Odyss. 8. p. 1506. explained by *η περι πάν ὀλγαρία, καὶ θρασύτης.* I must observe, too, that this will lead us to the true origin of a word which has puzzled all our etymologists, namely, *rogue*, which, I have no doubt, comes from *rachionvgos*; and *roguery*, being a term of equally extensive signification, would be no bad translation of the word now under our consideration.

It is, however, difficult to conceive how Paul could be thought to have committed any offence against the laws of the city; or, if he had, how Gallio could use the term *Ὑπέρκόμμω υμῶν*, bear with you, which would be quite incongruous, as Gallio ought rather to have *thanked* them for prosecuting a public offender. It should rather seem that Gallio regarded the procedure as an accusation respecting religious matters, and meant merely to say this: "Had there been any assault committed so as to disturb you in your religious services, or any *rachionvlya*, or *roguish indecent trick* played, in ridicule of your religious rites, &c. He perhaps thought it not improbable that as the Christians rejected circumcision, there might have been some insult cast on the Jews, such as that recorded by Josephus to have been perpetrated by a Roman soldier in mockery of the circumcision of

* So our words, bold, boldness, are sometimes used by the vulgar.
the Jews, and which, by the way, probably led to that rebellion which occasioned the ruin of the country.

Hence it will appear that πονηρός is not to be omitted (as Markland and Owen thought), or changed into φανερόν, as Markland proposes.

14. κατὰ λόγον, i.e. reasonably. Of this Priceaus and Wetstein cite several examples; as Artemid. 5, 77. ἀγθῶς, καὶ κατὰ λόγον. See also St. Thes. 5656 d.


16. ἀπήλασεν. This does not imply compulsory removal, but merely signifies, "bid them be gone." In illustration of which sense Kuinoel cites Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 4. τὰς γυναίκας ὧν ἀπήλασε, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀκονεύν.

17. ἑπιλαμβάνομεν δὲ πάντες οἱ Ἐλληνες. There is here some variation of reading, and no little question raised as to the true one; which consequently leaves the interpretation unsettled. Two antient MSS. and Versions omit οἱ Ἐλληνες, and others read οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. As to the latter reading, it cannot be tolerated: for why should the Jews have beaten him? Neither is it likely that they would have taken such a liberty before so solemn a tribunal. The words οἱ Ἐλληνες are thought by many critics, as Grotius, Mill, Pierce, Bengel, and Kuinoel, to be derived from the margin, like the last. Now those were Gentiles (say they) who beat Sosthenes: and hence some one wrote οἱ Ἐλληνες. As to the reason for the beating, it was to make the Jews go away the faster; and to this they were actuated partly by their hatred towards the Jews, and partly by a desire to please the Procurator." But this appears to be pressing too much on the word ἀπῆλασεν, which has by no means any such meaning. Besides, it is strange that the words
"Ελληνες should have crept into nearly all the MSS.; even into so many early ones. And, supposing "Ελληνες to be removed, what sense is to be given to πάντες? None (I think) satisfactory, or agreeable to the style of the New Testament. It must therefore be retained: and then the sense of πάντες will be as follows: "all the Greeks, both Gentiles and Christians": which is so evident, that I am surprised the Commentators should not have seen it. Some explain it of the Gentiles, and others of the Gentile Christians. Both indeed had reason to take umbrage at the intolerance and bitter animosity of the Jews. It is not likely that any should have joined in the beating, merely to please the Proconsul, who was not a man to be gratified by such a procedure. So that the gnomes brought forward by Grotius on the base assentatio of courtiers, are not here applicable.

By ἔτοσκω is merely to be understood beating, or thumping him with their fist, as he passed along.* Any thing more than that we cannot suppose they would have ventured upon, or the Proconsul have tolerated.

17. οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἐμελέλειν. Μέλει has usually the genitive of the thing and the dative of the person; and in the New Testament always occurs with a negative, either μὴ or οὐ, &c. The οὐδὲν is here from οὐ; and of this use many examples are produced by Wetstein; as, for instance, Aristoph. Ran. 226. ὑμῶν δ' ἵσως οὐδὲν μέλει. Indeed, it is more frequent in the Classical writers than the simple negative, as far as regards this phrase.

By τούτων we may, I think, understand both the accusation brought forward, and the cuffs which followed; to neither of which the Proconsul paid much attention; and this from disgust at the litigious conduct of the Jews; as also from the custom, mentioned

* So Thucyd. 4, 47. sub fin. ἄνδρας διῆγον διὰ δυνῶν στόιχου ὀξυτῶν—καὶ παιωμένους καὶ κεντουμένους ὑπὸ τῶν παρευσαγμένων, i. e. (as we say) running the gauntlet. On which passage I shall have occasion to compare several similar ones of antient authors.
by Prisco, of the Roman governors to pass by any
conduct which did not directly tend to degrade the
dignity of the Roman name, or weaken its influence,
in order that the yoke might be as easy as possible
to the provincials.

18. ἡμέρας ἰκανῶς, a great many days, a good while.
See the note on Matt. 28, 12. Ἀπορρήτου, bidding
adieu. See the note on Mark 6, 46. Κέφαλή, the
eastern port of Corinth. (See Strabo, Pliny, Cella-
rius, and other writers.) This may be reckoned with
the other names of plural form, on which see the
note on 17, 15.

18. κεφάλην τὴν κεφαλήν. The middle verb κε-
φαλάω denotes to shave oneself, or cause oneself to
be shaved. See Dresig. de V. M. p. 307. and Al-
berti on this passage. But the question is, to whom
we are to refer the word? To Paul, say many Com-
mentators. This is a point, however, though intri-
cate, of too little importance for me to examine at
large: and therefore I must content myself with
offering a compendium of what has been brought
forward in illustration of the subject by Kuinoel and
others.

Most of those who think it applicable to Paul,
admit that the vow in question was not one of Nara-
etship, since the obligation of it could only be ful-
filled in Jerusalem, and it is not probable that Paul
would have bound himself voluntarily by any such
ritual ceremony. And as to Acts 21, 28. the subject
of the passage is a vow not undertaken voluntarily,
but at the instigation of the Apostles. Therefore it
should rather seem to have been a civil vow; as is
the opinion of Salmasius de Comâ, 710. who observes
that such vows were often undertaken by the Jews;
as, for instance, when travelling, not to shave their
heads before they arrived at a certain place. Such
also were the vows, or anathemas, by which they
bound themselves not to take food or drink till they
had effected something which they purposed. See
Acts 23, 14. Such too were undertaken after reco-
vering from a disorder, or being delivered from any other peril, or calamity. See Joseph. B. 2, 15, 1. Nor were they unknown even among the Gentiles. Those who recovered from long disorder, or were delivered from any great peril, or who had obtained any unexpected good, used to consecrate and offer up their hair to the gods, who had preserved them. So Juv. Sat. 12, 8. Gaudent ubi vertice raso Garrula securi narrare pericula nautae. Artemid. Onir. 1, 23. ναυαγησαντες μεν γαρ ἢ ἐκ μεγάλης σοβέντες ιώσοι, ἐξορῶντες οἱ αὐθαρατοί. See more passages in Wetstein; to which I add Diphil: ap. Athen. 225 ο. κομὴν τρέφον —ιερὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Eurip. Bacch. 467. ιερὸς ὁ πλάκαμος, τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ αὐτόν τρέφο. Virg. Æn. 7, 394. Sacrum tibi pascere crinem.

But as such a civil vow savours too much of Jewish and Gentile manners and customs, Petit and Wolf devise another mode of interpretation, which, however, is too harsh to be admitted. Other interpreters, I think, more rightly follow the Vulgate and Chrysostom; and, removing the stop after Ἀκύλας, refer the word κείραμενος, &c. to Aquila: which mode of interpretation is favoured by the construction; and by it, moreover, all the difficulties attendant on the hypothesis, which supposes Paul to be the subject of these words, are removed. We are not, however, with Grotius, Hammond, Schlesner, and others, to understand a vow of Nazariteship, but (as Alberti, Heumann, and Heinrichs maintain,) a civil vow, undertaken by him, either on account of deliverance from sickness or other peril, or on account of something good which happened to him. (Kuin.)

Valcknaer, too, whose opinion on such a point is of great weight, refers κείραμενος, &c. to Aquila.

19—21. διελέχθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, discoursed unto. See the note on 17, 2. ὦκ ἐπένευε, non annuit. This signification is found both in the Classical writers (see Wets.) and the Old Testament. Eις Ἰεροσόλυμα, at Jerusalem. See 8, 40. and Matt. 2, 28. Ποιεῖν ἑστήν, “to celebrate the feast.” See
the note on Matt. 26, 18. *What* feast is here meant cannot with certainty be determined. But we may suppose that Paul’s chief business was to convey the money collected for the relief of the poorer Christians at Jerusalem. See Rom. 15, 26. The words are, however, not found in some few MSS. and Versions; and are by Bengel, Heumann, Beck, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel, suspected of being mere additions from the margin, and made up from Acts 20, 16, 19 & 21. But this seems resting too much on the authority of a few MSS.

22. Καισάρεια. A town on the sea-coast. See the note on 8, 40. ’Αναβάς, “and having gone up.” Whither? Some Commentators, as Camerar., De Dieu, Wolf, Calov., Heumann, Doddr., Thaleman, Beck, and Kuinoel, refer it to Cæsarea. But this requires the confirmation of examples. And we must take for granted that the city was built high above the port (which is not likely), or that the Church was so situated; which would be extremely frigid. Neither is it certain that there was a church. Besides, how can the expression καταβαίνω be proper, as used of travelling from a seaport-town, like Cæsarea, to Antioch? I therefore prefer the mode of interpretation adopted by some antient and many modern Commentators, as Beza, Grot., Mor., Rosenm., Reichard, Schott, Heinrichs, and others, who supply εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. This may indeed seem somewhat harsh, yet it must be remembered that not a few things are so in the New Testament; and ἀναβαίνω is there often used absolutely of going up to Jerusalem, and καταβαίνω of going from thence. Nor is this unexampled in the Classical writers. Xenophon uses the word in the very same sense of those going from Greece to the capital of Persia. See Anab. 1, 1, 2. Hist. 2, 1, 9, 10. An. 1, 4, 12. Hist. 4, 1, 2. 1, 5, 1. 1, 4, 2. and many other passages referred to by Sturz in his Lex. Xenoph. in voce. Besides, as the words εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα have just preceded, it is not very harsh to repeat them. Κui-
noel, indeed, and some others, treat those words as not genuine; but their opinion rests on mere sus-
picion, unsupported by any proof.

24. Ἀπολλώς. A name contracted from Απολλώνιος (which is read in the Cod. Cant.); as Epaphras from Epaphroditus, and Artemas from Artemonius. Of this Apollonius mention is also made in 1 Cor. 1, 12. 3, 5 seq. where Paul speaks of the labour he underwent in the instruction of the Corinthians. (1 Cor. 4, 6, 16, 12.) See Storr, Not. Hist. Epist. Paul. in Opusc. Acad. 12. p. 242. and Kraus, Comment. in Epist. 1. ad Corinth. Proleg. p. 35 & 659. Γένει, by birth, i. e. country; as in 18, 2. On the Jews of Alexandria see the note on 6, 9. That most cele-
brated city of Egypt abounded with men of learn-
ing, both Jews and Gentiles. (Kuin.)

24. ἀνὴρ λόγιος, an eloquent man. This term was by the Attics used in the sense of literatus, doctus; λόγος or λόγοι signifying letters, or literature. But in the common dialect it denoted eloquent. It may not be uninstructive to trace the order of the vari-
ous senses of λόγιος. It signified, 1st, an historian; as in Herodot. 2, 31 Αἰγυπτίων λογιστάτων: and 6, 187.
p. 6. τῶν λογιστάτων ἀνδρῶν. Philo 1026. τῶν κατὰ
τὴν Ἑλλάδα λογίων. Ξδύλ, learned, erudite; as in Herodot. 2, 77. Αἰγυπτίων λογιστάτων: and 4, 46.
Ἀελ. V. H. 16, 20. οἱ τῶν Ἰνδίων λόγιοι. Herod. 1, 5,
4. Ξδύλ, eloquent; as in Joseph. 17, 6, 2. Ἰουδαίων
λογιστάτων καὶ τῶν πατρίων ἐξηγητῶν νόμων, interpre-
ters of the Scriptures, λογίοι being there joined with
dυνατός ἐν τοῖς γραφαῖς. Philo 127. μικρά νόσου πρό-
φάσις — οὐ τὸ στόμα καὶ τῶν πάνω λογίων ἀπερράψεν.
Thus Mercury was called Ἔφρης λόγιος. And so
Hor. Cor. 1, 10, 1. Mercuri facunde. And this
seems to be the sense in the present passage.
(Kuin.) This interpretation better accounts for the
preference given by some to Apollos over Paul,
who was indeed endowed with profound Jewish learn-
ing, but by no means eloquent. See 1 Cor. 2, 4.
2 Cor. 10, 10. 11, 6. To the passages above cited may be added Plut. 1, 646 ε. (noted by Wets.) λόγιος ἐξ ἀφάνου γενόμενος. Some Commentators, however, assign to λόγιος the sense of erudite, learned, well versed in the Jewish religion: and thus the words δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς will be added by way of explanation. But this seems a less probable mode of interpretation. It is, however, often difficult to decide which of these senses should be assigned; and there are not wanting passages where both may have been intended. See the examples adduced by Elsner, Raphel, Kypke, Wets., and Loesner.

25. κατηχημένος τὴν ἱδίω τοῦ Κυρίου. By this we are to understand, “instructed in the doctrine of a Messiah,” but not in the doctrine of Jesus Christ; for Apollos knew only the doctrine of John, who baptized εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον, preached repentance, and announced the coming of the Messiah. (See Matt. 3, 2. compared with Acts 19, 4.): whereas, by the more accurate instruction which he received from Aquila and Priscilla, must be understood that of the Messiahship of Jesus; and what he had enjoined to be believed and practised. It must be observed, too, that Luke has used the term Κύριος, by which Jesus was chiefly designated, though Apollos then knew not that Jesus was the Messiah.

Κατηχείσθαι has here its proper signification, taught, instructed; as in Gal. 6, 6. Rom. 2, 8. Apollos was, it seems, taught and baptized by some Jew who had been a disciple of John; and, inflamed with ardour and zeal in the propagation of truth, he travelled about for that purpose. Of Jesus he had no certain intelligence; at least, not of his Messiahship. See the note on Matt. 11, 2. and Acts 19, 1. (Kuin.)

25. ἐλάληκα καὶ ἔδίδασκεν ἃ. τ. π. τ. Κ. “discoursed and taught,” &c. Ἀκριβῶς,* accurately, both in

* Bp. Sherlock here stumbles at Ἀκριβῶς, which he is pleased to render perfectly. And he asks how that could be; especially as at the next verse Aquila and Priscilla are said to have instructed him.
doctrine and in reasoning. Τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, "the things concerning the Lord." So Ἀeschin. Dial. 3, 10. τὰ περὶ βίαν. See Munthe. Now Apollonius was teaching them that the times of the Messiah were already at hand, and exhorting them to repentance and reformation, in order to a fit reception of the Messiah. See Matt. 3, 2 & 3. And he, being powerful in the Scriptures, recalled to their memory the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Messiah.

The βαπτισμα Ἰωάννου is put, by synecdoche, for the whole of John's ordinances. See the note on Matt. 21, 25. (Kuin.) It is generally supposed that he had been baptized by John himself: but this must have been twenty years before; and it is not probable that during that time he should have acquired no knowledge of Christianity. It should rather seem that he had been baptized by one of John's disciples; and perhaps not very long before the time here spoken of.

26. ἔργα τὰ παραβίασθαι, "proceeded to speak

more perfectly. He would therefore read ὅτι άπέβεβλτος; and he supposes the ὅτι to have been absorbed by the following άκ. And this has been approved of by G. Wakefield and Markland, who think there is a like omission in Athen. Deipn. p. 91. where, speaking of the necks of shell-fish, he says they are δυσκατόργανοι, δίο τοίς άστερωσι τὸν στόμαχον οἰκεῖον. Here they read οὖν οἰκεῖον. But I cannot assent to these learned Critics: for άπέβεβλτος, in the present passage, does not signify perfectly, especially in that absolute acceptation in which they are pleased to understand it, but carefully, diligently. And by the τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου is not meant the Gospel, but the things which treated of a Saviour.

Then as to supposing a syllable to have been absorbed by a similar one following, this is not very critical: nor is it supported by Athenaeus; for though that passage is undoubtedly corrupt, and ought to carry the sense suggested by Markland and Wakefield, it may be enended in a far milder manner, and make more Classical Greek, simply by reading άνοικείον. The άν was absorbed by άν preceding, as in a thousand other instances. It perhaps arose from some misunderstanding of the construction. As to the word άνοικείον, it occurs in good authors, especially the later ones; as Plutarch and Synesius. See Steph. Thes. Nov. Edit. p. 6638.
freely." There is here, as often, a pleonasm of ἄφαρτος. See 9, 27. 13, 46.

26. προτεθέθητο αὐτῷ, "attached him to their society, received him into the number of Christians." The word properly signifies to attach any one to one's interest, as a fellow or helper (Acts 17, 5.); but here, "to gain over as a fellow Christian."

27. Apollos had heard from Aquila and Priscilla of what Paul had done in Achaæa, especially at Corinth; and being ἔχων πνεύματι, he was disposed to go thither, hoping that he should be enabled, by refuting the Jews, to render no little service to the Christian cause. (Kuin.) In this resolution he was confirmed by the opinion of the brethren at Ephesus, who rather exhorted than dissuaded him. For this is the sense of προτεθέθητο, which it is far simpler, with the Syr., Chrys., Beza, Grot., Pisc., Wolf, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, to refer to Apollos, than, with our common Version, Bois, and Rosenm., to suppose a synchysis, and refer the word to the Corinthians.


With respect to the letters here mentioned, they were written for the purpose of encouraging Apollos, and recommending him to the brethren.*

27. συνεβάλετο τολὴ τοῖς πεπιστευκάσι διὰ τῆς χάριτος. In the interpretation of this sentence, it is easier to determine the sense of συνεβάλετο than that of διὰ τῆς χάριτος. The former expression, as is evi-

* This antient Ecclesiastical custom, of writing letters of recommendation, (which seems to have originated in the necessary caution to be observed in times of persecution, and arose out of the interrupted and tardy intercourse which, owing to their great distance from each other, subsisted between the Christians,) has been well illustrated by a tract of Ferrarius de Epistolis Ecclesiasticis, referred to by Wolf.
dent from the context, must mean, "profited them:" a signification which is found in the best Classical writers; where the word takes a dative or accusative with εἰς or πρὸς. To the examples adduced by Raphael, Munthe, Loesner, and Wetstein, I add Thucyd. 3, 45. καὶ τῷ τῳ ἐκ’ αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲν ἔλασσον ἕμμακελεῖαι ἐς τὸ ἐπιστεῖν for so the passage should be pointed. The word is chiefly used in a moral sense, and is rare in the physical one; yet one example has been adduced, from Herodot. 4, 50.

It is, however, of more importance to determine the construction, and, as dependent upon it, the sense of διὰ τῆς χάριτος. Many Commentators, as Beza, Camerarius, Raphael, Wetstein, Rosenm., and Heinrichs, interpret it of eloquence, and grace of diction. But, as Wolf remarks, it is no where so used without the addition of some other word. Limborch, Hammond, and others, take it of the doctrine, or preaching, of the Gospel. Wolf, Heumann, and others, understand χάρις in its common acceptance, as denoting kindness, benignity; joining διὰ τῆς χάριτος with πεποιθεκός. Others again, as Pierce, Morus, L’Enfant, and Kuinoel, construing χάρις with συμβαλέτο, assign this sense: "multum profuit Christianis, favore divino adjutus." It is difficult, indeed, to decide amidst such a variety of opinions, but I am inclined to prefer the mode of interpretation last mentioned. The construction is (I have no doubt) συμβαλέτο διὰ τῆς χάριτος. And on this all the best Commentators are agreed. Doddridge, indeed, thinks the transposition unnecessary; though, as he admits, it does not materially affect the sense; and then, with some inconsistency, he says that "the transposition fixes the sense, which ought to be left uncertain, and that to the less probable one." It seems as if he had thought that the words might be taken with both members: a most uncritical notion, which I have elsewhere observed in the good Doctor. Certainly the word will have an awkward air, if taken with πεποιθεκός, not to mention that no
example of any such phrase has been produced from Scripture. For though we do not deny that the grace of God is necessary, to make our faith complete and operative, yet the inculcation of such a doctrine here does not seem natural: whereas it was to be expected that something should be said of the grace or assistance of God afforded to one who so greatly promoted the cause of the Gospel. See 1 Cor. 8, 6. which Dodridge considers as the best comment on the passage.

By оι πειστευκότες are simply meant believers; as in 19, 18. πολλαί τῶν πειστευκότων.

manifest imitation of Xen. An. 7, 5, 4. (above cited); from which it is clear that ἐντόνως is in this passage the true reading.

In διακατηλέγχετο, refuted, the did signifies thoroughly, and is intensive. On the simple κατελέγχω see the note on Mark 9, 25. Δημοσίᾳ, publicly. Among the Classical passages cited by Wets. are Plat. de Prodic. ἄνω ἐπὶ δεῖξεν ποιεῖσθαι. Athen. p. 90 c. ἐπίδειξεν λόγων δημοσίᾳ ποιεῖσθαι.

CHAP. XIX.

In the mean time, while Apollon is abiding at Corinth, Paul returns to Ephesus, as he had promised (see 18, 21.); and there meets with some disciples of John, and baptizes them (1—7.). He makes a stay of more than two years at Ephesus, and converts many to Christianity (8—20.). A tumult is then excited by Demetrius, the goldsmith. Paul, however, escapes alive (28 fin.) Kuin.

1. τῷ Ἀπολλόνῳ. Accusative Attic for Ἀπολλόνῳ. Διελθόντα τὰ ἀνατερμά μέρη, “traversing the upper (i. e. inland) regions;” namely, Galatia and Phrygia. (Compare 18, 23.) For they are so called with reference to the maritime situation of Ephesus, which was κότω. (Kuin.) The sense of ἄνω, ἄνω, κάτω, and κότω is frequent in the Classical writers. See Sturz. Lex. Xen. and especially the numerous examples produced by Wetstein. On Ephesus see the Geographical writers. It is called by Josephus, Ant. 14, 17. προεύοντα τῆς Ἀσίας: where by Asia is meant Asia proper, i. e. Ionia.

1. εὐραί τινος μαθητῶς, i. e. “worshippers of the Messiah.” For μαθητῶς must here be taken in an extended signification; since those persons did not account Jesus as the Messiah, having only received John’s baptism. Yet they were worshippers, and prepared to be disciples of the Messiah, who they believed would shortly appear. See the note on 18, 25. and Noesselt’s Exerc. p. 51 seq. Now since
John himself did not comprehend who Christ was, before he applied to him for baptism, so it is not to be wondered at that these persons, who, at the original institution of baptism, had been baptized by John, and professed a belief in Christ’s advent, but afterwards, before the public ministry and death of Christ, had removed to distant regions, should have been ignorant that Jesus was the Christ, i.e. the Messiah. Nay many disciples of John, even after he had declared Jesus to be the Messiah, accounted their own master as a greater prophet than Jesus. See the note on Joh. 3, 26. and Matt. 11, 2. Neither is it likely that they were (as Wets., Bolton, and Heinrichs suppose) baptized by Apollos. For he himself had been a follower of, and baptized by, John; but afterwards had more correct knowledge communicated to him by Aquila and Priscilla, who undoubtedly expounded also to these men the δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ (see 18, 26.) In such ignorance were these twelve persons, who had been baptized by some disciples of John, that they seem, after the departure of Apollos, to have constituted a distinct society. For Paul found them, not assembled in the synagogue, but forming a separate congregation. (Kuin.)

2. Paul had, it seems, heard concerning these men, that they were separatists from Judaism, and constituted a society apart. Suspecting, therefore, that they were disciples of John, he went to them with the view of communicating to them more correct notions of religion. He seems, however, to have said more than is here recorded. For that he had asked them whether they were baptized, may be collected from the words of ver. 3. εἰς τι ὄν εβαπτίσθητε; And when they answered in the affirmative, he, in order to know whether they were votaries of the same Messiah with himself, further interrogated them with, εἰ πνεῦμα ἁγιου ἔλαβετε πιστεύσατε; “have ye experienced the effects of the Holy Spirit?”
Πιστεύω here denotes to believe in the doctrine of the Messiah. See the note on 18, 25. (Kuin.)

This question Paul was justified in putting, since Christianity had, as it were, but just dawned at Ephesus.

2. ἂλλ' οὖδὲ, εἰ πνεῦμα άγιον ἐστιν, ἥκωσαμεν, "we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." And yet they who said this were Jews. For John and his disciples baptized none but Jews; and to them the phrase ἑάρμνησαν could not but be familiar; and by this they believed the prophets were inspired. See Ezek. 11, 5. These Ephesians, then, seem to have meant, that they had never heard the Messiah was come, and who he was, that they had not known that the period spoken of by Joel 3, 1. (see the note on Acts 2, 17) had arrived, when the Spirit was to be poured out upon all men, still less had they been imbued with it. (Kuin.) The learned Commentator is moreover persuaded that Paul had appealed to this very prophecy. But this seems precarious.

At τι πνεῦμα άγιον ἐστι subaud ὅθεν. See the note on Joh. 7, 39., and Glass, Phil. Sacr. 680. Kuinoel has omitted to notice the sense of εἰ, "annon." See 1 Cor. 7, 16.

3. εἰς τί, scil. ἐνομα, or βαπτίσμα. Some Commentators, however, (as Kuinoel,) take the εἰς to denote the final cause: q. d. "To what purpose, then, were ye baptized? what doctrine did ye profess on baptism?" And they determine the answer to be, "Namely, that we should profess the doctrine which John announced, to which we were bound by his baptism." And thus Ἰωάννου βαπτίσμα will signify John's doctrine and baptism. This mode of interpretation, however, seems to need confirmation.

4. Ἰωάννου μὲν ἐβαπτισε, &c. Μὲν is here, as often, put without any particle to correspond to it. Βαπτίσμα μετανοιας signifies the baptism by which those who receive it are bound to reformation of life. See the note on Mark 1, 4. The words οὕτως εἰς τὸν
Acts of the Apostles, Chap. XIX.

Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν are those of St. Paul, explaining who is that ἐρχόμενος announced by John, namely Jesus, whom they ought (he means to say) to account as Messiah, and worship as such. There is a similar passage in Rom. 10. 6 & 7. (Kuin.) In τουτέστιν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, there is a popular brachylogia for, "now that Messiah whom John bound you to worship is Jesus." Yet I assent to Kuinoel, that Paul might proceed to explain more fully the doctrine of Christ, and enlarge on the magnitude and certainty of its benefits, both from Scripture and the discourses themselves of John: no doubt, too, he informed them of the death and resurrection of Jesus.

5. ἀκούοντες δὲ ἐβαπτίσθησαν ἐ. τ. ἀ. τ. κ.

That these men were re-baptized by Paul, who had been before baptized by John, every unprejudiced person will readily allow. But since some have abused this passage to depreciate the efficacy of John’s baptism; and since this repetition of baptism seemed to favour the notions of the Anabaptists, much pains have been bestowed on the explanation of the passage: and not a few have denied that Paul caused these men to be baptized. Most of them maintain that v. 5. is a continuation of Paul’s speech: and they refer the words of it to John’s baptism, received at his recommendation. So Beza, Drusius, Schmidt, Calixtus, Suicer, Glass, Buddeus, Olearius, Wolf, and others. They rest their proof chiefly on μεν and δέ, which they make to be relative particles, indicating a continuation of the same discourse. To this it may be answered, 1st, that the argument which rests upon μεν and δέ is of no force, since those particles are often not apodotic. See 2, 37. 2dly, that interpretation being admitted, a frigid tautology will arise. 3dly, we no where read that John baptized men into the name of Jesus. For it was not then known what would be the name of the Messiah. It was only the Apostles who did that. Nor does Paul, in fact, say that John exhorted the people to believe Jesus: he merely, in the words τοῦτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, &c., indicates that by ἐρχόμενον John meant Jesus, though he did not name him. 4thly, It is necessary that they who were baptized be those to whom the following αὐτοῖς pertains: καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς Παύλου τὸν Χείρας, in verse 6. But these cannot be different persons from these. 5thly. That those baptized by John were again dipped by the Apostles, may also be collected from Acts 2, 38, & 41. For since almost all the Jerusalemites and Jews had been baptized by John (see Matt. 3, 5.), it is incredible that none amongst the 3,000, who were baptized by the Apostles, had been baptized by John. And yet all without distinction are said to have been baptized by the Apostles.
6thly, Nor does it follow, because those baptized by John were again dipped by the Apostles, that the baptism of John was useless, and brought into contempt by the Apostolical baptism. For the abrogation of any thing, as being yet imperfect in respect to its time, is not casting any reproach upon it. Luke himself teaches us that the baptism of John was not altogether the same as the baptism in the name of Jesus. (See supra 18, 25.) Now John’s baptism was imperfect pro tempore ratione. John baptized entirely to the Messiah that was to come; the Apostles to Jesus the Messiah. But by John’s baptism and teaching the minds of the Jews were prepared to more readily receive Jesus and his better instruction, and to dedicate themselves to him by a new and similar rite. 7thly, Neither does this repetition of baptism favour the notions of the Anabaptists. For they repeat the same baptism. But those who are baptized in the Christian Church are fully bound to Christ and his doctrine, and therefore have no need of any repetition of baptism, to whatever sect they may join themselves. See Limborch in loc., and Ernest. Opusc. Theolog. 233. [and Doddr. in loc. Edit.] Carpzov., however, in a Disser. on this subject, maintains the sense to be as follows: “Agnoverunt, didicerunt illi se baptizatos olim fuisse a Johanne in nomen Jesu.” But it has been rightly objected by Semler that this interpretation offends against the usus loquendi, and every rule of narration. Other interpretations, still less admissible, have been proposed by Jung, Ziegler, &c. The true state of the case seems to be this. Those who were baptized by John were bound to the mevaoia, to which he exhorted them, and were prepared for the kingdom of the Messiah that was to come. The Apostles, while Jesus was on earth, baptized those who applied for baptism. (Joh. 3, 5., where see the note, and 26. 4. 1, 2.), thus binding them to Jesus and his doctrine, and instituting the new economy, soon to be established by the Messiah. So Joh. 4. 1. μαθητής περιει καὶ βαπτιζει, compared with verse 2. That Jesus was the Messiah the Apostles were not at that time assured (see the note on Matt. 16, 20, 10, 7.), and so they did not baptize them to Jesus the Messiah. Those who had undergone John’s baptism, and had been taught by Jesus himself, and admitted his doctrine, were not re-baptized by the Apostles. See Joh. 3, 26. Nor were the Apostles again baptized by Jesus; for they were nursed up under his instruction, and in due time taught his Messiahship, and were baptized with the Holy Spirit. But when, after Christ’s departure to Heaven, a Church had, by his direction, been established by the Apostles, whose foundations he himself had laid, and into which they who should account Jesus as the Messiah, and profess his doctrine, were to be received; then also those who had been baptized by John, or, after his death, by his disciples, and who had not enrolled themselves in the number of Jesus’s followers, while he was on earth, nor accounted him as Messiah (see Acts 2, 37 & 41.), were by the Apostles again baptized; as were by Paul those twelve disciples of John living at Ephesus, of whom we are now treating. It is not, indeed, at Acts 2. expressly said that any of John’s disciples were amongst the baptized, but from the silence of St. Luke nothing can be proved. Of Apollos’ (Acts 18.) it is no
where said that he was not re-baptized, but (as Erneti has well remarked) the thing is passed by, as well known and usual. (Kuin.)

6—8. ἐξάλογον γλάσσαίς, καὶ προεφήτευν. I can by no means accede to the harsh interpretations of these words propounded by the Foreign Commentators. The plain and simple sense is: “they spoke with other, and, to them, strange and foreign tongues, and sustained the character of prophets and inspired teachers.” See Cæcumenius and Chrysostom.

7. ἢσαν δὲ αἱ πάντες ἄνδρες ἁσεὶ δεκαδόο. Markland objects to our translation, and would render, “but they were all men, about twelve.” I should prefer, “there were in all about twelve, men.” It appears to me that a stress is laid upon ἄνδρες, in order thereby to hint that this was the number of the men, or masters of families, and did not include the women and children.

8. πείθων τὰ περὶ, &c., “persuasively urging on them the doctrines of Jesus.” Kuinoel thinks that Paul did not, at the beginning, teach that Jesus was the Messiah, but only after he had prepared the Jews for the Christian religion. See the note on 18, 4.

9. ὃς δὲ τίνες ἑκατερίματο καὶ ἰπέιδων, “but when some obstinately refused to yield credence.” This metaphorical term for contumacy is used in many passages of the Old and New Testament; as Ps. 94, 8. Hebr. 8, 8. μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδιὰς ὑμῶν, and Sirach. 30, 11. μὴ τοι σκληρυθής ἀπεθάνῃ σοι. A harsher metaphor occurs in the use of λειοῦ in Arrian. Epict. 1, 5.

These contumacious persons went so far as not only to refuse credence to the Gospel, but even to speak evil of it before the multitude; which seems to hint that they were themselves of the higher class. On ἀπεθάνειν see Keuchen, who, among other passages, compares Exech.

The words ἀστατὰς and ἀφαίρεσι& denote separating from Church communion. As to the name Tyrannus, it was, we are told, a not very unfrequent one, like King with us. Commentators are not quite
agreed what sort of a school this Tyrannus taught. Lightfoot, Vitringa, Hammond, Doddridge, and Schoettgen think it was a kind of Beth Midrasch, or Divinity Hall, designed for reading theological lectures. Others, as Pearce, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, think it was a philosophical lecture room,* and that Tyrannus was a rhetorician, or sophist. If the former conjecture be true, he was probably a converted Jew; if the latter, a converted Gentile.

10. ἀστε πάντας τῶν κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἁσιαν ἄκουσαι τῶν λόγων τ. Κ. Ἡ. Many Commentators take πάντας in a qualified sense, and understand it of those who resorted to Ephesus. And (as Grotius and Kuinoel observe) infinite was the number of persons who resorted to this capital and emporium of Asia Minor, on all kinds of business, religious, political, and commercial.

10. ἐν, unto, for, during. So Thucyd. 2, 35. See Raphel. Possibly ἀκοοῦσαι may mean "heard of;" a sense which the word often bears.

11. δυνάμεις τε οὐ τὰς τυχόντας. Here we have an elegant litotes; for the sense is, miracula insignia. Τυχών properly signifies, "what is met with, obvious, common." Hence, with οὐ, it denotes haud vulgaris, in the sense of insignis: examples of which are adduced by Wetstein, Munthe, and Loesner: as Diodor. Sic. 418 λ. οὐ τὴν τυχόνταν ἁγανίαν. Polyb. 1, 42. οὐ τὴν τυχόνταν ἁγοράν. & 53. οὐ μίκροις οὐδὲ τοῖς τυχόντας ἁγονας. Long. 16. Xiph. ταραχᾶς οὐ τῆς τυχόντας. The idiom appears to be one of later Greekism. Though something very much akin to it occurs in Soph. CEd. Tyr. 401. (cited by Valcknaer), οὐχὶ τοῦτοντος ἂν ἄνδρος.

12. ἀστε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀσθενοῦντας, &c. See the note on 15, 15. Σουδαρία is from the Latin sudarium, a handkerchief. See the note on Luke 19, 20. Σιμόκηδος, or σημίκηδος, is also of Latin origin, and sig-

* That the term was applied to them as well as to schools for boys, is well known, and is proved by Wetstein's citations.
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nifies literally a half girdle. It answers to our apron, (which, by the way, is a contraction for afore-one,) as is evident from the similar term pin-afore, in familiar use. Some, it seems, supposed that the power of healing was inherent in the body of Paul.

It is justly observed, by many writers, that these cures wrought upon absent persons, some of them at a considerable distance from Ephesus, might conduce greatly to the success of the Gospel among those whose faces Paul had not himself seen.

13. τινες ἀπὸ τῶν περιχωμένων Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν. Perhaps these words may be rendered, "some of the wandering Jewish exorcists." Such persons were called by the Greeks ἀγιόρται, and by the Latins circulatores.* These exorcists were a kind of men who (like our travelling quacks, or mountebanks, or conjurers,) pretended to cure violent disorders beyond the skill of the physician, and even to cast out devils; and all this by the use of certain incantations, or charms, partly by administering certain powerful medicines, and partly by strongly operating on the imagination. (See the note on 4, 7. and Matt. 12, 27.) Wetstein appositely cites Manethon. Apotel. 5. 303. καὶ μαγικὴ συνέσει πιθεται τὰ πνεύματα φεύγε, καὶ κρυφίμαις βίβλοις ἔταγαλλυμένους περιέργα. Hor. Ep. 1. 1. 3. 4. Sunt veiba et voces, quibus hunc lenire dolorem Possis, et magnam morbi depellere partem. And so Artemid. 8, 20. (cited by Priscœus), οἱ μάντες περισσοτέροι. I take this opportunity of emending a kindred phrase in Joseph. B. 2, 20, 3. γοητεύων Ἐλιάζαρος ἐκπερίπλε τῶν δῆμων where, for

* The Hebrews called them שׁוֹעַ יָבֹּר, i.e. persons who, using the sacred tetragrammaton, (which the Jews call קָרֵי חֲיֵיךְ שׁוֹעַ, or with the addition of שֶׁנֶּמֶר שׁוֹעַ,) thought they could perform various kinds of incantations. And, by the co-operation of the Devil and the permission of God, the effect often answered their magic arts; which arts whoever would call in question, would contradict the prophecy of Christ himself. (See Matt. 24, 24.)

That the Jews were much given to magic arts, is well known. And of this many proofs may be seen in Eisenmenger, Edzard, and Schudt. (Schoettg.)
ἀκατέργαστα I would read περιγύδθα. The common reading seems to have arisen from a confusion of two others, περιγύδθα and ἡγύδθα.

12. ἐπεχειρήσαν, undertook, ventured. So Hesych. επιχειρεῖ ταλμ.α.

13. ὄρκίζομεν ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Here we must sub-aud dià, and paraphrase thus: “We adjure you (to come out) by that Jesus (who has power to compel you to obedience).” Yet the ellipsis of ἐξελθεῖν would here be very harsh; and therefore we may suppose that the exorcists had previously charged the evil spirits to come out, and then followed up their requisition with the words ὄρκίζομεν, &c.

14. ἔσον δὲ τινὲς τοῖς Σκευαῖς Ιουδαίοις ἀρχείρεις ἐστά, οἱ τούτο ποιοῦντες. The sentence may be rendered: “Now the persons who did so, were some (i.e. about) seven sons of Sceva.” It is surprising that the Commentators should have stumbled at this sense of τις with numerals, either before or after them, which is found not only frequently in the Classical writers, but infra, 23, 23. δύο τινὰς τῶν ἐκατονάχων. Valck. cites examples from Diciarchus and Plutarch; but it is also used by the earliest and best writers; as Thucyd. 8, 111. & 7, 87. And indeed there is the same idiom in our own language; some twenty, for about twenty. I would, therefore, point thus: ἔσον δὲ τινὲς, (υἱοὶ) Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίοις ἀρχείρεις ἐστὰ οἱ τούτο ποιοῦντες.

15. ἀποκρίθη τὸ πνεῦμα. The recent Commentators think it plain that the man was merely a raving madman, who, however, at his lucid intervals, might, during the two years of Paul’s residence, have heard and known something of Paul and Jesus. And Kue- noel refers to his note on Matt. 8, 29. On the contrary, Doddridge remarks: “Not to insist upon the demonstration arising from this story, that this demoniac was not merely a lunatic, the evil spirit under whose operation this man was, seems either to have been compelled by a superior power to bear an unwilling testimony to Jesus, or craftily to have intended by it to bring Paul into suspicion, as acting
in confederacy with himself; and if the latter of these were the case, God, as in other instances, overruled this artifice of Satan, to the destruction of his own cause and kingdom."

The words may very well be explained according to the common opinion of his being a demoniac; nor will that supersede the excellent observation of Raphael, that the interrogation here does not imply ignorance, but rather expresses reproach and contempt: q. d. "You seem to be very different persons; I am not bound to obey you. Who are you that dare to meddle with your superiors?" In proof and illustration of this sense Raphael cites Arrian. Epict. 3, 1. Wetstein, too, compares Isaac. sv de tis el; soi de ti prosthke thatein; ou ginwskaw se.

16. ἐφαλλόμενος, "leaping upon them." A strong metaphor taken from wild beasts that leap on their prey. Our Philological illustrators have all neglected to clear up the sense of this word, or else have cited passages where it merely signifies to leap on horseback. And indeed the present signification is rare; but it occurs in Homer not unfrequently; as II. v. 611. π. 754. φ. 140. η. 260. μ. 404. ν. 362. 329. & 531. where the word is used with a dative of person. Some of these passages seem to have been in the mind of St. Luke.

16. κατακυριεύειςας αὐτῶν, ἰσχὺς κατ' αὐτῶν. Almost all Commentators from the time of Wolf to Kuinoel adopt the criticism of Bois (partly founded on the Syriac Version), that ἰσχὺς κατά τίνος does not here signify to overcome or prevail, but to use that victory as to exercise force over, violently beat, and ill treat. "For (say they) it is distinguished from κατακυριεύω, and there follows the words ὁτε γυμιώνω, &c." But these arguments seem to me little convincing, and will not weigh against the following, namely, that no proof has hitherto been produced that the word was so used, and as such a use would be a violent catachresis, we may very well suppose that none ever will. Indeed, I am not aware that
there is any other example of ἵσχυε with κατὰ. It seems better to adhere to the legitimate sense of ἵσ-
χυε κατὰ, to be an overmatch for: and thus take κυ-
πεισάς ἵσχυε κατὰ for an Hysteroproteorion; or un-
derstand ἵσχυε in the sense prevailed; as in Apoc. 12,
8. καὶ οὐκ ἵσχυσαν. Thus it will be a kind of pleon-
astic expression, denoting “overpowered and over-
came them,” or, as we say, “beat them;” which is
perhaps all that the Syriac Translator meant. Cer-
tain it is that our idiomatical use of beat is derived
from the French battre, which signifies, to beat
down, and, metaphorically, overcome. The only
Classical passage that I have noted, as apposite to
this, is Lucian 3, 275. οἰς ἵσχυειν ὑπὲρ ἄνδρας μωροὺς,
to be an overmatch. The ὀστρ will then denote the
effect; and all is plain.

I am surprised that Bp. Pearce should have ex-
plained γυμνὸς “deprived of the upper garment.” It
is evidently to be taken as a popular expression,
similar to one in our own language, “with the
clothes torn off their backs.” Wetstein compares
Liv. 3, 11. Qui obvius fuerat mulatus nudatusque
abibat. Dio C. 61. ἀπόδιαν τῶν ἀπαντάντας, παῖων,
tιτραίσκον. See the note on Matt. 25, 36.

17, 18. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο γυμνῶν—ἐκέπεσε φόβος ἐκτί
πάντας. This contributed not a little to confirm the
authority of Paul (ver. 15.) to whom, in curing de-
moniacs, nothing of this sort had ever happened;
and therefore the name of Jesus was celebrated, be-
cause by him true miracles were worked, not such as
were those of these deceivers. (Rosenm.) On ἐκέ-
πεσε φόβος ἐκτί πάντα see the note on 2, 43. and Luke
7, 16.

18. πολλοὶ τῶν πεπιστευκότων, &c. “many of the
believers,” i.e. Christians. Paul, on receiving these
Ephesians into the society of Christians, had ex-
orted them to reformation of mind and conduct;
and since at Ephesus magical arts were much prac-
tised, he had also admonished them to bid adieu to
superstition, and abstain from those arts. They,
however, had not obeyed the precepts and admonitions of the Apostle. But when these Christians saw Paul’s divine legation so remarkably confirmed, and how ill exorcism had succeeded with the sons of Sceva, they acknowledged and detested their sinful conduct; and those who had studied magic arts, in order to evince their detestation and entire abandonment of them, brought such books of magic as they possessed, and publicly burnt them. (Kuin.)

18. ἔξομολογοῦμένοι, &c. Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι here signifies to so confess one’s sins as to promise future reformation. See Matt. 3, 6. (Kuin.) It is perhaps more correct to say that in ἔξομολογεῖσθαι the ἔξ signifies openly, frankly, thoroughly: and as this public confession would be a strong motive to avoid sin, so it was probably accompanied with a profession of penitence, and an engagement to abstain from it in future. Hence it came, in the end, to designate all this. Thus in James 5, 16. ἔξομολογεῖσθε ἀλλήλοις τὰ παραπτώματα has a reference to this public and solemn confession, and not a private one whispered to a priest. So Chrys. and Ócumenius. Δεῖ πάντα πιστῶν λέγειν τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτίας, καὶ ἀποτάττεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν ἐλέγχειν, τοῦ μηκετί ποτειν ὑπὸ αὐτὰ, ἵνα δικαιωθῆναι κατὰ τὸ εἰρήμενον λέγει σὺ πρῶτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἵνα δικαιωθῆσ. The custom seems to have been founded on the public confession of sins made at the baptism of John. See Mark 3, 6, where there occurs the same expression, ἔξομολογοῦμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Examples of the sense openly confess occur in Phil. 2, 11. and Apoc. 3, 5; and that of engaging, and promising in Luke 22, 6, and Rom. 14, 11. I assent to Kuinoel, that by τὰς ἁμαρτίας we are to understand sins of every kind, and not merely magical arts. The context confines πράξεις to sinful actions; as in Rom. 8, 15. Col. 3, 9. and Ælian. Var. Hist. 2, 4. (cited by Schleusner in his Lex.) οὗ μάλιστα ἥδει περὶ τὴν τοιαύτην πράξειν θερμοτάτως. It is a sort of euphemism. As to the reading of some MSS., ἁμαρτίας, that is a mere gloss.
19. ἵκανοι δὲ τῶν τὰ περείγρανα πραξάντων. Here also there is an euphemism. The word περείγρανος, as applied to persons, signifies too much occupied, occupied to little purpose, vainly industrious, nimis sedulus, what the Latins call ardelio. Hence, as applied to things, it denotes supervacuus, vanus; and in this sense the term was specially appropriated to designate the arts of magic, and such "superstitious vanities," both by the Scriptural and Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wolf, Wetstein, Kypke, Irmsch on Herodot. 4, 12, 5. and Burman on Petron. p. 46; ex. gr. Philostrat. 175. γόμα, περείγρανον χρήμα καὶ μαντικὴν συσκευάζοντες. Isidor. 3, 139. τὰν πάρα Χαλδαίοις περείγραν παίδευσιν. Aristæn. 2, 18. where τίς τῶν περείγρανον signifies a magician, who is further described as ἐποκρινόμενος τῶν περείγραν τῶν σχῆμα. Vide Catull. Ep. 7. Hor. Ep. 17. where see the Scholiast. D. Cass. Exc. Vales. 714. ὁ Ἄδερεως περειγράτας ἤν καὶ μαντείαις καὶ μαγγανείαις παντοδαίμον ἔχριτο. And that this is the sense, is clear from the words immediately subjoined. See Ursin. Anal. Sacr. l. 2, 5. p. 48., Seber's Diss. de περείγραν Ephes., Wakef. Silv. Crit. 2, 148., and Deyling Obs. S. p. 277. This view of the περείγραν of the Ephesians is confirmed and illustrated by the following words, Ἐφέσια γράμματα, which were scrolls of parchment or paper, inscribed with certain formulæ, and bound to the body, like the ἀλεξιφάρμακα, or amulets, in order to keep off disorders, demons, &c. &c. All such amulets were specially termed Ἐφέσια γράμματα, since Ephesus seems to have been the chief manufactory of them. So Diogenian. Prov. Cent. 4. 78. Ἐφέσια γράμματα ἐπαδά τίνες ἦσαν, ἐσι οἱ φοίνικες ἐνίκαν ἐν παντι. And these are mentioned, or alluded to, in numerous passages cited by Wets. and Valckn., in his Schol. ex. gr. Menander. Ἐφέσια τοις γαμῳδίων οὕτως περιπατεῖ λέγων ἀλεξιφάρμακα. Eur. stath. on Hom. Od. τ. p. 694. 36. Athen. 548 c. Plut. Sympos. 7, 5. οἱ Μάγοι τούς δαίμονεσσιν κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλείψειν καὶ
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19. συνενέγκαντες τὸς βιβλίως, κατέκαυσαν. * These books, no doubt, denoted the various forms of incantation, and the other methods of exercising magic arts. Καὶ συνενέγκαντες τὸς βιβλίως, “computed, calculated the price.” This word comes from ψῆφος, calculus, a counting stone.

19. εἴρων ἄργυρων μυριάδας πέντε. An example of this sense of εὐρίσκειν, as used of the total price of any thing sold, has been produced by Raphel from Χενοφ. Ec. 2, 3., and by Wolf from Polyb. 1295. In explaining ἄργυρος (silver coin) the Commentators are not agreed. Drusius, Grotius, and others, take it to mean the silver shekel, which was equivalent to four Attic drachms. But (as others observe) it is not probable that at Ephesus the reckoning should have been by shekels, unless indeed these were foreign Jews. The objection against estimating them as minae, is, that the sum hence arising would be too large. Yet

* Here Οἰκουμενίαν observes, from Chrysostom: Ἐφεσωτέρου δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ τοὺς πολυτύμους οὖν τὰς γυναικάς αὐτῶν βιβλίως, ὡς τῶν ἐν βυζαντίων τὰ κάλλιστα, οἷς Χριστόν πιστεύοντες, οὖν ἐξκαθαρίζοντες, ἔκκινεν, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐκείνους τοὺς ἐκείνους ἡμῶν τῶν θεολόγων τὰς βιβλίας κτίσασθαι, πρῶτος μὲν ἵνα μὴ τὰ μετασχηματίζειν τὴν ἀληθὴν ἀγαθοθεότητα λύμειν, ἐκεῖνα δὲ ἵνα μὴ ἀλλὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας κτισθῶνται τι.

Wetstein has numerous citations, from similar passages; ex gr. Timon. ap. Sext. Empir. 36. Πρωταγόρης, ἡ τούτων δὲ τάφρων πανεγύρισμα θείαν, ὡς τε θεοῦ κατεγραφής οὗτοι εἰδέναι, οὕτω δύνασθαι, δύοί τινες εἰς, καὶ οὕτως ἀδροσάσθαι. He also gives several instances of pernicious books being burnt by the hands of the hangman, or public herald; as in Diog. Laert. 9, 52. Tacit. Agr. 9. Juuv. Paulus 5, 23. Libros magicos exis apud se semenem habitum lievet, et si penea quoscunque repetiti sunt, bonis ademis, ambassadore, qua pro publice, in insulam deportantur, humiliores capite puniuntur. Liv. 40, 39. Libri in comitio, igne a victimariis facto, in conspectu populi cremati sunt.
if that were all, I should not think it of force enough to reject the interpretation; for I find by Sueton. Aug. 31. that such books were very numerous, and we have reason to suppose that they sold at a very high price. The words of that writer are these: "Quicquid fatidicorum librorum Graeci Latinique generis nullis, vel parum idoneis auctoribus vulgo ferebatur, supra duo millia, contracta undique, cremavit." However, if I rightly recollect, the word ἀργυρίου, when thus used, invariably stands for a drachm. So Polyb. 16, 36, 3. πεντ' ἀργυρίου, scil. δραχμαί, where see the Scholiast. We must, therefore understand drachms; as almost all Commentators now do. But one difficulty still meets us. Are we certain that Attic drachms were used in computation at Ephesus? I think not. Until, then, it can be determined what kind of drachms is here meant, we can never calculate the exact amount of the sum total. See Deyling on this passage, Lakem. Obs. Phil. 2, 153., and Fisch. de Vit. Lex. N. T. 3, 11. & 24, 12.

20. οὖν κατὰ κράτος ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου ἔχανε. Κατὰ κράτος has here the sense of vehementer, extremely. So Hesych. τελελος ἵσχυρος. See the examples of this sense adduced by Wets. and Munthe. The most apposite are from Plut. 2. 213 E. ἐτὶ καὶ ἔντος φίλος αὐτῷ κατὰ κράτος ἐσσωτε ἵστε κατὰ κράτος ἐλέγχεσθαι τῶν Πυθαγόρων. Thucyd. 1, 64. κατὰ κράτος ἡ Ποτισδάια—ἐπολιορκεῖτο. Αὐξάνειν and ἰσχύειν are terms nearly synonymous. Valckn. compares Luke 1, 80. τὸ παιδίου ἵσχαν καὶ ἐκραταίοντο; and Munthe, Diodor. Sic. 37 D. But in all these the terms used are not quite synonymous: and I prefer, with Schleusner, to explain ἰσχυε, auctoritate valuit, vim exseruit.

Ὅτως is well explained by Kuinoel, thus, viz. "after it had so plainly appeared how great a difference there was between the miracles of the Apostles and the tricks of those impostors;" the truth of Christ's
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doctrine thus effectually triumphing over Gentile superstition, &c.

21. ας δε ἐπηραῖθη ταῦτα, “when these things were fulfilled.” Many events referred to in the Epistles happened during this period. It is probable that Philemon, a convert of Paul, (Philem. ver. 19.) and Epaphras, afterwards a minister of the Church at Colosse, were converted about this time: Col. 1. 4, 7, 8. 2, 1, 4. 12, 13. The Apostle was also visited by several Christians from neighbouring parts, during his abode here, particularly by Sosthenes and Apollos from Corinth, and by some of the family of Chloe, a woman, as it seems, of some figure there, (1 Cor. 1, 11.) as also by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, all from the same place, (1 Cor. 16. 17.) and Onesiphorus, who afterwards visited him so affectionately at Rome, was, as Timothy had frequent opportunities of observing, very serviceable to the Apostle here (2 Tim. 1, 16—18). And there is great reason to believe he wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians from hence, (1 Cor. 17, 18.) and about this time; for it is plain that Aquila and Priscilla were then with him in Asia (1 Cor. 16, 19.) as they now were (Acts 18, 18, 19, 26.) ; that it was after Apollos had visited Corinth, had watered Paul’s plantation there, and was returned to Ephesus again (1 Cor. 8, 6, 16, 8, 12.) ; and that it was when Paul himself, having lately given a charge to the Galatian Churches on that head, (compare 1 Cor. 16, 1, 2. with Acts 18, 28.) intended a journey from Asia to the Macedonian and Corinthian Churches, and was sending Timothy to prepare his way. See 1 Cor. 4, 17, 19. 16, 5, 10. compared with the verse now before us, and that which follows. (Doddr.)

21. ἢθεν ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι. It is not certain from the original ἢθεν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι, whether this relates to a determination he was moved to by the Holy Spirit, by whom he was directed in his journeys, or (as Beza and Grotius suppose) to a purpose
he formed in his own mind. But as we find that he delayed the execution of it, and was by several circumstances led to alter his intended course, and to continue longer in his progress than he first designed, it seems more reasonable to refer it to his own spirit; nor is it unusual to insert the article, where it only relates to the human spirit. See Acts 17, 16. Rom. 1, 9, 8, 16. 1 Cor. 2, 11. 5, 5. 6, 20. Gal. 6, 18. Eph. 4, 23. Gr. Accordingly, Beza renders it, "statuit apud se," and Stephens, "induxit in omnium." (Dodd.)

And so the expression is understood by almost all recent Commentators, who take it for εἰς τὸ πρέπεια, and compare the Hebr. בִּֽֽבֵּ֖שׁ; though it is also used by the Classical writers. It may therefore be rendered resolved; took counsel, &c. And in this view Wets. compares Dan. 1, 8. Hagg. 2, 19. 1 Cor. 7, 37.

Kuinoel is of opinion that the Apostle meant to visit the Churches he had founded in Greece and Macedonia, and to collect a fund for the relief of the poorer Christians at Jerusalem. See Rom. 19, 25 & 26.

22. ἐπέσχε χρόνον. The verb ἐπέσχε signifies, 1st. to hold to; and, 2dly. to keep to, stay: and has a reflected force by the subaudition of ἔσχε. In the sense of stay it occurs frequently in the best authors, either without, or (as here) with the addition of an accusative (depending on κατά), denoting duration of time; of which many examples are adduced by Raphel, Wets. Munthe, and Loesner. I add Thucyd. 4, 124. δόο τῇ τιμίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπέσχε, where the Scholiast supplies the pronoun αὐτοῦ. Now the difference between the Classical and Hellenistical use is this; that in the former, the word denoting time, whether χρόνος or ἡμέρα, &c. has some numeral, or adjective denoting much, or little, or sometimes τις, which a Classical writer would have used in the present passage; though Hemsterhuis, in the Obser. Mis. t. 3. says, that there are instances in the Classics of
Χρήμα in this sense. We may compare our idiom, "to stay a while."

23. περί τῆς Ἰδου, i.e. "the Christian doctrine;"
as supra, ver. 9. and 22, 4.

24. ἀργυροκόπος, a silver-worker, a silver-smith.
Beza, Piscator, Scaliger, Waser, Valck., Wolf, and
others, understand a coiner, mint-master; and by
ναοῦς ἀργυροκόπος Ἀρτέμιδος, they think, are meant silver
coins, bearing the figure of the Temple at Ephesus.
This interpretation they support by a comparison
with certain Attic coin, which, from having on it
the impression of an ox, was called βωτής. It is, how-
ever, liable to not a few objections; and especially
to one suggested by Casaubon, namely, that there is
no good evidence that such coins were ever struck.
And I would add, that even supposing they were, so-
many workmen would surely not be necessary to
strike coins only, of which, when once the die was
cast, great numbers might be worked off with very
little trouble. It therefore seems safer, with Chry-
sostom, Camerarius, Erasmus, Salmasius, Hammond,
Grotius, and indeed most critics for the last cen-
tury, (as Wolf, Bp. Pearce, Rosenmuller, Schleusner,
and Kuinoel,) to understand by these ναοῦς small silver
models of the chapel,* in which perhaps a little image

* This temple, which was one of the seven wonders of the world,
was 425 feet long, 220 broad, and had as many as 177 columns of
60 feet high, of which 36 were carved. See Plin. H. N. 36. 16. 40.
The whole is, in Aristoph. Nub. 598. called golden. See Pausan.
Ach. 9. p. 707. and Pomp. Mel. 1, 17. This superb edifice Hero-
stratus set fire to on the day of Alexander the Great's birth. But as
only part of the structure was consumed, it was soon repaired, and
brought to a higher degree of magnificence than ever; as we learn
from Strabo 948 c. See Val. Max. 8, 14, 5., Cic. N. T. 2, 27.
Macrob. Satur. 2, 3., and Gell. N. A. 2, 6. For further particulars
of this temple may especially be consulted Gronov. Thes. Antiq. Gr. T.
8, p. 2646. seq., Deyling Obs. 4, 293., Wets. on ver. 35., and
Polck Diss. de Magnâ Ephesiorum Diana Lips. In this temple was
the famous statue of Diana, whose figure may be sufficiently known
from coins. Its ornaments and symbols have been accurately de-
scribed by Menetrius in a Diss. entitled Symbolica Diana Ephesiae.
and Deyling, ubi supra, p. 288. (Kuin.)
of the goddess Diana was placed. These were bought by strangers for curiosity or devotion, as are the models of the Santa Casa at Loretto by the pilgrims. So great, indeed, was the fame of the Ephesian Diana, and so great the reverence shewn her, that her effigy was worshipped with singular fervency by even the most remote and barbarous nations, and temples were by them dedicated to her. (See Deyling 292.) Thus persons were continually resorting to Ephesus, there to offer their gifts and sacrifices to this goddess, who, it will be remembered, presided not only over hunting, but the compounding of poisons, or drugs, (literally, pharmacy,) and was therefore worshipped by those who cultivated magic arts. She was regarded as the author and distributor of health and sickness, and was especially invoked by women in travail. See Callim. Hymn on Diana 124. seq. Since therefore Diana, and especially the Ephesian Diana, was the object of such reverential worship, great numbers of the above mentioned portable silver models of the chapel were manufactured. Foreigners, it seems, purchased these models, who either could not perform their devotions at the temple itself, or who, after having done so, carried them away as memorials, and for purposes of worship. For it was a custom (which had prevailed from the earliest ages) for worshippers of idols to carry with them these portable chapels made of wood or metal, in which were inclosed images of the gods or goddesses. These, I say, they carried with them in journeys for a safeguard; and sometimes sent them, by way of expiating an offence, to other towns, to be placed in the temples there.

All the above particulars have been proved and illustrated at large by Hammond, Wetstein, Munthe, Doughty (Anal. P. 2. p. 90 seq.), and Kuinoel, to which last-mentioned Commentator I have here been largely indebted. I have only to add, that as the term ἄργυροκόπος is a very general one, so it may.
denote any worker* in silver, and include not only founding and casting, or engraving, &c. but also stamping and coining; and it seems highly probable these workmen would provide memorials for any class of purchasers, and, among the rest, such coins as Beza and others mention. That the word may signify a silver-founder, is clear from Jer. 6, 29. (Sept.); and that it may also denote a coiner, is clear from Harpocrates; and finally, that it may denote a silver-smith, is proved by Plutarch 9, 301 & 473, Reiske, and also is evident from Hesychius.

For further information on this subject I must refer my readers to the learned and instructive annotations of Pricæus and Hammond,† to whom all succeeding Commentators have been deeply indebted.

24. Ἀρτέμιδος. The most rational derivation of this name is from Ἀρτέμις, either from this Goddess’s incorrupt virginity, or as presiding over health. So Liban. Opp. 2, 666. (cited by Kuin.) ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ

* Or properly smith, from κάτω, to smite. We may compare the antient name of trade in our own country, lead-beater (from whence the proper name). We had other names of trades ending with beater. Though in later times it became the custom to introduce instead thereof smith, which is of the very same force, being derived from the third person singular present tense indicative, smit-eth, and of course signifies any worker with the hammer.

† From these Commentators Wetstein has selected the following citations.

Michaelis and Kuinoel are of opinion that Demetrius had a considerable manufactory of such like models, and was not only a manufacturer, but the chief vender of them, and whose models the workmen followed. By the τεχνίται they understand the working silver-smiths, and by the ἐργάται the inferior mechanics employed in some of the rougher work about these portable chapels. This is indeed an ingenious notion (though not a new one, having been before brought forward by De Dieu); but, without a more accurate knowledge of the antiquities of the antient trades, nothing can be determined with certainty. I am inclined to suspect the above distinction between τεχνίταις and ἐργάταις is unfounded. The term ἐργάταις does not necessarily imply inferiority to τεχνίταις. It properly, indeed, signified an agricultural labourer (see the note on 2 Tim. 2, 15.), but was not unfrequently used, like our workman, to denote a handicraft, or mechanic. Thus in Xenoph. 2. 4, 5 & 22. it signifies a miner. But not to multiply examples, there is a passage instar omnium in Lucian 1, 13. who, speaking of a statuary, says: οὐδὲν γας ὅπι μὴ ἐργάταις ἔσῃ, “thou canst be but a handicraft, or mechanic.” And though, I admit, there is here a distinction intended between τεχνίταις and ἐργάταις, yet it is not I think, of the kind Michaelis and Kuinoel suppose. The term ἐργάταις was often applied, like τεκτῶν, to handicraft trades, and in general to those of the rougher sort; as working in wood and stone: and therefore I cannot assent to the opinion of Adami, that these were painters and sculptors, who were employed in adorning the models; for such, as being of silver, would not need their art. I would therefore understand by τῶν τερτῶν τοιούτων ἐργατῶν the workmen employed about similar kinds of works, (namely, works connected
with the Pagan religion,) such as statuaries, carvers, engravers, painters, &c.

Finally, by παρείχε τοῖς τεχνιταῖς ἐργασίαις οὐκ ἔληγεν, I would not understand, with Wolf and others, “gave much employment to,” but paid considerable wages to. It comes, indeed, to much the same thing; but I prefer, with most Commentators, the latter interpretation; especially as it is confirmed by Acts 16, 16. ἦτε ἐργασίαι πολλὰ παρεῖχε τοῖς Κυρίων αὐτῶν. Examples of this sense of ἐργασίαι are adduced by Wetstein from Xenoph., Demosth., Dionys. Hal., and Artemidorus. I add Polyb. 4, 30, 8. τὸς ἐκ τῆς βαλάντης ἐργασίας. See the note on 16, 16.

25. ἐπιστῶσθε δι' ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἐργασίας ἡ εἰσορία ἠμῶν ἐστι. Ἐπιστῶσθε is by almost all the Commentators rendered wealth. But to this I must demur; since the workers could few of them be wealthy. The sense has been best expressed by Pagn. and Casaubon, facultates; and not amiss rendered by the Vulgate, acquisitio. It may be Englished: “by this craft we have what we have.” Ἐπιστῶσθε is indeed a term of middle signification, and to be interpreted according to circumstances. I had occasion to make a similar observation supra, 11, 29. on καθώς ἦπορεῖτο τιρ. Hence the numerous examples amassed by Kypke and Munthe, to establish the sense wealth, are useless.

25. µετέστησεν, “has perverted.” This word signifies to change the position of any thing, to remove, whether from office, or from any present condition; also to withdraw, alienate the mind and affections, &c.; of which sense Kypke gives several examples. Πείσεαι, “by persuasion.”

26. οὐκ εἰσὶ Θεοὶ οἱ διὰ χειρῶν γενόμενοι. This is a not inelegant periphrasis for οἱ χειροτονητοί Θεοὶ. Wets. has very appositely cited Philo 2, 160, 8. κατάβη, πρὸς ἀνομίαν ἐπενεσθεν ὁ λεως, χειροτονητον κατασκευάζωτες ταυρόμορφον θεόν, οὗ θεόν προσκύνουσι καὶ θύουσι.
The Heathens [at least the profaneum valgenes. Edit.] supposed that the images made of gold, silver, wood, and stone, were the Gods themselves. This notion prevailed amongst almost all the Gentiles. Thus of the Grecians Plut. de Isid. and Os. p. 379, says: τὰ χαλκοῖ καὶ τὰ γρανίτα καὶ λιθίνα μὴ μαθόντες μὴ ἔσθητεν ἀγάλματα καὶ τιμᾶσθε θεῶν, ἀλλὰ θεοῖ καλεῖν. Hence those who manufactured the images were called θεοκοιλοι καὶ θεοκλάσται. (See J. Pol. 1, 3., Philo de Septem Miraculis 266., and Philostr. 6, 19. p. 255 seq.) Wherefore, on the images being removed, the common people complained that the Gods were taken away. Thus the Ambraecians in Liv. L. 38, 43. Tempula tota urbe spoliata ornamentis; simulacra Deum, Deos immo ipsos convulsos ex sedibus suis ablatos esse; parietes posteaque nudatos. Quos adoren, ad quos precentur et supplicent, Ambraecius in suo superstes. Nay, so fondly did (in their opinion) the Gods cling to their images, that they could scarcely leave the temples without each removing his image. This the Scholiast on Ἀσχίλ. Sept. 207. tells us happened at the destruction of Troy, when each, he says, retired πέρας ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἔντυσε. Indeed innumerable examples of this sort occur in different authors, which evidently show that the images were accounted as the Gods, and worshipped as such. Some however there were who used more cautious language, especially from the time that the first Christian teachers, following the example of St. Paul, had exploded this opinion, (torn from its seat by the most powerful arguments,) and had taught that that was not a God which was the work of man's hands. Neither, however, had reason and common sense so far deserted the Pagans, as that they believed they could make Gods, or supposed themselves inferior to wood and stone. Then, indeed, they would have been more stupid than the stones themselves; as Julian himself (though a determined idolater) admits. They therefore sent that gross fancy packing to the mob. See Porph. ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. 7, 3. p. 98. They themselves by no means supposed that the images were Gods, but that the Gods in illis lutiisae, and that hence they were θεία, καὶ θείας μετονομαζότων ἄναξα, Divine, and filled with the presence of the Deity. (See Spank. on Callim. H. in Poll. 52.) They did not, however, maintain that the Gods needed images, but only that they were invented in condescension to the weakness of men, and were as far removed from God, as heaven from earth; and on account of mental and moral imbecility could not εὑρεῖ τοῖν οὐρανοῖν ἀνατενόμοιείν τῇ ψυχῇ τῶ θείω ἐντυγγιάνειν, having been merely contrived as θεμελί τῆς πρὸς τὸ Θείων τιμῆς; καὶ ὅπερ χειραγωγία τις καὶ δῶς πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν; as has been seriously argued by Max. Tyr. Diss. 38., from which (says Porphyry) the well informed (καθανερ ἐκ βιβλίων ἀναλέγειν τὰ περὶ τῶν Θεῶν) gather Divine knowledge. Therefore they pretended to hold their statues in some honour, as being representatives of the Gods, worthy of every honour, inasmuch as διὸς ἐστι φιλοβασιλείως ἢ διός ὡς τῇ τῶν βασιλέων εἰκόνα, νῦν ουκ ἀλλὰ φιλοθεῖος, ἢ διός εἰς τῶν Θεῶν ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ εἰκόνα ἀποβλέπει σεβόμενος καὶ φρίτων ἐκ ἀφάνος ὄρων τις εἰς αὐτὸν τοιού Θεὸς, yet
that they did not adore the *statues*, but only the Gods, *who, as it were, resided in them*. See Julian 293.

Now can any thing more exactly resemble the sophisms of the Romish Church, by which it is accustomed to justify the worship of idols? No one can doubt this, who has any tolerable knowledge of the similar opinions entertained by the Heathen Philosophers and the Catholics. I certainly do not remember any Doctor of their Church who has so learnedly, eloquently, and copiously pleaded the cause of image worship as either Maximus Tyr. or Julian: and yet how forcibly and zealously did the first Christian teachers oppose those opinions; nor is there any doubt but that the very error which in the Pagans they had so powerfully and successfully opposed, they would have as strenuously resisted, had they lived to see it introduced into the Christian Church! How injurious to the Deity to bind him, the Supreme Lord of the Universe, to wood and stone, and to believe that a material substance, devoid of all sense, is a domicile worthy of such a Being? And what can be less consonant to Christ’s doctrine, than to seek God in images, who has assured us that he inhabits no where upon earth unless (and that in a peculiar mode) in the assembly of believers, and in the hearts of the faithful? (See 2 Cor. 6, 16. and Matt. 18, 20.) To think of worshipping Him in *wood*, who requires only such worshippers as shall worship him as a *Spirit immense*, i.e. in spirit and in truth. (Joh. 4, 21 & 23.) What more foolish than to suppose it possible for God to inhabit an image made at the pleasure of men, and often by the hands of the most depraved; and that a seat is assigned to him by ceremonies designed by human fancy? What more unworthy of a man than to bend before wood and stone, and kneel to a stock of a tree, matter infinitely inferior to himself?

These reflections are, indeed, so obvious, that they did not escape even the Pagans, who had nature only as their teacher and guide. See Lucian de Imag. And so Plutarch and Plato ap. Euseb. Prepar. Evang. L. 8. p. 99, who maintains *αυτε δεων ἀφομοιωτα τα βελτιων τοις χειρων, αυτη ἐφαπεθανε Θεον δυνατον ἄλλως ἄφανεν*.

An opinion which Plutarch (in Numà) both ascribes to the Pythagoreans and first Romans, and himself adopts: insomuch that he, and Sophocl. ap. Euseb. L. 13, 13. account all the makers of images as most audacious men, and sharply rebuke them; and hold all image-worship in detestation. On the sentiments of the Persian Magi see Diog. Laer. Proem. § 6.; and on those of the Seres and Indians, Bardeanes ap. Euseb. L. 6, 10. That Moses forbade the use of images is even mentioned by Strabo, p. 1104. (Elssner.)

In times like the present, when the errors of Popery have so many avowed defenders, or concealed advocates, the above able exposure of one of the most pernicious of them will, I trust, be considered as neither unseasonable, nor, to the sober-minded of whatever Protestant denomination, unacceptable.

There can, I think, be no doubt but that nearly all the Heathen writers above cited had amended their Theology from the truths of Christian revelation. And equally true it is, that almost every
argument, or rather plea, advanced in defence of image worship, 
had been before employed in the most masterly and powerful man-
ner, by Celcus, Porphyry, Hierocles, Julian, and others, from whom 
it is not too much to say, that some learned Romans may have 
borrowed the best of their arguments. But to such I would say, 
"non talii auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!"

27. οὗ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο κινδυνεῖ ημῖν τὸ μέρος. Some 
Commentators explain τὸ μέρος "this part of our 
religion." Others, "quod attinet ad." I prefer, 
however, the interpretation of Erasmus and others, 
which is learnedly defended by Valckn., and ad-
mitted by most recent Commentators; namely, "this 
matter, this our share of the common employment, 
this our business." So, too, it was understood by 
the Syriac and Arabic translators. For examples of 
this Kuinoel refers to 2 Cor. 9, 3. Sir. 37, 17. and 
Polyb. 1, 20, 8., to which I add from Scheihgeser's 
Lex. Polyb. 1, 20, 10. 2, 37, 10. And the same 
sense is found in other passages, as Scheihgeser tes-
tifies. The Dative ημῖν is for the Genitive.

But to pass from words to things it is shrewdly 
observed by Valckn.: "Sic callidus opifex Deme-
trius (et habuit in isthac parte per omnia secula 
suos imitatores) causam suam privatam tegit sub 
larvâ religionis." I am surprised that neither he 
or any of the Commentators should have thought 
of a very opposite passage of Aristoph. Pac. 1212., 
where Trugeus, by bringing about a peace, incurs 
the open hatred and hostility of the armourers and 
manufacturers of swords, shields, and helmets. The 
helmet-maker exclaims: οἷς, αἷς προδέλυμοι μ', αὖ 
Τρυγαί, ἀπάλεσας. Το. τί δ' ἕστιν, αὐ κακοδαιμον; οὖ 
τι τοῦ λοφᾶς; Λο. ἀπάλεσας μοι τὴν τεχνήν, καὶ τὸν 
βίον, καὶ τοῦτοι, καὶ τὸν δορυφόρον κενοῦτ.

27. εἰς ἄπελεγμον ἐλθεῖν, "to come into contempt." 
Now ἄπελεγμον signifies properly to be refuted, 
and, by a metonymy, to be rejected, despised, neg-
flected: a word used by Symmachus in Ps. 118, 118.

The simple noun ἔλεγμον is not unfrequently used 
by the Greek translators of the Old Testament.
27. τῆς μεγάλης βδέλι Αρτέμιδος ήερων εἰς ωδέν λογισθήναι. To be accounted for nought. The same expression occurs in Sap. 9, 6. εἰς ωδέν λογισθήναι.

27. μελέειν δὲ καὶ καθαιρεῖσαι. The construction is somewhat harsh, and, indeed, unusual; and therefore the passage has been treated as corrupt, and has been tinkered by both ancient and modern critics; for I consider the various readings of the few MSS. here noted as nothing else. But, in fact (as Kuinoel rightly remarks), no change is necessary, since the style is what we call popular, and the construction is, κινδυνεύει τὸ ήερών — λογισθήναι, τὴν τε μεγελειότητα αὐτῆς μελέειν καὶ καθαιρεῖσαι. I would render the καὶ even; but I am not without a suspicion that it arose from the καὶ following, since τε is very often followed by καὶ when placed between two infinitives. Μεγαλειον. signifies her magnificence, majesty. So Luke 9, 45. ἔξεπλησσόντο ἐπί τῆς μεγελειότητος τοῦ Θεοῦ, and 2 Pet. 1, 16. ἔποτα γενθήνετε τῆς ἐκείνου μεγελειότητος.

27. Ὑλὴ ἡ Ἀσία καὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη σέβεται. That the worship of Diana was extended over all the civilized world, especially Greece and Asia minor, has been shown by Spanh. on Callim. H. in Dian. 7., and Deyling ubi supra 292. seqq.

28. μεγάλη ἡ Αρτέμις Ἑ. Elsner has learnedly shown that the Gentiles used to apply the term μέγας not only to the twelve superior Deities,* but to those gods minorum gentium whose eminent achievements entitled them to that honour; as Serapis, Osiris, &c. The term is applied to Apollo by Virgil, to Bacchus by Artemidorus, to Mars and Saturn in an inscription ap. Rieaes. p. 124., and to Juno in Gruter p. 6. Thus Venus was, by the Saracens, worshipped under the name Хαδης, i.e. Great. And Ceres is called μεγάλη βδεί in Falconer. Inscr. p. 2302., and in Callim. Hymn on Ceres 122. &c. But why Diana of the Ephesians was called η μεγάλη, the great, may

* Though (he says) the epithet properly belonged only to Jupiter, yet it was transferred to all the twelve of the first order, hence called by Virgil, Æn. 2, 623. numina magna.
be learned from Pausan. Messen. C. 31, 6. e. 570. Fac. Still the use of the article seems to denote that the η μεγάλη was an epithet appropriated to Diana; in proof of which, the following passages, cited by Wets., may be considered as decisive. Aristid. p. 292. καὶ ἐβάσαν ἡ ἐν τῷ ὅνειρα, σοὶ ἀν ύπαρ τε καὶ ἀπ’ ὅνειρα τετελεσμένῳ μέγας ὁ Ἀσκληπιός. 295. τὸ πολυμυηνον ἰδὶ τοῦ βοώντων μέγας ὁ Ἀσκληπιός. Xenoph. Ephes. p. 1, 15. ὁμιόω τε τὴν πάτριαν ἲσυν, τὴν μεγάλην Ἑφεσίων Ἀρτεμιν, Achill. Tat. 8. p. 501. τῇ ἀρτεμῖς η μεγάλη θεὸς αἰμφότερος ἐσώε. To which may be added the following passage, cited by Valckn.

29. ἡλη συγχύσεως, a tumult, a tumultuary concourse of people. The Philologists refer to a similar use in Polyb., Diodor. Sic., Philostratus, and the Septuagint. It never, as far as I remember, occurs in the earlier writers.

29, ἀφροσαν ὁμοθυματιζόν εἰς τὸ θεάτρον, ὁμοθυματιζόν signifies here, as often, “together,” of which sense Krebs and Loesner produce examples; as Joseph. Ant. 15, 8, 2. ὁμοθυματιζόν εἴσαν. Philo 623. ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων ὁμοθυματιζόν εἴσανταν.

29. Εἰς τὸ θεάτρον. With the Greeks, and other states of Grecian origin, the theatre was used as a place of assembly for public business of every kind, and served for senate-house, town-hall, forum, &c.; and harangues to the people were there delivered. See the note on 12, 2. Indeed, all important political affairs were there transacted; war was declared, peace proclaimed, and criminals were executed. (Kuin.) This curious point of antiquity has been learnedly illustrated by Kaphel, Wets., Kypke, and Krebs.* Wets. well observes, that the very situa-

* Of whose Classical citations the following are the most important. Joseph. B. 3, 3. τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀντιοχείων ἐκκλησιαζόμενος εἰς τὸ θεάτρον, τῶν τε πατέρα τῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐνδεικνύον καθηγούν. Cic. pro Flacco, e. 7. Illa vetus Grecia, quae quondam opibus, imperio, gloriā floruit, hoc uno malo concidit, libertate immoderatā, ac licentiā concionum. Cum in theatro imperiti homines
tion of the place would, not a little, promote and increase the tumult, since, as we find from the accounts of those who (as Spohn. and Wheeler) have surveyed the situation of the temple of Diana, it was within view of the theatre.

29. συναφάσαντες Γάιον καὶ Ἀρισταχέων Μακεδώνας, συνεκδήμους τοῦ Παύλου. It is not quite clear what is the force of συνεκδήμος here, and in 2 Cor. 8, 19. Some render it fellow traveller; which is, indeed, its primary sense, but does not seem very suitable here. Others render fellow countryman. But that signification wants confirmation. (See Schl. Lex.) Most recent Commentators here adopt the interpretation of the Vulgate, comites, companions; which is supported by the Gloss. Vet.

29. συναφάσαντες, "seizing and hurrying away with them." These persons (of whom Γάιος is not to be confounded with the one mentioned in Rom. 16, 23., who was a Corinthian) are supposed by Kuinoel to have resided in the vicinity of Demetrius's house. Of Aristarchus, see 20, 4 & 27. 2 Col. 4, 10., and Philem. 24.

30. βέβαιαν τινα εἰσελθεὶν εἰς τὸν δήμον. The Greeks used the phrases εἰσελθεὶν and παρελθεῖν εἰς δήμον, and προσέβαι τῷ δήμῳ, of those who came forward to address the people in an oration.*

30. οὐκ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ, "the Christians would not suffer him:" from regard to his personal safety.


31. των τῶν Ἀσιαρχῶν. These Asiarchæ, who derived their appellation from the name of the province over which they presided (as Syriarchæ, Cypriarchæ, &c.) were, in Proconsular Asia (of which Ephesus was the metropolis), the chief presidents of the religious rites, whose office it also was to exhibit, in honour of the Gods, and the Roman Emperor, every year, solemn games in the theatre, at their own expense (like the Roman ædiles); whence none but the more opulent could bear this office, though it only lasted a year. The mode in which they were chosen was as follows:—At the beginning of every year (i.e. about the autumnal equinox) each of the cities of Asia held an assembly, in which they elected some one of their citizens to be put in nomination for this office. Then each town sent one ambassador to some certain city of importance in Proconsular Asia, such as Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardes; and others to the τὸ κοινόν, or common council of the nation, in order to publicly announce the name of him whom they had elected to be put in nomination, as Asiarch. Of those whom each of the cities of Asia had thus recommended, the common council created ten only as Asiarchs, and out of that number the Roman Proconsul chose the president of the sacred rites, sometimes called the Αρχερχιερας. Commentators, however, are not agreed on one point, namely, whether all who were designated by the public council of Asia performed this function together, or whether only one was elected Asiarch. In my opinion, one elected by the Proconsuls was κατ’ ἐξοχὴν styled ὁ Ἀσιαρχής, and the rest were his assessores, and themselves also styled Asiarchæ. Strabo, indeed (p. 960 α.), makes mention of many Asiarchs. But in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 4, 15., Polycarp is said to have suffered martyrdom when "Philip was Asiarch, and Statius Quadratus Proconsul of Asia." Moreover, the Asiarchs (as we find from the Greek authors) did not (as some have supposed) always reside at Ephesus, but also in other
cities to which the sacred rites of Asia were common; as Smyrna, Cyzicus, &c. (See Spanh. de Num. p. 694.) At the time when Paul abode at Ephesus, the Asiarch, with his colleagues, was, it seems, then in residence, and games were probably then in exhibition; from whence, however, it does not follow that the events here narrated took place at the solemn games. There is not in the whole narration any mention made of the Ephesian games. It must be observed, too, that even those who had discharged the office of Asiarch, used to have the title still bestowed on them by courtesy, (as was the case among the Jews with those who had filled the office of High Priest); so that the Asiarchs here mentioned may either have been those then in office, or who had been so. See Spah. ubi supra, Salmas. ad Solin. C. 40. p. 566., Van Dalen’s Diss. ad Antiquq. et Marm. p. 253. seqq., Hammond in loc., Schoettg. Diss., Deyling’s Obss. 8. 295., Wesseling’s Diss. de Asiarchis, 1758., Lintrup Spec. 2. Melet. Crit., and Zeibeich. Obss. ex nummis sacròs p. 86. (Kuin.)

To enlarge and illustrate the above admirable compendium of the best information on this subject, consult the copious Classical citations adduced by Wetso, of which the following are the most important. Phlegon. de mirab. who mentions an Ηταλιαρχός Strabo 989. who mentions a Λυκιαρχός. Philostrat. V. Sophist. 1, 21. άρχεισας μὲν άγένετο τῆς 'Asiaς κατ' αὐτὸν γενόμενος τὸ άνώτερον τών, παντός εἰς στατήσας τούτος ὁ άρχεισας οἰκίαν πολλὴν, καὶ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν χρημάτων. Libur. Ep. 1217., who mentions a Συριαρχός. Galen, too, and Hippocrates, call these Asiarchs άρχεισας, which, I conceive, is only applicable to the άσιαρχία, or principal Asiarch. I add Modestin. 6. 14. 'Άσιαρχία, Βιβλιαρχία, κατακώκερχία, έδωξε ιερόποιμοι. 31. παραεκάλουν μη δουλεύειν εἰς τὸ διάτορον. This, like the ωρησθεῖν εἰς ἀξιώματα just before, was a forensic, or political phrase of the same import with the former. At least, such is the opinion of Valckyn.
Kypke; in support of which they cite Joseph. Ant. 7, 9 & 15, 11. Diodor. Sic. 5, 99., and Cic. Verr. 3, 19. Populo se ac corone daturum. But in the passage of Joseph. and Diodor. the sense is, betake oneself to; which is not here suitable. The others from Demosth., Polyb., and Dionys., are more apposite (since there is here a sense of throwing oneself into danger), but εἰς κίνδυνον, or the like, is added. In this, therefore, consists the difference between this and the Classical usage: and thus it is to be considered as an Hellenistic idiom, or perhaps a Latinism; as we may judge from the passage of Cicero, which, after all, is the only apposite one.

32. Ἀλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλο τι ἐκατέργαζον, “now some were bawling one thing, and some another.* So 21, 34. Ἀλλοι δὲ ἄλλο τι ἔβολον. The student will observe this Greek phrase, which is highly elliptical and idiomatic.

The ἐκκλησία signifies the people assembled, as we say, the meeting, assembly. Deyling remarks that this was not a regular ἐκκλησία, since that, like the Latin concio, required to be legitimately convoked. This is very true; but ἐκκλησία was often applied to public meetings of the people, and even very tumultuary ones; though not, I think, in the earlier and purer writers. At this the Grammateus hints in his speech, when he says their requests shall be considered εἰ τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in the lawful assembly.

The words οἱ πλείως οὓς ἔδεισαν τίνος ἕνεκεν συνελθοῦσαν are a very lively picture of a tumultuous mob; with which Elsner compares a similar one of Plutarch 1, 1030.

33. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ σχολοῦ. Here times must, as often, be supplied. See Matt. 25, 34. and Joh. 16, 17. Προεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον, προβαλέντων αὐτῷ τῶν ἱσ-

On the construction, and, as depending thereon, the sense of, these words, the Commentators are much divided in opinion; which has been partly owing to somewhat of defect in point of perspicuity in style. Many adopt the following construction: \( \text{προβιβάζων Ἀλέξανδρον ἐκ τοῦ δακνοῦ}, \) and they render, "drove or thrust forward Alexander out of the multitude." But this interpretation the true force of \( \text{προβιβάζω} \) will not admit of, which must be, "they made him go forward, and set him up to speak." And if so, the construction of \( \text{ἐκ τοῦ δακνοῦ} \) must be adopted. In this sense most recent Critics take \( \text{προβιβάζων} \). But they have omitted to observe, that this word, and some other compounds of \( \text{βιβάζω} \), are used of setting up any one to speak. So Lucian 2, 899. ἄτόριος ἀναβιβάζωται τοὺς ἐρωτον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Polyb. 24, 8, 7. \( \text{προβιβάζειν τινα εἰς λόγους.} \) We may also advert to Thucyd. 3, 52 fin. αἰτησάμενοι μακρότερα εἰπεῖν, καὶ προτάξαντες σφῶν αὐτῶν Ἀστίμαχον. Hence it very frequently signifies to impel, urge, &c. Those who did it were, it seems, the better disposed of the multitude: and thus it is easy to see what is the sense of \( \text{προβαλόντων} \), which our Translators, closely following the metaphor, render, "putting him forward." Others, more intelligibly, recommending. This signification of \( \text{προβιβάζω} \) is frequent in the best writers, and examples of it are given by Kypke and Wets.; as Plut. Pericl. p. 157 ε. ἐς μὲν γὰρ εἰς τῶν κατηγόρων ὁ Περικλῆς ὕπο τοῦ δήμου προβεβηλήμενος. Thucyd. εμὲ προβάλλετε. But the most apposite passage I have yet seen is that cited by Wets. from Plutarch 1, 991 ε. Τύλλιον Κύμηρον ἐξ ἑαυτῶν προβάλλοντες: which is the more acceptable, since Kypke professes that he had not seen this signification in the active.

The circumstances of the narration are thus illustrated by Kuinoel: "The Ephesians had been fired with desire to vindicate the worship and honour of Diana, in opposition to the Jews. (v. 34.) For they accounted as Jews Cajus and Aristarchus, whom
they supposed to have offended against Diana. The Jews, therefore, on an uproar arising on all sides against them, appointed Alexander, who seems to have been an eloquent man, for the purpose of pleading to the people in their behalf, thus turning their fury from them, and making it fall upon Paul and the rest of the Christians.”

33. κατασέργας τὴν χειρα, “having motioned silence.” See the note on 12, 17. Here Kypke aptly cites Joseph, Ant. 8, 5. p. 281. τῇ χειρι κατασέργας, τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τῷ Ἱεροβαλμοῦ ἀκουσ αὕτων πρῶτον αὐτοῦ μεθ’ ἄγωγιας ἔστωσε.

It cannot be determined with certainty who this Alexander was. Some, as Beza, Grot., and Pearce, suppose him to have been the same with Alexander the copper-smith, mentioned in 2 Tim. 4, 14. But that is a mere conjecture, which has not even probability to recommend it. The name Alexander was a very common one. See Hammond.

33. ἤδεξεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δῆμῳ, “would have made a defence unto the people.” On the sense of these words, which certainly is not very obvious, there has been much diversity of opinion. Bishop Pearce strenuously maintains that τῷ δῆμῳ means for the people: and, in confirmation of this, he cites Arrian on Epict. 2, 26. But this is so rare a construction, that I question whether any other example of it could be found: and the introduction of it here seems to be not warranted by the context, or by the circumstances of the narrative. For to whom was the apology to be made? “To the recorder and magistrates, (says Bp. Pearce,) who seem to have been present almost from the first.” This, however, is very improbable. It is far more likely that they were drawn thither by the pertinacious shouting and clamour of the multitude.

34. οὖν ἔγενε — Ἐφεσίαν, “when they knew that Alexander was a Jew, and therefore probably a favourer of Paul, they broke out into a rage, and would not hear him; and, in order to drown his
voice, exclaimed incessantly for two hours," &c. This was, indeed, (as is observed by Chrysostom,) a most puerile device; not, however, unexampled; as appears from the following passages cited by Wetstein. Curt. 7, 27. Una vox erat, pari emissa consensu, ut innocentibus et fortibus viris parceretur. Dionys. Hal. V. 4, 37. κραυγὴς δὲ καὶ ἀγανακτήσεως εἷς ἀπάντων ἐπὶ τούτῳ γενομένης, συνπήγαν κελεύσας αὐτούς ἐξίου — κραυγῇ τε εἷς ἀπάντων ἐγένετο — τινὲς δὲ εἷς αὐτῶν καὶ βάλλειν Ταρκύνιοι ἐβοῶν.

35. καταστέλλαις δὲ ὁ γραμματεύς τῶν ἡγεμόνων. The rage, fury, and vociferation of the people was now repressed by the exertions and authority of the Grammateus, or Chancellor, who had been, it seems, sent to quell the sedition.

Καταστέλλαι signifies primarily to put down; and in this physical sense it occurs in Ps. 65, 8. (Aquila.) ὁ καταστέλλαι τὸ κύτος τῆς βαλάντος. See 4 Macc. 31. and 3 Macc. 6. It is, however, more frequently used in a metaphorical sense; of which Wets. cites as examples Plut. 2, 207 B. ὅρμουσιν καταστελλάς καταστέλλαις & 547 B. καταστέλλαι τοὺς μέγα τι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγοντας. Joseph. Ant. 14, 9, 1. καταστέλλαιν ὅρμουν & Vit. 1. καταστέλλαιν τοὺς στασιωδένες. See also Diodor. Sic. 1, 76., Philo 1, 569., and Porphyr. de abst. 4, 6.: and consult Krebs, Loesner, Kypke, and Munthe.

35. ὁ γραμματεύς. In defining the exact sense of this word, Commentators and Translators have varied considerably. It now seems pretty well agreed, that the word signifies some chief magistrate; though it is not easy to express this more specially by any term of modern languages. Be that, however, as it may, this officer was president of the senate, and united in himself the offices of Recorder, Chancellor, and Secretary of State. Among other of his duties was that of publicly reading aloud letters and state papers. All these functions Wets. illustrates by the following citations. Thucyd. 7, 10. τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἑπέδοσαν· ὁ δὲ γραμματεύς τῆς πόλεως παρελθὼν
Acts of the Apostles, Chap. XIX.

ἀνέγνω τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. Polyæn. 150. τοῦ δὲ γραμματεύως τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἀναγόντος, καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀποστέλλοντος. Malela p. 377. ἀνατίθηται—οὐκ αὐτὸς ὁ Zεὺς—ὁ δὲ γραμματεύως προσεχείσθη πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς θουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου Πολιτειανὸς κουσατάρι—ἐν τινα ἑτίμαν καὶ προσεκίουν, ὡς τινα Ἀπόλλωνα. Apollon. p. 398. Ἐφεσίων γραμματέως. Et in nummis Laodic. et Ephes. Ἐφεσίων. Ἀρχιερεὺς εὐθυκράτης, Γλαύκον γραμματέως—ἐπὶ παῖτον γραμματέως γραμματέως Ἀριστότεος. So also the Syriac primarius civitatis, i. e. head-man. From the passages of Malela, Apollonius, and the Coins, it appears to have been an office of the highest dignity. Hence I do not see with what propriety the Commentators have compared that of the γραμματεύως among the Athenians, in which there are few other points of resemblance than the name. On this office, Duker on Thucyd., ubi supra, refers to Pollux 8, 98., and the Commentators there: and he observes that it has been shewn by Petit, Spanheim, and the Scholiast in loc., that the office of γραμματεύως at Athens was not very honourable. It may possibly not have differed materially from that of our Town clerk. On this subject see also Schwartz in a Dissertation inserted in his Opusc. Acad. 280., Ellis's Fort. Sacr. 119., Fessel Adv. Sacr. L. 1, 1., Trotz. de scrib. Heb. Gr. et Rom. at the end of Hug's book, de primâ scribendi origine 477—513.

The speech of the γραμματεύως in question is invariably admitted to evince considerable judgment and prudence; and if not great ability (which Doddr. ascribes), yet not a little of what we call tact, or seeing promptly the gist of any question. He urges (to use the words of Doddridge) that there was no need of such a public declaration that they were votaries of Diana, since everybody knew it, ver. 35, 36.; that the persons accused were not guilty of any breach of the law, or public offence, ver. 37.; that if they were, this was not a legal method of prosecuting them, ver. 38. & 39.; and that they were
themselves liable to prosecution for such a tumultuous proceeding, ver. 40.

35. ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι, τίς γὰρ ἐστιν ἀνθρώπος. In this expression it may be noted, that γὰρ implies a reason for something going before; but here, as nothing was said before, it must be a reason for something that went before in the thoughts of the speaker. And this manner of introducing a speech is not to be tolerated, except on great and necessary occasions. An instance of it is given by Longinus de Sublim. sect. 22., where he quotes from Herodot. (6, 11.) these words at the beginning of a speech made by Dionysius of Phocæa, Ἔρωτος γὰρ ἀκμής ἔχειν ἥμιν τὰ πράγματα. "For our affairs are in the uttermost danger." (Bp. Pearce.)

Markland fills up the ellipsis thus: "Ye men of Ephesus [there is no need of all this clamour and repetition of, Great is Diana of the Ephesians] for what man is there," &c. And he observes that this dropping of a proposition is frequently used where a person speaks in a hurry, or with great earnestness. Here Wets. aptly compares Demosth. Olynth. 1. τίς ἐστιν ἐν ἔνδος ἐστιν ὑμῶν, ὡστε ἄγνοι τὸν ἐκείθεν πόλεμον δεῦτε ἐξοντα. See Van Dalen's Diss. ad Ant. et Marm. 425., and Deyling's Obs. S. P. 3, 299.

35. νεωκορὸν ὠςαν τ. μ. θ. 'Α. Νεωκόρος, originally, from the force of its etymology, signified a sweeper of the temple. Afterwards, however, from the humility of religious devotees, it was employed to denote aeditus, a curator, or one whose office it was to see that the temple was kept in good repair; neat, clean, and furnished with every thing proper for the celebration of worship; and therefore it was not dissimilar to our Churchwarden. In one thing, however, it differed materially, namely, that the office was thought to partake, in some degree, of the Sacerdotal. Of this functionary mention is made in Xen. Cyr. 5. (cited by Wets.) κατέλιπε παρὰ Μεγαθίσφ Εκ

* This manner of commencing a speech is peculiar to orators. (Markland.)
Finally, what was properly applicable only to a person, was transferred, by Prosopopeia, to cities, especially as it was usual to personify them. And thus, by an accommodation of the sense, it came to signify devoted, consecrated to,* and was used in reference to the tutelary Deities of a city.† It is not ill rendered by the Vulgate translator cultura. Dr. Doddridge, as usual, presses too much on the etymological force of the word, when he says it implies that the whole city was, as it were, an attendant devotee in Diana’s temple, and imports the humility with which they were ready to stoop to the lowest offices of service there. The term was by no means confined to Ephesus, but extended to many other cities of Greece and Asia minor (on which see a treatise of Rubenius in Græv. Thes. Ant. T. 11. p. 1347 seqq. de urbis neocoris). Nay, it sometimes happened that one and the same city was called νεωκόροι with respect to three, or even four, different gods, as is evident from the ancient coins. And so Plato de Legg. (cited by Wets.) καταρτικῶν ιερέων καὶ ιερείων νεωκορούς γίνονται τοῦ θεοῦ. See Van Dalen’s Dissert. ubi supra Diss. 4. p. 300., Ellis’s Fort. Sacr. 122., Seeleins’s Melet. Exeg. P. 1. p. 522. seqq.; and some other writers referred to by Kuinoel.

Of the numerous citations illustrative of the word and the office, brought forward by Wets., the following are the most important. Aristid. 2, 297. †

* This is admirably illustrated by the following passage of Ἑλλην, H. V. 3, 26. (cited by Wets.) συνεβολευσεν αἱ Πίνδαρος Ἑφεσίως, ἐπιδέονται τού τυλών, καὶ τοῦ τρυχῆν θύματα συμβαναὶ τοῖς κλοιον τοῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος νεω, οἷον τὴν κελῶν ἀνάθημα ὕπνατο εἰναι τῷ Ἀρτέμιδω.

† The νεωκόροι was an officer chosen by the Ephesians annually. Hence in some medals now extant, and struck upon occasion of the public shows there exhibited, are found inscriptions signifying that such an one was then the νεωκόροι, i.e. guardian, or warden of the temple. And these wardens being appointed by the citizens, the city itself was, properly enough, called (as it is here) the guardian, or warden of the temple of that Goddess. (Bp. Pearce.)
Acts of the Apostles, Chap. XIX.

οὐς ἦσεν ἐκαθόρισεν ἄνευ & B. 1, 7, 6. καθαρὰ τοῦ 
magnos Neocoros—aut prophetae, aut sacerdotum 
principes—Senapis in Aegyptio colit tur; hic adoratur 
—hujus simulacrum Neocororum turba custodit. 
Theodor. H. E. 9, 14 & 16. from whom it appears 
that these Neocori used to dispense what was the holy 
water of the Pagans. Strabo 6. Inscription e προσβάτα 
τον των νεωκόρων η φιλοσεβαστὸς Ἠφεσίων βουλή, καὶ τ 
νεωκόρος δήμος.

Wetstein has, too, an immense number of passages 
both on the city and temple of Ephesus, of which 
the following are the most curious and interesting. 
Dio. Chrys. 327 b., from whom it appears that the 
temple was used as the sacred treasury or bank of 
most of the civilized world. Thus it is called by 
Aristid. p. 522. τὸ ταμεῖον τὸ κοινὸ τῆς Ἀσίας.* By 
the time of Gallienus it was despoiled and burnt. 
From Artemid. 4, 5. it appears that no woman (by 
which, I suppose, he means married woman) was 
permitted to enter the temple. It was built at the 
common expense of all the cities of Asia, and is 
styled by Philo de sept. miraculis μόνος Θεόν οἶκος. 
Pliny says it took two hundred and twenty (or, as 
some copies read, one hundred and twenty) years in 
buiding. From Thucyd. 8, 104. and the Schol. we 
learn that there was an annual festival in honour of 
Diana at Ephesus, to which the Ionians generally 
resorted. The temple was (as we learn from Xenoph.) situated close by the river Sellinus. The 
image of the goddess (Pliny tells us) was of ebon (or, 
as some read, vine wood). Vitruv. says it was of 
cedar. All, however, agree that it had never been 
changed. We find by coins, and the descriptions of 
ancient writers, that the image was περίμενος (had

* And so the temple of Delos was to Greece; as appears from 
Thucyd. 1, 96. ταμεῖον Δήλος ἔν αἰνοίς. Generally speaking, in- 
deed, the temples were the bank, and only secure deposits of the 
antient world.
many breasts), and wore a sort of high-crowned cap, or mitre, with feet involved in the garments, and had two stags on the right and left.

35. καὶ τοῦ Διοπτερᾶ, scil. ἀγάλματος, which is supplied in Herodian 1, 11, 2, and by the Syriac and Arabic translators. Now the images of remote antiquity, of whose fabrication no record remained, were, by the priests (in order to work upon the superstition of the vulgar) said to have fallen from heaven. For in the passage of Herodian above-mentioned, it is said of the image of the mother of gods at Pessinus, τὸ ἄγαλμα Διοπτερᾶς, αἰς λέγουσιν, οὗτε δὲ τὴν ὑλήν, οὗτε τεχνιτῶν ὅστις ἐποιήσεν ἐγκαταστήσει, οὗτε ψυχῶν χειρῶς ἀνθρωπίνης.

For further information on this subject I must refer my readers to a Dissert. of Siberus, mentioned by Wolf, and a recent one by Amnel, Upsal 1748.

I must be permitted to observe, that though in all these accounts much may be attributed to sacerdotal imposture, yet not, as I conceive, all. Sometimes, I am inclined to believe, the material of the image might have fallen from the skies. Indeed, it is now admitted by natural philosophers, that very large stones have so fallen; and the subject has lately been treated at considerable length by various writers. Now as it is well known that sometimes these stones are of very grotesque shapes, so it is not improbable that formerly one of these, by a kind of lusus naturæ,


For the above examples I am chiefly indebted to Wetstein.
might bear a sort of rude resemblance to a bust, and as coming from the skies (i.e. from heaven and Jove) would, by the superstition of the priests and populace, be thought to have been sent from thence as an object of worship. Afterwards similar *aerolites* (as I think they are called) would be applied to the same purpose, and, not being *naturally* so shaped, would be formed by art, though *sometimes* left unformed; as seems to have been the case with the famous *black stone* in the Kaaba at Mecca, which has been several thousand years an object of worship, and of which a description may be seen in Ali Bey’s Travels, or in the Modern Traveller.

36, ἀναντίρρήτων οὖν ἄντων τούτων, “since these positions are undeniable true, irrefragable,” &c. This sense of ἀναντίρρητος is found in Job 11, 2, 33, 12, (Sym.), and also in Polyb. and Plutarch. One may compare δυσαντίρρητος, ἀναμφισβήτητος, ἀνατίλεκτος, ἀνατιφάντης. As, however, it is sup. *  

* Of this we have another remarkable example in Herodian 5, 3, where mentioning the temple of Heliogabalus, i.e. of the Sun, he says it had an image not χειροτονητόν, and yet Θεοῦ φέρον εἰκόνα. He then proceeds to give the following description of it: λίθος δὲ τις ἐκεῖ μέγιστος, κάτωθεν περιφέρει, λήγων εἰς δύσης κωμοιδές αὐτῷ σχῆμα, μελανά τε ἡ χρώμα διωκτὴρ τε αὐτὸν εἶναι σεμινολογοῦντα, ἐκώνα τε τινὰς βραχεῖας καὶ τίσους δεκαώσους, εἰκόνα τε ἡλίου ἀνέγιγματον εἰναι θελουν, οὕτως βλέποντες. The last words of this passage are generally considered as corrupt; and the Critics are not a little perplexed. Gedike would read οὕτως βλέπειν θέλουσι. But that is too bold a conjecture. I should prefer οὕτως βλέπειν θέλουσι. Yet how could so plain a sentence have been thus changed? I formerly suspected it was a futile marginal observation, and that the writer of it put down οὕτως βλέποντες. But a kindred passage a little further on (5, 4, 6, πιστεύσαντες ὡμοίωτα- 

τω, βλέπειν γὰρ οὕτως ἠθελον) confirms both the sentiment ascribed to the present passage by Sylburg, and, I think, the present reading. It is, in fact, an elliptical sentence, and requires to be supplied from the preceding clause, ὡς θέλουσι. Certainly θέλουσι may be repeated ἀπὸ τοῦ κοίνου, and of the apodotic particles οὕτως and ὡς, one is often left to be supplied. The sentiment itself is profound, but it is borrowed from: Thucyd. 3, 3, init. καὶ οἷς ἀνεθέσαντο πρῶτον τὰς καταγορίας, μείζον μέρος νέμοντες τῷ μη βούλεσθαι ἄλληθε εἶναι. Where I shall compare a considerable number of similar imitations.
posed that the President was favourably disposed to
the Christians, he might probably take shelter under
a dubious term. For this adjective form in ῥοσ not
only signifies what cannot be done, but what is not
done. And thus (as was long ago seen by Grotius) the
meaning of his words may be this: “There has been
nothing said against your διαστέθες, but only against
the χελώνωνα.” And so ἀναπτέρητος is used in
Polyb. 6, 7, 7. In the same light, too, the passage
is viewed by Bp. Pearce and Doddridge.

36. κατεσταλμένως, stayed, composed. See note
on ver. 35.

36. καὶ μὴ ἐὰν προετέρος πράττεις, “do nothing rash,
or precipitate, inconsiderate, and of which you may
afterwards repent.” Here there seems to be an
euphemism. The word προετέρος primarily denotes
what has tumbled forwards; and, like our word
headlong, signifies hasty, inconsiderate, rash, whether
in words, or deeds. So 2 Tim. 3, 4. προδέται, προετέρεις.
See Alberti on this passage, Herodian 1, 8, 11,
and Irmiach on that passage.

37. οὐγάγετε γὰρ τούς ἀνθρώπους τούτους. Here again
the γὰρ refers to a sentence omitted: q. d. “And
that you have been hasty and rash is certain, for you
have brought hither,” &c. “Αγευ is here used as in
Mark 13, 11. οὕτως ἐν εὐγένειαν υἱῶν παραδίδοντες, i. e.
“brought up as criminals.” Ιεροσόλυμα. By this
term was denoted any one who had been guilty of
laying hands on any thing sacred, whether to steal
or destroy. Examples of the latter especially are
frequent.

For τῶν θεῶν Griesbach and Matthiae have edited
τῶν θεῶν, from many MSS., Editions, and Fathers:
and the Commentators cite several examples from
the Greek writers. And they might have added
that it occurs frequently in Thucydides; ex. gr.
2, 18 & 15., where by τῶν θεῶν is meant Minerva.
Indeed this use of θεῶ is frequent in the best authors,
though it has often been removed by the ignorance
of the litterati. The question here is, whether Luke
was likely to use this Atticism? Now it does not occur in the Old Testament, nor is it found anywhere else in the New; whereas we have it just before; and though it is omitted in some MSS., yet these are so few, as not to afford ground for any just suspicion of its genuineness. I would therefore retain dear.

38. εἰ ἔχοντι πρὸς τινα λόγον. Most recent Commentators, following Beza, Camerarius, and Kypke, ascribe to λόγον the sense litum, a case at law, &c., like πράγμα in 1 Cor. 6, 1. And in this forensic signification the word was unquestionably used by the Classical writers, from whom the above Commentators cite several examples. But whether it be so employed here, may seem doubtful. It appears too elegant a term for St. Luke. I prefer, with Grotius, Hammond, Priceus, Markland, and others, to suppose λόγος here used, after the example of the Heb. פִּיא in Exod. 18, 16., for ἀντιλογία, by a subaudition of μορφής. So Col. 3, 18. ἐὰν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχῃ μορφήν. Sometimes in the place of λόγος we have τι; as in Acts 24, 19. εἰ τι ἔχων πρὸς με. So also Matt. 5, 23. ἔχει τι. Sometimes even the τι itself is left to be supplied; as in Δορικ. 2, 1. ἀλλ' ἔχω κατὰ σου, ὅτι.

38. ἀγοραίοι ἄγοντες, scil. ἰμέρας, "there are court days held (for hearing complaints and trying causes)."* The Latin version of the Cod. Cant. is: "conventus aguntur, forum agitur." See Suidas. Wets. adduces an example of this ellipsis from Strabo 932. τὰς ἀγοραίας παύουσιν καὶ τὰς δικαιοδοσίας. In which passage, however, κράτος is to be understood, rather than ἰμέρας. Thus Hesychius explains ἀγοραῖον by δικαιοδοσίας. Markland aptly compares that of Demosth. de Cor. p. 15. νέποι εἰσίν. Nor is the idiom unknown to the modern languages.

* Kuinoel here compares Senec. Controv. 3, 8. Quid costi (συμπεριφέρεται, v. 40.) opus est? sunt scriptae ad vindictam injurias omnium leges. And so Quintil. Declam. 13. (cited by Priceus); Nos iudeo magistratus legesque a majoribus nostris accepmus, ne sui quique doloris judex sit: et assidue seculum causes se refellant, si ultio crimen imitabitis.
38. καὶ ἄνθοτατοί εἰσίν. Commentators here stumble at the use of the plural, since there could be but one proconsul. To remove this difficulty many expedients have been devised by Beza, Grotius, Bis-coe, and others. The only probable one is, that the proconsul's legate may have been taken into the account. But it cannot be proved that such legates were ever called proconsuls, even by courtesy. Nor can we understand (with others) the proconsuls of other provinces then present at the games: still less proconsuls in succession. The simplest and most rational mode of accounting for the plural, is by supposing it to be a rhetorical hypallage, such as is frequently used by orators, both antient and modern. Indeed it is a popular idiom, the purport of which may be thus expressed: "It is for laws and proconsuls to decide such matters." And so the passage is understood by Markland, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel. See the paraphrases of Pearce and Markland.

38. ἔγκαλεῖτοσαν ἁλλήλοις, "let them implead each other, go to law with each other, have a suit against each other." The word is explained by Etym. Mag. ἔγκλησιν εἰσάγα, crimen intentare. It usually takes a genitive with περὶ or κατὰ. Examples of the dative, however, have been produced by Munthe from Diodor. Siculus. Xenoph. Cyr. 1, 26. has γίγνεται παῖσι πρὸς ἁλλήλοις ἐγκλήματα περὶ κλοπῆς which is equivalent to ἐγκαλοῦσιν ἁλλήλοις. See more on Herodian 1, 10, 5., and Stöber on T. Mag. 261. The Commentators might also have added Thucyd. 4, 123. ἐνεκάλει τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις παράδονει τὰς σφοδρὰς. Priceus aptly cites Hesiod: Διακρινόμεθα νεῖκος Ἰθέως δίκαιος, αἱ τ' ἐκ Διὸς εἰσίν ἀρισταίν.

39. εἰ δὲ τι περὶ ἑτέρων ἐπιτίθετε. It is not very clear what is meant by ἑτέρων, and Commentators are, as usual, not agreed. It should seem, from the

* So Isæus, p. 51, 3. ὅπως δικῶν, "though there was a power of seeking justice."
context, to mean "matters of public concern," whether political, or religious, adverting to the worship of Diana in question, which was under the management of the city. See Grot. and Pearce.

The reading of some MSS. περαιτέρω, is indeed very elegant, but unsuitably so for the occasion. It seems to have come from some learned polisher of the style of the New Testament, such as the one who has perpetually corrected the text of the Cod. Cant. Perhaps, too, he read, as did Theophylact, εἰ δὲ ἔτι, which may be confirmed by Thucyd. 3, 81. καὶ ἔτι περαιτέρω, where I shall adduce numerous examples of that idiom.

89. ἐν τῇ ἐνόμω ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκληνήθησεν, "it shall be decided in a legal assembly (which this is not)," such as is called the κυρία, from being regularly convoked and appointed. The expression occurs in Aristoph. Ach. 19. (cited by Wets.), where the Scholiast explains, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰ ψηφίσματα, εἰς δὲ νόμων ἐκκλησίας. So also Lucian. Deor. Concil. 14. ἐκκλησίας ἐνόμων ἐγραμένης. And many of these privileges were allowed to the Grecian cities in the exercise of that qualified αὐτοκρατία, which they still enjoyed under the Roman empire. The regular periods of assembly were three or four times a month; though there were extraordinary ones convoked for the despatch of any pressing business. (Grot. and Wets.) See Dorv. on Charit. p. 212. and Bp. Blomfield on Ἀσχηλ. Choeph. 479.

40. καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύωμεν. The γὰρ seems to have reference to a sentence omitted; q. d. "which this is not; for we are in danger," &c. The president, we may observe, uses the first for the second person, with a delicacy and propriety highly commendable.

Bishop Pearce makes a similar remark on the following words στάσεως and συντροφῆς. But his criticism seems not well founded. The latter is almost the only term which the president could have employed, to express the sense he intended; and as to the former, it is by no means a gentle appellation,
since it signifies insurrection, sedition, &c. The words which follow are exegetical, and confirmatory of the preceding, and plainly indicate what στάρτις, in the law acceptation, was, namely, an irregular assemblage of persons, in justification of which no good reason could be assigned. Such an one was regarded as a seditious concourse, and constituted a capital offence.

Συστροφή signifies an assemblage, and is also used in a bad sense, to denote mob.* Neither the Philological illustrators, nor Schl. Lex. nor Steph. The-saur. give any apt examples of this sense, except from Herodot. 7, 9, and Aristot. Polit. 5, 5. The following will therefore be acceptable: Dionys. Hal. 1, 358. ult. Sylb. σωμος ἡδη κατὰ συστροφὰς ἐγίνομαι. & 428, 39. κατὰ συστροφὰς καὶ ἐταιρίας—συμίστε. Joseph. p. 1204, 9. κατὰ συστροφὰς οἱ στρατιώται διε- λαλοῦν. Artemid. L. 2, 20. p. 174. Reif. κατ’ ἄγελας καὶ συστροφὰς, &c. These authors seem to have had in view Thucyd. 2, 21. κατὰ ξυστάσεις γιγνομένων where I shall indicate many other imitations of that passage.

By λόγος is here meant a good and lawful cause; as in 1 Pet. 3, 9. For (as Grotius remarks) there were allowable causes of assemblage, as a sudden attack of the enemy, fire, inundation, or any thing else which suddenly endangered human life: otherwise it was illegal, and constituted a capital offence.†

41. ἀπέλυσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. So Matth. 14, 15. ἀπι

* This word, of which the etymologists give no tolerable account, undoubtedly comes from the Latin moveo, the b and the v being here, as often, interchanged. So mota multudo, in Senec. Controv. 3, 8.
† Grotius and Kuinoel aptly cite the following passage of Seneca Controv. 3, 8. in which there is a similar use of concursus. Lex: qui cœtum et concursum fecerit, capitale sit.—Non quotiens convene- runt in aliquem locum plures, cetus et concursus est : sed quotiens convocati, quotiens parati quasi ad ducem suum concurrerunt. Non si una vicina coit, aut si transeuntium paucorum numerus affluxit; sed ubi totus, aut ex parte magnâ populus, ubi divisa est in partes civitas.—Quid cœtus opus est? Sunt scriptæ ad vindictam injuria- rum omnium leges. Mota semel multudo modum non servat.
λυσον τως διαλαυς. The Classical writers use either the simple λύω or διαλύω. This *dismission* was generally couched under some appropriate term; as in Thucyd. 2, 46. ἐπίτε. Joseph. 68, 18. 231, 8. Dionys. Hal. 391, 45. and many other passages, which I adduce, on Thucyd. The Latin orators used *licit*.

END OF VOL. IV.