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PREFACE TO THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION.

The third edition of this Commentary appeared in the year 1861. The accessions to the exegetical literature of the Book of Acts since that date have been on the whole meagre; and they have been chiefly directed to the investigation of certain specially important facts which are recorded in the Book, as regards their miraculous character and their relation to the Pauline Epistles.\(^1\) The critical researches as to this canonical writing are, doubtless, not yet concluded; but they are in such a position that we must regard the attempts—prosecuted with so much keenness, confidence, and acuteness—to make the Book of Acts appear an intentional medley of truth and fiction like a historical romance, as having utterly failed. To this result several able apologetic works have within the last ten years contributed their part, while the criticism which finds "purpose" everywhere has been less active, and has not brought forward arguments more cogent than those already so often discussed. Even the new edition of the chief work of Baur, in which its now departed author has devoted his last scientific labours to the contents of the Acts of the Apostles, furnishes nothing essentially new, and it touches only here and there on the objections urged by his opponents.

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

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

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

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

¹ Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien und der evang. Geschichte, Gotha, 1869.
pendent study, till nearly half of my book was already finished and in type. But it has reference for the most part to the Gospels and their Chronology, the investigation of which, however, extends in many cases also into the Book of Acts. The arguments adduced by Wieseler in his tenth *Beitrag*, with his wonted thoughtfulness and depth of research, in proof of the agreement of Luke xxiv. 44 ff. and Acts i. 1, have not availed to shake me in my view that here the Book of Acts follows a different tradition from the Gospel.

**Hannover, October 22, 1869.**

**Dr. Meyer.**
PREFATORY NOTE.

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

Glasgow College, May, 1877.

W. P. D.
EXEGETICAL LITERATURE.

[For commentaries and collections of notes embracing the whole New Testament, see Preface to the Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew. The following list consists mainly of works which deal with the Acts of the Apostles in particular. Several of the works named, especially of the older, are chiefly doctrinal or homiletic in their character; while some more recent books, dealing with the history and chronology of the apostolic age, or with the life of St. Paul, or with the genuineness of the Book of Acts, have been included because of the special bearing of their discussions on its contents. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by Meyer in loc. The editions quoted are usually the earliest; al. appended denotes that the work has been more or less frequently reprinted; † marks the date of the author’s death; c = circa, an approximation to it.]
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Du Veil. See Veil (Charles Marie de).
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ERRATA.

On pages 33, 35, and 36, for the letters (p), (m), and (r), indicating the notes appended to the chapter, read (m), (r), and (r) respectively.
PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

New York, January 6, 1882.

W. Ormiston.
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<td>F</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>His brethren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fate of Judas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Thou, Lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>The Lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Other tongues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Parousia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sadducees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Annas the high priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>For we cannot but speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Stated prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>All things common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ananias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Peter's shadow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Thendas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>A murmuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Seven men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>The face of an angel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Stephen's speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Historical errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Abraham's call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Death of Terah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Four hundred years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Jacob's burial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Cast out... children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>An angel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>A great persecution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Devout men carried Stephen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Simon believed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Samaritans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Mission of Peter and John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>They received the Holy Ghost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Saul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Damascus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>A light from heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Stood speechless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Many days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Peter and Paul—Lydda and Joppa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Conversion of Cornelius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>A devout man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Fell into a trance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Accepted with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>They of the circumcision contended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Antioc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Herod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>He killed James.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Peter in prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Death of Herod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Special documentary source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Prophets and teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>John as an attendant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Second psalm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Paul's sermon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Iconium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>An assault made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Cities of Lycaonia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Gods in the likeness of men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Chosen them elders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Except ye be circumcised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Apostles and elders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>James answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Paul's visits to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Send greeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Verse supposed spurious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>The contention of Paul and Barnabas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>We endeavored to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>The chief city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Baptism of Lydia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>The inner prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>And washed their stripes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Thessalonica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Honorable women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Timothy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>The market-place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>An unknown God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Corinth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Gallio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Having shorn his head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Apollos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Ephesus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Whether there be any Holy Ghost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Exorcists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>He dismissed the assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>After the uproar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>18–38</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>ἡ ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>413</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>Paul's address at Miletus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>Rhodes and Patara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>Disciples at Tyre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Philip's four daughters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Tarried many days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>Paul purifying himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>I did not know that he is the high priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²</td>
<td>XXIII.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>Pharisees and Sadducees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>The Lord stood by him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>Paul's sister's son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A²</td>
<td>XXIV.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Tertullus began to accuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>According to our law, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G²</td>
<td>XXV.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>Felix trembled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>I appeal to Caesar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>XXVI.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Unto my Lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G²</td>
<td>XXVII.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>Almost thou persuadest me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>And he put us therein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Fair Havens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Toward the N. W. and S. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>Euroclydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>The angel of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>They cast four anchors out of the stern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>XXVIII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>Except these abide, ye cannot be saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>Melita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>This sect spoken against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Two whole years in his own hired house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>Paul's second imprisonment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidential value of the Acts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. I.—AUTHORSHIP AND GENUINENESS OF THE BOOK.

The fifth historical book of the New Testament, already named in early Christian antiquity (Canon Murat., Clem. Al. Strom. v. 12, p. 696, ed. Potter, Tertull. c. Marc. v. 3 f., de jejun. 10, de bapt. 10; comp. also Iren. adv. haer. iii. 14. 1, iii. 15. 1) from its chief contents πράξεως (τῶν) ἀποστόλων, announces itself (i. 1) as a second work of the same author who wrote the Gospel dedicated to Theophilus. The Acts of the Apostles is therefore justly considered as a portion of the historical work of Luke, following up that Gospel, and continuing the history of early Christianity from the ascension of Christ to the captivity of Paul at Rome; and no other but Luke is named by the ancient orthodox church as author of the book, which is included by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 25, among the Homologoumena. There is indeed no definite reference made to the Acts by the Apostolic Fathers, as the passages, Ignat. ad Smyrn. 3 (comp. Acts x. 41), and Polycarp, ad Phil. 1 (comp. Acts ii. 24), cannot even be with certainty regarded as special reminiscences of it; and the same remark holds good as to allusions in Justin and Tatian. But, since the time of Irenæus, the Fathers have frequently made literal quotations from the book (see also the Epistle of the churches at Vienne and Lyons in Eus. v. 2), and have expressly designated it as the work of Luke (A). With this fact before us, the passage in Photius, Quaest. Amphiloch. 145 (see Wolf Cur. IV. p. 781, Schmidt in Stäudlin’s Kirchenhist. Archiv. I. p. 15), might appear strange: τὸν δὲ συγγραφέα τῶν πράξεων οἱ μὲν Κλήμεντα λέγουσι τὸν Ρώμης, άλλου δὲ Βαρνάβαν καὶ άλλου Λουκᾶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν, but this statement as to Clement and Barnabas stands so completely isolated, unsupported by any other notice of ecclesiastical antiquity, that it can only have reference to some arbitrary assumption of individuals who knew little or nothing of the book. Were it otherwise, the Gospel of Luke must also have been alleged to be a work of Clement or Barnabas; but of this there is not the slightest trace. That the Book of Acts was in reality much less known and read than the Gospels, the interest of which was the most general, immediate, and supreme, and than the N. T. Epistles, which were destined at once for whole churches, and, inferentially, for yet wider circles, is evident from Chrysostom, Hom. I.: πολλοῖς τοντι τὸ βιβλίον οὐδ’ δτι ενι, γνώριμων

1 It cannot be a matter of surprise that our ed. codd. name no author in the superscription (only some minuscule name Luke), since there are not several “Acts of the Apostles” in the Canon, as there are several Gospels, needing distinctive designation by the names of their authors. Comp. Ewald, Jahrb. IX. p. 57.
And thus it is no wonder if many, who knew only of the existence of the Book of Acts, but had never read it (for the very first verse must have pointed them to Luke), guessed at this or that celebrated teacher, at Clement or Barnabas, as its author. Photius himself, on the other hand, concurs in the judgment of the church, for which he assigns the proper grounds: Αὐτὸς δὲ Λουκᾶς ἐπηρεῖται. Πρῶτον μὲν ζε ὡς πιστομαζέω, ὡς καὶ ἔτηρα αὐτῷ προσγαματεί, τὰς δὲ πράξεις παρέχουσα πράξεις καταβέβληται. Δεύτερον δὲ, ζε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἑαυτού εὐαγγελιστῶν διαστέλλεται, ὅτι μέχρι τῆς ἀναλήψεως οὐκέτι ἄλλων τὸ συντάγμα προελθείν ἐπιστάσατο, ἀλλ' οὗτος μόνος καὶ τὴν ἀνάληψιν ἀκριβῶς ἔγειρε, καὶ πάλιν τὴν τῶν πράξεων ἀπαρχήν ἀπὸ ταύτης ἑπιστάσατο. Moreover, so early an ecclesiastical recognition of the canonicity of this book would be inexplicable, if the teachers of the church had not from the very first recognized it as a second work of Luke, to which, as well as to the Gospel, apostolic (Pauline) authority belonged.

The weight of this ancient recognition by the church is not weakened by the rejection of the book on the part of certain heretical parties; for this affected only its validity as an authoritative standard, and was based entirely on dogmatic, particularly on anti-Pauline, motives. This was the case with the Ebionites (Epiph. Haer. xxx. 16), to whom the reception of the Gentiles into Christianity was repugnant; with the Severians (Euseb. ii. 29), whose ascetic principles were incompatible with the doctrines of Paul; with the Marcionites (Tertull. c. Marc. v. 2, de praescr. 22), who could not endure what was taught in the Acts concerning the connection of Judaism and Christianity; and with the Manichaens, who took offence at the mission of the Holy Spirit, to which it bears testimony (Augustin. de utilit. credendi, ii. 7, epist. 237 [al. 253], No. 2).—From these circumstances—the less measure of acquaintance with the book, and the less degree of veneration for it—is to be explained the somewhat arbitrary treatment of the text, which is still apparent in codd. (particularly D and E) and versions (Ital. and Syr.), although Bornemann (Acta apost. ad Codicis Cantabrig. fidem rec. 1848) saw in cod. D the most original form of the text ("agmen ducit codex D hau dubie ex autographo haustus," p. xxviii.), which was an evident error.


---

1 So much the less can it be assumed with certainty, from the fragment of Papiae, preserved by Apollinaris, on the death of Judas (of which the different forms of the text may be seen, (1) in Theophyl. on Acts I. 18, and Cramer, Cat. in Act. p. 19 f.; (2) in Oecum. I. p. 11, Cramer, Cat. in Matth. p. 281, and Boissonade, Anecd. II. p. 468; (3) Scholion in Mathesil on Acts I. 18), that Papiae had in view the narrative of the event in the Acts, and wished to reconcile it with that of Matthew. He gives a legend respecting the death of Judas, differing from that of Matthew and the Acts, and independent of both. See the dissertations on this point: Zahn in the Stud. u. Krit. 1866, p. 649 ff., and in opposition to him, Overbeck in Hilgenf. Zeitschr. 1867, p. 35 ff.; also Stieitz in the Stud. u. Krit. 1868, p. 57 ff.
references of individual passages (de Wette, Einl. § 115, and Zeller, p. 408 ff.), and also from that unity in the tenor and connection of the essential leading ideas (see Lekebusch, p. 89) which pervades the whole. This similarity is of such a nature that it is compatible with a more or less independent manipulation of different documentary sources, but not with the hypothesis of an aggregation of such documentary sources, which are strung together with little essential alteration (Schleiermacher’s view; comp. also Schwanbeck, über d. Quellen der Schriften des Luk. I. p. 258, and earlier, Königsman, de fontibus, etc., 1798, in Pott’s Synlogs, III. p. 215 ff.). The same peculiarities pervade the Acts and the Gospel, and evince the unity of authorship and the unity of literary character as to both books. See Zeller, p. 414 ff. In the passages xvi. 10–17, xx. 5–15, xxi. 1–18, xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16, the author expressly by “we” includes himself as an eye-witness and sharer in the events related. According to Schleiermacher, these portions—belonging to the memoirs, strung together without elaboration, of which the book is composed—proceed from Timothy, a hypothesis supported by Bleek (in his Einl., and earlier in the Stud. u. Krit. 1836, p. 1025 ff., p. 1046 ff.), Ulrich (Stud. u. Krit. 1837, p. 367 ff., 1840, p. 1003 ff.), and de Wette, and consistently worked out by Mayerhoff (Einl. in d. Petr. Schr. p. 6 ff.) to the extent of ascribing the whole book to Timothy; whereas Schwanbeck seeks to assign these sections, as well as in general almost all from xv. 1 onwards, to Silas. But the reasons, brought forward against the view that Luke is the narrator using the we, are wholly unimportant. For, not to mention that it is much more natural to refer the unnamed I of that narrative in the first person plural to Luke, who is not elsewhere named in the book, than to Timothy and Silas, who are elsewhere mentioned by name and distinguished from the subject of the we; and apart also from the entire arbitrariness of the assertion that Luke could not have made his appearance and taken part for the first time at xvi. 10; the circumstance that in the Epistle to the Philippians no mention of Luke occurs, although the most plausible ground of the objectors, is still merely such in semblance. How long had Luke, at that time, been absent from Philippi! How probable, moreover, that Paul, who sent his letter to the Philippians by means of Epaphroditus, left it to the latter to communicate orally the personal information which was of interest to them, and therefore adds in the Epistle only such summary salutations as iv. 29! And how possible, in fine, that Luke, at the time of the composition of the Philippian Epistle, was temporarily absent from Rome, which is strongly supported, and, indeed, is required to be

1 Assuming, with extreme arbitrariness, that the redactor has in xvi. 10 ff., misled by the preceding ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῖν (I), copied the first person after the Silas-document, and only in ver. 19 felt the necessity of changing the ἡμῖν of Silas into the names concerned, in doing which, however, he has forgotten to include the name of Timothy. See Schwanbeck, p. 270 f., who has many other instances of arbitrariness, e.g. that ἀδρας ἱγινα ἐν τοις ἱδιοῖς, xvi. 33, stood in the Silas-document after ἐκλεγμένοις, and other similar statements, which refute themselves. The holding Luke and Silas as identical (van Vioten in Hilgenf. Zeitsschr. 1867, p. 228 f.) was perhaps only a passing etymological fancy (Lucus, silva). See, in opposition to it, Cropp in Hilgenf. Zeitsschr. 1868, p. 383 ff.
assumed by Phil. ii. 20 f., comp. on Phil. ii. 21. The non-mention of Luke in the Epistles to the Thessalonians is an unserviceable argumentum e silentio (see Lekebusch, p. 395); and the greater vividness of delineation, which is said to prevail where Timothy is present, cannot prove anything in contradistinction to the vividness of other parts in which he is not concerned. On the other hand, in those portions in which the "we" introduces the eye-witness, the manipulation of the Greek language, independent of written documents, exhibits the greatest similarity to the peculiar colouring of Luke's diction as it appears in the independent portions of the Gospel. It is incorrect to suppose that the specification of time according to the Jewish festivals, xx. 6, xxvii. 9, suits Timothy better than Luke, for the designations of the Jewish festivals must have been everywhere familiar in the early Christian church from its connection with Judaism, and particularly in the Pauline circles in which Luke, as well as Timothy, moved. The insuperable difficulties by which both the Timothy-hypothesis, already excluded by xx. 4 f., and the Silas-hypothesis, untenable throughout, are clogged, only serve more strongly to confirm the tradition of the church that Luke, as author of the whole book, is the person speaking in those sections in which "we" occurs. See Lekebusch, p. 140 ff.; Zeller, p. 454 ff.; Ewald, Gesch. d. Apost. Zeitalt. p. 38 ff., and Jahrb. IX. p. 50 ff.; Klostermann, l.c.; Oertel, Paul. in d. Apostelgesch. p. 8 ff. In the "we" the person primarily narrating must have been the "I," with which the whole book begins. No other understanding of the matter could have occurred either to Theophilus or to other readers. The hypothesis already propounded by Königsmann, on the other hand, that Luke had allowed the "we" derived from the memoir of another to remain unchanged, as well as the converse fancy of Gfrörer (Heil. Sage, II. p. 244 f.), impute to the author something bordering on an unintelligible mechanical process, such as is doubtless found in insipid chroniclers of the Middle Ages (examples in Schwanbeck, p. 188 ff.), but must appear utterly alien and completely unsuitable for comparison in presence of such company as we have here.

Recent criticism, however, has contended that the Acts could not be composed at all by a companion of the Apostle Paul (de Wette, Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, and others). For this purpose they have alleged contradictions with the Pauline Epistles (ix. 19, 23, 25–28, xi. 90, compared with Gal. i. 17–19, ii. 1; xvii. 18 f., xviii. 5, with 1 Thess. iii. 1 f.), inadequate accounts (xvi. 6, xviii. 22 f., xxvii. 30 f.), omission of facts (1 Cor. xv. 32; 2 Cor. i. 8, xi. 25 f.; Rom. xv. 19, xvi. 3 f.), and the partially unhistorical character of the first portion of the book (according to de Wette, particularly ii. 5–11), which is even alleged to be "a continuous fiction" (Schwegler, nachapostol. Zeitalt. I. p. 90, II. p. 111 f.). They have discovered un-Pauline miracles (xxviii. 7–10), un-Pauline speeches and actions (xxi. 20 ff., xxiii. 6 ff., chap. xxii., xxvi.), an un-Pauline attitude (towards Jews and Jewish-Christians: approval of the

---

apostolic decree). It is alleged that the formation of legend in the book (particularly the narrative of Simon and of Pentecost) belongs to a later period, and that the entire tendency of the writing (see sec. 2) points to a later stage of ecclesiastical development (see especially Zeller, p. 470 ff.); also that its politically apologetic design leads us to the time of Trajan, or later (Schwegler, II. p. 119); that the ἡμεῖς in the narrative of the travels (held even by Köstlin, Uebr. d. Synopt. Evang. p. 292, to be the genuine narrative of a friend of the apostle) is designedly allowed to stand by the author of the book, who wishes to be recognized thereby as a companion of the Apostle (according to Köstlin: for the purpose of strengthening the credibility and the impression of the apologetic representation); and that the Book of Acts is "the work of a Pauline member of the Roman church, the time of the composition of which may most probably be placed between the years 110 and 125, or even 130 after Christ" (Zeller, p. 488). But all these and similar grounds do not prove what they are alleged to prove, and do not avail to overthrow the ancient ecclesiastical recognition. For although the book actually contains various matters, in which it must receive correction from the Pauline Epistles; although the history, even of Paul the apostle, is handled in it imperfectly and, in part, inadequately; although in the first portion, here and there, a post-apostolic formation of legend is unmistakeable; yet all these elements are compatible with its being the work of a companion of the apostle, who, not emerging as such earlier than chap. xvi., only undertook to write the history some time after the apostle's death, and who, when his personal knowledge failed, was dependent on tradition developed orally and in writing, partly legendary, because he had not from the first entertained the design of writing a history, and had now, in great measure, to content himself with the matter and the form given to him by the tradition, in the atmosphere of which he himself lived. Elements really un-Pauline cannot be shown to exist in it, and the impress of a definite tendency in the book, which is alleged to betray a later stage of ecclesiastical development, is simply imputed to it by the critics. The We-narrative, with its vivid and direct impress of personal participation, always remains a strong testimony in favour of a companion of the apostle as author of the whole book, of which that narrative is a part; to separate the subject of that narrative from the author of the whole, is a procedure of sceptical caprice. The surprisingly abridged and abrupt conclusion of the book, and the silence concerning the last labours and fate of the Apostle Paul, as well as the silence concerning the similar fate of Peter, are phenomena which are intelligible only on the supposition of a real and candid companion of the apostle being prevented by circumstances from continuing his narrative, but would be altogether inconceivable in the case of an author not writing till the second century, and manipulating with a definite tendency the historical materials before him,—inconceivable, because utterly at variance with his supposed designs. The hypothesis, in fine, that the tradition of Luke's authorship rests solely on an erroneous inference from the ἡμεῖς in the narrative of the travels (comp. Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; see especially
assumed by Phil. ii. 20 f., comp. on Phil. ii. 21. The non-mention of Luke in the Epistles to the Thessalonians is an unserviceable *argumentum a silentio* (see Lekebusch, p. 395); and the greater vividness of delineation, which is said to prevail where Timothy is present, cannot prove anything in contradistinction to the vividness of other parts in which he is not concerned. On the other hand, in those portions in which the "we" introduces the eye-witness,1 the manipulation of the Greek language, independent of written documents, exhibits the greatest similarity to the peculiar colouring of Luke's diction as it appears in the independent portions of the Gospel. It is incorrect to suppose that the specification of time according to the Jewish festivals, xx. 6, xxvii. 9, suits Timothy better than Luke, for the designations of the Jewish festivals must have been everywhere familiar in the early Christian church from its connection with Judaism, and particularly in the Pauline circles in which Luke, as well as Timothy, moved. The insuperable difficulties by which both the Timothy-hypothesis, already excluded by xx. 4 f., and the Silas-hypothesis, untenable throughout, are clogged, only serve more strongly to confirm the tradition of the church that Luke, as author of the whole book, is the person speaking in those sections in which "we" occurs. See Lekebusch, p. 140 ff.; Zeller, p. 454 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. d. Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 33 ff., and *Jahrb. IX.* p. 50 ff.; Klostermann, *l.c.;* Oertel, *Paul. in d. Apostelgesch.* p. 8 ff. In the "we" the person primarily narrating must have been the "I," with which the whole book begins. No other understanding of the matter could have occurred either to Theophilus or to other readers. The hypothesis already propounded by Königsman, on the other hand, that Luke had allowed the "we" derived from the memoir of another to remain unchanged, as well as the converse fancy of Gfrörer (*heil. Sage*, II. p. 244 f.), impute to the author something bordering on an unintelligent mechanical process, such as is doubtless found in insipid chroniclers of the Middle Ages (examples in Schwanbeck, p. 188 ff.), but must appear utterly alien and completely unsuitable for comparison in presence of such company as we have here.

Recent criticism, however, has contended that the Acts could not be composed at all by a companion of the Apostle Paul (de Wette, Baur, Schwe格尔, Zeller, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, and others). For this purpose they have alleged contradictions with the Pauline Epistles (ix. 19, 28, 25-28, xi. 30, compared with Gal. i. 17-19, ii. 1; xvii. 16 f., xviii. 5, with 1 Thess. iii. 1 f.), inadequate accounts (xvi. 6, xviii. 22 f., xxviii. 30 f.), omission of facts (1 Cor. xx. 33; 2 Cor. i. 8, xi. 25 f.; Rom. xv. 19, xvi. 3 f.), and the partially unhistorical character of the first portion of the book (according to de Wette, particularly ii. 5-11), which is even alleged to be "a continuous fiction" (Schwegler, *nachapostol. Zeitalt.* I. p. 90, II. p. 111 f.). They have discovered un-Pauline miracles (xxviii. 7-10), un-Pauline speeches and actions (xxi. 20 ff., xxiii. 6 ff., chap. xxii., xxvi.), an un-Pauline attitude (towards Jews and Jewish-Christians: approval of the
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GENUINENESS.

apostolic decree). It is alleged that the formation of legend in the book (particularly the narrative of Simon and of Pentecost) belongs to a later period, and that the entire tendency of the writing (see sec. 2) points to a later stage of ecclesiastical development (see especially Zeller, p. 470 ff.); also that its politically apologetic design leads us to the time of Trajan, or later (Schwegler, II. p. 119); that the ὑπείς in the narrative of the travels (held even by Köstlin, Uepr. d. Synopt. Evang. p. 292, to be the genuine narrative of a friend of the apostle) is designedly allowed to stand by the author of the book, who wishes to be recognized thereby as a companion of the Apostle (according to Köstlin: for the purpose of strengthening the credibility and the impression of the apologetic representation); and that the Book of Acts is "the work of a Pauline member of the Roman church, the time of the composition of which may most probably be placed between the years 110 and 125, or even 130 after Christ" (Zeller, p. 488). But all these and similar grounds do not prove what they are alleged to prove, and do not avail to overthrow the ancient ecclesiastical recognition. For although the book actually contains various matters, in which it must receive correction from the Pauline Epistles; although the history, even of Paul the apostle, is handled in it imperfectly and, in part, inadequately; although in the first portion, here and there, a post-apostolic formation of legend is unmistakeable; yet all these elements are compatible with its being the work of a companion of the apostle, who, not emerging as such earlier than chap. xvi., only undertook to write the history some time after the apostle's death, and who, when his personal knowledge failed, was dependent on tradition developed orally and in writing, partly legendary, because he had not from the first entertained the design of writing a history, and had now, in great measure, to content himself with the matter and the form given to him by the tradition, in the atmosphere of which he himself lived. Elements really un-Pauline cannot be shown to exist in it, and the impress of a definite tendency in the book, which is alleged to betray a later stage of ecclesiastical development, is simply imputed to it by the critics. The We-narrative, with its vivid and direct impress of personal participation, always remains a strong testimony in favour of a companion of the apostle as author of the whole book, of which that narrative is a part; to separate the subject of that narrative from the author of the whole, is a procedure of sceptical caprice. The surprisingly abridged and abrupt conclusion of the book, and the silence concerning the last labours and fate of the Apostle Paul, as well as the silence concerning the similar fate of Peter, are phenomena which are intelligible only on the supposition of a real and candid companion of the apostle being prevented by circumstances from continuing his narrative, but would be altogether inconceivable in the case of an author not writing till the second century, and manipulating with a definite tendency the historical materials before him,—inconceivable, because utterly at variance with his supposed designs. The hypothesis, in fine, that the tradition of Luke's authorship rests solely on an erroneous inference from the ὑπείς in the narrative of the travels (comp. Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; see especially
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Köstlin, p. 291), is so arbitrary and so opposed to the usual unreflecting mode in which such traditions arise, that, on the contrary, the ecclesiastical tradition is to be explained, not from the wish to have a Pauline Gospel, but from the actual possession of one, and from a direct certainty as to its author.—The Book of Acts has very different stages of credibility, from the lower grade of the legend partially enwrapping the history up to that of vivid, direct testimony; it is to be subjected in its several parts to free historical criticism, but to be exempted, at the same time, from the scepticism and injustice which (apart from the attacks of Schrader and Grösser) it has largely experienced at the hands of Baur and his school, after the more cautious but less consistent precedent set by Schneckenburger (über d. Zweck d. Apostelgeschd. 1841.) On the whole, the book remains, in connection with the historical references in the apostolic Epistles, the fullest and surest source of our knowledge of the apostolic times, of which we always attain most completely a trustworthy view when the Book of Acts bears part in this testimony, although in many respects the Epistles have to be brought in, not merely as supplementing, but also in various points as deciding against particular statements of our book (b).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(A)

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

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

(B)

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

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

SEC. II.—AIM AND SOURCES OF THE BOOK.

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

1 The parallel between the two apostles is not made up, but historically given. Both were the representatives of apostolic activity, and what the Acts informs us of them is like an extended commentary on Gal. ii. 8. Comp. Thiersch, Kirche im apostol. Zeitalt. p. 190 ff. At the same time, the purpose of the work as a private composition is always to be kept in view; as such it might, according to its relation to the receiver, mention various important matters but briefly or not at all, and describe very circumstantially others of less importance. The author, like a letter-writer, was in this untrammeled. Comp. C. Bertheau, iiber Gal. ii. (Programm), Hamb. 1854.
fall gradually into the background in the history, but also how the re-
fection of Paulinism frequently presents itself in the pre-Pauline half
("hence this book might well be called a gloss on the Epistles of St.
Paul," Luther's Preface). One who was not a disciple of Paul could not
have written such a history of the apostles. The fact that even in respect
of Paul himself the narrative is so defective and in various points even inap-
propriate, as may be proved from the letters of the apostle, is sufficiently
explained from the limitation and quality of the accounts and sources with
which Luke, at the late period when he wrote, had to content himself and
to make shift, where he was not better informed by his personal knowledge
or by the apostle or other eye-witnesses.

Nevertheless, the attempt has often been made to represent our book as a
composition marked by a set apologetic¹ and dogmatic purpose. A justifi-
cation of the Apostle Paul, as regards the admission of the Gentiles into the
Christian church, is alleged by Griesbach, Diss. 1798, Paulus, Frisch, Diss.
1817, to be its design; against which view Eichhorn decidedly declared
1841) has revived this view with much acuteness, to the prejudice of the
1836, 8, then especially in his Paulus 1845, second edition edited by Zeller,
1866, also in his neutest. Theol. p. 331 ff., and in his Gesch. der drei ersten
Jahrh. 1860, ed. 2) a transition was made, as regards the book, from the
apologetic to the conciliatory standpoint. He was followed specially by
Schwegler, nachapost. Zeitalt. II. p. 73 ff.; Zeller, p. 320 ff.; and Volkmar,
Relig. Jesu, p. 336 ff.; while B. Bauer (d. Apostelgesch. eine Ausgleichung des
Paulinismus und Judenthums, 1850) pushed this treatment to the point of
self-annihilation. According to Schneckenburger, the design of the Acts
is the justification of the Apostle Paul against all the objections of the
Judaizers; on which account the apostle is only represented in that side of
his character which was turned towards Judaism, and in the greatest pos-
sible similarity to Peter (see, in opposition to this, Schwanbeck, Quellen d. 
Luk. p. 94 ff.). In this view the historical credibility of the contents is
maintained, so far as Luke has made the selection of them for his particular
purpose (c). This was, indeed, only a partial carrying out of the purpose-
hypothesis; but Baur, Schwegler, and Zeller have carried it out to its full
consequences,² and have, without scruple, sacrificed to it the historical

¹ Aberle, in the theol. Quartalschr. 1853, p. 173 ff., has maintained a view of the apo-
logetic design of the book peculiar to himself; namely, that it was intended to defend Paul
against the accusation still pending against him in Rome. Everything of this nature is
invented without any indication whatever in the text, and is contradicted by the pro-

² Certainly we are not carried by the Acts, as we are by the Pauline Epistles, into the
fresh, living, fervent conflict of Paulinism with Judaism; and so this later work may
appear as a work of peace (Reuss, Gesch. d. N. T. p. 306, ed. 4) and reconciliation, in the
composition of which it is conceivable enough of itself, and without imputing to it
conciliatory tendencies, that Luke, who did not write till long after the death of Paul and
the destruction of Jerusalem, already looked back on those conflicts from another calmer
and more objective standpoint, when the
Pauline ministry presented itself to him in
its entirety as the manifestation of the great
principle, 1 Cor. ix. 19 ff.
character of the contents. They affirm that the Paul of the Acts, in his compliance towards Judaism, is entirely different from the apostle as exhibited in his Epistles (Baur); that he is converted into a Judaizing Christian, as Peter and James are converted into Pauline Christians (Schwegler); and that our book, as a proposal of a Pauline Christian towards peace by concessions of his party to Judaism, was in this respect intended to influence both parties, but especially had in view the Roman church (Zeller). The carrying out of this view—according to which the author, with "set reflection on the means for attaining his end," would convert the Gentile apostle into a Petrine Christian, and the Jewish apostles into Pauline Christians—implies to the Book of Acts an imperceptibly neutralizing artfulness and dishonesty of character, and a subtlety of distortion in breaking off the sharp points of history, and even of inventing facts, which are irreconcilable with the simplicity and ingenuous artlessness of this writing, and indeed absolutely stand even in moral contradiction with its Christian feeling and spirit, and with the express assurance in the preface of the Gospel. And in the conception of the details this hypothesis necessitates a multitude of suppositions and interpretations, which make the reproach of a designed concoction of history and of invention for the sake of an object, that they are intended to establish, recoil on such a criticism itself. See the Commentary. The most thorough special refutation may be seen in Lekebusch, p. 253 ff., and Oertel, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. p. 183 ff. Comp. also Lechler, apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalt. p. 7 ff.; Ewald, Jahrb. IX. p. 62 ff. That, moreover, such an inventive reconciler of Paulinism and Petrinism, who is, moreover, alleged to have not written till the second century, should have left unnoticed the meeting of the apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome, and their contemporary death, and not have rather turned them to account for placing the crown on his work so purposely planned; and that instead of this, after many other incongruities which he would have committed, he should have closed Paul's intercourse with the Jews (chap. xxviii. 25 ff.) with a rejection of them from the apostle's own mouth,—would be just as enigmatical as would be, on the other hand, the fact, that the late detection of the plan should, in spite of the touchstone continually present in Paul's Epistles, have remained reserved for the searching criticism of the present day.

As regards the sources (see Richm. de fontibus, etc., Traj. ad Rhen. 1821; Schwanbeck, u. d. Quellen d. Schriften d. Luk. I. 1847; Zeller, p. 289 ff.; Lekebusch, p. 402 ff.; Ewald, Gesch. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 40 ff. ed. 3), it is to be generally assumed from the contents and form of the book, and from the analogy of Luke i. 1, that Luke, besides the special communications which he had received from Paul and from intercourse with apostolic men, besides oral tradition generally, and besides, in part, his own personal knowledge (the latter from xvi. 10 onwards), also made use of written documents. But he merely made use of them, and did not simply string them together (as Schleiermacher held, Einl. in d. N. T. p. 360 ff.). For the use has, at any rate, taken place with such independent manipulation, that the attempts accurately to point out the several documentary sources em-
ployed, particularly as regards their limits and the elements of them that have remained unaltered, fail to lead to any sure result. For such an independent use he might be sufficiently qualified by those serviceable connections which he maintained, among which is to be noted his intercourse with Mark (Col. iv. 10, 14), and with Philip and his prophetic daughters (xxi. 8, 9); as, indeed, that independence is confirmed by the essential similarity in the character of the style (although, in the first part, in accordance with the matters treated of and with the Aramaic traditions and documentary sources, it is more Hebraizing), and in the employment of the Septuagint. The use of a written (probably Hebrew) document concerning Peter (not to be confounded with the ἡγεμόνα Πέτρου), of another concerning Stephen, and of a missionary narrative perhaps belonging to it (chap. xiii. and xiv.; see Bleek in the Stud. u. Krit. 1836, p. 1043 f.; comp. also Ewald, p. 41 f.), is assumed with the greatest probability; less probably a special document concerning Barnabas, to which, according to Schwanbeck, iv. 86 f., ix. 1–30, xi. 19–30, xii. 25, xiii. 1–14, 28, xv. 2–4 belonged. In the case also of the larger speeches and letters of the book, so far as personal knowledge or communications from those concerned failed him, and when tradition otherwise was insufficient, Luke must have been dependent on the documents indicated above and others; still, however, in such a manner that—and hence so much homogeneity of stamp—his own reproduction withal was more or less active. To seek to prove in detail the originality of the apostolic speeches from the apostolic letters, is an enterprise of impossibility or of self-deceiving presupposition; however little on the whole and in the main the genuineness of these speeches, according to the respective characters and situations, may reasonably be doubted. As regards the history of the apostolic council in particular, the Epistle to the Galatians, not so much as even known to Luke, although it supplements the apostolic narrative, cannot, any more than any of the other Pauline Epistles, be considered as a source (in opposition to Zeller); and the apostolic decree, which cannot be a creation of the author, must be regarded as the reproduction of an original document. In general, it is to be observed that, as the question concerning the sources of Luke was formerly à priori precluded by the supposition of simple reports of eye-witnesses (already in the Canon Murat.), recently, no less à priori, the same question has been settled in an extreme negative sense by the assumption that he purposely drew from his own resources; while Credner, de Wette, Bleek, Ewald, and others have justly adhered to three sources of information—written records, oral information and tradition (Luke i. 1 ff.), and the author’s personal knowledge; and Schwanbeck has, with much acuteness, attempted what is unattainable in the way of recognizing and separating the written documents, with the result of degrading the book into a spiritless compilation.¹

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

sources—the conclusion which Lekebusch has reached by the path of thorough inquiry—is all the less satisfactory, the later the time of composition has to be placed and the historical character of the contents withal to be maintained. See also, concerning the derivation of the Petrine speeches from written sources, Weiss in the Krit. Beblatt a. Deutsch. Zeitschr. 1854, No. 10 ff., and in reference to their doctrinal tenor and its harmony with the Epistle of Peter, Weiss, Petr. Lehrbegr. 1855, and bibl. Theol. 1868, p. 119 ff.1 Concerning the relation of the Pauline history and speeches to the Pauline epistles, see Trip, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. 1866; Oertel, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. 1868. Comp. also Oort, Inquir. in orat., quae in Act. ap. Paulo tribuntur, indolem Paulin. L. B. 1862; Hofstede de Groot, Vergelijking van den Paulus der Brieven met dien der Handelingen, Gröning. 1860.

NOTE BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(a)

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

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

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

SEC. III.—TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

As the Gospel of Luke already presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem (xxi. 20–25), the Acts of the Apostles must have been written after that event. Acts viii. 26 cannot be employed to establish the view that the book was composed during the Jewish war, shortly before the destruction of the city (Hug, Schneckburger, Lekebusch; see on viii. 26). The non-mention of that event does not serve to prove that it had not yet occurred, but rather leads to the inference that it had happened a considerable time ago. A more definite approximation is not possible. As, however, the Gospel of John must be considered as the latest of the four, but still belongs to the first century, perhaps to the second last decade of that century (see Introduction to John, sec. 5), there is sufficient reason to place the third Gospel within the seventh decade, and the time of the composition of the Acts cannot be more definitely ascertained. Yet, as there must have been a suitable interval between it and the Gospel (comp. on i. 8), it may have reached perhaps the close of the seventh decade, or about the year 80; so that it may be regarded as nearly contemporary with the Gospel of John, and nearly contemporary also with the history of the Jewish

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

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

---

1 So also Lange, apostol. Zeitalt. I. p. 107; Otto, geschichtl. Verh. d. Pastoral-briefe, p. 189. This opinion is unnatural, because it was just in the issue of the trial—whether that consisted in the execution (Otto) or in the liberation of the apostle—that the Pauline work at Rome had its culmination, glorifying Christ and fulfilling the apostolic task (Luke xxiv. 47). See Phil. i. 20. How important must it therefore have been for Luke to narrate that issue, if he should not have had for the present other reasons for being silent upon it! That Luke knew what became of Paul after his two years' residence in Rome, is self-evident from the words έποιεύτων κατὰ διανικά κ. τ. λ., xxviii. 30.
on the part of Zeller, Lekebusch, and Ewald. Still more arbitrary, however, is its transference to Alexandria (Mill, according to subscriptions in codd. and vss. of the Gospel), to Antioch, or to Greece (Hilgenfeld); and not less so the referring it to Hellenic Asia Minor (Köstlin, p. 294).

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

SEC. IV.—CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF THE ACTS.

Ann. Dion. 31, u.c. 784 (d). The risen Jesus ascends to heaven. Matthias becomes an apostle. The outpouring of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, and its immediate consequences (i. and ii.).—Since, according to the well-founded assumption that the feast meant at John v...1 is not a Passover, it must be considered as certain that the time of the public ministry of Jesus embraced no more than three paschal feasts (John ii. 13, vi. 4, xii. ff.), consequently only two years and some months; as it is further certain that our Lord was not crucified on the 15th, but on the 14th of the month Nisan, which fell on a Friday; according to the researches founded on the Jewish calendar by Wurm (in Bengel's Arch. II. p. 1 ff., p. 261 ff.) and Anger (de tempor. in Act. ap. ratione, Lips. 1833, pp. 80–88), the date laid down above appears to result as the most probable ("anno 31, siquidem est intercalis erat, diem Nisani 14 et 15, anno 33, siquidem vulgaris erat, diem Nisani 14, anno vero 32 neutrum in Veneris diem incidere potuisse. Atqui anno 33, ideo quod ille annum sabbaticum proxime antecedebat, Adarum alter adjiciendi erat. Ergo neque annum 32 neque 33 pro ultimo vitae Christi anno haberi posse apparet," Anger, p. 38). Nevertheless, the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar would not permit us to attain to any quite reliable result, if there were no other confirmatory points. But here

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

2 Every calculation which is based on the 18th of Nisan as the day of the death of Jesus (so Wieseler, according to whom it happened on 7th April 30) is destitute of historical foundation, because at variance with the exact account of John, which must turn the scale against the Synoptical narrative (see on John xviii. 28).
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comes in Luke iii. 1, according to which John appeared in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius, i.e. from 19th August 781 to 19th August 783 (see on Luke, l.c.). And if it must be assumed that Jesus began his public teaching very soon after the appearance of John, at all events in the same year, then the first Passover of the ministry of Jesus (John ii. 18) was that of the year 782; the second (John vi. 4), that of the year 788; the third (John xii. ff.), that of the year 784. With this agrees the statement of the Jews on the first public appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem, that (see on John ii. 20) the temple had been a-building during a period of 46 years. This building, namely, had been commenced in the 18th year of the reign of Herod the Great (i.e. autumn 784-785). If now, as it was the interest of the Jews at John ii. 20 to specify as long an interval as possible, the first year as not complete is not included in the calculation, there results as the 46th year (reckoned from 785-786), the year from autumn 781 to autumn 782; and consequently as the first Passover, that of the year 782. The same result comes out, if the first year of the building be reckoned 783-785, and the full 46 years are counted in, so that when the words John ii. 20 were spoken, the seven and fortieith year (i.e. autumn 781-782) was already current.—AER. Dion. 31-34, u.c. 784-787. Peter and John, after the healing of the lame man (iii.), are arrested and brought before the Sanhedrim (iv.); death of Ananias and his wife (v. 1-11); prosperity of the youthful church (v. 12-16); persecution of the apostles (v. 17-42). As Saul's conversion (see the following paragraph) occurred during the continuance of the Stephanic persecution, so the execution of Stephen is to be placed in the year 38 or 34 (vi. 8-vii.), and not long before this, the election of the managers of alms (vi. 1-7); and nearly contemporary with that conversion is the diffusion of Christianity by the dispersed (vii. 4), the ministry of Philip in Samaria (viii. 5 ff.), and the conversion of the chamberlain (viii. 26 ff.). What part of this extraneous activity of the emigrants is to be placed before, and what after, the conversion of Paul, cannot be determined.—AER. Dion. 35, u.c. 788. Paul's conversion (ix. 1-19), 17 years before the apostolic council (see on Gal. ii. 1).—According to 2 Cor. xi. 32, Damascus, when Paul escaped thence to betake himself to Jerusalem (ix. 24-26), was under the rule of the Arabian King Aretas. The taking possession of this city by Aretas is not, indeed, recorded by any other author, but must be assumed as historically attested by that very passage, because there the ethnarch of Aretas appears in the active capacity of governor of the city, and his relation to the πόλει Δαμασκοῦ is supposed to be well

1 Not of his joint reign, from which Wiese- net now reckons in Herzog's Enzykli. XXI. p. 547.

2 In presence of this quite definite statement of the year of the emperor, the different combinations, which have been made on the basis of the accounts of Josephus concerning the war between Antipas and Aretas in favour of a later date for the public appearance of Jesus (34-35; Kelm, Gesch. Jesu, i. p. 690 ff.), necessarily give way. These, moreover, are not sufficiently reliable for an exact marking off of the year, to induce us to set aside the year of the emperor mentioned by Luke, which could only be based on general notoriety, and the exact speci- fication of which regulates and controls the synchronistic notices in Luke iii. 1 f.

3 Not merely of a judicial chief of the Ara- ban population of Damascus, subordinate to the Roman authority (Kelm in Schenkel's Bibellex. L. p. 339.) There is no historical
known to the readers. It is therefore very arbitrary to regard this relation as a temporary private one, and not as a real dominion (Anger: "forte fortuna eodem, quo apostolum tempore propter negotia nescio quae Damasci versatum esse," and that he, either of his own accord or at the request of the Jews, obtained permission for the latter from the magistrates of Damascus to watch the gates). The time, when the Arabian king became master of Damascus, is assigned with much probability, from what Josephus informs us of the relations of Aretas to the Romans, to the year 37, after the death of Tiberius in March of that year. Tiberius, namely, had charged Vitellius, the governor of Syria, to take either dead or alive Aretas; who had totally defeated the army of Herod Antipas, his faithless son-in-law (Joseph. Antt. xviii. 5. 1). Vitellius, already on his march against him (Joseph. l.c. xviii. 5. 8), received in Jerusalem the news of the death of the emperor, which occurred on the 16th of March 37, put his army into winter quarters, and journeyed to Rome. Now this was for Aretas, considering his warlike and irritated attitude toward the Roman power, certainly the most favourable moment for falling upon the rich city of Damascus—which, besides, had formerly belonged to his ancestors (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 15. 2)—because the governor and general-in-chief of Syria was absent, the army was inactive, and new measures were to be expected from Rome. The king, however, did not remain long in possession of the conquered city. For when, in the second year of Caligula (i.e. in the year from 16th March 38 to 16th March 39), the Arabian affairs were regulated (Dio Cass. lix. 9. 12), Damascus cannot have been overlooked. This city was too important for the objects of the Roman government in the East, to allow us to assume with probability—what Wieseler, p. 172 ff., and on Gal. p. 589, assumes—that, at the regulation of the Arabian affairs, it had only just come by way of gift into the hands of Aretas, or (with Ewald, p. 389) that according to agreement it had remained in his possession during his lifetime, so that he would have to be regarded as a sort of Roman vassal. This, then, limits the flight of Paul from Damascus to the period of nearly two years from the summer of 37 to the spring of 39. As, however, it is improbable that Aretas had entrusted the keeping of the city gates to the Jews in what remained of the year 37, which was certainly still disturbed by military movements; and as his doing so rather presupposes a quiet and sure possession of the city, and an already settled state of matters; there remains only the year 38 and the first months of the year 39. And even these first months of the year 39 are excluded, as, according to Dio Cassius, l.c., Caligula apportioned Arabia in the second year of his reign; accordingly Aretas can hardly have possessed the conquered city up to the very end of that year, especially as the importance of the matter for the Oriental interests of the Romans made an early arrangement of the affair extremely probable. Every month Caligula became more dissolute and worthless; and certainly the securing of the dangerous East would on this account

trace of the relation thus conjectured, and it would hardly have included a jurisdiction over the Jew Saul.

1 See also his three articles in Herzog's Encycl.; Aretas, GalateröfK, and Zeitrechnung, new ed.
rather be accelerated than delayed. Accordingly, if the year 38¹ be ascertained as that of the flight of Paul, there is fixed for his conversion, between which and his flight a period of three years intervened (Gal. i. 18), the year 35. — AER. DION. 38, 37, u.c. 789, 790. Paul labours as a preacher of the gospel in Damascus (ix. 20–25); journey to Arabia and return to Damascus (see on ix. 19). — AER. DION. 38, u.c. 791. His flight from Damascus and first journey to Jerusalem (ix. 28–29 ff.), three years after his conversion, Gal. i. 18. From Jerusalem he makes his escape to Tarsus (ix. 29, 30). — AER. DION. 39–43, u.c. 792–796. The churches throughout Palestine have peace and prosperity (ix. 31). Peter makes a general journey of visitation (ix. 32), labours at Lydda and Joppa (ix. 32–43), converts Cornelius at Caesarea (x. 1–48), and returns to Jerusalem, where he justifies himself (xi. 1–18). Christianity is preached in Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, and in that city even to the Gentiles, on which account Barnabas is sent thither, who fetches Paul from Tarsus, and remains with him for one year in Antioch (xi. 19–26). In this year (43) Agabus predicts a general famine (xi. 27, 28). — AER. DION. 44, u.c. 797. Afer the execution of the elder James, Peter is imprisoned without result by Agrippa I., who dies in August 44 (xii. 1–23). In the fourth year of the reign of Claudius occurs the famine in Judea (see on xi. 28), on account of which Paul (according to Acts, but not according to Gal. ii. 1) makes his second journey to Jerusalem (with Barnabas), whence he returns to Antioch (xi. 29, 30, and see on xii. 25). — AER. DION. 45–51, u.c. 798–804. In this period occurs the first missionary journey of the apostle with Barnabas (xiii. and xiv.), the duration of which is not indicated. Having returned to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas remain there χρήστην οίκ οίδε καὶ γυνον (xiv. 28). — AER. DION. 52, u.c. 805. The third journey of Paul to Jerusalem (with Barnabas) to the apostolic congress (xv. 1–29), according to Gal. ii. 1, fourteen years after the first journey. Having returned to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas separate, and Paul with Silas commences his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 30–41). — AER. DION. 53, 54, u.c. 806, 807. Continuation of this missionary journey through Lycaonia, Phrygia, and Galatia; crossing from Troas to Macedonia; journey to Athens and Corinth, where Paul met with Aquila banished in the year 52 by the edict of Claudius from Rome, and remained there more (see on xviii. 11) than a year and a half (xvi. 1–xviii. 18). — AER. DION. 55, u.c. 808. From Corinth Paul journeys to Ephesus, and thence by Caesarea to Jerusalem for the fourth time (xvii. 20–22), from which, without staying, he returns to Antioch (xviii. 22), and thus closes his second missionary journey. He tarries there χρήστην τινά (xviii. 23), and then commences his third missionary journey through Galatia and Phrygia (xviii. 28), during which time Apollos is first at Ephesus (xviii. 24 ff.) and then at Corinth (xix. 1). — AER. DION. 56–58, u.c. 809–811. Paul arrives on this

¹ With this also agrees the number of the year AF of a Damascene coin of King Areias, described by Eckhel and Monnet, namely, in so far as that number (101) is to be reckoned according to the Pompeian era commencing with 690 u.c., — and this is at any rate the most probable, — whence the year 38 may be safely assumed for the coinage. The circumstance that there are extant Damascene coins of Augustus and Tiberius, and also of Nero, but none of Caligula and Claudius (see Eckhel, i. 3, p. 330 f.), is unsatisfactory as evidence of a longer continuance of the city under the power of Areias, and may be accidental.
journey at Ephesus (xix. 1), where he labours for not quite three years (see on xix. 10). After the tumult of Demetrius (xix. 24-40) he journeys to Macedonia and Greece, and tarries there three months (xx. 1, 2).—Aer. Dion. 59, u.c. 812. Having returned in the spring from Greece to Macedonia (xx. 3), Paul sails after Easter from Philippi to Troas (xx. 6), and from Assos by way of Miletus (xx. 13-38), and Tyre (xxi. 1-6) to Ptolemais (xxi. 7), thence he journeys by Caesarea (xxi. 8-14) to Jerusalem for the fifth and last time (xxi. 15-17). Arriving shortly before Pentecost (xx. 16), he is after some days (xxi. 18-38) arrested and then sent to Felix at Caesarea (xxiii. 23-35).—Aer. Dion. 60, 61, u.c. 813, 814. Paul remains a prisoner in Caesarea for two years (from the summer of 59 to the summer of 61) until the departure of Felix, who leaves him as a prisoner to his successor Festus (xxiv. 27). Festus, after fruitless discussions (xxv., xxvi.), sends the apostle, who had appealed to Caesar, to Rome in the autumn (xxvii. 9), on which journey he winters at Malta (xxviii. 11).—That Felix had retired from his procuratorship before the year 62, is evident from Joseph. Antit. xx. 8. 9, according to which this retirement occurred while Pallas, the brother of Felix, was still a favourite of Nero, and while Burrus, the praefectus praetorio, was still living; but, according to Tac. Ann. xiv. 65, Pallas was poisoned by Nero in the year 62, and Burrus died in an early month of the same year (Anger, de temp. rat. p. 101). See also Ewald, p. 52 ff. Further, that the retirement of Felix took place after the year 60, is highly probable from Joseph. Vit. § 3, and from Antit. xx. 8. 11. In the first passage Josephus informs us that he had journeyed to Rome μετ' εἰκοστοῦ καὶ ἕκτου ἔτους of his life, in order to release certain priests whom Felix, during his (consequently then elapsed) procuratorship (καθ' ἐν χρόνον Φηλίκες τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπηρώτευεν), had sent as prisoners thither. Now, as Josephus was born (Vit. § 1) in the first year of Caligula (i.e. in the year from 16th March 37 to 16th March 38), and so the completion of his 26th year fell in the year from 16th March 63 to 16th March 64, that journey to Rome is to be placed in the year 63, for the sea was closed in the winter months until the beginning of March (Veget. de re milit. iv. 89.) If, then, Felix had retired as early as the year 60, Josephus would only have interested himself for his unfortunate friends three years after the removal of the hated governor,—a long postponement of their rescue, which would be quite inex-
plicable. But if Felix resigned his government in the year 61, it was
natural that Josephus should first wait the result of the complaint of
the Jews of Caesarea to the emperor against Felix (Joseph. Antt. xx. 8, 10);
and then, when the unexpected news of the acquittal of the procurator
came, should, immediately after the opening of the navigation in the year
63, make his journey to Rome, in order to release his friends the priests.
Further, according to Joseph. Antt. xx. 8. 11, about the time of the
entrance of Festus on office (κατὰ τὸν καυρὸν τοῦτον), Poppaea, the mistress
of Nero, was already his wife (γυνῆ,) which she became according to Tac.
Ann. xiv. 59, Suet. Ner. 35, only in May of the year 62 (see Anger, l.c. pp.
101, 103). Now, if Festus had become already procurator in the year 60,
we must either ascribe to the expression κατὰ τὸν καυρὸν τοῦτον an undue
indefiniteness, extending even to inaccuracy, or in an equally arbitrary
manner understand γυνῆ proleptically (Anger, Stölting), or as uxor injusta
(Wieseler), which, precisely in reference to the twofold relation of Poppea
as the emperor’s mistress and the emperor’s wife, would appear unwarr-
anted in the case of a historian who was recording the history of his
own time. But if Festus became governor only in the summer of 61, there
remains for τὸν καυρὸν τοῦτον a space of not quite one year, which, with the
not sharply definite κατὰ κ.τ.λ., cannot occasion any difficulty. The ob-
jection urged by Anger, p. 100, and Wieseler, p. 86, on Gal. p. 584 f.,
and in Herzog’s Enzykli. XXI. p. 557, after Pearson and Schrader, against
the year 61, from Acts xxviii. 16,—namely, that the singular τῷ οὐτοτεθύμμορχ
refers to Burris (who died in the spring of 62) as the sole praefectus
praetorii at the period of the arrival of the apostle at Rome, for before
and after his prefecture there were two prefects,—is untenable, because
the singular in the sense of : the praefectus praetorii concerned (to whom
the prisoners were delivered up), is quite in place. The other reasons
against the year 61, taken from the period of office of Festus and Albinus,
the successors of Felix (Anger, p. 101 ff.; Wieseler, p. 89 ff.), involve too
much uncertainty to be decisive for the year 60. For although the en-
trance of Albinus upon office is not to be put later than the beginning of
October 62 (see Anger, l.c.), yet the building (completion) of the house of
Agrippa, mentioned by Joseph. Antt. xx. 8. 11, ix. 1, as nearly contem-
poraneous with the entrance of Festus on office, and the erection of the
wall by the Jews over against it (to prevent the view of the temple), as
well as the complaint occasioned thereby at Rome, might very easily have
occurred from the summer of 61 to the autumn of 62; and against the
brief duration of the high-priesthood of Kabi, scarcely exceeding a month
on this supposition (Anger, p. 105 f.), the history of that period of rapid
dissolution in the unhappy nation raises no valid objection at all.—Aer.
Dion. 63, 64, u.c. 815–817. Paul arrives in the spring of 62 at Rome
(xxviii. 11, 16), where he remains two years (xxviii. 30), that is, until the
spring of 64, in further captivity. Thus far the Acts of the Apostles.—
On the disputed point of a second imprisonment, see on Rom. Introd. p.
15 ff.

See also Laurent, neuest. Studien, p. 84 ff.
AUTHORITIES FOR CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

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

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

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

### INTRODUCTION.

#### SYNOPSIS OF THE DATES FIXED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension of Christ, ... 31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen's martyrdom, 33 or 34</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Claud. I. a.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's conversion, ... 35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's first journey to Jerusalem, ... 35</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Claud. II. a.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's arrival at Antioch, ... 43</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Claud. III. a.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of James, ... 44</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The famine, ... 44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's second journey to Jerusalem, 1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's first missionary journey, ... 43-51</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's third journey to Jerusalem, to the apostolic Council, ... 52</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul commences his second missionary journey, ... 53</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of the Jews from Rome, ... 53</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul arrives at Corinth, ... 53</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's fourth journey to Jerusalem (at Caesarea), and third missionary journey, 55</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's abode at Ephesus, 56-58</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's fifth journey to Jerusalem, and imprisonment, 59</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's removal from Caesarea to Rome, ... 61</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's two years' imprisonment at Rome, ... 62-64</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Lehmann (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1858, p. 312 ff.) furnishes from this point onward the following dates:—Second journey to Jerusalem, 44; first missionary journey, 45 and 46; apostolic council, 47; second missionary journey, 48.—In 49 Paul arrives at Corinth; fourth journey to Jerusalem, 51; third missionary journey, 52, during which he remains at Ephesus from the autumn of 53 until 54, and in 55 proceeds to Macedonia and Greece; fifth journey to Jerusalem, and imprisonment, 56; removal from Caesarea to Rome, 55; imprisonment in Rome, 59 to 61.—These dates chiefly depend on the assumption that Felix had been recalled as early as the year 56.—Laurent, neuest. Stud. p. 94 ff., fixes, with me, on the year 61 as that of the departure of Felix and the voyage of the apostle.—Gerlach (Statthalter in Syrien und Judäa, § 14) does not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Table</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY DIFFERENT CHRONOLOGISTS.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ehrhorn.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bezaolt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter on the chronological question, but fixes on the year 50 or 61.—Holtzmann, *Jud. Chr. Christenth.*, p. 547 ff., agrees in essential points with our dates.—Stötzing, *Beltr. s. Eeget. d. Paul. Br.* 1869, starting from the assumption that the fourteen years in Gal. ii. 1 are to be reckoned from the conversion to the composition of the Epistle, and that so likewise the fourteen years in 2 Cor. xii. 2 are to be determined, fixes for the conversion of Paul the year 40; for the first journey to Jerusalem, 43 (for the second, 45); for the third, 49; for the second missionary journey to Corinth, 50-58; for the fourth journey to Jerusalem, 59; for the arrest, 56; for the two years' imprisonment, 59 to 61.
INTRODUCTION.

NOTE BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(p)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων.

B, Lachm. Tisch. have πράξεις ἀποστόλων. So also Born. Later enlargements of the title in codd.: ὅσα ἐναγγελιστὶ πράξεις ἀποστόλων, al. al πράξεις τῶν ἠγίων ἀποστόλων. Peculiar to D; πράξεις ἀποστόλων. Ν has merely πράξεις, but at the close πράξεις ἀποστόλων.—The codex D is particularly rich in additions, emendations, and the like, which Bornemann has recently defended as the original text. Matth. ed. min. p. 1 well remarks: "Hic liber (the Book of Acts) in re critica est difficilissimus et impeditissimus, quod multa in eo turbata sunt. Sed corruptiones versionum Syrarum, Bedae et scribae codicis D omnem modum excidunt." Tisch. justly calls the proceeding of Bornemann, "monstruosam quandam ac perseveram novitatem" (z).

CHAPTER I.


Ver. 1. Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησα.] Luke calls his Gospel the first history, inasmuch as he is now about to compose a second. πρῶτος, in the sense of μωρέσως. See on John i. 15. λόγος, narrative, history, or the like, what is contained in a book.1 As to ποιεῖν used of mental products, comp. Plat. Phaed. p. 61 B: ποιεῖν μυθοῦς, ἄλλα ὠν λόγους. Hence λογοποίης = ἰστορικός.2 μέν, without a subsequent ἕως. Luke has broken off the construction. Instead of continuing after ver. 2 somewhat as follows: "but this δεύτερος λόγος is to contain the further course of events after the Ascension," which thought he had before his mind in the μέν, ver. 1,—he allows himself to be led by the mention of the apostles in the protasis to suppress the apodosis, and to pass on at once to the commencement of the history itself.3 — περὶ πάντων] a popular expression of completeness, and therefore not to be pressed. — ὁν ἡσαυτοῦ k. t. l.] ὁν is attracted, equivalent to ἐν; and, setting aside the erroneous assertion that ἡσαυτοῦ ποιεῖν is equivalent to ἐποίησα (Grotius, Calovius, Valckenar, Kuinoel), it is usually explained: "what Jesus began to do and to teach (and continued) until the day," etc., as if Luke had written: ὁν ἁρξάμενος Ἰσαῦς ἐποίησα k. t. l. Comp. xi. 4.4 But Luke has not so written, and it is arbitrary thus to explain his words. Baumgarten, after Olshausen and Schneckenburger, has maintained that ἡσαυτοῦ denotes the whole work of Jesus up to His ascension as initial and preparatory, so that this second book is conceived as the continuation of that doing and teaching which was only begun by Jesus up to His ascension; as if Luke had written ἡσαυτοῦ ποιεῖν τε καὶ ἀδελφῶν.5 In point of fact, ἡσαυτοῦ is inserted according to the very frequent custom of the Synoptists, by which that which is done or said is in a vivid and graphic manner denoted according to its moment of commencement. It thus here serves to recall to the recollection from the Gospel all the several incidents and events up to the ascension, in which Jesus had appeared as doer and teacher. The reader is supposed mentally to realize from the Gospel all the scenes in which he has seen Jesus come forward as acting and

---

1 So in Xen. Ages. 10. 3, Anab. ill. 1. 1, and frequently. See also Schweigh. Lec. Herod. II. p. 78; Creuzer Symbol. I. p. 44 ff.
2 Pearson, ad loc. p. 244.
teaching,—a beginning of the Lord, which occurred in the most various instances and varied ways up to the day of His ascent. The emphasis, moreover, lies on τοιεν τε καλ διαδεκαειν, which comprehends the contents of the Gospel. It may, consequently, be paraphrased somewhat thus: "The first narratives I have composed of all that, by which Jesus exhibited His activity in doing and teaching during His earthly life up to His ascension." τοιεν proceeds, comp. Luke xxiv. 19, because it was primarily the ἐργα of Jesus that demonstrated His Messiahship, John x. 38; Acts x. 38.

Ver. 2. Until the day on which He was taken up, after that He had commissioned by means of the Holy Spirit the apostles whom He had chosen, belonging to ἰν ἡρτατο κ.τ.λ.—ἀχρ ἡ ἡμιαστ— a usual attraction, but to be explained as in ver. 29; Luke i. 20, xvii. 27; Matt. xxiv. 38. —ἐντειλάμενος] refers neither merely to the baptismal command, Matt. xxviii., nor merely to the injunction in ver. 4; but is to be left as general: having given them charges, "ut facere solent, qui ab amicis, vel etiam ex hoc mundo descendent," Beza. —διὰ πνεύμ. ἀγιο[ belongs to εὐνοι. των ἄνωτος: by means of the Holy Spirit, of which He was possessor (Luke iv. 1, xiv. 18; John iii. 34, xx. 22), and by virtue of which He worked, as in general, so specially as regards His disciples (ix. 55). Yet it is not to be explained as: by communication of the Spirit (comp. Bengel), since this is not promised till afterwards; nor yet as: quae agere debent per Spir. S. (Grot.), which the words cannot bear. Others connect διὰ πνεύμ. ἀγιο[ with ovs ἔκτασιν, quos per Sp. S. elogarat. But there thus would result a hyperbaton which, without any certain example in the N. T., 2 would put a strong emphasis and yet without any warrant in the context, on διὰ πν. ἀγιο[. 4—οvs ἔκτασιν, is added with design and emphasis; it is the significant premiss to εὐνοι. κ.τ.λ. (whom He had chosen to Himself); for the earlier ἐκλογή on the part of Jesus was a necessary preliminary to their receiving the ἐντολή διὰ πν. ἀγιο—αὐνελφθη] Luke ix. 51, xxiv. 51 (Elz.).

Ver. 3. Ovs καλ] to whom also. To the foregoing ovs ἔκτασιν, namely, there is attached a corresponding incident, through which the new intercourse, in which the ἐντειλάμενος κ.τ.λ. took place, is now set forth. —μετὰ τὸ πνεύμ. αὐτῶν] includes in it the death as the immediate result of the suffering (iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 28; Heb. xiii. 12). —οvs ἤμηρ τεσσαράκ.] He showed Himself to them throughout forty days, (κ) not continuously, but from time to time, which is sufficiently indicated as well known by the preceding ἐν πολλ. τεσσαράκ. —τα περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τ. Ἰουδαίων speaking to them that which related to the Messiah's kingdom, which He would erect. The Catholics have taken occasion hence to assume that Jesus at this stage gave instructions concerning the hierarchy, the seven sacraments, and the like.—As to the variation of the narrative of the forty days from the narrative given in the Gospel, see on Luke xxiv. 50 f. This diversity

1 Comp. Papias in Euse. iii. 39.
2 Syr. Ar. Aeth. Cyril, Augustine, Beza, Scaliger, Heumann, Kypke, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, de Wette.
4 Plat. Apol. p. 19 D, al.; Disc. ad Dem. de cor. p. 177 f. ; and see on Rom. xvi. 27.
presupposes that a not inconsiderable interval occurred between the composition of the Gospel and that of Acts, during which the tradition of the forty days was formed or at least acquired currency. The purposely chosen ὅπανώμενον conspicuendum se praebens corresponds to the changed corporeality of the Risen One (comp. the remark subjoined to Luke xxiv. 51), but does not serve in the least degree to remove that discrepancy (in opposition to Baumgarten, p. 12), as if it presupposed that Jesus, on occasion of every appearance, quitted "the sphere of invisibility." Comp. the ἄγκη in Luke xxiv. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.; comp. with John xx. 17; Acts i. 21 f., x. 41; Luke xxiv. 42 f.

Ver. 4. To the general description of the forty days' intercourse is now added by the simple καὶ, and, in particular, the description of the two last interviews, ver. 4 f. and ver. 6 ff., after which the αὐτοῖς took place, ver. 9. — συναλίζωμαι. παρίγγ. αὐτοῖς] while He ate with them, He commanded them. συναλίζωμαι is thus correctly understood by the vss. (Vulg.: consensum), Chrysostom (τραπεζ. κοινών), Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome, Beda, and others, including Cassaubon. — συναλίζωμαι (properly, to eat salt with one) in the sense of eating together, is found in a Greek translator of Ps. cxi. 4, where συνσιδήρω (LXX.: συνσιδήρω) corresponds to the Hebrew דגנ, also in Clem. Hom. 6, and Maneth. v. 339. As to the thing itself, comp. on x. 41. Usually the word is derived from συναλίζων, to assemble. It would then have to be rendered; when He assembled with them. But against this it is decisive that the sense: when He had assembled with them, would be logically necessary, so that Luke must have written συναλίσθησί. The conjecture of Hemsterhuis: συναλύζωμενοι, is completely unnecessary, although approved by Valckenaer. — τὴν εἰκασίαν τοι πατρός] see on Luke xxiv. 49. Jesus means the promise καὶ ἵππαρχον, given by God through the prophets of the O. T. (comp. ii. 16), which, i.e. the realization of which, they were to wait for (περιμένειν only here in the N. T., but often in the classics); it referred to the complete effusion of the Holy Spirit, which was to follow only after His exaltation. Comp. John vii. 39, xv. 26, xiv. 16. Already during their earthly intercourse the πνεῦμα ἄγιος was communicated by Jesus to the disciples partially and provisionally. Luke ix. 55; John xx. 21, 22.— ἦν ἱκώνισασέ μοι] The oblique form of speech is changed, as frequently also in the classics, with the increase of animation into the direct form, Luke v. 41, and elsewhere, particularly with Luke. Bengel, moreover, aptly says: "Atque hic parallelismus ad arctissimum nexit pertinere utriusque libri Lucae,"—but not in so far as ἦν ἱκών, μοι points back to Luke xxiv. 49 as to an earlier utterance (the usual opinion), but in so far as Jesus had employed the active. This is grammatically incorrect; it must then have been συναλίζω, or, with logical accuracy (as Luther felt), συναλίσθησιν.

1 Comp. Tob. xii. 19; 1 Kings viii. 8.
2 Herod. v. 15. 102; Xen. Anab. vii. 3. 48; Lucian, Euct. 7.
3 Not as Luther (when He had assembled them), Grotius ("in unum recolligens qui dispersi fuerant"), and most interpreters, including even Kuinoel and Olshausen (not Beza and de Wette), explain it, as if Luke
here, shortly before his ascension, gives the same intimation which was also
given by Him on the ascension day (Luke xxiv. 49), directly before the
ascent; although according to the gospel the day of the resurrection
coincides with that of the ascension (2, p. 6). Therefore ἤν ἵκοι. μου is to be
considered as a reference to a former promise of the Spirit, not recorded
187 (E. T. 249).

Ver. 5. Reminiscence of the declaration of the Baptist, Luke iii. 16; John
i. 33. "For on you the baptism of the Spirit will now soon take place
which John promised instead of his baptism of water."—βαπτισθήσετε] τὴν ἐπίθεσιν καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χαρᾶς σου. Theophyl. ; Matt. iii. 11;
Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; Acts xi. 16. Moreover, comp. on John i. 33.—
οἱ μετὰ πολλ. ταῦτ. ἡμ. ] is not a transposition for οἱ πολὺ μετὰ ταῦτ. ἡμ.,
but: not after many of these, now and, up to the setting in of the future
event, still current, days.¹ The position of the negative is to be explained
from the idea of contrast, not after many, but after few.³

Ver. 6. Not qui consenuerant (Vulgate, Luther, and others), as if what
follows still belonged to the scene introduced in ver. 4; but, as is evident
from συναίνεις, ver. 4, comp. with ver. 12, a new scene, at which the ascen-
sion occurred (ver. 9). The word of promise spoken by our Lord as they
were eating (vv. 4, 5), occasioned (μὲν οὖν) the apostles to come together,
and in common to approach Him with the question, etc. Hence: They,
therefore, after they were come together, asked Him. Where this joint asking
occurred, is evident from ver. 12.³ To the μὲν corresponds the ἕν in ver. 7.
—ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦ λ. ] The disciples, acquainted with the O. T. promise, that
in the age of the Messiah the fullness of the Holy Spirit would be poured
out (Joel iii. 1, 2; Acts ii. 16 ff.), saw in ver. 5 an indirect intimation of
the now impending erection of the Messianic kingdom; comp. also
Schneckenburger, p. 169. In order, therefore, to obtain quite certain
information concerning this, their nearest and highest concern, they ask:
"Lord, if Thou at this time restorseth the (fallen) kingdom to the people Israel?"
The view of Lightfoot, that the words were spoken in indignation⁴ simply
introduces arbitrarily the point alleged.—ei] unites the question to the
train of thought of the questioner, and thus imparts to it the indirect
character. See on Matt. xii. 10, and on Luke xiii. 23.—ἐν τῷ χρ. τοῦ μοι
i.e. at this present time, which they think they might assume from ver. 4 f.
—ἀποκαθιστ.] See on Matt. xvii. 11. By their τῷ Ἰσραήλ they betray
that they have not yet ceased to be entangled in Jewish Messianic
hopes, according to which the Messiah was destined for the people of

¹ Comp. Winer, p. 152 (E. T. 301).
iv. 2, 6, v. 7, 30, vii. 3, 30; Dem. 90, 11; Alc. 1, 14.
³ Concerning the time of the question, this expression ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦ μου gives so far in-
formation that it must have occurred very soon after that meal mentioned in ver. 4, so
that no discussions intervened which would have diverted them from this definite inquiry
as to the time. Therefore it was probably on the same day. The τοῦ μου is thus ex-
plained, which sounds as a fresh echo of that
οἰ μετὰ πολλ. ταῦτ. ἡμ. 
⁴ "Itane nunc regnum restitues Judaeas illis, qui te crucifixerunt?"
### SYNOPSIS OF THE DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension of Christ</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen's martyrdom, 33 or 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claud. I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's conversion</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>Claud. II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's first journey to Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claud. III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's arrival at Antioch</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>Claud. III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of James</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The famine</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's second journey to Jerusalem</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's first missionary journey</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's third journey to Jerusalem, to the apostolic Council</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul commences his second missionary journey</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of the Jews from Rome</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul arrives at Corinth</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's fourth journey to Jerusalem (at Caesarea) and third missionary journey</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's abode at Ephesus</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's fifth journey to Jerusalem, and imprisonment</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's removal from Caesarea to Rome</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's two years' imprisonment at Rome</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Lehmann (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 312 f.) furnishes from this point onward the following dates:—Second journey to Jerusalem, 44; first missionary journey, 45 and 46; apostles' council, 47; second missionary journey, 48;—in 49 Paul arrives at Corinth; fourth journey to Jerusalem, 51; third missionary journey, 52, during which he remaines at Ephesus from autumn of 52 until 54, and in 55 proceeds to Macedonia and Greece; fifth journey to Jerusalem and imprisonment, 56; removal from Caesarea to Rome, 56; imprisonment in Rome, 59 to 60. These dates chiefly depend on the assumption that Felix had been recalled as early as the 56. —Laurent, *neces. Stud.* p. 94 f., fixes, with me, on the year 61 as that of the departure of Felix and the voyage of the apostles. —Gerlach (*Staatsalter in Syrien und Judäa*, § 14) doe
CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

BY DIFFERENT CHRONOLOGISTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31 1</td>
<td>39 1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31 1</td>
<td>33 1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31 1</td>
<td>30 1</td>
<td>32 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37 1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38 1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38 1</td>
<td>39 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38 1</td>
<td>39 1</td>
<td>38 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>60 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
<td>40 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
<td>43 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>44 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
<td>45 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
<td>46 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>49 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enter on the chronological question, but fixes on the year 60 or 61.——Holtzmann, Judenth. u. Christenth. p. 547 ff., agrees in essential points with our dates.—Stöffling, Betr. s. Exeges. d. Paul. Br. 1869, starting from the assumption that the fourteen years in Gal. ii. 1 are to be reckoned from the conversion to the composition of the Epistle, and that so likewise the fourteen years in 2 Cor. xii. 2 are to be determined, fixes for the conversion of Paul the year 40; for the first journey to Jerusalem, 43 (for the second, 45); for the third, 49; for the second missionary journey to Corinth, 50—53; for the fourth journey to Jerusalem, 53; for the arrest, 56; for the two years' imprisonment, 59 to 61.
Although the author contends strongly for the date he assigns for the ascension, that the feast referred to in John v. 1 was not the Passover, but the feast of Purim, and hence our Lord's public ministry extended only over a period of a little more than two years, the exact chronology of the Acts is still an unsettled question. The great diversity in the chronological table furnished by him is proof of this. "The exact number of Passovers from the baptism to the crucifixion of Christ, and the length of our Lord's ministry, are points on which there is much difference of opinion. For myself I can see no better view than the old one, that our Lord's ministry lasted three years." (Ryle.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων.

B, Lachm, Tisch. have πράξεις ἀποστόλων. So also Born. Later enlargements of the title in odd.: άνυπεραγγελιαστῶν πράξεις ἀποστόλων, al. al πράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων. Peculiar to D; πράξεις ἀποστόλων. Ν has merely πράξεις, but at the close πράξεις ἀποστόλων.—The codex D is particularly rich in additions, emendations, and the like, which Bornemann has recently defended as the original text. Matth. ed. min. p. 1 well remarks: "Hic liber (the Book of Acts) in re critica est difficilissimus et impeditissimus, quod multa in eo turbata sunt. Sed corruptiones versionum Syrurum, Bedae et scribæ codicis D omnem modum excedunt." Tisch. justly calls the proceeding of Bornemann, "monstruosam quandam ac perversam novitatem" (3).

Chapter I.


Ver. 1. Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησε.] Luke calls his Gospel the first history, inasmuch as he is now about to compose a second. πρῶτος, in the sense of μορφῆς. See on John i. 15. λόγος, narrative, history, or the like, what is contained in a book. As to ποιεῖν used of mental products, comp. Plat. Phaed. p. 61 B: ποιεῖν μθὰν, ἀλλ' οὐ λόγους. Hence λογοποιός = λογοκόπως. μὲν, without a subsequent ἦν. Luke has broken off the construction. Instead of continuing after ver. 2 somewhat as follows: "but this δεύτερος λόγος is to contain the further course of events after the Ascension," which thought he had before his mind in the μὲν, ver. 1,—he allows himself to be led by the mention of the apostles in the protasis to suppress the apodosis, and to pass on at once to the commencement of the history itself. — περὶ πάντων] a popular expression of completeness, and therefore not to be pressed. — ὁ ἐργαζόμενος κ. τ. λ.] ὁ is attracted, equivalent to ὁ; and, setting aside the erroneous assertion that ἔργατο ποιεῖν is equivalent to ἐποίησε (Grotius, Calovius, Vaikkenaar, Kuinoel), it is usually explained: "what Jesus began to do and to teach (and continued until the day)," etc., as if Luke had written: ὁ ἔργατος ἐποίησε κ. ἔργατον ἀρχὴ κ. τ. λ. Comp. xi. 4. But Luke has not so written, and it is arbitrary thus to explain his words. Baumgarten, after Olshausen and Schneckenburger, has maintained that ἔργατο denotes the whole work of Jesus up to His ascension as initial and preparatory, so that this second book is conceived as the continuation of that doing and teaching which was only begun by Jesus up to His ascension; as if Luke had written ἔργατο ποιῶν τε καὶ ὀδιδάσκων. In point of fact, ἔργατο is inserted according to the very frequent custom of the Synoptists, by which that which is done or said is in a vivid and graphic manner denoted according to its moment of commencement. It thus here serves to recall to the recollection from the Gospel all the several incidents and events up to the ascension, in which Jesus had appeared as doer and teacher. The reader is supposed mentally to realize from the Gospel all the scenes in which he has seen Jesus come forward as acting and

1 So in Xen. Ages. 10. 3, Anab. iii. 1. 1, and frequently. See also Schweig. Lex. Herod. II. p. 76; Creuzer Symbol. I. p. 44 ff.
2 Pearson, ad loc. p. 244.
3 Comp. Winer, p. 335 (E. T. 720); Butttm. neut. Gr. p. 318 (E. T. 365); Küehler, ad Xen. Anab. i. 2. 1; Baehni, Paral. p. 163 f.
teaching,—a beginning of the Lord, which occurred in the most various instances and varied ways up to the day of His ascent. The emphasis, moreover, lies on τοιον τε καὶ διάδοσιν, which comprehends the contents of the Gospel. It may, consequently, be paraphrased somewhat thus: "The first narrative I have composed of all that, by which Jesus exhibited His activity in doing and teaching during His earthly life up to His ascension." τοιον precedes, comp. Luke xxiv. 19, because it was primarily the ἔργα of Jesus that demonstrated His Messiahship, John x. 38; Acts x. 38.

Ver. 3. Until the day on which He was taken up, after that He had commissioned by means of the Holy Spirit the apostles whom He had chosen, belonging to ἐν ἀρισταρχῷ κ.τ.λ.—ἀρχὴ ἡ ἡμέρα;] a usual attraction, but to be explained as in ver. 22; Luke i. 20, xvii. 27; Matt. xxiv. 38. —ἐνεπλήκτοι] refers neither merely to the baptismal command, Matt. xxviii., nor merely to the injunction in ver. 4; but is to be left as general: having given them charges, "ut facere solent, qui ab amicis, vel etiam ex hoc mundo discendunt," Beza. —διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγίου] belongs to ἐπελήμ. τοῦ ἀποστ.: by means of the Holy Spirit, of which He was possessor (Luke iv. 1, xiv. 18; John iii. 34, xx. 23), and by virtue of which He worked, as in general, so specially as regards His disciples (ix. 55). Yet it is not to be explained as: by communication of the Spirit (comp. Bengel), since this is not promised till afterwards; nor yet as: quae agere deberent per Spir. S. (Grot.), which the words cannot bear. Others* connect διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγ. with ὅς ἐκλέξατο, quos per Sp. S. elegerat. But there thus would result a hyperbaton which, without any certain example in the N. T., would put a strong emphasis and yet without any warrant in the context, on διὰ πν. ἁγίου. —ὅς ἐκλέξ.] is added with design and emphasis; it is the significant premiss to ἐνεπλήκτοι, κ.τ.λ. (whom He had chosen to Himself) ; for the earlier ἐκλογή on the part of Jesus was a necessary preliminary to their receiving the ἐνεπλήκτοι διὰ πν. ἁγ. —ἀνεπλήκτοι[ Luke ix. 51, xxiv. 51 (Elz.).

Ver. 3. Οἷς καὶ] to whom also. To the foregoing ὅς ἐκλέξ., namely, there is attached a corresponding incident, through which the new intercourse, in which the ἐνεπλήκτοι κ.τ.λ. took place, is now set forth,—μετὰ τὸ πάσχειν αὐτῶν] includes in it the death as the immediate result of the suffering (iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 23; Heb. xiii. 12). —ὅτε ἡμέρ. τεσσαράκ.] He showed Himself to them throughout forty days, (v) not continuously, but from time to time, which is sufficiently indicated as well known by the preceding ἐν πολλ. τεκμηρίωσιν. —τὰ περὶ τῆς βασ. τ. Θεοῦ] speaking to them that which related to the Messiah's kingdom, which He would erect. The Catholica have taken occasion hence to assume that Jesus at this stage gave instructions concerning the hierarchy, the seven sacraments, and the like.—As to the variation of the narrative of the forty days from the narrative given in the Gospel, see on Luke xxiv. 50 f. This diversity

---

1 Comp. Papias in Eus. iii. 39.
4 Flat. Apol. p. 19 D, al.; Diesen. ad Dem. de cor. p. 177 f.; and see on Rom. xvi. 27.
presupposes that a not inconsiderable interval occurred between the composition of the Gospel and that of Acts, during which the tradition of the forty days was formed or at least acquired currency. The purposely chosen ἄρτι παντεύωσις ... in Luke xxiv. 51), but does not serve in the least degree to remove that discrepancy (in opposition to Baumgarten, p. 12), as if it presupposed that Jesus, on occasion of every appearance, quitted “the sphere of invisibility.” Comp. the ἐφη in Luke xxiv. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.; comp. with John xx. 17; Acts i. 21 f., x. 41; Luke xxiv. 42 f.

Ver. 4. To the general description of the forty days’ intercourse is now added by the simple καί, and, in particular, the description of the two last interviews, ver. 4 f. and ver. 6 ff., after which the ἀναλύομαι took place, ver. 9. — συναλίζομαι, παραγγελντις, αὐτοῖς, while He ate with them, He commanded them. συναλίζομαι is thus correctly understood by the vss. (Vulg.: conveneres), Chrysostom (τραπεζάων κοινωνών), Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome, Beda, and others, including Cassaubon. — συναλίζομαι (properly, to eat salt with one) in the sense of eating together, is found in a Greek translator of Ps. cxli. 4, where συναλειθω (LXX.: συνδείσω) corresponds to the Hebrew דֹּּּחַ, also in Clem. Hom. 6, and Maneth. v. 339. As to the thing itself, comp. on x. 41. Usually the word is derived from συναλίζων, to assemble. It would then have to be rendered; when He assembled with them. But against this it is decisive that the sense: when He had assembled with them, would be logically necessary, so that Luke must have written συναλίζομαι. The conjecture of Hemsterhuis: συναλίζομένωις, is completely unnecessary, although approved by Valkenier. — τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς] see on Luke xxiv. 49. Jesus means the promise και ἐσχήν, given by God through the prophets of the O. T. (comp. ii. 16), which, i.e. the realization of which, they were to wait for (περιμένων only here in the N. T., but often in the classics); it referred to the complete effusion of the Holy Spirit, which was to follow only after His exaltion. Comp. John viii. 39, xv. 26, xiv. 16. Already during their earthly intercourse the πνεύμα ἦγε was communicated by Jesus to the disciples partially and provisionally. Luke ix. 55; John xx. 21, 22.— ἦν ἡκούσατι μον] The oblique form of speech is changed, as frequently also in the classics, with the increase of animation into the direct form, Luke v. 41, and elsewhere, particularly with Luke. Bengel, moreover, aptly says: “Atque hic parallelismus ad arctissimum nexum pertinet utrisque libri Lucae,”—but not in so far as ἦν ἡκούσατι μου points back to Luke xxiv. 49 as to an earlier utterance (the usual opinion), but in so far as Jesus

1 Comp. Tob. xii. 19; 1 Kings viii. 8.
2 Herod. v. 12102; Xen. Anab. vii. 3. 48; Lucian, Lyc. 7.
3 Not as Luther (when He had assembled them), Grotius (“in unum recolligens qui dispersi fuerunt”), and most interpreters, including even Kninoel and Olshausen (not Beza and de Wette), explain it, as if Luke had employed the active. This is grammatically incorrect; it must then have been συναλίζομαι, or, with logical accuracy (as Luther felt), συναλίζομαι.
here, shortly before his ascension, gives the same intimation which was also given by Him on the ascension day (Luke xxiv. 49), directly before the ascent; although according to the gospel the day of the resurrection coincides with that of the ascension (v. p. 6). Therefore ἕν ἔκοισον πολλοί is to be considered as a reference to a former promise of the Spirit, not recorded by Luke. Comp. John xiv. 16 f., xv. 26.—On ἰκονεύει τι τινος, see Winer, p. 187 (E. T. 249).

Ver. 5. Reminiscence of the declaration of the Baptist, Luke iii. 16; John i. 33. "For on you the baptism of the Spirit will now soon take place which John promised instead of his baptism of water."—βαπτισθήσετε τὴν ἐπίπτωσιν καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χαρᾶς συμαινεῖ,, Theophyl. ; Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; Acts xi. 16. Moreover, comp. on John i. 33.—οὔ μετὰ πολλῇς ταύτῃ ἡμέρᾳ is not a transposition for οὔ πολλῇ μετὰ ταύτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, but: not after many of these, now and, up to the setting in of the future event, still current, days.¹ The position of the negative is to be explained from the idea of contrast, not after many, but after few.²

Ver. 6. Not qui consuerant (Vulgate, Luther, and others), as if what follows still belonged to the scene introduced in ver. 4; but, as is evident from συναλὶς, ver. 4, comp. with ver. 12, a new scene, at which the ascension occurred (ver. 9). The word of promise spoken by our Lord as they were eating (vv. 4, 5), occasioned (μὲν οὖν) the apostles to come together, and in common to approach Him with the question, etc. Hence: They, therefore, after they were come together, asked Him. Where this joint asking occurred, is evident from ver. 12.³ To the μὲν corresponds the οὐ in ver. 7.—ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ κ.τ.λ.] The disciples, acquainted with the O. T. promise, that in the age of the Messiah the fulness of the Holy Spirit would be poured out (Joel iii. 1, 2; Acts ii. 16 ff.), saw in ver. 5 an indirect intimation of the now impending erection of the Messianic kingdom; comp. also Schneckenburger, p. 169. In order, therefore, to obtain quite certain information concerning this, their nearest and highest concern, they ask: "Lord, if Thou at this time restorest the (fallen) kingdom to the people Israel!" The view of Lightfoot, that the words were spoken in indignation⁴ simply introduces arbitrarily the point alleged.—εἰ] unites the question to the train of thought of the questioner, and thus imparts to it the indirect character. See on Matt. xii. 10, and on Luke xiii. 28.—ἐν τῷ χρῷ τοῦτῳ i.e. at this present time, which they think they might assume from ver. 4 f.—ἀνακαθήσετι.] See on Matt. xvii. 11. By their τῷ Ἰσραήλ they betray that they have not yet ceased to be entangled in Jewish Messianic hopes, according to which the Messiah was destined for the people of

¹ Comp. Winer, p. 152 (E. T. 201).
² See Kühner, II. 688. On ταύτας, inserted between ἐν τῷ κ.τ.λ. and ἡμέρᾳ, comp. Xen. Anab. iv. 2. 6, v. 7. 20, vii. 3. 30; Dem. 90. 11; Alc. 1. 14.
³ Concerning the time of the question, this expression ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦτῳ gives so far information that it must have occurred very soon after that meal mentioned in ver. 4, so that no discussions intervened which would have diverted them from this definite inquiry as to the time. Therefore it was probably on the same day. The τοῦτῳ is thus explained, which sounds as a fresh echo of that οὔ μετὰ πολλῇς ταύτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
⁴ "Istane nunc regnum restitutum Judaeas illis, qui te cruciis affixerunt?"
Israel as such; comp. Luke xxiv. 21. An artificial explanation, on the other hand, is given in Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 647.—The circumstance that, by the declaration of Jesus, ver. 4 f., their sensuous expectation was excited and drew forth such a rash question, is very easily explained just after the resurrection, and need occasion no surprise before the reception of the Spirit itself; therefore we have not, with Baumgarten, to impute to the disciples the reflection that the communication of the Spirit would be the necessary internal ground for all the shaping of the future, according to which idea their question, deviating from the tenor of the promise, would be precisely a sign of their understanding.

Ver. 7 f. Jesus refuses to answer the question of the disciples; not indeed in respect of the matter itself involved, but in respect of the time inquired after, as not beseeing them (observe the emphatic оίχ χρόνον); and on the contrary (ἀλλά) He turns their thoughts, and guides their interest to their future official equipment and destination, which alone they were now to lay to heart. Chrysostom aptly says: διδασκάλου τοῦ τοῦτο ἐστὶ μὴ ἀ βουλέσται ὁ μάθητης, ἀλλ' ἀ συμφέρει μαθεῖν, διδάσκειν.—χρόνος ἡ καιρός] times or, in order to denote the idea still more definitely, seasons. καιρός is not equivalent to χρόνος, but denotes a definite marked off portion of time with the idea of fitness.¹ On ἡ, which is not equivalent to καί, comp. here Dem. Ol. 3: τίνα γὰρ χρόνον ἡ τίνα καιρόν τοῦ παρόντος βελτίω ζητεῖτε;—θεός εἰν τῇ ἑκάστῳ has established by means of His own plenitude of power. On ἐν, comp. Matt. xxi. 23.—The whole declaration (ver. 7) is a general proposition, the application of which to the question put by the disciples is left to them; therefore only in respect of this application is an ad hanc rem perficiendam to be mentally supplied with θεός. Bengel, however, well observes: “gravis descriptio reseratata divini;” and “ergo res ipsa firma est, alias nullum ejus rei tempus esset.” But this res ipsa was, in the view of Jesus, which, however, we have no right to put into the question of the disciples, in opposition to Hofmann,² the restoration of the kingdom, not for the natural, but for the spiritual Israel, comprehending also the believing Gentiles (Rom. iv. 9), for the Ἰσραήλ τοῦ θεοῦ (Gal. vi. 16); see Matt. viii. 11; John x. 16, 26, viii. 42 ff. al.; and already Matt. iii. 9;—δύναμιν ἐπελθῇ τοῦ ἄγ. πν. ἐφ' ἑμᾶς] power, when the Holy Spirit has (shall have) come upon you.³—μύρτωπες] namely, of my teaching, actions, and life, what ye all have yourselves heard and seen, v. 21 f., x. 39 ff.; Luke xxiv. 48; John xv. 27.—ἐν τε ἑρωνεῖα... τῆς τῆς denotes the sphere of the apostles’ work in its commencement and progress, up to its most general diffusion; therefore γῆς γῆς is not to be explained of the land, but of the earth; and, indeed, it is to be observed that Jesus delineates for the apostles their sphere ideally. Comp. xiii. 47; Isa. viii. 9; Rom. x. 18; Col. i. 28; Mark xvi. 15.

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

² Schriftdew. II. 2, p. 647.
³ Winer, p. 119 (E. T. 156).
of the presence of God, who takes to Himself His Son into the glory of heaven. Comp. on Luke i. 35; Matt. xvi. 5. Chrysostom calls this cloud ῥό ἔχναμα ῥό βασιλείαν. — Concerning the ascension itself, which was certainly bodily, but the occurrence of which has clothed itself with Luke in the traditional form of an external visible event (according to Dan. vii. 18; comp. Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64). The representation of the scene betrays a more developed tradition than in the Gospel, but not a special design (Schneckenburger: sanction of the foregoing promise and intimation; Baumgarten: that the exalted Christ was to appear as the acting subject properly speaking in the further course of the Book of Acts). Nothing of this kind is indicated.

Vv. 10, 11. 'Ἀστὶκῶς ἵδιαν] expresses continuance: they were in fixed gazing. To this (not to πορευμα. aor.) εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν belongs. Strangely erroneous is the view of Lange, Apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 12: that ὅσ is not temporal, but as if: "they wished to fix the blue (?) heaven, which one cannot fix." — πορευμοίων αὐτῶν] whilst He, enveloped by the cloud, was departing (into heaven). — καὶ ἱδον] as in Luke vii. 12, Acts x. 17; not as an anacoluthon, but: behold also there! — The men are characterized as inhabitants of the heavenly world, 'ἀγέλων, who are therefore clothed in white. See on John xx. 12. — οἱ καὶ εἰπον] who (not only stood, but) also said: comp. ver. 3. — τί ἱστηκατε κ.κ. The meaning is: "Remain now no longer sunk in aimless gazing after Him; for ye are not for ever separated from this Jesus, who will so come even as ye have seen Him go away into heaven." — φθοράς] i.e. in the same manner come down from heaven in a cloud as He was borne up. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 30. — On the emphasis φθοράς, ὅν τρόπον, comp. xxvii. 25; 2 Tim. iii. 8.

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

1 See remark subjoined to Luke xxiv. 51.
2 Comp. iii. 4, vi. 15, vii. 55, xi. 6, xiii. 9; 3 Cor. iii. 13, τὴν ἐνότητι might also have stood, Luke iv. 30, xxii. 56; Acts iii. 12, x. 4, xxiii. 1. See generally, Valck. Scol. p. 207 ff. Comp. Polyb. vi. 11. 7.
3 See Naegeleb, s. Ilia, p. 164, ed. 3.
4 According to Ewald, we are to think on Moses and Elias, as at the transfiguration.
5 But if the tradition had meant these—and in that case it would certainly have named them —Luke would hardly have left them unnamed. Comp. rather Luke xxiv. 4; Acts x. 30.
7 Wieseler, Synop. p. 435.
8 Baumgarten, p. 28 f.: that he wished to lead their thoughts to the future, according to Ezek. xi. 23; Zech. xiv. 6.
Sabbath’s way. The way is conceived as something which the mountain has, i.e. which is connected with it in reference to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Such is—and not with Wetstein and Kuinoel: τεχνον προ απεπεκοτον—the correct view also in the analogous passages in Kypke, II. p. 8. The more exact determination of δ ιστον εεγος ιπερων is here given; hence also the explanation of Alberti and Kypke, that it expresses the extent of the mountain (Sabbati constans stinere), is contrary to the context, and the use of τον εενον is to be referred to the general idea conjunctum quid cum quo esse. — Α αδες σαμβασον, a journey permitted on the Sabbath, according to the traditional maxims, was of the length of 2000 cubits. See on Matt. xxiv. 20. The different statements in Joseph. Antt. xx. 6. (six stadia), and Bell. Jud. v. 2. 3 (five stadia), are to be considered as different estimates of the small distance. Bethany was fifteen stadia from Jerusalem, hence the locality of the ascension is to be sought for beyond the ridge of the mountain on its eastern slope.

Vv. 13, 14. Εισηδενoν not: into their place of meeting, as Beza and others hold, but, in accordance with what immediately precedes: into the city. The simple style of a continued narrative. — τον επερων τηςπ, the room directly under the flat roof, used for praying and for meetings. It is here to be conceived as in a private house, whose possessor was devoted to the gospel, and not with de Dieu, Lightfoot, Hammond, Schoettgen, and Krebs, as an upper room in the temple (on account of Luke xxiv. 53; see on that passage), because, considering the hatred of the hierarchy, the temple could neither be desired by the followers of Jesus, nor permitted to them as a place for their special closed meetings. Perhaps it was the same room as in John xx. 19, 26. — οβ ισαν καραμ.] where, i.e. in which they went to reside, which was the place of their common abode. The following δε τον Πετρος κ.τ.λ. is a supplementary more exact statement of the subject of ανιδωσαν. According to Acts, it is expressly the Eleven only, who were present at the ascension. In the Gospel, xxiv. 38, comp. vvv. 36, 44, 50, the disciples of Emmaus and others are not excluded; but according to Mark xvi. 14, comp. vvv. 15, 19, 20, it is likewise only the Eleven.—As to the list of the apostles, comp. on Matt. x. 2—4; Mark iii. 17, 18; Luke vi. 14—16. — δ ζηλωτης the (formerly) zealot. See on Matt. x. 4. — Ιυδος τηςσελωσθενον the relationship is arbitrarily defined as: brother of the (younger) James. It is: son of (an otherwise unknown) James. See on Luke vi. 15; John xiv. 22; and Huther on Jude, Introd. § 1. Already the Syriac gives the correct rendering. — δυσνομαδον ] denotes no mere external being- together; but, as Luther correctly renders it: unanimously. — σων γνωσθη]
RETURN TO JERUSALEM.

along with women; not: cum uxoribus (as Calvin holds);¹ they are partially known from the Gospels; Matt. xxvi. 56, 61; Luke viii. 2 f., xxiv. 10; Mark xv. 40 f. — kai Μαρία kal, also, singles out, after the mention in general terms, an individual belonging to the class as worthy of special remark.² — ἀδελφοίς. The unbelief of the four brothers-german (α) of the Lord was very probably overcome by His resurrection. Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 7. Observe that here, besides the eleven apostles, two other classes are specified as assembled along with them (σὺν ... καὶ σῦ), namely (α), women, including the mother of Jesus; and (b) the brethren of Jesus. Among the latter, therefore, none of those eleven can be included. This, in opposition to Lange, Hengstenberg, and older commentators. Comp. on John vii. 3.

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

Vv. 16, 17. Ἀνήρ ἀδελφοί is more honourable and solemn than the simple familiar ἀδελφοί.¹ — ἕδει.] It could not but be an especial object with Peter to lay the foundation for his judgment, by urging that the destruction of Judas took place not accidentally, but necessarily according to the counsel of God. — τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην] this which stands written—comp. on viii. 35—is not, with Wolf and Eckermann, to be referred to Ps. xli. 10 (John xiii. 18, xviii. 3), because otherwise that passage must have been adduced; but to the passages contained in ver. 20, which Peter has already in view, but which he only introduces—after the remarks which the vivid thoughts crowding on him as he names Judas suggest—at ver. 20 in connection with what was said immediately before. — δὴ κατηγορ.] δὴ is equivalent to εἰς ἐκεῖνο, δὴ (Mark xvi. 14; John ii. 18, ix. 17; 2 Cor. i. 18, al.). If Judas had not possessed the apostolic office, the γραφή referred to, which predicted the very

¹ See also Calovius and others, not uninterested in opposing celibacy.
² See Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 11.
³ See on Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; John vii. 5.
⁴ Comp. Ewald, ad Apoc. 3. 4. The expression is not good Greek, but formed after the Hebrew, Num. i. 2, 18, 30, iii. 40, 43.
⁵ Comp. Wieseler, Synopsis, p. 434, and see on 1 Cor. xv. 6; also Lechler, apost. u. nachapost. Zeitt. p. 275 f.; Baumgarten, p. 29 f.
⁶ Comp. ii. 1, iii. 1; Luke xvii. 35; Matt. xxiii. 34; 1 Cor. vii. 5, xii. 20, xiv. 23; Hist.Susann. 14; often also in the LXX. and in Greek writers. See Raphael, Polyb., and Loesner.
vacating of an apostolic post, would not have been fulfilled in his fate. This fulfilment occurred in his case, inasmuch as he was an apostle. — τὸν κληρ. τῆς διακ. ταυτ. [the lot of this (presenting itself in us apostles) ministry, i.e. the apostolic office. Comp. Rom. xi. 18. ὁ κληρον is primarily the lot, ver. 26, then that which is assigned by lot, and then generally what is assigned, the share; just as in Greek writers.]1 Baumgarten gratuitously would understand it as an antitype of the share of the twelve tribes in the land of Canaan. The genitive is to be taken partitively—share in this ministry—as the idea of apostolic fellowship, in which each κληρον has therefore his partial possession in the service, also occurs in the sequel (see vv. 22, 26). — λαγχάνει here not, as in Luke i. 9, with the partitive genitive, but, as is usual (2 Pet. i. 1), with the accusative of the object.2 The word is the usual term for obtaining by lot, as in Luke i. 9; it next signifies generally to obtain, and is especially used of the receiving of public magistracies.3 So here in reference to τ. κληρ. τ. διακ. ταυτ.; in which case, however, an allusion to a hierarchical constitution (Zeller) is excluded by the generality of the usus loquendi of the expressions, which, besides, might be suggested by the thought of the actual use of the lot which afterwards took place.

Ver. 18. This person now acquired, for himself a field for the wages of his iniquity—a rhetorical indication of the fact exactly known to the hearers: for the money which Judas had received for his treason, a place, a piece of land, was purchased, Matt. xxvii. 6–8. This rhetorical designation, purposely chosen on account of the conscientiousness of Judas,4 clearly proves that ver. 18 is part of the speech of Peter, and not, as Calvin, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others think, a remark inserted by Luke. With regard to the expression of the fact itself, Chrys. correctly remarks: οὐκ ἐν τοῖς διακ. καὶ λαγχάνει τὴν αἰτίαν παρευθυνόντως οὐδὲν ἁπάτωσίν τει. To go further, and to assume—what also the fragment of Papias in Cramer's Cat. narrates—that the death of Judas took place in the field itself,5 is not warranted by any indication in the purposely chosen form of representation. Others, such as Strauss, Zeller, de Wette, Ewald, have been induced by the direct literal tenor of the passage to assume a tradition deviating from Matthew, that Judas himself had actually purchased the field; although it is improbable in itself that Judas, on the days immediately following his treason, and under the pressure of its tragical event, should have made the purchase of a property, and should have chosen for this purchase the locality of Jerusalem, the arena of his shameful deed. — καὶ προνηθε γενόμενον, etc.] καὶ is the simple and, annexing to the infamous deed its bloody reward. By προνηθε γενόμενον.6 θ. l., the death of Judas is represented as a violent fall,7 and bursting. The particular circumstances are presupposed as well known,
but are unknown to us. The usual mode of reconciliation with Matthew—that the rope, with which Judas hanged himself, broke, and that thus what is here related occurred—is an arbitrary attempt at harmonizing. Luke follows another tradition, of which it is not even certain whether it pointed to suicide (ς). The twofold form of the tradition, and in Papias there occurs even a third, does not render a tragical violent end of Judas unhistorical in itself (Strauss, Zeller, and others), but only makes the manner of it uncertain. See, generally, on Matt. xxvii. 5,—ἐκλάξας] he cracked, burst in the midst of his body—a rhetorically strong expression of bursting with a noise.  

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

---

1 See on Matt. xxvii. 5, and comp. Intro. sec. 1.  
4 Antiqu.: of the dwellers of Jerusalem (who spoke the Aramaic dialect), spoken from the standpoint of Luke and Theophilus, "quorum alter Graece scribere alter legere," Erasmus.  
5 Aeschin. i. 99: Matt. xxvii. 7.  
6 Valckkenset well observes on the distinction between these two ideas: "Habent omnes dialecti ariquid inter se commune; habent enim omnes randem lingvam matrem, sed dialectum effect; quod habent singulare peculiare sibi." The Greeks also employ ὑπάρχει in both senses (see also Clem. Al. Strom. L 21, p. 404, Pott).  
Ver. 20. Ἡρ] The tragic end of Judas was his withdrawal from the apostolic office, by which a new choice was now necessary. But both that withdrawal and this necessity are, as already indicated in ver. 16, to be demonstrated not as something accidental, but as divinely ordained.—The first passage is Ps. lxix. 26, freely quoted from memory, and with an intentional change of the plural (LXX, αὐτῶν), because its historical fulfillment is represented καὶ ἔξοχήν in Judas. The second passage is Ps. cix. 8, verbatim after the LXX. Both passages contain curses against enemies of the theocracy, as the antitype of whom Judas here appears.—The ἐκτασίς is not that χωρίον which had become desolate by the death of Judas (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others; also Strauss, Hofmann, de Wette, Schneckenburger), but it corresponds to the parallel ἐπισκοπή, and as the χωρίον is not to be considered as belonging to Judas (see on ver. 18), the meaning is: “Let his farm, i.e. in the antitypical fulfillment of the saying in the Psalm, the apostolic office of Judas, become desolate, forsaken by its possessor, and non-existent, i.e. let him be gone, who has his dwelling therein.” — τὴν ἐπισκοπήν] the oversight, the superintendence which he had to exercise, ἡγεῖται, in the sense of the πάροιχος: the apostolic office. Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 1 (of the office of a bishop).

Vv. 21, 22. Οὕτω] In consequence of these two prophecies, according to which the office of Judas had to be vacated, and its transference to another is necessary. — τῶν συνελήφτων] dependent on ἐν, ver. 22: one of the men who have gone along with us, who have taken part in our wanderings and journeys. Others: who have come together with us, assembled with us. So Vulgate, Beza, de Wette, but never so in the N. T. See on Mark xiv. 53. — ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ, ἐν ὧ̣] all the time, when. — εἰσὶν ἤδη καὶ ἐξῆλθαν] a current, but not a Greek, designation of constant intercourses. Deut. xxviii. 19; Ps. cxxi. 8; 1 Sam. xxix. 6; 2 Chron. i. 10. Comp. John x. 9; Acts ix. 28. — ἵππος] a brief expression for εἰσῆλθα, ὑπ’ ἡμᾶς κ. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. — ἔρημος . . . Ἰωάννου is a parenthesis, and ἔστι τῆς ἡμέρας is to be attached to εἰσῆλθε . . . Ἰωάννου, as Luke xxiii. 5. See on Matt. xx. 8. — ἔστι τὸν ἡμᾶς κ. τ.λ.] ἡ is not put by attraction for ὦ as the attraction of the dative, very rare even among the Greek writers, is without example in the N. T., but is the genitive of the definition of time. Hence also the expression having the preposition involved, ἐξ ἡμῶν τῆς ἡμέρας, ver. 2, comp. xxiv. 11. — μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστ. αὐτῷ i.e. apostle, inasmuch as the apostles announce the resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. xv.), the historical foundation of the gospel, as eye-witnesses, i.e. as persons who had themselves seen and conversed with the risen Jesus; comp. ii. 32, and see on ver. 8. — τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς] is impressively removed to the end, pointing to those to be found among the persons present (of those there).

1 Lucian, D. D. xx. 8, frequently in the LXX. and Apocyr.
2 ix. 39, x. 48, al.; Hom. B. x. 294.
3 Soph. O. E. 572; Polyb. i. 78. 4.
4 See Valckenaer on the passage, and ad Burip. Phoen. 536; Winer, p. 590 (E. T. 750). Comp. also John i. 51.
5 See Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. II. 2. 4.
6 Matthiae, § 377. 2; Winer, p. 155 (E. T. 204). So, too, in Lev. xxiii. 15; Bar. i. 19. Comp. Tob. x. 1; Susann. 15· Hist. Bel and Drag. 3.
and emphatically comprehending them. — Thus Peter indicates, as a requisite of the new apostle, that he must have associated with the apostles (ἡμῶν) during the whole of the ministry of Jesus, from the time when John was still baptizing (ἐν τῷ βάπτ. Ἰωάνν.) until the ascension. That in this requirement, as Heinrichs and Künzel suppose, Peter had in view one of the Seventy disciples, is an arbitrary assumption. But it is evident that for the choice the apostles laid the entire stress on the capacity of historical testimony (comp. x. 41), and justly so, in conformity with the positive contents of the faith which was to be preached, and as the element of the new divine life was to be diffused. On the special subject-matter of the testimony (τῆς ἰσαρ. αὐτοῦ) Bengel correctly remarks: "qui illud credidere, totam fidem suscepera." How Peter himself testified, may be seen at 1 Pet. i. 3. Comp. Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, iv. 33, v. 32, x. 40.

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

Vv. 24, 25. Without doubt it was Peter, who prayed in the name of all present. The κρυπτάμαι, is contemporaneous with εἰσάγω: praying they said. See on Eph. i. 9.—κύριε] (1), γνώρισμά. Comp. iv. 29. In opposition to the view of Bengel, Olshausen, and Baumgarten, that the prayer is directed to Jesus, —for which ὅν ἐκλήσου ἀνεπάκερτος, because Christ chooses His own messengers,—xv. 7 is decisive, where the same Peter says expressly of God: ἐκλήσω διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκούσαι τὰ ἔφη, etc.; and then also calls God καταγγέλλωσε (comp. 27 ἐπὶ, Jer. xvii. 10). By the decision of the lot the call to the apostleship was to take place, and the call is that of God, Gal. i. 15. God is addressed as καταγγέλλωσε, because the object was to choose the intrinsically best qualified among the two, and this was a matter depending on the divine knowledge of the heart. The word itself is found neither in Greek writers nor in the LXX.—In λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον (see the critical notes) the ministry is considered as a place, as a post which the person concerned

1 Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 235. 2 And Luke relates this as faithfully and dispassionately as he does what is contained in x. 41. He would hardly have done so, if he had had the design imputed to him by Baur and his school, as such sayings of Peter did not at all suit the case of Paul. 3 In opposition to Heinrichs and others, also Ullmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1892, p. 377 2. 4 See also Mynster in the Stud. u. Krit. 1892, p. 395 f. 5 Traditional notices in Cave, Antiq. ap. p. 735 ff. According to Eus. i. 12. 1, he was one of the Seventy. Concerning the apocryphal Gospel under his name, already mentioned by Origen, see Fabric. Cod. apocr. N. T. p. 732 ff. Apocryphal Acts Andree & Matthaei may be seen in Tischendor. Act. apocr. p. 122 ff.
is to receive. Comp. Ecclus. xii. 13. — καὶ ἀποστολῆς] designates more definitely the previous διακονια. There is thus here, among the many instances for the most part erroneously assumed, a real case of an ἐν διὰ δόνοιν.1— ἀφ’ ἡς παρέβασα] away from which Judas has passed over, to go to his own place. A solemn circumstance in description. Judas is vividly depicted, as he, forsaking his apostleship (ἀφ’ ἡς), has passed from that position to go to his own place. Comp. Ecclus. xxxiii. 18: παραβαίνων ἀπὸ τῆς κλίνης αὐτοῦ. — πορευθ. eἰς τ. τόπ. τ. ἱδον] denotes the end destined by God for the unworthy Judas as his own, to which he must come by his withdrawal from the apostolic office. But the meaning of ὁ τόπος ὁ ἱδος (the expression is purposely chosen as correlative to τὸν τόπον τ. διακ. etc.) is not to be decided from the linguistic use of τόπος, as τόπος may denote any place, but entirely from the context. And this requires us to understand by it Gehenna, which is conceived as the place to which Judas, according to his individuality, belongs. As his treason was so frightful a crime, the hearers could be in no doubt as to the τόπος ἱδος. This explanation is also required for the completeness and energy of the speech, and is itself confirmed by analogous rabbinical passages.2 Hence the explanations are to be rejected which refer τόπος ἱδος to the habitation of Judas,3 or to that γυριόν, where he had perished,4 or to the "societas, quam cum sacerdotibus ceterisque Jesu advocativis intereat" (Heinrichs). Others (Hammond, Homberg, Heumann, Kypke, comp. already Oecumenius) refer πορευθ. . . ἱδον even to the successor of Judas, so that the τόπος ἱδος would be the apostleship destined for him. But such a construction would be involved (πορευθ. would require again to be taken as an object of λαβεῖν), and after λαβεῖν . . . ἀποστολῆς tautological. The reading δικαίων, instead of ἱδον, in A hits the correct meaning. The contrast appears in Clem. Cor. I. 5 as to Paul: eἰς τὸν ἄγιον τὸν τόπον ἰπορεύθη, and as to Peter: eἰς τὸν ὄφειλόμενον τὸν τόπον τῆς δόξης.5

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

1 See Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 556; Nägelsb. s. ilias, p. 261, ed. 3.
2 See in Lightfoot, e.g. Basil Thurim, on Num. xxiv. 25: "Balaam ivit in locum summum, i.e. in Gehennam."  
3 Keuchen, Moldenhauer, Krebs, Bolten. 
4 Eil extending, Zeller, Lange, Baumgarten, and others. 
5 Comp. Polyc. Phil. 9; Ignat. Magn. 5. 
6 πάλλειν, comp. Hom. H. iii. 316. 334, vili. 181, Od. xii. 306, al. 
7 Hom. Od. xiv. 200; Ps. xxii. 19, al. Comp. LXX. Ezek. xxiv. 6; John i. 7. 
8 Plut. Legg. vi. 750 C; comp. Prov. xvi. 33. 
9 Num. xxvi. 59 ff.; Josh. vii. 14; 1 Sam. x. 90; 1 Chron. xxiv. 5, xxv. 8; Prov. xvi. 33; comp. also Luke i. 9.
NOTES.

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

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(*) Name. V. 1.

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

(v) "Forty days." V. 3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Fate of Judas. V. 18.

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

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

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

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

(Alexander.

(i) "Thou, Lord." V. 24.

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


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

Ver. 1. σπανεσ ὁμοθυμάδον] Lachm. and Tisch. read πάντες ὁμοθ, after A B C* Ν, min. Vulg. Correctly: the ὁμοθυμάδον, so very frequent in the N. T. only in John; πάντες, which is wanting in Ν*, critically goes along with the reading ὁμοθ. — Ver. 2. καθημενοι] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read καθετζιμένοι, according to C D. The Recepta (comp. on xx. 9) is more usual in the N. T., and was accordingly inserted. — Ver. 3. άσει] is wanting only in Ν*. — ἐκάθισε] Born., following D* Ν*, Syr. utr. Arr. Capt. Ath. Did. Cyr., reads ἐκάθισαν. A correction occasioned by γλώσσαι. — Ver. 7. After ἐξιστανυ ἐδ Εlz. has πάντες, which Lachm. Scholz. Tisch. Born. have erased, following B D, min. and several vss. and Fathers. From ver. 12. — πρός ἀλλήλοις] is wanting in A B C Ν, 26, Capt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. Theodoret. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It was, as self-evident, easily passed over. Its genuineness is supported by the reading πρός ἀλλήλους, ver. 12, instead of ἀλλος πρός ἀλλον, which is found in 4, 14, al., Aeth. Vulg. Chrys. Theophyl., and has manifestly arisen from this passage. — Ver. 12. τι ἀν θλοι τοῦτο εῖναι] Lachm. Born. read τι θέλει τοῦτο εἶναι, following A B C D, min. Chrys.: A has θέλει after τοῦτο. But after λέγειν the direct expression was most familiar to the transcribers (comp. ver. 7). — Ver. 13. διακελεύοντες] Elz. reads χλελοζοντες, against preponderating testimony. — Ver. 16. 'Ιωάε] Tisch. and Born. have deleted this word on too weak authority; it is wanting among the codd. only in D. — Ver. 17. ἐνυπνιοις] Elz. reads ἐνύπνια, against decisive codd. From LXX. Joel iii. 1. — Ver. 22. αὐτοῖς] Elz. reads καί αὐτοί. But Lachm. and Tisch. have correctly deleted καί, in accordance with A B C* D E Ν, min. and several vss. and Fathers. καί, both after καθώς and before αὐτοί, was very familiar to the transcribers. — Ver. 23. After εἰδον Elz. and Scholz read λάβοντες, which is wanting in A B C Ν*, min. and several vss. and Fathers. An addition to develop the construction. — Instead of χειρῶν, Lachm. Tisch. Born. have χειρός, following A B C D Ν, min. Syr. p. Aeth. Ath. Cyr. And justly, as χειρῶν was evidently inserted for the sake of the following ἀνέμοι. — Ver. 24. βανάναν] D. Syr. Erp. Capt. Vulg. and several Fathers read δόντα. So Born. From vv. 27, 31. — Ver. 27. δόντα] Lachm. Born. and Tisch. read δόν, which was already recommended by Griesb., in accordance with A B C D Ν, min. Clem. Epiph. Theophyl. As in the LXX. Ps. xvi. 10, the reading is also different, A having δόν and B δόν; the text here is to be decided merely by the preponderance of testimonies, which favours δόν. — Ver. 30. Before καθισα, Elz. Scholz. Born. read τῷ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστάσεων τῶν Χριστῶν, which is wanting in A B C D* Ν, min. and most vss. and several Fathers, has in other witnesses considerable variation, and, as already Mill correctly saw, is a marginal gloss inserted in the text. — Instead of τοῦ βρόντον, Lachm. Born. Tisch. read τῶν βρόντων, according to A B C D Ν, min. Eus. This important authority, as well as the circumstance that τί with the genitive along with καθισα is very usual in the N. T. (comp. Luke xxii. 20; Acts xii. 21, xxv. 6, 17; Matt. xix. 28, xxiii. 2,
xxv. 31), decides for the accusative. — Ver. 31. καταλείψῃ] A B C D E Μ, min. and several Fathers read ἐγκαταλείψῃ. Recommended by Grieseb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. From ver. 27. Therefore not only is φῶν (instead of φῶν) read by Tisch., but also after καταλείψῃ there is read by Elz. ἡ ψευθὸς αὐτός, for the omission of which the authorities decide. — οὕτως... οὕτως is according to important testimony to be received, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., instead of οὗ... οὕτως, as the reading given in the text appears likewise to have been formed from ver. 27. — Ver. 33. οὐεῖ] Elz. Scholz have νῦν οὐείς. But, according to A B C* D Μ, min. and many vss. and Fathers, Lachm. Born. Tisch. have erased νῦν, which is an addition by way of gloss. — Ver. 37. ποιήσωμεν] ποιήσωμεν is found in A C E Μ, min. Fathers. But the deliberative subjunctive was the more usual. Comp. on iv. 16. — Ver. 38. ἐστι] is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be erased, as it is entirely wanting in B min. Vulg. ms. Aug., and other witnesses read φησίν, which they have partly after μετανοεῖ. (A C Μ, 15, al.), partly αὐτός (D). A supplementary addition. — Ver. 40. διεσαρμάτου] Elz. Scholz read διεσαρμάτωρος, against decisive testimony. A form modelled after the following imperfect. — Ver. 41. After οὗν, Elz. Scholz read ἀπεμένωσ, which Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted, in accordance with far preponderating testimony. A strengthening addition. — Ver. 42. καὶ before τῇ κλάσει is rejected by decisive testimony (erased by Lachm. Tisch. Born.). — Ver. 43. εἰσέρχομαι] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read εἰσέρχομαι, according to A B C D Μ, min. Vulg. Copt. Syr. utr. This considerable attestation prevents us from assuming a formation resembling what follows; on the contrary, εἰσέρχομαι has been inserted as the more usual form. — Ver. 47. τῇ εὐκάλυψι] is wanting in A B C Μ, Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Cyr. Deleted by Lachm., after Mill and Bengel. It was omitted for the sake of conformity to ver. 41, because καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ, iii. 1, was considered as still belonging to ii. 47, and therefore iii. 1 began with Ἰερός δέ (so Lachm.).

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

1 Concerning the Pentecostal occurrence, see van Hengel, de gans der talen, Prikaster-studie, Leid. 1884.
2 See Gesen. Thes. s.v. מַעְלָם.
3 Comp. also ix. 28; Luke ii. 6, xxii. 9, 51, and many similar passages in the N. T. and in the Apocrypha.
4 Comp. 3 Eedr. 158; Dan. ix. 2.
5 Ostern und Pfingst, p. 30 f.
6 Comp. 2 Macc. xii. 32.
moral signification, and ἐν τῷ πεντηκοστῷ τοῦτῷ is there: on the Pentecost-feast. The feast of Pentecost, נְפַרְצָשׁ, Deut. xvi. 9, 10 (ἀγιὰ ἐν τῷ ἔθνους, Tob. l.c.), was one of the three great festivals, appointed as the feast of the grain-harvest (Ex. xxiii. 16; Num. xxviii. 26), and subsequently, although we find no mention of this in Philo and Josephus, regarded also as the celebration of the giving of the law from Sinai, falling (Ex. xix. 1) in the third month. It was restricted to one day, and celebrated on the fiftieth day after the first day of the Passover (Lev. xxiii. 15, 16); so that the second paschal day, i.e. the 10th of Nisan, the day of the sheaf offering, is to be reckoned as the first of these fifty days. Now, as in that year the Passover occurred on the evening of Friday (see on John xviii. 28), and consequently this Friday, the day of the death of Jesus, was the 14th of Nisan, Saturday the 15th, and Sunday the 10th, the tradition of the ancient church has very correctly placed the first Christian Pentecost on the Sunday. Therefore the custom—which, besides, cannot be shown to have existed at the time of Jesus—of the Karaites, who explained בּוּשׁ in Lev. xxiii. 15 not of the first day of the Passover, but of the Sabbath occurring in the paschal week, and thus held Pentecost always on a Sunday, is to be left entirely out of consideration (in opposition to Hitzig); and it is not to be assumed that the disciples might have celebrated with the Karaites both Passover and Pentecost. But still the question arises: Whether Luke himself conceived of that first Christian Pentecost as a Saturday or a Sunday? As he, following with Matthew and Mark the Galilean tradition, makes the Passover occur already on Thursday evening, and be partaken of by Jesus Himself, and accordingly makes the Friday of the crucifixion the 15th of Nisan; so he must necessarily—but just as erroneously—have conceived of this first πεντηκοστῆ as a Saturday, unless we should assume that he may have had no other conception of the day of Pentecost than that which was in conformity with the Christian custom of the Sunday celebration of Pentecost; which, indeed, does not correspond with his account of the day of Jesus’ death as the 15th Nisan, but shows the correctness of the Johannine tradition.—[ὑπὲρ πάντως ὅσοι ἐν τῷ αἰώνι] Concerning the text, see the critical remarks; concerning ἐν τῷ αἰώνι, see on i. 16. These πάντως, all, were not merely the apostles, but all the followers of Jesus then in Jerusalem, partly natives and partly strangers, including the apostles. For, first of all, it may certainly be presumed that on the day of Pentecost, and, moreover, at the hour of prayer (ver. 15), not the apostles alone, but with them also the other μαθηταί—among whom there were, without doubt, many foreign pilgrims to the feast—were assembled. Moreover, in ver. 14 the apostles are distinguished from the rest. Further, the πάντως,

1 See Fritzsch in loc.
4 See Lightfoot and Wetstein in loc.; Ewald, Alteh. p. 476 f.; Kell, Archäol. § 52.
5 In opposition to the view of Hupfeld, de primitiva et vera fessorum ap. Hebr. raione, Hal. 1859, who will have the fifty days reckoned from the last paschal day; see Ewald, Jahrh. IV. p. 184 f.
6 Ideler, II. p. 618; Wieseler, Synop. p. 849.
7 See also Vahlhinger in Herzog’s Entschr. XL. p. 476 f.
designedly added, by no means corresponds to the small number of the apostles (i. 26), especially as in the narrative immediately preceding mention was made of a much greater assembly (i. 15); it is, on the contrary, designed—because otherwise it would have been superfluous—to indicate a still greater completeness of the assembly, and therefore it may not be limited even to the 120 persons alone. Lastly, it is clear also from the prophetic saying of Joel, adduced in ver. 16 ff., that the effusion of the Spirit was not on the apostles merely, but on all the new people of God, so that διακονεῖ (ver. 1) must be understood of all the followers of Jesus—of course, according to the latitude of the popular manner of expression.

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

¹ Comp. τρητοίς βιον, Arrian. Epit. Al. II. 6. 3.; Fussae. x. 17. 11.
the temple, with the same warrant there might be seen in this an equally imposing indication of the entire severance of the new theocracy from the old. Yet Luke has indicated neither the one nor the other idea, and it is not till ii. 44 that the visit to the temple emerges in his narrative.—Kaiser\(^1\) infers from ἥσυχος . . . τις τὸ αὐτῶ, ver. 1, as well as from οἶκος, καθήμενος, ὁ ἐμπίστικα, ver 15, etc., that this Christian private assembly, at the first feast of Pentecost, had for its object the celebration of the Agapae.\(^3\) An interpretation arbitrarily put into the words. The sacredness of the festival was in itself a sufficient reason for their assembling, especially considering the deeply excited state of feeling in which they were, and the promise which was given to the apostles for so near a realization. — ὁ ἥσυχος κα ἐξομηνῶν, that is, in which they were sitting. We have to conceive those assembled, ere yet the hour of prayer (ver. 15) had arrived (for in prayer they stood), sitting at the feet of the teachers.

Ver. 3. After the audible οὐκεῖον immediately follows the visible. Incorrectly Luther: "there were seen on them the tongues divided as if they were of fire." The words mean: There appeared to them, i.e. there were seen by them, tongues becoming distributed, fire-like, i.e. tongues which appeared like little flames of fire, and were distributed (ii. 45; Luke xxi. 17, xxiii. 34) upon those present; see the following εἰκάθια κ.τ.λ. They were thus appearances of tongues, which were luminous, but did not burn: not really consisting of fire, but only ὡσεὶ πυρός; and not confluent into one, but distributing themselves severally on the assembled. As only similar to fire, they bore an analogy to electric phenomena; their tongue-shape referred as a οὐκεῖον to that miraculous λαλεῖν which ensued immediately after, and the fire-like form to the divine presence (comp. Ex. iii. 2), which was here operative in a manner so entirely peculiar. The whole phenomenon is to be understood as a miraculous operation of God manifesting Himself in the Spirit, by which, as by the preceding sound from heaven, the effusion of the Spirit was made known as divine, and His efficacy on the minds of those who were to receive Him was enhanced. A more special physiological definition of the οὐκεῖον, vv. 2, 3, is impossible. Lange,\(^4\) fancifully supposes that the noise of the wind was a streaming of the heavenly powers from above, audible to the opened visionary sense, and that the tongues of fire were a disengaging of the solar fire-power of the earth and its atmosphere (?). The attempts, also, to convert this appearance of fire-like tongues into an accidental electric natural occurrence (Paulus, Thiess, and others) are in vain; for these flames, which make their appearance, during an accumulation of electric matter, on towers, masts, and even on men, present far too weak resemblances; and besides, the room of a house, where the phenomenon exclusively occurred, was altogether unsuited for any such natural development. The representation of the text is monstrously altered by Heinrichs: Fulgura ceilam vero pervadebant, sed in
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\(^1\) Commentar. 1830, pp. 3-23; comp. bibl. Theol. II. p. 41.

\(^2\) Comp. Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christl. Arch. IV. p. 184.

\(^3\) Therefore the expression is not to be explained from Isa. v. 24, for there is a representation of that which consumes.

\(^4\) Apost. Zeitatt. II. p. 19.
Gift of Tongues.

inuisitatis imaginex ex effinxit apostolorum commota mens; as also by Heumann: that they believed that they saw the fiery tongues merely in the ecstatic state; and not less so by Eichhorn, who says that "they saw flames" signifies in rabbinical usus loquendi: they were transported into ecstatic excitement. The passages adduced by Eichhorn from Schöttgen contain no merely figurative modes of expression, but fancies of the later Rabbinians to be understood literally in imitation of the phenomena at Sinai,—of which phenomena, we may add, a real historical analogue is to be recognised in our passage,—εκάθεν τα], namely, not an indefinite subject, something, but such a γλώσσα ὡσπι πυρός. If Luke had written εκάθεν (see the critical remarks), the notion that one γλώσσα sat upon each would not have been definitely expressed. Occumenius, Beza, Castalio, Schöttgen, Kuinoel, incorrectly take πῦρ as the subject, since, in fact, there was no fire at all, but only something resembling fire; ὡσπι πυρός serves only for comparison, and consequently πῦρ cannot be the subject of the continued narrative. Others, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Wolf, Bengel, Heinrichs et al., consider the πνεύμα ἄγιον as subject. In that case it would have to be interpreted, with Fritzsche, Conject. i. p. 18: καθανανς ἐς ἐκαστόν αὑρῶ, ἐντιόθησαν ἀπαντες πνεύματος ἄγιον, and Matt. xvii. 18 would be similar. Very harsh, seeing that the πνεύμα ἄγιον, in so far as it sat on the assembled, would appear as identical with its symbol, the fiery tongues; but in so far as it filled the assembled, as the πνεύμα itself, different from the symbol.—The τα] joining on to the preceding (Lach. reads κα], following insufficient testimony) connects εκάθεας κ.τ.λ. with ἐφόθησαν κ.τ.λ. into an unity, so that the description divides itself into the three acts: ἐφόθησαν κ.τ.λ., ἐπιλήθησαν, κ.τ.λ., and ἡρέαντο κ.τ.λ., as is marked by the thrice recurring κα].

Ver. 4. After this external phenomenon, there now ensued the internal filling of all who were assembled, without exception (ἐκλ. ἄπαντες, comp. ver. 1), with the Holy Spirit, of which the immediate result was, that they, and, indeed, these same ἄπαντες (comp. iv. 31)—accordingly not excluding the apostles (in opposition to van Hengel)—ἡρέαντο λαλεῖν κτίριας γλώσσαις. Earlier cases of being filled with the Spirit are related to the present as the momentary, partial, and typical, to the permanent, complete, and antitypical, such as could only occur after the glorifying of Jesus; see ver. 33; John xvi. 7, vii. 39. — ἡρέαντο] brings into prominence the primum impetus of the act as its most remarkable element. — λαλεῖν κτίριας γλώσσαις] For the sure determination of what Luke meant by this, it is decisive that κτίριας γλώσσαις on the part of the speakers was, in point of fact, the same thing which the congregated Parthians, Medes, Elamites, etc., designated as ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις (comp. ver. 8: τῇ ἱδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν). The κτίρια γλώσσαι (κ) therefore are, according to the text, to be considered as absolutely nothing else than languages, which were different from the native

---

3 Chrysostom well remarks: «οἱ ἅ ἐν ἑιρετεῖς, καὶ ἀποκτάνων δύναν ἐκι, εἰ μὴ καί οἱ ἄλοι ἑλικτοχεῖν. See also van Hengel, p. 54 ff.
language of the speakers. They, the Galileans, spoke, one Parthian, another Median, etc., consequently languages of another sort; i.e., foreign, 1 Cor. xiv. 21; and these indeed—the point wherein precisely appeared the miraculous operation of the Spirit—not acquired by study (γλῶσσας καυ主管部门, Mark xvi. 17). Accordingly the text itself determines the meaning of γλῶσσα as languages, not tongues, as van Hengel again assumes on the basis of ver. 3, where, however, the tongues have only the symbolic destination of a divine σήμεωρ; and thereby excludes the various other explanations, and in particular those which start from the meaning verba obsolete et poetica. This remark holds good (1) of the interpretation of Herder, that new modes of interpreting the ancient prophets were meant; (2) against Heinrichs, who founds on that assumed meaning of γλῶσσα his explanation of enthusiastic speaking in languages which were foreign indeed, different from the sacred language, but were the native languages of the speakers; (3) against Bleek. The latter explains γλῶσσα as glosses, i.e., unusual, antiquated poetical and provincial expressions. According to him, we are not to think of a connected speaking in foreign languages, but of a speaking in expressions which were foreign to the language of common life, and in which there was an approximation to a highly poetical phraseology, yet so that these glosses were borrowed from different dialects and languages (therefore ἑρπαίς). Against this explanation of the γλῶσσα, which is supported by Bleek with much erudition, the unus loquendi is already decisive. For γλῶσσα in that sense is a grammatico-technical expression, or at least an expression borrowed from grammarians, which is only as such philologically beyond dispute. But this meaning is entirely unknown to ordinary linguistic usage, and particularly to that of the O. and N. T. How should Luke have hit upon the use of such a singular expression for a thing, which he could easily designate by words universally intelligible? How could he put this expression even into the mouths of the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, etc.? For ἑρπαίς γλῶσσαίς, ver. 11, must be explained in a manner entirely corresponding to this. Further, there would result for ἑρπαίς a wholly absurd meaning. ἑρπαίς γλῶσσα, forsooth, would be nothing else than glosses, obsolete expressions, which are peculiar only to the Parthians, or to the Medes, or to the Elamites, etc., just as the ἀντικαί γλῶσσαί of Theodorus are provincialisms of Attica, which were not current among the rest of the Greeks. Finally, it is further decisive against Bleek that, according to his explanation of γλῶσσα
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1 Luke ix. 29; Mark xvi. 13; Gal. 1. 6. 8; Pollux. li. 4; Plut. Pyth. orae. 34; and see Giese. Acod. Dial. p. 42 ff.
2 Van Hengel understands, according to ver. 3, by ἑρπαίς γλ., "tongues of fire, which the believers in Jesus have obtained through their communion with the Holy Spirit." That is, "an open-hearted and loud speaking to the glorifying of God in Christ," such as had not been done before. Previously their tongues had been without fire.
5 After A. G. Meyer, de charismate τῶν γλῶσων, etc., Hannov. 1797.
7 See all the passages in Bleek, p. 32 ff., and already in A. G. Meyer, l.c.; Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 741.
8 In Athen. xiv. p. 685 c, p. 1457, ed. Dindorf.
transferred also to 1 Cor. xii. 14, no sense is left for the singular term γλώσσα λαλεῖν; for γλώσσα could not denote genus locutionis glossematicum, but simply a single gloss. As Bleek's explanation falls to the ground, so must every other which takes γλώσσα in any other sense than languages, which it must mean according to vv. 6, 8, 11. This remark holds particularly (4) against the understanding of the matter by van Hengel, according to whom the assembled followers of Jesus spoke with other tongues than those with which they formerly spoke, namely, in the excitement of a fiery inspiration, but still all of them in Aramaic, so that each of those who came together heard the language of his own ancestral worship from the mouth of these Galileans, ver. 6.

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

But how is the occurrence to be judged of historically? On this the
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2. Comp., besides 1 Cor. xiv. 31, Ecclus. præf.: πρὸς μαθαξαμένα (the Hebrew) εἰς εἵραν γλώσσαν (Leo, Thuc. 4. 40: γλώσσας διαφέρουσας λαλεῖν); also Asch. Sept. 171: καὶ τετελεσθήσεται μὴ προδοθῇ ἐνεργείης ὑπερήφανος. Not different is Pind. Pyth. 1. 68: ἐλευθεροὶ γλώσσαι.
4. Augustin.: "coeperunt loqui linguis omnium gentium."
following points are to be observed: (1) Since the sudden communication of a facility of speaking foreign languages is neither logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable, and since in the case of the apostles not the slightest indication of it is perceptible in their letters or otherwise (comp., on the contrary, xiv. 11); since further, if it is to be assumed as having been only momentary, the impossibility is even increased, and since Peter himself in his address makes not even the slightest allusion to the foreign languages—the event, as Luke narrates it, cannot be presented in the actual form of its historical occurrence, whether we regard that Pentecostal assembly (without any indication to that effect in the text) as a representation of the entire future Christian body (Baumgarten) or not. (2) The analogy of magnetism,¹ is entirely foreign to the point, especially as those possessed by the Spirit were already speaking in foreign languages, when the Parthians, Medes, etc., came up, so that anything corresponding to the magnetic “rapport” is not conceivable. (3) If the event is alleged to have taken place, as it is narrated, with a view to the representation of an idea,² and that, indeed, only at the time and without leaving behind a permanent facility of speaking languages, “in order to represent and to attest, in germ and symbol, the future gathering of the elect out of all nations, the consecration of their languages in the church, and again the holiness of the church in the use of these profane idioms, as also of what is natural generally,”³ such a view is nothing else than a gratuitously-imported subjective abstraction of fancy, which leaves the point of the impossibility and the non-historical character of the occurrence entirely unsettled, although it arbitrarily falls back upon the Babylonian confusion of tongues as its corresponding historical type. This remark also applies against Lange,⁴ according to whose fanciful notion the original language of the inner life by which men’s minds are united has here reached its fairest manifestation. This Pentecostal language, he holds, still pervades the church as the language of the inmost life in God, as the language of the Bible, glorified by the gospel, and as the leaven of all languages, which effects their regeneration into the language of the Spirit. (4) Nevertheless, the state of the fact can in nowise be reduced to a speaking of the persons assembled in their mother-tongues, so that the speakers would have been no native Galileans;⁵ along with which David Schulz⁶ explains ἐπαναγγέλλεται λάους even of other kinds of singing praise, which found utterance in the provincial dialects contrary to their custom and ability at other times. Thus the very essence of the narrative, the miraculous nature of the phenomenon, is swept away, and there is not even left matter of surprise fitted to give sufficient

occasion for the astonishment and its expressions, if we do not, with Thiers, resort even to the hypothesis that the speakers had only used the Aramaic dialects instead of the Galilean. Every resolution of the matter into a speaking of native languages is directly against the nature and the words of the narrative, and therefore unwarranted. (5) Equally unwarranted, moreover, is the conversion, utterly in the face of the narrative, of the miracle of tongues into a *miracle of hearing*, so that those assembled did not, indeed, speak in any foreign tongue, but the foreigners listening believed that they heard their own native languages. See against this view, Castalio *in loc.*, and Beza on x. 46. This opinion—which Billroth on 1 Cor. strangely outbids by his fancy of a *primeval language* which had been spoken—is already represented by Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat. 44*, as allowable by the punctuation of ii. 6; is found thereafter in the *Pseudo-Cyprian* (Arnold), in the appendix to the *Opp. Cypr.* p. 60, ed. Brem. (p. 475, ed. Basil. 1530), in Beda, Erasmus, and others; and has recently been advocated especially by Schneckenburger;¹ legend also presents later analogous phenomena—in the life of Francis Xavier and others. (6) The miraculous gift of *languages* remains the centre of the entire narrative,² and may in nowise be put aside or placed in the background, if the state of the fact is to be derived entirely *from this narrative*. If we further compare x. 46, 47, the καθὼς καὶ ἥεις in that passage shows that the λαλεῖν γλώσσας, which there occurred at the descent of the Spirit on those assembled, cannot have been anything essentially different from the event in Acts ii. A corresponding judgment must in that case be formed as to xix. 6. But we have to take our views of what the γλώσσας λαλεῖν really was, not from our passage, but from the older and absolutely authentic account of Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 14: according to which it (see comm. on 1 Cor. xii. 10) was a speaking in the form of prayer—which took place in the highest ecstasy, and required an interpretation for its understanding—and not a speaking in foreign languages. The occurrence in Acts ii. is therefore to be recognised, according to its historical import, as the *phenomenon of the glossolalia* (not as a *higher stage* of it, in which the foreign languages supervened, Olshausen), which emerged *for the first time in the Christian church*, and that immediately on the effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost,—a phenomenon which, in the sphere of the marvellous to which it belongs, was elaborated and embellished by legend into a speaking in foreign languages, and accordingly into an occurrence quite *unique*, not indeed as to substance, but as to mode,³ and far surpassing the subsequently frequent and well-known *glossolalia*, having in fact no parallel in the further history of the church.⁴ How this transformation—the supposition of which is by


³ Comp. Hilgenfeld, p. 146.

⁴ The conclusion of Wieseler (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1869, p. 118), that Luke, who, as a companion of Paul, must have been well acquainted with the *glossolalia*, could not have represented it as a speaking in foreign languages, is incorrect. Luke, in fact, conceives and describes the Pentecostal miracle not as the *glossolalia*, which was certainly well known to him, as it
no means to be treated with suspicion as the dogmatic caprice of unbelief (in opposition to Rossteuscher, p. 125) — took place, cannot be ascertained. But the supposition very naturally suggests itself, that among the persons possessed by the Spirit, who were for the most part Galileans (in the elaborated legend; all of them Galileans), there were also some foreigners, and that among these very naturally the utterances of the Spirit in the glossolalia found vent in expressions of their different national languages, and not in the Aramaic dialect, which was to them by nature a foreign language, and therefore not natural or suitable for the outburst of inspired ecstasy. If this first glossolalia actually took place in different languages, we can explain how the legend gradually gave to the occurrence the form which it has in Luke, even with the list of nations, which specifies more particularly the languages spoken. That a symbolic view of the phenomenon has occasioned the formation of the legend, namely, the idea of doing away with the diversity of languages which arose, Gen. xi., by way of punishment, according to which idea there was to be again in the Messianic time εἰς λαοί κυρίων καὶ γλώσσα μια is not to be assumed (Scheenckeburger, Rossteuscher, de Wette), since this idea as respects the γλώσσα μια, is not a N. T. one, and it would suit not the miracle of speaking, such as the matter appears in our narrative, but a miracle of hearing, such as it has been interpreted to mean. The general idea of the universal destination of Christianity cannot but have been favourable to the shaping of the occurrence in the form in which it appears in our passage.

The view which regards our event as essentially identical with the glossolalia, but does not conceive the latter as a speaking in foreign languages, has been adopted by Bleek whose explanation, however, of highly poetical discourse, combined with foreign expressions, agrees neither with the τριπ. γλ. generally nor with vv. 8 and 11; by Baur, who, however, explains on this account τριπ. γλ. as new spirit-tongues, and regarded this expression as the original one, but subsequently, amidst a mixing up of different opinions, has acceded to the view of Bleek; by Steudel, who explains the Pentecostal event from the corresponding tone of feeling which the inspired address encountered in others, — a view which does not at all suit the concourse of foreign unbelievers in our passage; by Neander, who, however, idealizes the speaking of inspiration in our passage too indefinitely and indistinctly; was a frequent gift in the apostolic age, but as a quite extraordinary occurrence, such as it had been presented to him by tradition; and in doing so, he is perfectly conscious of the distinction between it and the speaking with tongues, which he knew by experience. With justice Holtzmann also (in Herzog's Encycl. XVIII. p. 689) sees in our narrative a later legendary formation, but from a time which was no longer familiar with the nature of the glossolalia. This latter statement is not to be conceded, partly because Luke wrote soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the source which he here made use of must have been still older; and partly because he was a friend of Paul, and as such could not have been otherwise than familiar with the nature of that χάρισμα, which the apostle himself richly possessed.

1 Test. XII. Patr. p. 618.
2 Comp. Zeller, Hilgenfeld.
3 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1889, p. 50 ff.
5 Which the Spirit has created for Himself as His organs, different from the usual human tongues. See also in his newest. Theol. p. 323 f.
6 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1888, p. 618 ff.
8 4th edition, p. 98.
by Wieseler, who makes the τρυπηεία γλώσσαν be described according to the impression made upon the assembled Jews,—an idea irreconcilable with our text (vv. 6–12); by de Wette, who ascribes the transformation of the glossolalia in our passage to a reporter, who from want of knowledge, imported into the traditional facts a symbolical meaning; by Hilgenfeld, according to whom the author conceived the gift of languages as a special γένος of speaking with tongues; by van Hengel, who sees in the Corinthian glossolalia a degenerating of the original fact in our passage; and by Ewald, who represents the matter as the first outburst of the infinite vigour of life and pleasure in life of the new-born Christianity, which took place not in words, songs, and prayers previously used, nor generally in previous human speech and language, but, as it were, in a sudden conflux and moulding of all previous languages, amidst which the synonymous expressions of different languages were, in the surging of excitement, crowded and conglomerated, etc.—a view in which the appeal to the ἐβδόμοντα πατήρ and μαραθων ἄθα is much too weak to do justice to the τετραίς γλώσσας as the proper point of the narrative. On the other hand, the view of the Pentecostal miracle as an actual though only temporary speaking in unacquired foreign languages, such as Luke represents it, has been maintained down to the most recent times, a conception which Hofmann supports by the significance of Pentecost as the feast of the first fruits, and Baumgarten, at the same time, by its reference to the giving of the law. But by its side the procedure of the other extreme, by which the Pentecostal occurrence is entirely banished from history, has been carried out in the boldest and most decided manner by Zeller (p. 104 ff.), to whom the origin of the narrative appears quite capable of explanation from dogmatic motives—according to the idea of the destination of Christianity for all nations—and typical views. — καθὼς, as, in which manner, i.e. according to the context, in which foreign language. — ἀποφθεγμάτισαν, eloqui, a purposely chosen word for loud utterance in the elevated state of spiritual gifts.

1 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 743 ff., 1890, p. 117.
4 Weissag. u. Ebr. II. p. 306 ff.
5 Weiss, sprang. Gesch. II. p. 417 ff., identifies the matter even with the appearance of the risen Christ to more than 800 brethren, recorded in 1 Cor. xv. 6—Grüner, Gesch. d. Übrer. I. 2, p. 287 f., derives the origin of the Pentecostal history in our passage from the Jewish tradition of the feast of Pentecost as the festival of the law, urging the mythological miracle of tongues on Sinai (comp. also Schneckeburger, p. 302 ff.).
6 Comp. also Baur, who finds here Paul's idea of the λαλεῖν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, 1 Cor. xiii. 1, converted into reality. According to Baur, neuest. Theol. p. 322, there remains to us as the proper nucleus of the matter only the conviction, which became to the disciples and first Christians a fact of their consciousness, that the same Spirit by whom Jesus was qualified to be the Messiah had also been imparted to them, and was the specific principle—determining the Christian consciousness—of their fellowship. This communication of the Spirit did not, in his view, even occur at a definite point of time.
7 Lucian, Zeux. 1, Paras. 4, Plat. Mor. p. 466 E, Dilog. L. i. 63.
8 Comp. ii. 14, xxvi. 25.
9 1 Chron. xxv. 1; Eccles. Prolog. ii.; comp.
Ver. 5 gives, as introductory to what follows, preliminary information how it happened that Jews of so very diversified nationality were witnesses of the occurrence, and heard their mother-languages spoken by the inspired. Stolz, Paulus, and Heinrichs are entirely in error in supposing that ver. 5 refers to the λαλεῖν ἐπὶ γλ., and that the sense is: "Neque id secus quam par erat, nam ex pluribus nationibus diverse loquentibus intererant isti coetui homines," etc. The context, in fact, distinguishes the Ioubaioi and the Galilaioi (so designated not as a sect, but according to their nationality), clearly in such a way that the former are members of the nation generally, and the latter are specially and exclusively Galileans. — ἰδοὺ . . . κατοικοῦντες] they were dwelling, is not to be taken of mere temporary residence, but of the domicile which they had taken up in the central city of the theocracy, and that from conscientious religious feelings as Israelites (hence εὐλαβεῖς, comp. on Luke ii. 25). Comp. Chrys.: τὸ κατοικεῖν εὐλαβεῖς ἑν σημείῳ πῶς; ἀνδρόσων γὰρ εἷσιν ὁσίες καὶ πατρίδας ἀδίνετες . . . ἄγων αὐτόι. — τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οἴρον.] sc. ἐθνῶν, of the nations to be found under heaven (Bernhardt). — ὑπὸ τῶν οἰρῶν is classical, like ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν. The whole expression has something solemn about it, and is, as a popular hyperbole, to be left in all its generality. Comp. Deut. ii. 25; Col. i. 23.

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

ἀπόθετημα, Deut. xxxii. 2, also Zech. x. 2; also of false prophets, Ezek. xiii. 19; Mich. v. 12. See, generally, Schleusner, Theol. I. p. 417; also Valckenaer, p. 544; and van Hengel. p. 40. ¹ See also van Hengel, p. 9.
² Kuinoel, Oleshausen, and others.
⁵ Comp. ix. ix. 30; 1 Mac. iv. 27; 2 Mac. x. 30; Herod. viii. 99; Plat. Ep. 7, p. 346 D; Diod. S. iv. 63; Lucian. Nigr. 31.
⁶ Comp. John xvi. 52; Acts ix. 29 al.; Jacobs, ad Achill. Tat. p. 622; Amelius on Hom. Od. x. 307; Bernhardt, p. 430.
chosen, because the foreigners who arrived spoke not entirely different languages, but in part only different dialects of the same language. Thus, for example, the Asiatics, Phrygians, and Pamphylians, respectively spoke Greek, but in different idioms; the Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, Persian, but also in different provincial forms. Therefore, the persons possessed by the Spirit, according to the representation of the text, expressed themselves in the peculiar local dialects of the ἐπρον γλωσσῶν. The view that the Aramaic dialect was that in which all the speakers spoke (van Hengel), appears—from ver. 8; from the list of nations, which would be destitute of significance; from προσήλυτος (ver. 10), which would be meaningless; and from ver. 11, as well as from the opinions expressed in vv. 12, 13, which would be without a motive—as an exegetical impossibility, which is also already excluded by εἰς ἐκαστὸς in ver. 6. — λαλοῦντων αὐτῶν] not, of course, that all spoke in all dialects, but that one spoke in one dialect, and another in another. Each of those who came together heard his peculiar dialect spoken by one or some of the inspired. This remark applies in opposition to Bleek, who objects to the common explanation of λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τ. γλώσσας, that each individual must have spoken in the different languages simultaneously. The expression is not even awkward (Olshausen), as it expresses the opinion of the people comprehended generally, and consequently even the summary αὐτῶν is quite in order.

Vv. 7, 8. Ἐκσκαρπὸς denotes the astonishment now setting in after the first perplexity, ver. 6; ἰδαίμονα is the continuing wonder resulting from it. Comp. Mark vi. 51.—ἰδὼν] to be enclosed within two commas. — πάντες αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.] pointing out: all the speakers present. It does not distinguish two kinds of persons, those who spoke and those who did not speak (van Hengel); but see ver. 4. The dislocation occasioned by the interposition of εἰς αὐτοῦ brings the πάντες αὐτοὺς into more emphatic prominence. — Ἑβραῖοι They wondered to hear men, who were pure Galileans, speak Parthian, Median, etc. This view, which takes Ἡβραῖος in the sense of nationality, is required by vv. 8, 11, and by the contrast of the nations afterwards named. It is therefore foreign to the matter, with Herder, Heinrichs, Olshausen, Schulz, Rossteuscher, van Hengel, and older commentators, to bring into prominence the accessory idea of want of culture (uncultivated Galileans); and erroneous, with Stolz, Eichhorn, Kuinoel, and others, to consider Ἡβραῖος as a designation of the Christian sect—a designation, evidence of which, moreover, can only be adduced from a later period. It is erroneous, also, to find the cause of wonder in the circumstance that the Galileans should have used profane languages for so holy an object (Kuinoel). So, in opposition to this, Ch. F. Fritzache, nova or. p. 310. — καὶ πῶς] καὶ, as a simple and, annexes the sequence of the sense; and (as they are all Galileans) how happens it that, etc. — ἥτις ἄκωμεν ἐκαστὸς κ.τ.λ.] we on our part (in contrast to the speaking Galileans) hear each one, etc. That, accordingly, ἰεροθεότης is to be understood distributively, is self-evident from the connec-

1 Where neither in itself nor according to ver. 8 can ταῖς ἑμεῖς γλώσσαις mean what van Hengel puts into it: as we do with our
2 Augusti, Denkwürd. IV. pp. 49, 53.
tion (comp. ταῖς ἡμερ. γλώσσαις, ver. 11); therefore van Hengel—wrongly objects to the view of different languages, that the words would require to run: πῶς ἡμ. ἀκ. τ. ἴδι. διαλ., ἐν ἧ ἐκατος ἐγγενήθη. — ἐν ὧ ἐγγενήθη] designation of the mother-tongue, with which one is, in the popular way of expressing the matter, born furnished.

Vv. 9–11. Πάρθοι . . . Ἀραβῖς is a more exact statement, placed in opposition, of the subject of ἐγγενήθημεν. After finishing the list, ver. 11, Luke again takes up the verb already used in ver. 8, and completes the sentence already there begun, but in such a way as once more to bring forward the important point τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλ.κτῷ, only in a different and more general expression, by ταῖς ἡμερ. γλώσσαις. Instead, therefore, of simply writing λαλοῦντ. αὐτ. τὰ μεγαλ. τ. Θεοῦ without this resumption in ver. 11, he continues, after the list of nations, as if he had said in ver. 8 merely καὶ πῶς ἡμείς. — The list of nations itself, which is arranged not without reference to geography, yet in a desultory manner east, north, south, west, is certainly genuine (in opposition to Ziegler, Schultess. Kuinoel), but is, of course, not to be considered, at any rate in its present order and completeness, as an original constituent part of the speech of the people (which would be psychologically inappropriate to the lively expression of strong astonishment, but as an historical notice, which was designedly interwoven in the speech and put into the mouth of the people, either already in the source whence Luke drew, or by Luke himself, in order to give very strong prominence to the contrast with the preceding Γαλιλαίου. — Ἀλαμίται, on the Persian Gulf, are so named in the LXX. (Isa. xxi. 2); called by the Greeks Ἑλυμαίοι. — Ἰουδαίου) There is a historical reason why Jews should be also mentioned in this list, which otherwise names none but foreigners. A portion of those who had received the Spirit spoke Jewish, so that even the native Jews heard their provincial dialect. This is not at variance with the τῇ ἰδιᾳ γλώσσαις, because the Jewish dialect differed in pronunciation from the Galilean, although both belonged to the Aramaic language of the country at that time; comp. on Matt. xxvi. 73. Heinrichs thinks that Ἰουδαίαι is inappropriate (comp. de Wette), and was only included in this specification in flae γε ὁμολογία; while Olshausen holds that Luke included the mention of it from his Roman point of view, and in consideration of his Roman readers. What a high degree of carelessness would either suggestion involve! 1 Ewald guesses that Syria has dropped out after Judaea. — τῇ 'Ασίᾳ] is here, as it is mentioned along with individual Asiatic districts, not the whole of Asia Minor, nor yet simply Τοια (Kuinoel), or Lydia (Schneckenburger), to which there is no evidence that the name Asia was applied; but the whole western coast-region of Asia Minor. 4 — τὰ μέτω τῆς Διαβίσης

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

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

3 Tertull. c. Jud. 7, read Armenia. Conjectural emendations are: 'Ἰουδαίαι (Caspar Barth), 'Ἰδίαι (Erasmus Schmid), 'Βαλτονίας (Hemsterhuis and Valckenauer).

4 Caria, Lydia, Mysia, according to Plin. H. N. v. 38; see Wilner, Basaln., Wieseler, p. 83 ff.
EFFECTS OF THE MIRACLE.


Comp. Ps. lxxi. 19; Eccl. xvii. 8, xvili. 8, xxxiii. 8; 3 Macc. vii. 93.

1 Comp. xvili. 18; Herm. ad Virg. p. 759; Bernhardy, p. 410 f.

2 Comp. also Maetzner, ad Antiph. p. 130. On θέλω of impersonal things, see Wetstein and Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. p. 380 B.

3 Dem. 1291. 56; Plat. Az. p. 364 B; Polyb. xvii. 4, 4, xxxix. 2, 18; used absolutely also, Polyb. xxx. 12. 12.
which struck them as eccentric, and the use of foreign languages instead of the Galilean, as the effect of drunken excitement. Without disturbing themselves whence this foreign speaking, according to the historical position of the matter, this speaking with tongues, had come and become possible to the Galileans, they are arrested only by the strangeness of the phenomenon as it struck the senses, and, in accordance with their own vulgarity, impute it to the having taken too much wine. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 23. The contents of the speaking (van Hengel) would not, apart from that form of utterance as if drunk with the Spirit, have given ground for so frivolous an opinion, but would rather have checked it. The judgment of Festus concerning Paul (xxvi. 24) is based on an essentially different situation. — γλείκων | γλείκως τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν πατρινὶ, Hesychius.¹

Vv. 14, 15. Στραβείς | as in v. 20, xvii. 22, xxvii. 21; Luke xix. 8, xviii. 11. The introduction of the address (he stood up, etc.) is solemn. — σὺν τοῖς ἐνδέκα | thus Matthias is already included, and justly; ver. 83, comp. with i. 22. We may add that Grotius aptly remarks (although contradicted by Calovius): “Hic incipit (Petrus) nominis sui a rupe dicti meritum implere.” — ἀπεθάνει | as in ver. 4: but not as if now Peter also had begun to speak ἐν τρεῖσι γλώσσαις. (van Hengel). That speaking is past when Peter and the eleven made their appearance; and then follows the simple instruction regarding it, intelligible to ordinary persons, uttered aloud and with emphasis. — κατακολούθεν | quite as in ver. 5. The nominative with the article, in order to express the imperative address.⁴ — τοῦτο | namely, what I shall now explain to you. Concerning ἐνωρίζεσθαι (from ὤψ) auribus percipere, which is foreign to the old classical Greek, but in current use in the LXX. and the Apocrypha.³ In the N. T. only here.⁴ — οὐ γὰρ | γὰρ justifies the preceding summons. The ὄντος, these there, does not indicate that the apostles themselves were not among those who spoke in a miraculous manner, as if the gift of tongues had been a lower kind of inspired speech;⁴ but Peter, standing up with the eleven, places himself in the position of a third person, pointing to the whole multitude, whom he would defend, as their advocate; and as he did so, the reference of this apology to himself also and his fellow-apostles became self-evident in the application. This also applies against van Hengel, p. 64 f. — ἀπαρτὶ | about nine in the morning; so early in the day, and at this first of the three hours of prayer (see on iii. 1), contemporaneously with the morning sacrifice in the temple, people are not drunk! Observe the sober, self-collected way in which Peter speaks.

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

² See Bernhardy, p. 67.
³ See Sturz, Dial. Al. p. 166.
⁴ Comp. Test. XII. Patr. p. 530.
⁵ 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19; so de Wette, at variance with ver. 4.
ness of the Holy Spirit, and then frightful catastrophes in heaven and on earth. This prophecy, Peter says, has now entered upon its accomplishment. — καὶ ἔσται καὶ ημέραι [καὶ ημέραι] and it will be the case: quite according to the Hebrew (and the LXX.) ἡμέραι. The καὶ in the prophetic passage connects it with what precedes, and is incorporated in the citation. — ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις] The LXX., agreeing with the Hebrew, has only μετὰ ταῦτα. Peter has inserted for it the familiar expression ἡμέραι ἡμέρας (Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1, al.) by way of more precise definition, as Kimchi also gives it (see Lightfoot). This denotes the last days of the pre-Messianic period—the days immediately preceding the erection of the Messianic kingdom, which, according to the N. T. view, could not but take place by means of the speedily expected Parousia of Christ; see 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jas. v. 8; and as regards the essential sense, also Heb. i. 1, — ἐκχεῖται] a later form of the future. The outpouring figuratively denotes the copious communication. Tit. iii. 6; Acts x. 45. Comp. i. 5, and see on Rom. v. 5. — ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μον] deviating from the Hebrew יִשָּׂרָאֵל. The partition expression (Bernhardy, p. 222) denotes that something of the Spirit of God conceived as a whole—a special partial emanation for the bestowal of divers gifts according to the will of God (Heb. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xii.)—will pass over to every individual (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα) — πᾶσαν σάρκα] every flesh, i.e. omnes homines, but with the accessory idea of weakness and imperfection, which the contrast of the highest gift of God, that is to be imparted to the weak mortal race, here presents. In Joel 2:1-5, 5 certainly refers to the people of Israel, conceived, however, as the people of God, the collective body of whom, not merely, as formerly, individual prophets, shall receive the divine inspiration. Comp. Isa. liv. 13; John vi. 45. But as the idea of the people of God has its realization, so far as the history of redemption is concerned, in the collective body of believers on Christ without distinction of nations; so also in the Messianic fulfilment of that prophecy meant by Peter, and now begun, what the prophet has promised to all flesh is not to be understood of the Jewish people as such (van Hengel, appealing to ver. 89), but of all the true people of God, so far as they believe on Christ. The first Messianic effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost was the beginning of this fulfilment, the completion of which is in the course of a progressive development that began at that time with Israel, and as respects its end is yet future, although this end was by Peter already expected as nigh. — καὶ προφητεύοντα κριθήματα ἐννοητεύοντα describes the effects of the promised effusion of the Spirit. προφητεύοντα κριθήματα, affliatu divino loquentur (Matt. vii. 22), is by Peter specially recognized as a prediction of that apocalypticly inspired speaking, which had just commenced with the εἰρήνη γλώσσας. This we may the more warrantably affirm, since, according to the analogy of xix. 6, we must assume that that

1 Comp. Weiss, Petrin. Lehrbegr. p. 89 f.
2 Winer, p. 74 (E. T. 91).
3 The impersonality of the Spirit is not thereby assumed (in opposition to Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 129), but the distribution of the gifts and powers, which are represented as a par
tial effusion of the Spirit on individuals. For the personality of the Spirit, comp. especially the saying of Peter, v. 8.
4 Comp. Rom. iii. 29; Gal. ii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 29; Matt. xxiv. 22; Luke iii. 6.
speaking was not mere glossolalia in the strict sense, but, in a portion of the speaker’s prophecy. Comp. the spiritual speaking in Corinth. — οἱ νῦντες καὶ οἱ θυγατέρες τοῦ θεοῦ, the male and female members of the people of God, i.e. all without exception. Peter sees this also fulfilled by the inspired members of the Christian theocracy, among whom, according to i. 14., there were at that time also women. — ὀράσεις . . . ἐννοιών visions in waking and in sleeping, as forms of the ἀποκάλυψις of God, such as often came to the prophet. This prophetic distinction, Joel predicts, will, after the effusion of the Spirit in its fulness, become common property. The fulfilment of this part of the prophecy had, it is true, not yet taken place among the members of the Christian people of God, but was still before them as a consequence of the communication of the Spirit which had just occurred; Peter, however, quotes the words as already fulfilled (ver. 16), because their fulfilment was necessarily conditioned by the outpouring of the Spirit, and was consequently already in idea included in it. — νεανίσκαι . . . πρεσβείες belong likewise, as the preceding clause (νῦντες θυγατέρες), to the representation of the collective body as illustrated per μερισμόν. The ὀράσεις correspond to the lively feelings of youth; ἐννοια, to the lesser excitability of more advanced age; yet the two are to be taken, not as mutually exclusive, but after the manner of parallelism. — The verb, with the dative of the cognate noun, is here (ἐννοιών ἐννοιασαν, they will dream with dreams; comp. Joel iii. 1) a Hebraism, and does not denote, like the similar construction in classic Greek, a more precise definition or strengthening of the notion conveyed by the verb (Lobeck, Paral. p. 524 f).

Ver. 18. A repetition of the chief contents of ver. 17, solemnly confirming them, and prefixing the persons concerned. — καὶ γε] and indeed. 1 It seldom occurs in classical writers without the two particles being separated by the word brought into prominence or restricted, in which case, however, there is also a shade of meaning to be attended to. 2 We must not explain the δούλος μου and the δούλας μου with Heinrichs and Kuinoel, in accordance with the original text, which has no μου, of servile hominum genus, nor yet with Tychsen 3 of the alienigenae (because slaves were wont to be purchased from abroad): both views are at variance with the μου, which refers the relation of service to God as the Master. It is therefore the male and female members of the people of God (according to the prophetic fulfilment: of the Christian people of God) that are meant, inasmuch as they recognise Jehovah as their Master, and serve Him: my male and female worshippers; comp. the Hebrew נָּתי, נָּתי. In the twofold μου Peter agrees with the translators of the LXX., 4 who must have had another reading of the original before them.

2 See Kloz., ad Decar. p. 319.
4 So much the less ought Hengstenberg, Christol. i. p. 403, to have imported into this enclitic μου what is neither found in it nor relevant: 'on servants and handmaids of men, who are at the same time my servants and handmaids, and therefore in spiritual things are quite on a level with the free.' Similarly Bengel, and recently Beelen (Catholic) in his Comment. in Acta ap. ed. 3, 1864, who appeals inappropriately to Gal. iii. 27 f.
Vv. 19, 20. After this effusion of the Spirit I shall bring about (διώκω, as at Matt. xxiv. 24) catastrophes in heaven and on earth—the latter are mentioned at once in ver. 19, the former in ver. 20—as immediate heralds of the Messianic day. Peter includes in his quotation this element of the prophecy, because its realization (ver. 19), conditioned by the outpouring of the Spirit which necessarily preceded it, presented itself likewise essentially as belonging to the allotted portion of the ταχαρά ψήφα. The dreadful events could not but now—seeing that the effusion of the Spirit preceding them had already commenced—be conceived as inevitable and very imminent; and this circumstance could not but mightily contribute to the alarming of souls and their being won to Christ. As to τίρατα and σημεία, see on Matt. xxiv. 24; Rom. xv. 19—aĩμα... καπνὸς contains the σημεία ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, namely, bloodshed (war, revolt, murder) and conflagration. Similar devastations belonged, according to the later Jewish Christology also, to the dolores Messiae. See on Matt. xxiv. 6, 7. "Cum videris regna se invicem turbantia, tunc expectes vestigia Messiae." The reference to blood-rain, fiery meteors, and pillars of smoke arising from the earth is neither certainly in keeping with the original text of the prophecy, nor does it satisfy the analogy of Matt. xxiv.—ἀγιοί καπνοῦ] vapour of smoke.—Ver. 20. Meaning: the sun will become dark, and the moon appear bloody. Comp. onMatt. xxiv. 29; also Isa. xiii. 10; Ezek. xxxii. 7.—πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ere there shall have come.—ἡμερὰς κυριοῦ i.e. according to the sense of the prophetic fulfilment of the words: the day of Christ, namely of His Parousia. Comp. on Rom. x. 13. But this is not, with Grotius, Lightfoot, and Kuinoel, following the Fathers, to be considered as identical with the destruction of Jerusalem, which belongs to the σημεία of Parousia, to the dolores Messiae. See on Matt. xxiv. 29.—ἡμερὰς μεγάλης κ. ἐπιφανῆ the great (καὶ εὐχήν, fraught with decision, comp. Rev. xvi. 14) and manifest, i.e. which makes itself manifest before all the world as that which it is. Comp. the frequent use of ἐπιφάνεια for the Parousia (2 Thess. ii. 8, al.). The Vulgate aptly renders: manifestus. Instead of ἐπιφανῆ, the Hebrew has נגנּנּה, terribilis, which the LXX., deriving from ⃞, has incorrectly translated by ἐπιφανή, as also elsewhere. But on this account the literal signification of ἐπιφαν. need not be altered here, where the text follows the LXX.

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

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

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

1 See Kähner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 2. 3, ad Anab. ii. 5. 10.
2 Comp. iii. 3, iv. 10.
3 Comp. vi. 14, xxiv. 5.
4 Joseph. Antiq. vii. 14. 5; Poppo, ad Thuc. i. 17. 1; Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 280 (E. T. 286).
5 Bornem. Schol. in Luc. p. xxx.
6 See Schaefer. Mutil. p. 84; Dissew, ad Dem. de cor. p. 255.
7 μᾶς χειρὸς (see the critical remarks) is here not to be taken, like "τῷ", for the mere per (see Fritzache, ad Marc. p. 199), but, as it is a manual action that is spoken of, in its concrete, literal meaning. It belongs to vivid rhetorical delineation. Comp. Dorville, ad Otkon. p. 273.
after the analogy of the action of the human mind.—The datives is, as in xv. 1, that in which the ἐδοτος has its ground. Without the divine ὑπὸν ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, it would not have taken place.—The question, How Peter could say to those present: Ye have put Him to death, is solved by the remark that the execution of Christ was a public judicial murder, resolved on by the Sanhedrim in the name of the whole nation, demanded from and conceded by the Gentiles, and accomplished under the direction of the Sanhedrim (John xix. 16) ; comp. iii. 13 f. The view of Olshausen, that the death of Christ was a collective act of the human race, which had contracted a collective guilt, is quite foreign to the context.

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

1 Ps. xviii. 5 f., cxvi. 3. See Gesen. Theos. L. p. 440.
2 Comp. on προέρχεται ἐκ τῶν παραγόντων, Col. i. 18.
3 ηθανάτος ὑπὸν κατέχειν εὐτύχως, Chrys.
4 On λύειν, see LXX. Job xxxix. 3; Soph.


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

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

Ver. 26. Therefore my heart rejoiced and my tongue exulted. The aorists denote an act of the time described by προωρώμενος κ. ἡ λ., the joyful remembrance of which is here expressed. — ἡ καρδία μου, ἔδέθη: the heart, the centre of personal life, is also the seat of the moral feelings and determinations of the will. * — Instead of ἡ χλόωσα μου, the Hebrew has ἑλπίζω, i.e. my soul,* in place of which the LXX. either found a different reading or gave a free rendering. — ἐτί δὲ καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου κ. ἡ λ., but moreover also my flesh (body) shall tabernacle, that is, settle itself by way of encampment, on hope, by which the Psalmist expresses his confidence that he shall not perish, but continue in life—while, according to Peter, from the point of view of the fulfilment that has taken place in Christ, these words eἰς Χριστόν (ver. 25) prophetically express that the body of Christ will tarry in the grave on hope, i.e. on the basis of the hope of rising from the dead. Thus what is divinely destined for Christ—His resurrection—appears in poetical mould as the object of the hope of His body. — ἐτί δὲ καὶ] Comp. Luke xiv. 26; Acts xxii. 28; Soph. O. R. 1845. — ἐν ἔλαιῳ] as in Rom. iv. 18.

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

---

1 Xen. Hell. iv. 3. 18; otherwise, xxii. 29.
2 Xen. Cypr. iii. 3. 31.
3 Dorville, ad Char. p. 307.
4 Delitzsch, Psych. p. 248 ff.
5 Ps. vii. 5, xxx. 15, etc.; see Schoettgen, p. 415.
me to die in my present life-peril, and will not give Thy Holy One, according to the Ketibh of the original: *Thy holy one*, the plural of category, comp. Hupfeld in loc., to see corruption—is by Peter, as spoken εἰς Χριστόν, taken in accordance with the prophetic meaning historically fulfilled in Him: Thou wilt not forsake my soul in Hades, after it shall have come thither; but by the resurrection wilt again deliver it, and will not suffer Thy Holy One, the Messiah, to share corruption, i.e. according to the connection of the sense as fulfilled, putrefaction (comp. xiii. 34 ff.). Instead of διαφθοράν, the original has ἔμφυτῳ, a pit, which, however, Peter, with the LXX., understood as διαφθορά, and accordingly has derived it not from ἔμφυτῳ, but from ἔμφυτος, διαφθορά; comp. Job. xvii. 14.—On ὅπως, comp. x. 40. The meaning is: Thou wilt not cause, that, etc. Often so also in classical writers from Homer onward. As to ιδοὺ in the sense of experiencing, comp. on Luke ii. 26.

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

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

Ver. 29. Μετὰ παραψηφίας] frankly and freely, without reserve; for the main object was to show off a passage honouring David, that it had received fulfilment in a higher and prophetic sense in another. Bengel well remarks: "Est igitur hoc loco προτεραπεία, prævia sermonis mitigation."—David is called ὁ παραψηφίας as the celebrated ancestor of the kingly family, from which the nation expected their Messiah. —ὅτι] that (not for). Peter wishes to say of David what is notorious, and what it is allowable for him to say on account of this very notoriety; therefore with ἐγὼ there is not to be supplied, as is usually done, ἐσώ, but ἐστι (ἐστιν). —ἐν ἡμῖν] David was buried at Jerusalem. In τῆς μνήμης αὐτοῦ, his sepulchre, there is involved, according to the context, as self-evident: "cum ipso Davidis corpore corrupto; molliter loquitur," Bengel.
Vv. 30–32. οὖν] infers from the previous καὶ τὸ μνήμα αὐτοῦ . . . ταῦτας, whence it is plain that David in the Psalm, i.e., as a prophet and divinely conscious progenitor of the future Messiah, has spoken of the resurrection of Christ as the one who should not be left in Hades, and whose body should not decay.—καὶ εἰδὼς see 2 Sam. vii. 12.—ἐκ καρποῦ τ. ὅφισος αὐτοῦ] sc. τῶν. Of the frequent supplying of the indefinite pronoun, see Kühner, II. p. 37 f.; Fritzsche, Conject. I. 36. The well-known Hebrew-like expression καρπὸς τῆς ὅφισος αὐτοῦ (Ps. cxxxii. 11) presupposes the idea of the uninterrupted male line of descent from David to Christ.—καθίσαι εἰς τ. θρόνον αὐτοῦ] to sit on His throne, namely, as the Messiah, who was to be the theocratic consummator of the kingdom of David (Mark xi. 10; Acts xv. 16). Comp. Luke i. 32.—προϊδὼν] prophetically looking into the future. Comp. Gal. iii. 8.—δι' οὗ κατελ.] since He, in fact, was not left, etc. Thus has history proved that David spoke prophetically of the resurrection of the Messiah. The subject of κατελείψῃ κ.τ.λ. is not David— which no hearer, after ver. 39, could suppose—but ὁ Χριστός; and what is stated of Him in the words of the Psalm itself is the triumph of their historical fulfilment, a triumph which is continued and concluded in ver. 32.—τοῦτον τὸν Ιησοῦν] has solemn emphasis; this Jesus, no other than just Him, to whom, as the Messiah who has historically appeared, David's prophecy refers.—οὗ] neuter: wherever. See Bernhardy, p. 298.—μάρτυρες] in so far as we, His twelve apostles, have conversed with the risen Christ Himself. Comp. i. 22, x. 41.

Ver. 33 οὖν] namely, in consequence of the resurrection, with which the exaltation is necessarily connected.—τῇ δέξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ] by the right hand, i.e. by the power of God, v. 31.; Isa. lxiii. 12. The rendering: to the right hand of God, however much it might be recommended as regards sense by ver. 34, is to be rejected, seeing that the construction of simple verbs of motion with the dative of the goal aimed at, instead of with πρὸς or εἰς, belongs in classical Greek only to the poets, and occurs, indeed, in late writers, but is without any certain example in the N. T., often as there would have been occasion for it; for Acts xxii. 16 admits of another explanation, and Rev. ii. 16 is not at all a case in point. In the passage of the LXX. Judg. xi. 18, deemed certain by Fritzsche, τῇ γῇ Μωάβ, if the reading is correct, is to be connected, not with ἡλέων or ἀναλάβων, but as appropriating dative with ἀναλάβων ἡλέων. The objection, that by the right hand of God is here inappropriate (de Wette and others), is not tenable. There is something triumphant in the element emphatically prefixed, which is correlative to ἄντοναν δ. Θεοῦ (ver. 32); God's work of power was, as the resurrection, so

1 Comp. Heb. vii. 5; Gen. xxxv. 11; 2 Chron. vi. 9; and see remark after Matt. i. 18.
2 Xen. Anab. ii. 1. 4.
3 Hofm. Schriften. II. 1, p. 115.
4 Comp. Vulgate, Luther, Castallo, Beza, Bengel, also Zeller, p. 503, and others.
5 See the passages from Homer in Nægela, p. 12, ed. 3, and, besides, Erfurt, ad Antig. 234; Bernhardy, p. 25; Fritzsche, Conject. I. p. 42, the latter seeking to defend the use as legitimate.
6 The dative of interest (e.g. ἔρχομαι σου, I come for thee) has often been confounded with it. Comp. Krüger, § 45. 9. 1. See Winer, p. 201 f. (B. T. 298 f.).
7 Concerning ἕρωτα, Xen. Anab. i. 2. 25, see Bornemann, ed. Lips.
also the exaltation. Comp. Phil. ii. 9. A Hebraism, or an incorrect translation of ἡ ἐξήγησις, has been unnecessarily and arbitrarily assumed. — τῆς τε ἐν καιρῷ, τ. Ἡγ. πτ." παρὰ τ. παρὰ.] contains that which followed upon the ἡ ἐξήγησις, and hence is not to be explained with Kuinoel and others: "after He had received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father;" but: "after He had received the promised (i. 4) Holy Spirit from His Father." See on Luke xxiv. 49. — τὸ τῶν is either, with Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, Kuinoel, and others, to be referred to the πνεῦμα ἁγιον, so that the δ is corresponds to the explanatory id quod or—which, on account of the δ annexed to τοῦ τὸν, is more natural and more suitable to the miraculous character—it is, with Luther, Calvin, and others, to be taken as an independent neuter: He poured forth, just now, this, what ye, in effect, see and hear, in the conduct and speech of those assembled. Accordingly, Peter leaves it to his hearers, after what had previously been remarked (τῆς τε ἐν καιρῷ . . . παρὰ τ. παρὰ.), themselves to infer that what was poured out was nothing else than just the πνεῦμα ἁγιον. — The idea that the exalted Jesus in heaven receives from His Father and pours forth the Holy Spirit, is founded on such instructions of Christ as John xv. 26, xvi. 7. Comp. on i. 4.

Vv. 34, 35. Γὰρ] The fundamental fact of the previous statement, namely, the τ reflexivity of τοῦ τὸν, has still to be proved, and Peter proves this also from a saying of David, which has not received its fulfilment in David himself. — λέγει διὰ αὐτόκτονα] but he himself says, but it is his own declaration; and then follows Ps. cx. 1, where David distinguishes from himself Him who is to sit at the right hand of God, as His Lord (τὸ κυρίων μου). This King, designated by τὸ κυρίων μου of the Psalm, although it does not proceed from David (see on Matt. xxii. 48), is, according to the Messianic destination and fulfilment of this Psalm, Christ, who is Lord of David and of all the saints of the O. T.; and His occupying the throne, sit Thou at my right hand, denotes the exaltation of Christ to the glory and dominion of the Father, whose αὐτόκτονος He has become; Heb. i. 8, 13; Eph. i. 21 f.

Ver. 36. The Christological aim of the whole discourse, which, as undoubtedly proved after what has been hitherto said (οὐκ), is emphatically at the close set down for recognition as the summary of the faith now requisite. In this case ἀσφαλῶς (unchangeably) is marked with strong emphasis. — πάς ὅσος ἵκαρον.] without the article, because οἱ κατὰ Ἰούδα. has assumed the nature of a proper name. — The whole people is regarded as the family of their ancestor Israel (ἡ γῆ τῆς Ἰσραήλ). — καὶ κυρίων αὐτῶν κ. Χριστόν] him Lord, ruler generally. comp. x. 36, as well as also Messiah. The former general expression, according to which He is δ ἐν καὶ πάνων, Rom. ix. 5, and κατὰ ἰναπ τάντα, in their case be supposed that they had already received baptism in the lifetime of our Lord, to which conclusion vv. 38, 41 point.

2 Kühner, § 308. 2.
3 It cannot, however, be said that "the first congregation of disciples receives this gift without baptism," (Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 150). Those persons possessed by the Spirit were, in fact, all confessors of Christ, and it must have been a matter of time, how long, when they were going to receive it. — Comp. LXX. 1 Kings xii. 28; Ezek. xiv. 6, al. Winer, p. 105 (R. T. 137).
Eph. i. 22, the latter special, according to which He is the ωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, v. 31, John iv. 42, and καλοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Eph. i. 22, Col. 1. 18, together characterize the Messianic possessor of the kingdom, which God has made Christ to be by His exaltation, seeing that He had in His state of humiliation emptied Himself of the power and glory, and was only reinstated into them by His exaltation. Previously He was indeed likewise Lord and Messiah, but in the form of a servant; and it was after laying aside that form that He became such in complete reality. It is not to be inferred from such passages as this and Acts iv. 27, x. 38, xvii. 31 (de Wette), that the Book of Acts represents the Messianic dignity of Jesus as an acquisition in time; against which view even παρὰ τοῦ πατρός in our passage (ver. 33), compared with the confession in Matt. xvi. 16, John xvi. 30, is decisive, to say nothing of the Pauline training of Luke himself. Comp. also ver. 34. — αὐτὸν is not superfluous, but τὸν τοῦ Ἰσαοῦ is a weighty exegesis, which is purposely chosen in order to annex the strongly contrasting ὅτε ἐσταυρώσατε (comp. iii. 13, vii. 52), and thus to impart to the whole address a deeply impressive conclusion. "Aculeus in fine," Bengel.

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

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

expressions, Luke xxli. 8, xxiv. 47; Acts v. 28, 40; Matt. xxiv. 5, al. — ἡ ἁπασία μητέρων denotes the object of the baptism, which is the remission of the guilt contracted in the state before μετάνοια. Comp. xxii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 11. — καὶ λήφθη καὶ consecutivum. After reconciliation, sanctification; both are experienced in baptism. — τὸν ἄγιον πνεύματος] this is the δωρεά itself. Heb. vi. 4; Acts x. 45, xi. 17.

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

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

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


2 Sam. vii. 19, comp. the classical οἴκε εἰς μακρᾶν.

3 Comp. viii. 4 (so Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Bengel, Kuinoel, and others).

4 Comp. i. 6, viii. 25, xv. 3 (so Castalio, de Wette).
the already existing followers of Jesus, as is self-evident from the context. — ψυχαὶ persons, according to the Hebrew ἐστὶ ἐκ τοῦ, Ex. i. 5; Acts vii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 20; this use is not classical, since, in the passages apparently proving it, ψυχὴ means, in the strict sense, sou̱l (life). — The text does not affirm that the baptism of the three thousand occurred on the spot and simultaneously, but only that it took place during the course of that day (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡκείνῃ). Observe further, that their baptism was conditioned only by the μετάνοια and by faith on Jesus as the Messiah; and, accordingly, it had their further Christian instruction not as a preceding, but as a subsequent condition (ver. 42).

Ver. 42 now describes what the reception of the three thousand had as its consequence; what they, namely, the three thousand and those who were already believers before (for the whole body is the subject, as is evident from the idea of προσελθοῦσιν), as members of the Christian community under the guidance of the apostles perseveringly did. The development of the inner life of the youthful church follows that great external increase. First of all: they were perseveringly devoted to the instruction (2 Tim. iv. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 6) of the apostles, they were constantly intent on having themselves instructed by the apostles. — τῷ κοινωνία] is to be explained of the mutual brotherly association which they sought to maintain with one another.

The same in substance with the ἀδελφόν, 1 Pet. ii. 17, v. 9. It is incorrect in Wolf, Rosenmüller, and others to refer it to τῶν ἐποικίων, and to understand it of living in intimate association with the apostles. For καί τῇ κοινωνία is, as well as the other three, an independent element, not to be blended with the preceding. Therefore the views of others are also incorrect, who either take the following (spurious) καί as explicativum (et communione, videlicet fractionis panis et precibus), or suppose a ἐκ διὰ δόνων (Homberg) after the Vulgate: et communications fractionis panis, so that τῇ κοινωνία would already refer to the Agape. Recently, following Moesheim, the explanation of the communication of charitable gifts to the needy has become the usual one. But this special sense must have been indicated by a special addition, or have been undoubtedly suggested by the context, as in Rom. xv. 26; Heb. xiii. 16; especially as κοινωνία does not in itself signify communicatio, but communio; and it is only from the context that it can obtain the idea of fellowship manifesting itself by contributions in aid, etc., which is not here the case. — τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου in the breaking of their bread (τοῦ ἄρτου). By this is meant the observance of common evening-meals (Luke xxiv. 30), which, after the manner of the last meal of Jesus, they concluded with the Lord's Supper (Agape, Jude 12). The Peschito and several

1 Eur. Androm. 619, Mod. 247, al.; see Kypke, ii. p. 19.
2 With the spuriousness of the second καί (see the critical note), the four particulars are arranged in pairs.
3 Comp. on Phil. i. 5. See also Weisse, Bibl. Theol. p. 141 f., and Ewald. (Wolf.
4 Cornelius a Lapide and Mede as quoted by
6 So Helmrichs, Kunoel, Oehler, Baumgarten, also Lohé, Aphorism. p. 80 ff., Harneck, christl. Gemeindegebilde. p. 78 ff., Haeckel, and others. That the moral nature of the κοινωνία expresses itself also in liberality, is correct in itself, but is not here particularly brought forward, any more than other forms of its activity. This in opposition to Lechler, apost. Zeit., p. 225.
Fathers, as well as the Catholic Church, with Suicer, Mede, Wolf, Lightfoot, and several older expositors, arbitrarily explain it exclusively of the Eucharist; comp. also Harnack, l.c. p. 111 ff. Such a celebration is of later origin; the separation of the Lord’s Supper from the joint evening meal did not take place at all in the apostolic church, I Cor. xi. The passages, xx. 7, 11, xxvii. 35, are decisive against Heinrichs, who, after Kypke, explains the breaking of bread of beneficence to the poor (Isa. lviii. 7), so that it would be synonymous with κονωνία (but see above). — ταῖς προστευχαίς] The plural denotes the prayers of various kinds, which were partly new Christian prayers restricted to no formula, and partly, doubtless, Psalms and wonted Jewish prayers, especially having reference to the Messiah and His kingdom.—Observe further in general the family character of the brotherly union of the first Christian church.

Ver. 43. ‘But fear came upon every soul, and many miracles, etc. Luke in these words describes: (1) what sort of impression the extraordinary result of the event of Pentecost made generally upon the minds of those who did not belong to the youthful church; and (2) the work of the apostles after the effusion of the Spirit. Therefore ταῖς is the simple copula, and not, as is often assumed, equivalent to γάρ. — ἐγινετο] (see the critical note) is in both cases the descriptive imperfect. Elsewhere, instead of the dative, Luke has ἐπὶ with the accusative, or ἐμφασος γινεται. — φόβος, as in Mark iv. 41, Luke i. 68, vii. 16, etc., fear, dread, which are wont to seize the mind on a great and wonderful, entirely unexpected, occurrence. This φόβος, occasioned by the marvellous result which the event of Pentecost together with the address of Peter had produced, operated quasi freno (Calvin), in preventing the first internal development of the church’s life from being disturbed by premature attacks from without. — δὲ τῶν ἀπουρ.] for the worker, the causa efficientis, was God. Comp. ver. 22, iv. 30, xv. 12.

Vv. 44, 45. But (ὅτι, continuative) as regards the development of the church-life, which took place amidst the φόβος without and this miracle-working of the apostles, all were ταῖς ἀπετέλεσα. This, as in i. 15, ii. 1, is to be understood as having a local reference, and not with Theophylact, Kypke, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel: de animorum consensu, which is foreign to N. T. usage. They were accustomed all to be together. This is not strange, when we bear in mind the very natural consideration that after the feast many of the three thousand—of whom, doubtless, a considerable number consisted of pilgrims to the feast—returned to their native countries; so that the youthful church at Jerusalem does not by any means seem too large to assemble in one place. — καὶ εἰς ἀπαντὰς κοινὰς] they possessed all things in common, i.e. all things belonged to all, were a common good. According to the more particular explanation which Luke himself gives (καὶ τὰ συμμαθα...
... εἰς, comp. iv. 32), we are to assume not merely in general a distinguished beneficence, liberality, and mutual rendering of help,\(^1\) or "a prevailing willingness to place private property at the disposal of the church;"^2 but a real community of goods in the early church at Jerusalem, according to which the possessors were wont to dispose of their lands and their goods generally, and applied the money sometimes themselves (Acts ii. 44 f., iv. 32), and sometimes by handing it to the apostles (Acts v. 2), for the relief of the wants of their fellow-Christians. See already Chrysostom. But for the correct understanding of this community of goods and its historical character (denied by Baur and Zeller), it is to be observed: (1) It took place only in Jerusalem. For there is no trace of it in any other church; on the contrary, elsewhere the rich and the poor continued to live side by side, and Paul in his letters had often to inculcate beneficence in opposition to selfishness and πλούσια. \(^3\) Comp. also Jas. v. 1 ff.; 1 John iii. 17. And this community of goods at Jerusalem helps to explain the great and general poverty of the church in that city, whose possessions naturally—certainly also in the hope of the Parousia speedily occurring—were soon consumed. As the arrangement is found in no other church, it is very probable that the apostles were prevented by the very experience acquired in Jerusalem from counselling or at all introducing it elsewhere. (2) This community of goods was not ordained as a legal necessity, but was left to the free will of the owners. This is evident from Acts v. 4 and xii. 12. Nevertheless, (3) in the yet fresh vigour of brotherly love,\(^8\) it was, in point of fact, general in the church of Jerusalem, as is proved from this passage and from the express assurance at iv. 32, 34 f., in connection with which the conduct of Barnabas, brought forward in iv. 36, is simply a concrete instance of the general practice. (4) It was not an institution borrowed from the Essenes^4 (in opposition to Grotius, Heinrichs, Ammon, Schneckenburger). For it could not have arisen without the guidance of the apostles; and to attribute to them any sort of imitation of Essenism, would be devoid alike of internal probability and of any trace in history, as, indeed, the first fresh form assumed by the life of the church must necessarily be conceived as a development from within under the impulse of the Spirit. (5) On the contrary, the relation arose very naturally, and that from within, as a continuation and extension of that community of goods which subsisted in the case of Jesus Himself and His disciples, the wants of all being defrayed from a common purse. It was the extension of this relation to the whole church, and thereby, doubtless, the putting into practice of the command Luke xii. 33, but in a definite form. That Luke here and in iv. 32, 34 expresses himself too strongly (de Wette), is an arbitrary assertion.

---

\(^1\) Comp. also Hundschede in Herzog's Enzykl. III. p. 36. In this view the Pythagorean τὰ τῶν φίλων κοινὰ might be compared with it (Rittersh. ad Porphy. Vit. Pyth. p. 48).


\(^3\) Bengel on iv. 34 aptly says: "non nisi summum fideli et amoris florit conventum."

COMMUNITY OF GOODS. 71

Schneckenburger, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1855, p. 514 ff., and Ewald have correctly apprehended the matter as an actual community of goods. 1 — τὰ κτήματα the landed possessions (belonging to him). 2 ισπάρξεις: possessions in general, 3 εἰπράξα it, namely, the proceeds. The reference is involved in the preceding verb (ἐπισκοπσκο), 4 — καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἴχε] just as any one had need. ἄν with the indicative denotes: "acciudisse aliquid non certo quodam tempore, sed quotiescunque occasio ita ferret." 8

Ver. 46. Καθ ἡμέραν] daily. See Bernhardy, p. 341. — On προσκαρπερεῖν ἐν, to be diligent in visiting a place, comp. Susann. 6. — ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ] as confessors of the Messiah of their nation, whose speedy appearance in glory they expected, as well as in accordance with the example of Christ Himself, and with the nature of Christianity as the fulfilment of true Judaism, they could of course have no occasion for voluntarily separating themselves from the sanctuary of their nation; on the contrary, they could not but unanimously (ὁμοθυμ.) consider themselves bound to it; comp. Luke xxiv. 53. — κλώντες ἄρτον] breaking bread, referring, as in ver. 42, to the love-feasts. The article might stand as in ver. 42, but is here not thought of, and therefore not put. It would mean: their bread. — καὶ ὁ ἵκον] Contrast to ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ; hence: at home, in meetings in their place of assembly, where they partook of the meal, perhaps in detachments. Comp. Philem. 2. So most commentators, including Wolf, Bengel, Heinrichs, Olshausen, de Wette. But Erasmus, Salmasius, and others explain it domatim, from house to house. So also Kuinoel and Hildebrand. Comp. Luke viii. 1; Acts xv. 21; Matt. xxiv. 7. But there is nowhere any trace of holding the love-feasts successively in different houses; on the contrary, according to i. 13, it must be assumed that the new community had at the very first a fixed place of assembly. Luke here places side by side the public religious conduct of the Christians and their private association; hence after ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ the express καὶ ὁ ἵκον was essentially necessary. 6 — μετελάβαραν τροφῆς] they received their portion of food (comp. xxvii. 33 f.), partook of their sustenance. 7 Ver. 46 is to be paraphrased as follows: In the daily visiting of the temple, at which they attended with one accord, and amidst daily observance of the love-feast at home, they wanted not sustenance, of which they partook in gladness and singleness of heart. — ἐν ἄγωλωσι] this is the expression of the joy in the Holy Spirit, as they partook of the daily bread, "fructus fidei et character veritatis," Bengel. And still in the erection of

2 See v. 1; Xen. Anc. 20. 23; Eustath. ad II. vi. p. 695.
3 Polyb. ii. 17. 11; Heb. x. 34, and Bleek in loc.
4 Comp. Luke xviii. 22; John xii. 5. See generally, Winer, p. 138 (5. T. 181 f.).
5 Herm. ad Viger. p. 830. Comp. lv. 35; Mark vi. 56; Krüger, Anab. i. 5. 2; Kühner, ad Mem. i. 1. 16; and see on I Cor. xii. 2.
6 Observe how, on the one hand, the youthful church continued still bound up with the national cultus, but, on the other hand, de-
7 Plat. Polit. p. 275 C: παυδείας μετελάβας και τροφῆς.
8 See v. 1; Xen. Anc. 20. 23; Eustath. ad II. vi. p. 695.
the kingdom believers are ἄμοιοι εἰν ἀγαλλιάσει, Jude 24. This is, then, the joy of triumphp. — ἄφελτος] plainness, simplicity, true moral candour. The word is not elsewhere preserved in Greek, but ἄφθεια is.¹

Ver. 47. Οἰκονόμης τ. Θεὸν] is not to be restricted to giving thanks at meals, but gives prominence generally to the whole religious frame of spirit; which expressed itself in the praises of God (comp. de Wette). This is clearly evident from the second clause of the sentence, καὶ ἐξοντες . . . λαῶν, referring likewise to their relation in general. That piety praising God, namely, and this possession of the general favour of the people, formed together the happy accompanying circumstances, under which they partook of their bodily sustenance with gladness and simple heart. — πρὸς θλ. τ. λαῶν] possessing favour, on account of their pious conduct, in their relation to the whole people.² Comp. Rom. v. 1. — δύσιος] i.e. Christ, as the exalted Ruler of His church. — τῶν σωτομένων] those who were being saved, i.e. those who, by their very accession to the church, became saved from eternal perdition so as to partake in the Messianic kingdom. Comp. ver. 40.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(5) Other tongues. V. 4.

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

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

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

Dr. Jacobson, Bishop of Chester, says: “Nothing short of the sudden communication of the power of speaking languages, of which there had been previously no colloquial knowledge, and which were not learned in the ordinary course, can have been implied by this statement, reiterated as it is in vv. 6, 8, and 11. None of the suggestions of vehement excitement, for a time affecting the organs of speech, so as to render it more or less unintelligible, of ecstatic inarticulate utterances, of the use of archaic words or poetic phraseology, or of new modes of interpreting ancient prophecies, can be accepted as at all ade-
quate to this narrative." For a full discussion of the subject see Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," vol. i., pp. 234–245.

(2) Hades. V. 27.

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

VER. 3. After ἑλπισις, λαθεῖν is to be defended, which is wanting in D, min. Theophyl. Lucif. and some vss., and is wrongly deleted by Heinr. and Bornem. The authorities which omit it are too weak, especially as the complete superfluousness of the word (it is otherwise in ver. 5) rendered its omission very natural. — Ver. 6. ἐγείρας καὶ is wanting in B D Ε, Sahid.; deleted by Bornem. But as Peter himself raises up the lame man, ver. 7, this portion of the summons would more easily be omitted than added from Luke v. 23, vi. 8; comp. v. 14. Lachm. and Tisch. have the form ἐγείρω; rightly, see on Matt. ix. 5; Mark ii. 9. — Ver. 7. After ἐγείρω, A B C Ε, min., the vss., and some Fathers, have αὐτῶν. Adopted by Lachm. A usual addition. — Ver. 11. αὐτῶν] Elz. has τοῦ ἅγιον ἄγων, against decisive testimony. A church-lesson begins with ver. 11. — Ver. 13. καὶ Ἰσαὰκ κ. Ἰακώβ] Lachm. and Bornem. read καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ κ. Θεὸς Ἰακώβ, following A C D Ε, 15, 18, 25, several vss., Chrys., and Theophyl. From Matt. xxii. 32 (therefore also several of these witnesses have the article before Θεὸς), and LXX. Ex. iii. 6. — μέν] is wanting in Elz., but is to be defended on the authority of A B C E Ε, min., vss., and Fathers, and because no corresponding ἐτ follows. — Ver. 18. αὐτῶν (not αὐτῶν) is, with Lachm. and Tisch., according to decisive evidence, to be placed after κριτον, and not after προφητῶν (Elz. Scholz). — Ver. 20. προσεχειρισμένων] Elz.: προσεκχειρισμένων, against decisive evidence. A gloss (vv. 18, 21 ff.) more precisely defining the meaning according to the context (comp. also xiii. 23 f.). — Ver. 21. τῶν] Elz.: πάνων, against decisive testimony. Introduced to make the statement stronger, in accordance with ver. 24. — ἀν' αἰώνος] is wanting in D, 19, Arm. Cosm. Tert. Ir.; so Born. It was considered objectionable, because, strictly speaking, no prophets existed ἀν' αἰώνος. The position after ἅγιων (Lachm. Tisch.) is so decidedly attested that it is not to be derived from Luke i. 70. — Ver. 22. Instead of μέν, Elz. has μέν γὰρ, against decisive evidence. γὰρ was written on the margin, because the connection was not understood. — πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας] is wanting in A B C Ε, min. Syr. Copt. Vulg. It is placed after εἰπεν in D E, vss., and Fathers. So Born. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition by way of gloss. — Ver. 23. Instead of ξαλοθρ., A B C D, Lachm. Born. Tisch. read ξαλοθρ. An etymological alteration, which often occurs also in Codd. of the LXX. Comp. the variations in Heb. xi. 28.— Ver. 24. κατηγγειλαν] Elz.: προκατηγγειλαν, against decisive evidence. A gloss of more precise definition. — Ver. 25. οἴ νῦν] Elz.: νῦν. But the article, which before νῦν was easily left out by a transcriber, is supported by preponderant witnesses, as is also the ν wanting before τῷ σπέρμ. in Elz., which was omitted as superfluous. — Ver. 26. After αὐτῶν Elz. has Ἰησοῦν, against many and important authorities. A familiar addition, although already read in A B. — τῶν] C, min. vss. Ir. have αὐτῶν (so Lachm.) or αὐτῶν. The original νῦν was first changed into αὐτῶν (in conformity with ξαλοθρ.), and then the plural would be easily inserted on account of the collective sense. The pronoun is entirely wanting in B.
Ver. 1. After the description of the first peaceful and prosperous life of the church, Luke now, glancing back to ii. 43, singles out from the multitude of apostolic τῆπα κ. σήμεια that one with which the first persecution was associated. — ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτόν here also in a local reference; 1 not merely at the same time and for the same object, but also in the same way, i.e. together, ἵνα, 2 Sam. 1. c. Prominence is here given to the united going to the temple and the united working, directing special attention to the keeping together of the two chief apostles. — ἀνέβαινον] they were in the act of going up. — ἐπὶ τὴν ὕπαν τῆς προσευχῆς] ἐπὶ, used of the definition of time, in so far as a thing extends to a space of time. 2 Hence: during the hour, not equivalent to περὶ τὴν ὕπαν. 3 Concerning the three hours of prayer among the Jews: the third (see on ii. 15), the sixth (noon), and the ninth (that of the evening sacrifice in the temple), see Lightfoot, Schoetgen, and Wetstein, in loc. Comp. x. 3, 9.—The Attic mode of writing ἵναπην is decidedly attested in the Book of Acts.

Ver. 2. Χωλός ἐκ κολ. μητρ.] born lame. Comp. xiv. 8; John ix. 1. And he was above forty years old, iv. 22.—The imperfect εὐαγγέλτε, he was being brought, denotes the action in reference to the simultaneous ἀνέβαινον, ver. 1 ; and εἰδοὺν, its daily repetition. — τὴν λεγομ. ὑπαίαν] which bears the by-name, 4 "Beautiful." The proper name was, "gate of Nicana." It lay on the eastern side of the outermost court of the temple, leading towards the valley of Kidron, and is described by Josephus, Bell. v. 5. 3, as surpassingly splendid: τῶν δὲ πυλῶν αὐτί μὲν ἐνεάχρον καὶ ἀργύρω κεκαλυμμένων πανταχοῦν ἤσαν, ὡμοίως τε παραστάσεις καὶ τὰ ἐπιτρέποντα, μία δὲ ἡ ἔσχετον τοῦ νεὼς Κορυνθίου χαλκοῦ πολὺ τῇ τίμῃ τὰς καταργήσεις καὶ περιχρύσους ὑπεράγονα. Καὶ δύο ἦσαν ἐκάτω τὸν πυλῶνος θύρας, τριάκοντα δὲ πιχών τὸ ὄψις ἐκάτον, καὶ τὸ πλάτος ἦ τοιτεχνίδια. Others (Wagenseil, Lund, Bengel, Walch) understand it of the gate Susan, which was in the neighbourhood of Solomon’s porch, and at which the market for pigeons and other beasts for sacrifice was held. But this is at variance with the signification of the word ὑπαίας; for the name Susan is to be explained from the Persian capital (ṷšš, town of lilies), which, according to Middoth, 1 Kal. 3, was depicted on the gate. 5 Others (Kuinoel, et. al.) think that the gate Chudla, i.e. tempestiva, leading to the court of the Gentiles, is meant. 6 But this derivation of the name (from ἔπη, tempus) cannot be historically proved, nor could Luke expect his reader to discover the singular appellation porta tempestiva in ὑπαίας, seeing that for this the very natural "porta speciosa" (Vulg.) could not but suggest itself.—Among the Gentiles also beggars sat at the gate of their temples 7—a usage probably connected with the idea (also found in ancient Israel) of a special divine care for the poor 8—τοῦ αἵτων ὑπὸ fine, ut pereat.

1 See on i. 15; comp. LXX 2 Sam. ii. 13; Joseph. Antt. xvi. 5. 6.
2 See on Mark xv. 1; Ngaeob. on the Iiad, p. 556, ed. 3.
3 Alberti. Obae. Valckense, Wilner, and many others.
5 Perhaps, however, this picture of Susan on the gate of the temple is only an invention on account of the name, and the latter might be sufficiently explained from the lily-shaped decorations of the columns (יוֹם הַנּוּם)
7 Martial. i. 119.
8 Hermann, Privatliebr. § 14. 2.
HEALING OF A LAME MAN.

Vv. 3–5. Μηλλοντας εισείναι εἰς τ. ἱερ. For it was through this outermost gate that the temple proper was reached. — ἡρώτα ἐκλημον. λαβ.] he asked that he might receive an alms. Modes of expression used in such a case, Merere in me.; In me benefacie tibi, and the like, may be seen in Vajiora rabbi. 1. 20, 8, 4. — On λαβεῖν, which in itself might be dispensed with, see Winer, p. 565 [E. T. 760]. — ἀτένισας ... βλέψον εἰς ἡμᾶς] They would read from his look, whether he was spiritually fitted for the benefit to be received. "Talis intuitus non caruit peculiari Spiritus motu; hinc fit, ut tam secure de miraculo pronuntiet," Calvin. Comp. xiii. 9. — ἐπείξεν αἰτοῖς] The supplying of τὸν νόσον serves to make the sense clear. Comp. Luke xiv. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 16. He was attentive, intent upon them. 1

Ver. 6. Δίδωμι I give thee herewith. — εἰν τῷ δόμῳ. ... περιπάτει] by virtue of the name [now pronounced] of Jesus the Messiah, the Nazarene, arise and walk. in denotes that on which the rising and walking were causally dependent. Mark xvi. 17; Luke x. 17; Acts iv. 10, xvi. 18. Comp. the utterance of Origen, c. Cela. 1, against the assertion of Celsius, that Christians expelled demons by the help of evil spirits: τοσούτων γὰρ δύναται τὸ δώμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. This name was the focus of the power of faith, through which the miraculous gift of the apostles operated. Comp. on Matt. vii. 22; Luke ix. 49, x. 17; Mark xvi. 17. A δίκον or the like is not (in opposition to Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others) to be supplied with εἰν τῷ δόμῳ. κ.τ.λ. Observe, moreover, first, the solemnity of the Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ; and secondly, that Χριστοῦ, as in ii. 38, cannot yet be a proper name. Comp. John xviii. 3, i. 42.

Vv. 7, 8. Ἄρρεν τῆς δεξιάς] comp. Mark ix. 27, and see Valckenaer, ad Theocr. iv. 35. — ἰστρεπόθησαι] his feet were strengthened, so that they now performed their function, for which they had been incapacitated in the state of lameness, of supporting the body in its movements. — αἱ βάσιμος are the feet. — τὰ στούμα: the ankle-bones, tali (very frequent in the classics), after the general expression subjoining the particular. — ἐξαλλήλωνος, springing up, leaping into the air. 2 Not: exsiliens, videlicet e grappulo (Casaubon), of which last there is no mention. — καὶ ἐκοίμη . . . τὸν θέντο] This behaviour bears the most natural impress of grateful attachment (comp. ver. 11), lively joy (περιπατ. καὶ ἀλληλουγος, — at the same time as an involuntary proof of his complete cure for himself and for others), and religious elevation. The view of Thiess—that the beggar was only a pretended cripple who was terrified by the threatening address of Peter into using his feet, and afterwards, for fear of the rage of the people, prudently attached himself to the apostles—changes the entire narrative, and makes the apostle himself (vv. 12, 16, iv. 9, 10) the deceiver. Peter had wrought the cure in the possession of that miraculous power of healing which Jesus had imparted to His apostles (Luke ix. 1), and the supernatural result cannot in that case, any more than in any other miracle, warrant us to deny


2 As in Wisd. xiii. 18; Joseph. Antt. vii. 5. 3 Xen. Cyr. vili. 1. 38; Anab. vii. 3. 38;
its historical character, as is done by Zeller, who supposes that the general χωλοὶ περιπταγόσιν, Luke vii. 22, Matt. xvi. 31, has here been illustrated in an individual instance.

Ver. 10. Ἡσυχίας καὶ ἱματιῶν, ὅπως κ.τ.λ.] A well-known attraction.—πρὸς τῆς ἐλεφαντ.[for the sake of alms.—ὁ καθήμενος] See on John ix. 8. — ἐπὶ τῇ ὀραίᾳ π.] ἐπί: immediately at; on the spot of the Beautiful gate. See on John iv. 6. —θαμνῷ καὶ ἱσταύν.] astonishment and surprise at what had happened to him—an exhaustive designation of the highest degree of wonder.

Ver. 11. Κρατοῦν] But as he held fast Peter and John, i.e. in the impulse of excited gratitude took hold of them and clung to them, in order not to be separated from his benefactors. There is no sanction of usage for the meaning commonly given, and still adopted by Olshausen and De Wette: assecdari. For in Col. ii. 19 κρατεῖν occurs in its proper sense, to hold fast; the LXX. 2 Sam. iii. 6 is not at all in point, and in Achill. Tat. v. p. 309, ἐπέχειρε με κρατεῖν is: me retinere conabatur. — As to the porch of Solomon, see on John x. 23. — ἰδωρσόμενον] the plural after the collective noun ὁ λαός.

Ver. 12. Ἀπεκρίνετο] he began to speak, as a reply to the astonishment and concourse of the people, which thereby practically expressed the wish for an explanation. See on Matt. xi. 25. Observe the honourable address, ἀνδρ. ἱερ., as in ii. 22, v. 35, xiii. 16, xxi. 28. — τι θαυμάζετε ἐπὶ τόσον;] The wonder of the people, namely, was unfounded, in so far as they regarded the healing as an effect of the ὄνομας η ἐνοεῖτο. of the apostles themselves. — τόσον] is neuter; see ver. 10: at this. As to the ἡ, an, introducing the second question, observe that the course of thought without interrogation is as follows: You astonishment is groundless, provided that you were reasonably entitled to regard us as the workers of this cure. The ἡ is accordingly: or else, if you think that you must wonder why, etc. — ἡνίως emphatically prefixed: ἡδίᾳ is then correlative. — εἰσεβίαι] "quasi sit preedium pietatis nostrae a Deo nobis concessum," Heinrichs. In us lies neither the causa effectu neor the causa meritoria. — πεποιηκόν τοῦ περιπ. αὐτόν] to be taken together: as if we had been at work, in order that he might walk. That this telen designation of that which was done is given with the genitio of the infinitive, is certainly to be traced to the frequent use of this form of expression in the LXX.; but the conception of the aim is not on that account to be obliterated as the defining element of the expression, especially as even in classical writers this mode of conception is found, and presents itself in the expression ποιεῖν ὅπως. The ποιεῖν is conceived as striving.

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

---

1 Winer, p. 561 (E. T. 731).
2 Comp. θάυμα καὶ ἱματία, Plut. de auctt. 8, 145, and similar expressions, Lobecck, Paral. p. 60 f.
3 Comp. John xx. 23; Rev. ii. 25, iii. 11; Song of Sol. iii. 4: ἡγατύνουται αὐτῶν καὶ οἰκία ἀφικάνε αὐτῶν. Polyb. viii. 20. 8; Eur. Phoen. 600; Plut. Mor. p. 90 D.
5 See Winer, p. 306 (E. T. 410).
6 See, e.g., Herod. i. 117: τοιεῖν . . . ὅπως ἔσται ἡ ἱσταυρία τὸν καθημερινόν, v. 109, i. 300. Comp. πράσσεως ὅπως, Kräger on Thuc. i. 56.
7 Comp. John ix. 3 f., xi. 4.
Jesus, whom you delivered up, etc.—what a stinging contrast! — τ. παρήγγειλεν ἡμῖν] embraces the three patriarchs. Comp. on Rom. ix. 5.—The venerated designation: "the God of Abraham," etc. (Ex. iii. 15 f.), heightens the blame of the contrast. — ἔδεσας] namely, inasmuch as He granted such a result by means of His name (ver. 6). — τόν παιδόν] is not to be explained, after the Vulgate, with the older interpreters (and still by Heinrichs, Künnoel), as filium, since only υἱὸς Θεοῦ is throughout used of Christ in this sense; but with Piscator, Bengel, Nitzsch,1 Olahauen, de Wette, Baumgarten, and others, as servo:; and the designation of the Messiah as the fuller of the divine counsel: servant of God, has arisen from Isa. xl.—lxxvi. namely, from the Messianic reference of the νησί, τῇ There. Comp. Matt. xii. 18. So also in ver. 26, iv. 27, 30. Observe that an apostle is never called υἱὸς (but only δοῦλος) Θεοῦ. Comp. especially iv. 29 f. — ἐν ἰμεῖς μέν] This μέν, which pierces the conscience of the hearers, is not followed by any corresponding δέ. Comp. on i. 1. The connection before the mind of Luke was: whom you have indeed delivered up, etc., but God has raised from the dead. But by κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολέειν he was led away from carrying out this sentence, and induced to give to it another turn. — παρεδόκας] namely, to Pilate. — ἤρθεν δέ τινι τούτων i.e. ye have denied that He is the Messiah, John xix. 14, 15; Luke xxiii. 2. Comp. also vii. 35. The object of the denial was obvious of itself, since Jesus had just been spoken of as the υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Observe, moreover, that with ἤρθον τούτων the relative construction is not carried on, but with rhetorical emphasis the sentence is continued independent of it: and ye have denied Him.2 This is in keeping with the liveliness of the discourse and its antitheses; but without such a breaking off of the construction aitōn would be quite superfluous, as the regiment remains the same as before. — κατὰ πρόσωπον towards the face; ye have denied Him even unto the face of Pilate, so audaciously! Comp. Gal. ii. 11. There is no Hebraism.3 — κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολέειν although the latter had decided to release (him). See John xix. 4; Luke xxiii. 16. ἐκείνου is designedly used instead of aitōn, in order to make the contrast felt between what Pilate judged and what they did.4 Chrys. well says: ἵματι ἐκείνου ἀπολέειν by judgment does no one judge.

Vv. 14, 15. 'Τοιούτης δέ] Contrast to κρίναντος ἐκ. ἀπολέειν, ver. 13. — τόν ἰμάν καὶ δίκαιον] the κατ' ἐξοχήν Holy, consecrated to God, inasmuch as He is the θεὸς, and Just, innocent and entirely righteous, see on John xvi. 10. Comp. Isa. lxxii. 11. To this characteristic description of Jesus ἰδίον φωνα, Barabas,5 forms a purposely chosen contrast: a man whose was a murderer. It is more emphatic, more solemn, than the simple φωνα; but ἰδίον φωνα would have been more contemptuous, Bernhardy, p. 48. — χαρισθήσει ἰμν] condonati vobis,6 that he should be by way of favour be delivered to

2 Comp. Bernhardy, p. 304; Kühner, § 799.
3 See Jacobso, ad Achill. Tatt. p. 612; Schweig.
4 Comp. ver. 14. See Krüger and Kühner,
5 See Deiss. ad Dom. de
6 cor. p. 819; and the examples from Plato in
9 Comp. Soph. O. C. 945: ἰδίον παραδότων,
0 O. R. 943: ἰδίον ἀγαθόν.
1 Ducker, ad Flor. iii. 5. 10.
you. — τὸν δὲ ἄρχειν τῆς [ζωῆς] forms a double contrast, namely, to ἀνάφα 
φωνά and to ἀπεκτείνα. It means: the author of life, inasmuch as Christ 
by His whole life-work up to His resurrection was destined (vv. 20, 21) to 
provide eternal life, all that is included in the Messianic αὐτοποία (Heb. ii. 10). 
See John iii. 16, xi. 25; 2 Tim. i. 10. The inclusion, however, of physical 
life (de Wette, Hackett), according to the idea of John i. 4, has no support 
in the text, nor would it have been so understood by the hearers, although 
even Chrysostom comes ultimately to the idea of the original Living one. — 
δν ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . οὗ ἡμείς κ.τ.λ.] great in its simplicity. The latter, in which 
οὐ is neuter, is the burden of the apostolic consciousness. Comp. on ii. 32. 
Observe, moreover, on vv. 14, 15: “Graphic sane majestatem illam aposto-
licam expressit, quam illiuisse in dicendo vel una ejus testatur epistola,” 
Erasmus. The Epistle of Peter is written as with runic characters.

Ver. 16. Ἡπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ οὐκε. αἰνοῦ] on account of faith in His name 
(which we acknowledge as that of the Messiah), i.e. because we believe in 
His Messiahship. On ἐπὶ, of the cause on which the fact rests, on the ground of, see Bernhardy, p. 250; as to the genitive of the object with πίστει, see 
on Rom. iii. 23. Others—particularly Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, and Ols-
hausen—understand ἐπὶ of the aim in order that faith in Jesus may be 
excited in you (and at the same time in the healed man himself, according to 
Olshausen). But the very connection of thought is in favour of the first 
explanation. For καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει κ.τ.λ. attaches itself closely to the pre-
ceding οὐ ἡμεὶς μάρτυρες ἐσμεν; so that Peter, immediately after mentioning 
the testimony, brings forward the extraordinary efficacy of the faith on 
on which this apostolic testimony is based. Still more decisive is the paral-
lelism of the second clause of the verse, in which the thought of the first 
clause is repeated emphatically, and with yet more precise definition. — τὸ 
ὅνομα αἰνοῦ] so far, namely, as the cure was effected by means of His name 
pronounced, ver. 6. Observe the weighty repetition and position at the end. 
— ἣ πίστις ἢ δι’ αἰνοῦ] the faith wrought (in us) through Him. Through 
Christ was the faith, namely, in Him as the Messiah; wrought in Peter and 
John, and in the apostles generally, partly by means of His whole mani-
festation and ministry during His life (Matt. xvi. 16; John i. 14), partly by 
means of the resurrection and effusion of the Spirit. The view which takes 
πίστις of trust in God brought about through Christ, is not in keeping with 
the first half of the verse, which has already specifically determined the 
object of πίστει. — ταύτην] δεικτικός. For the bodily soundness of the man, 
who was present (ver. 11), was apparent to their eyes. — ἐπίσημον πάντως ἢμ.] 
corresponds to δν θεωρεῖστα in the first clause of the verse. The faith, etc., 
gave to him this restoration in the presence of you all; so that no other way 
of its coming to pass was at all to be thought of.

Vv. 17, 18. Peter now pitches his address in a tone of heart-winning

---

footnotes:

1. Plut. O. Gracch. 4; Acta xxv. 11, xxvii. 24; Philem. 21. See Loeper, Óbes. p. 173 f.
2. Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2; Mic. i. 18; 1 Mac. ix. 61: Plat. Locr. p. 96 C; Tim. p. 21 E.
5. On δλόκασθαι, comp. Plat. Mor. p. 1063 F; Plat. Tim. p. 44 C: δλόκασθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ παρα-

---
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gentleness, setting forth the putting to death of Jesus (1) as a deed of ignorance (ver. 17) and (2) as the necessary fulfilment of the divine counsel (ver. 18). — καὶ νῦν and now, i.e. et sic, itaque; so that νῦν is to be understood not with reference to time, but as: in this state of matters. — ὄρθροι familiar, winning. Chrys.: αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς εἰδέθως τῇ τῶν ὄρθρων προστάτησαν. Comp. on the other hand, ver. 12: ἀνδρέας Ἰσαμπλίται. — κατὰ ἀγωνίαν unknowingly (Lev. xxi. 14), since you had not recognised Him as the Messiah; spoken quite in the spirit of Jesus. See Luke xxiii. 34; comp. xiii. 27. “Hoc ait, ut spe venias eos excitet,” Præceus. Comp. also 1 Pet. i. 14. The opposite: κατὰ πρόθεσιν, κατὰ προαιρέσιν. — δοσις καὶ οἱ ἀρχ. ἰμών] namely, have acted ignorantly. Wolf (following the Peshito) refers the comparison merely to ἔπραξεν: scio vos ignorantia adductos, ut faceretis sicut duces ventri. But it would have been unwise if Peter, in order to gain the people, had not purposed to represent in the same mild light the act also of the Sanhedrists (ἀρχοντες), on whom the people depended. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 8. — Ver. 18. But that could not but so happen, etc. Comp. Luke xxiv. 44 ff. — πάντων τῶν προφητῶν] comp. Luke xxiv. 27. The expression is needless to be explained as a hyperbole (Kuinoel) nor from the typical character of history (Olshausen), but from the point of view of fulfillment, in so far as the Messianic redemption, to which the divine prediction of all the prophets referred (com. x. 48), has been realized by the sufferings and death of Jesus. Looking back from this standpoint of historical realization, it is with truth said: God has brought into fulfilment that which He declared beforehand by all the prophets, that His Messiah should suffer. On τ. Ἱσααργόν αὐτῶν, comp. iv. 28; Luke ii. 26, ix. 20; Rev. xi. 15, xii. 10. — ὁτέρο] so, as it has happened, vers. 14, 15, 17.

Ver. 19. ὅπωρ] infers from ver. 17. — μετανοήσατε see on ii. 38. The ἐπιστρέφατε (comp. xxvi. 20), connected with it, expresses the positive consequence of the μετανοεῖν. “Significatur in resipiscente applicatio sui ad Deum,” Bengel. — εἰς τὸ ἐπάλειψθε, κ.τ.λ.] contains the aim, namely, the mediate aim: the final aim is contained in ver. 20, which repentance and conversion ought to have. The idea of the forgiveness of sins is here represented under the figure of the erasure of a hand-writing. Baptist is not here expressly named, as in ii. 88, but was now understood of itself, seeing that not long before thousands were baptized; and the thought of it has suggested the figurative expression ἐπάλειψθε: in order that they may be blotted out, namely, by the water of baptism. The causa meritoria of the forgiveness of sins is contained in ver. 18 (παθέων τῶν Χ.). The causa apprehendens (faith) is contained in the required repentance and conversion.

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

3 Since, in fact, only by this self-manifestation of the risen Christ must the true light concerning Him who was formerly rejected and put to death have dawned upon you; otherwise you could not have so treated Him. Comp. Xen. Anab. iv. 1. 19, and Kühner in loc. See also vil. 84, x. 5, xxi. 16; John ii. 29; 2 John 5.

* See on Col. ii. 14. Comp. Ps. ii. 9; Isai. xiii. 25; Dem. 791. 13: ἐπάλειψθαι τὸ δέλλωμα.

* Comp. Wessel, Petr. Lehnbegr. p. 258.
(καὶ ἀποστείλῃ κ.τ.λ.) (M) will set in, as soon as the Jewish nation is converted to the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah. It required a further revelation to teach him that the Gentiles also were to be converted—and that directly, and not by the way of proselytism—to Christ (chap. x.). — διὸς ἄν, with the subjunctive, denotes the purpose that is to be attained in dependence on a supposition, here, in this event; if ye comply with the summons. This ἄν, consequently, is not equivalent to εἰ (Vulg.: ut cum venerint), in which case an apodosis which would be wanting is arbitrarily supplied in thought (see Erasmus and, recently, Beelen). Others (Beza, Castalio, Erasmus Schmid, Eckermann, et al.) consider διὸς as a particle of time — ὅτε: quandoconque venerint. Against this it may be decisively urged, in point of linguistic usage, that in Greek writers (in Herod. and the poets) the temporal διὸς is joined with the indicative or optative, but does not occur at all in the N. T.; and, in point of fact, the remission of sins takes place not for the first time at the Parousia, but at once on the acceptance of the gospel. — καιροὶ ἀναψεῖς, seasons of refreshing: namely, the Messianic, as is self-evident and is clear from what follows. It is substantially the same as is meant in Luke ii. 25 by παράλλης τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, — namely, seasons in which, through the appearance of the Messiah in his kingdom, there shall occur blessed rest and refreshment for the people of God, after the expiration of the troublous seasons of the αἰών υἱῶν. The αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι in chap. ii. 7 are not different from these future καιροὶ. This explanation is shown to be clearly right by the fact that Peter himself immediately adds, as explanatory of καιροὶ ἀναψεῖς: καὶ ἀποστείλῃ τὸν προκεχειρ. ἵμιν Ἰησ. Χ., which points to the Parousia. Others rationalizing have, at variance with the text, explained the καιροὶ ἀναψ. either of the time of rest after death, or of deliverance from the yoke of the ceremonial law, or of the putting off of penal judgment on the Jews, or of the sparing of the Christians amidst the destruction of the Jews, or of the glorious condition of the Christian church before the end of the world. On ἀνάψεις, comp. LXX. Ex. viii. 15; Αq. Isa. xxviii. 12; Strabo, X. p. 459.— ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου] The times, which are to appear, are rhetorically represented as something real, which is to be found with God in heaven, and comes thence, from the face of God, to earth. Thus God is designated as αἰτως of the times of refreshing (Chrysostom). — τὸν προκεχ. ἵμιν Χ.] Jesus the Messiah destined for you (for your nation). On προχειρίσθαι (xxii. 14, xxvi. 16), properly, I take in hand; then, I undertake, I determine, and with the accusative of the person: I appoint one. Analogous is ὅ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός, Luke xxiii. 35.

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

1 xv. 17; Luke ii. 35; Rom. iii. 4; Matt. vi. 5.
3 Tim. iii. 1; Gal. i. 4; Acts xiv. 22.
5 Kraft, Gose. sacri. fisc. IX. p. 271 f.
6 Berkey.
7 Grotius, Hammond, Lightfoot.
8 Virtinga.
9 Comp. 2 Macc. iii. 7, viii. 9; Polyb. vi. 58. 3; Plat. Gobii. 8; Diod. Sic. xii. 28; Wetstein and Kypke in loc.; Schleierm. Theol. iv. p. 519.
for Him by God until the Parousia. Taken thus, 1 εἰρανθείν is the subject, and δὲ does not stand for ἵνα, as if Peter wished historically to narrate the ascension; but the present tense places before the eyes the necessity of the elevation of Christ into heaven as an absolute relation, which as such is constantly present until the Parousia (ver. 20, and ἀρξῃ χρόνων κ.τ.λ., ver. 21). Hence also the infinitive is not of the duration of the action (δέχεσθαι), but of its absolute act (δέχεσθαι). Others find the subject in οὖς: who must occupy heaven (so Luther and many of the older Lutherans, partly in the interest of Christ’s ubiquity; also Bengel, Heinrichs, Olshausen, Lange, Weiss, et al.); “Christus coelum debuit occupare cœ ca regiam suam,” Calvius. But against this view the linguistic usage of δέχεσθαι, which never signifies occupare, 2 is decisive. — On the μέν solitarius Grotius aptly remarks, that it has its reference in ἀρξῃ χρόνων ἀποκαταστ., “quasi dicit: ubi illud tempus venerit, ex coelo in terras reedit.” — ἀρξῃ χρόνων ἀποκαταστ. πάντων] until times shall have come, in which all things will be restored. Before such times set in, Christ comes not from heaven. Consequently the times of the αἰών ὁ μὲλλὼν itself—the καιρὸι ἀναφίξεως—cannot be meant; but only such times as shall precede the Parousia, and by the emergence of which it is conditioned, that the Parousia shall ensue. Accordingly the explanation of the universal renewal of the world unto a glory such as preceded the fall 3 is excluded, seeing that that restoration of all things (πάντων) coincides with the Parousia, in opposition to de Wette, as well as many other expositors, who think on the resurrection and the judgment. The correct interpretation must start from Mal. iv. 6 as the historical seat of the expression, and from Matt. xvii. 11, where Christ Himself, taking it from Malachi, has made it His own. Accordingly the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων can only be the restoration of all moral relations to their original normal condition. Christ’s reception in heaven—this is the idea of the apostle—continues until the moral corruption of the people of God is removed, and the thorough moral renovation, the ethical restitutio in integrum, of all their relations shall have ensued. Then only is the exalted Christ sent from heaven to the people, and then only does there come for the latter the ἀνάψυξις from the presence of God, ver. 20. What an incitement neither to neglect nor to defer repentance and conversion as the means to this ἀποκατάστασις πάντων! The mode in which this moral restitution must take place is, according to ver. 22, beyond doubt,—namely, by rendering obedience in all points to what the

1 Gregory of Nazianzus, Ora. 2 de fli., already has evidently this view: δὲ γὰρ αὐτὸν . . . ὅν εἰρανθείν δέχεσθαι, and Oecumenius calls heaven the ἀναφίξεως τοῦ ἀποκαταστάσιον. The Vulgate repeats the ambiguity of the original: quern operiet coelum suicerunt, but yet appears, by suicerunt, to betray the correct view. Clearly and definitely Castalio gives it with a passive turn: “quern operiet coelo capr.”

2 Beza, Placato, Castallo, and others, the Socinians, also Kunoel, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lechler, Hackett.

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


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

Vv. 22—24. Connection: What has just been said: “By the mouth of His holy prophets from the beginning,” is now set forth more particularly in two divisions,—namely: (1) Moses, with whom all O. T. prophecy begins (comp. Rom. x. 19), has announced to the people the advent of the Messiah, and the necessity of obedience to Him, vv. 22, 23. Thus has he made a beginning in speaking of the ἀποκατάστασις πάνω, which in fact can only be brought about by obedience to all which the Messiah has spoken. (2) But also the collective body of prophets from Samuel onwards, that is, the prophets in the stricter sense, etc., ver. 24 — Μωσῆς] The passage is Deut. xviii. 15 f., 19, which, applying according to its historical sense to the prophetic order generally which presents itself to the seer collectively as in one person, has received its highest fulfillment in Christ as the realized ideal of all the Old Testament interpreters of God, consequently as the ἀληθινὸς προφητὴς.11

Comp. vii. 87. — ὅς ἔμε] as He has raised up me by His prepara-

---

2 Polyb. iv. 23. 1; v. 2. 11; xxviii. 10. 7; Dion. Hal. x. 8; also Plat. Az. p. 370.
3 On λαλῶ τι, in this sense, comp. Matt. xxvi. 13; Plat. Az. p. 306 D; Soph. Phil. 110. So also λέγω τι, to tell of something; see Stallbaum, ad Plat. Apol. p. 93 A; Philod. p. 79 B.
4 Baumgarten, p. 88, endeavours to bring out essentially the same meaning, but without any change in the idea of ἀποκατάστασις. In this way: he supplies the verb ἀποκαταστάθησθαι with ὅν ἔλλασσεν, and supposes the kingdom of Israel (l. 6) to be meant. To imagine the latter reference, especially after πάνω, is just as arbitrary, as the supplying of that verbal notion is exceedingly harsh. Hofm. Schriften. II. 2, p. 648, follows the correct reference of ὅν to χρόνων.
5 Rosenmüller, Morus, Stoiba, Behnrichs.
6 Grotius, Hammond, Bolten.
7 Kuinoel.
8 Oecumenius.
11 Calvin appropriately says: “Non modo quia prophetarum omnium est princeps, sed quod in ipsius dirigebantur omnes superiores propheticæ, et quod tandem Deum per omnes absoluta loquentes est.” Heb. i. 1 ff.
tion, calling, commission, and effectual communion. Bengel well remarks regarding the Messianic fulfilment: "Similitudo non officit excellentiae." — ἔτι οὐκέτι see on ii. 17. — ἔξωλόπ. ἕκ. τοῦ λαοῦ] In the LXX. it runs after the original text: ἔξω ἵστασιν ἕξ αἵτων. Peter, in order to express this threat according to its more special import, and thereby in a manner more deterrent and more incentive to the obedience required, substitutes for it the formula which often occurs in the Pentateuch after Gen. xvii. 14: οὐκέτι ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἡ μοιρή, which is the appointment of the punishment of death excluding forgiveness. The apostle, according to his insight into the Messianic reference and significance of the whole passage, understands by it, exclusion from the Messianic life and ejection to Gehenna, consequently the punishment of eternal death, which will set in at the judgment. — καὶ ἅδε | i.e. Moses on the one hand, and all the prophets on the other. Thus over against Moses, the beginner, who was introduced by μη, there is placed as similar in kind the collective body. See as to καὶ ἅδε, on John vi. 51, and observe that ἅδε is attached to the emphasized idea appended (πάντες). — All the prophets from Samuel and those that follow, as many as have spoken, have also, etc., evidently an inaccurate form of expression in which two constructions are mixed up,—namely: (1) All the prophets from Samuel onward, as many of them as have spoken, have also, etc.; and (2) All the prophets, Samuel and those who follow, as many of them as have spoken, have also, etc. The usual construction since Casaubon, adopted also by Valckenaer and Kuinoel, is that of the Vulgate: "et omnes prophetas a Samuel, et deinceps qui locuti sunt," so that it is construed καὶ δοκεί τῶν καθήκων ἑλάλη; it yields a tautology, as those who follow after are already contained in πάντες οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σ. Van Hengel's expedient, that after τῶν καθήκων there is to be supplied ἐς ἑλάλην, and after προφῆται, ἄρξαμεν, is simply arbitrary in both cases. — After Moses Samuel opens the series of prophets in the stricter sense. He is called in the Talmud also (see Wetstein) magister prophetarum. For a prophecy from 2 Sam., see Heb. i. 5. — κ. τῶν καθήκων] "longa temporum successionem, uno tamen consensus," Calvin. — τῶν ἑμών πάντες i.e. those days, of which Moses has spoken what has just been quoted, namely, ὁ χρόνος ἀποκαταστ. πάντα, which necessarily follows from ὁ ἑλάλην ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ., ver. 21. Hence we are not to understand, with Schneckenburger, Weiss, Hofmann the time of the present as referred to; in which view Hofmann would change the entire connection, so as to make vv. 22-24 serve as a reason for the call to repentance in ver. 19, whereas it is evident that ὁ ἑλάλην κ.τ.λ., ver. 21, must be the element determining the following appeals to Moses and the prophets.

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

2 See Green. Theor. II. p. 718; Ewald, Allerta.
3 On ἐξωλόπρα, οἱ καθήκοντες perdo, frequent in the LXX., the Apocrypha, and in the Test. XII. Patr., also in Clem. Rom., who has only the form ἐξωλόπ., only known to later Greek, see Kypke, II. p. 27; Sturz, Dial. Mac. p. 302 f.
4 Comp. Baenuml. Partik. p. 149.
5 Winer, p. 588 (E. T. 789).
7 Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. I. p. 143 ff.
8 Schriftbeur. II. 1, p. 140.
9 Observe the great emphasis of the ἐς as of the ἐς (ver. 25). From their position of preference they ought, in the consciousness of
to both, inasmuch as what was promised by the prophets and pledged in the covenant is to be realized for and in you, as the recipients in accordance with promise and covenant. Comp. ii. 30; Rom. ix. 4, xv. 8. On νοι νη διαθήκης, comp. the rabbinical passages in Wetstein. Concerning νοις, used to denote closer connection (like [3]), see on Matt. viii. 13. Incorrectly Lightfoot, Wolf, and Kuinoel render: "prophetarum discipuli, Matt. xii. 27; so the Greek παιδες; because then νοι in the same signification does not suit τῆς διαθήκης. Hence, incorrectly, also Michaelis, Morus, Heinrichs: "e vestra natione provenerunt prophetae." — διαθήκη, covenant. For God bound Himself by covenant to bless all generations through the seed of Abraham, on the condition, namely, that Abraham obeyed His command (Gen. xii. 1). So with διαθήκη also in the classics. — πρὸς τοῖς πατ. ἕμ.] πρὸς denotes the ethical direction. Bernhardy, p. 265. Abraham is conceived as representative of the forefathers; hence it is said that God had bound Himself towards the fathers when He spoke to Abraham. — καὶ εἰν τῷ σπῆρατῳ σου] καί, and, quite as in ii. 17. — The quotation (Gen. xxii. 18; comp. xviii. 18, xii. 8) is not exactly according to the LXX. According to the Messianic fulfilment, from which point of view Peter grasps and presents the prophetic meaning of the passage (see ver. 26), εἰν τῷ σπῆρατῳ σου is not collective, but: in thy descendant, namely, the Messiah (comp. Gal. iii. 16), the future blessing of salvation has its causal ground. As to παρθαι, gentes, here nations, see on Eph. iii. 15.

Ver. 26. Progress of the discourse: "This bestowal—in accordance with God's covenant-arrangements—of salvation on all nations of the earth through the Messiah has commenced with you," to you first has God sent, etc. — πρὸς τοὺς παρθαί近两年 than to all other nations. "Praevium indicium de vocacione gentium," Bengel. Rom. i. 16, xi. 11. On this intimation of the universality of the Messianic salvation Olshausen observes, that the apostle, who at a later period rose with such difficulty to this idea (ch. x.), was doubtless, in the first moments of his ministry, full of the Spirit, raised above himself, and in this elevation had glimpses to which he was still, as regards his general development, a stranger. But this is incorrect: Peter shared the views of his people, that the non-Jewish nations would be made partakers in the blessings of the Messiah by acceptance of the Jewish theocracy. He thus still expected at this time the blessing of the Gentiles through the Messiah to take place in the way of their passing through Mosaicism. "Caput et summa rei in adventu Messiae in eo continetur, quod omnes omnino populi adorant Iovam illumque colant unanimiter." 18 "Gentes non traditae sunt Israelitae in hoc saeculo, at tradentur in diebus Messiae." 19 See already Isa. ii. 2 f., lx. 3 ff. — ἀναστήσας] causing His servant to appear (the sorit participle synchronous with ἀναστ.). This view of ἀναστ. is required by ver. 23. Incorrectly, therefore, Luther, Beza, Heumann, and Barkey: after He has raised Him from the dead. — εἰλισκόντα ἑμᾶς] blessing you. The

their being the people of God, to feel the more urgently the duty of accepting the Mess

1 Blomf. Gloss. Perses. 408.

2 On διαθήκη, comp. Heb. viii. 10, x. 16; Gen. xv. 18, al.; 1 Mac. i. 11.

3 Mikrae Kodesch, f. 103. 1.

4 Berth. rab. f. 28. 2.
correlate of ἐνέλυεν, v. 25. This efficacy of the Sent One procuring salvation through His redeeming work is continuous. — εἰν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν] in the turning away, i.e. when ye turn from your iniquities (see on Rom. i. 29), consequently denoting that by which the ἐνέλυεν must be accompanied on the part of the recipients (comp. iv. 30) — the moral relation which must necessarily be thereby brought about. We may add, that here the intranstive meaning of ἀποστρέφειν,1 and not the transitive, which Piscator, Calvin, Hammond, Wetstein, Bengel, Morus, Heinrichs adopt (when He turns away), is required by the summons contained in ver. 19. — The issue to which vv. 25 and 26 were meant to induce the hearers — namely, that they should now believingly apprehend and appropriate the Messianic salvation announced beforehand to them by God and assured by covenant, and indeed actually in the mission of the Messiah offered to them first before all others — was already expressed sufficiently in ver. 19, and is now again at the close in ver. 26, and that with a sufficiently successful result (iv. 4); and therefore the hypothesis that the discourse was interrupted while still unfinished by the arrival of the priests, etc. (iv. 1), is unnecessary.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(m) Parousia. V. 20.

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

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

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

1 So only here in the N. T.; but see Xen. Hist. iii. 4. 12; Gen. xviii. 33, al.; Ecl. viii. 5, xvii. 21; Bar. ii. 38; Sappho, ad Xen. ad res eq. 12. 13; Kretzer, § iii. 2. 5.
"The reference is evidently to an objective and not a subjective advent. It is a matter of dispute in what manner the apostles regarded the second coming of Christ. In all probability they were so engrossed with it that they lost sight of intermediate events; it was the object of their earnest desire; the period was indeed concealed from them, but they continually looked forward to it; they expected it, as that which might occur at any moment. Afterwards, as revelation disclosed itself, and the course of Providence was developed, they did not expect it to occur in their days. Paul especially seems to have regarded it as an event in the remote future, and cautions his converts not to be shaken in mind or to be troubled, as if the day of Christ was at hand (2 Thess. ii. 2). The precise period of the advent, we are expressly informed by our Lord, formed no part of divine revelation; it was designedly left in uncertainty by God." (Glegg.)
CHAPTER IV.

VER. 2. τὴν εἰκ νεκρῶν] D, min. and some vss. and Fathers have τῶν νεκρῶν. Recommended by Grieseb., adopted by Bornem. An alteration in accordance with the current ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν.—Ver. 5. εἰς] A B D E, min. Chrys. have ἐν, which Grieseb. has recommended, and Lachm. Tisch. Born. adopted. A correction, as the reference of εἰς was not obvious, and it was taken for ἐν; hence also εἰς Ἰερούς. (regarded as quite superfluous) is entirely omitted in the Syr.—Ver. 6. Lachm. has simple nominatives, καὶ Ἀρμανι . . . Ἀλέξανδρος, in accordance no doubt with A B D Μ; but erroneously, for the very reason that this reading was evidently connected with the reading συνῆχεσαν, ver. 5, still preserved in D; Born. has consistently followed the whole form of the text in D as to vv. 5, 6 (also the name Ἰωάννης instead of Ἰωάννης). —Ver. 7. εἰς τῷ μέσῳ with the article is to be defended after Elz., with Lachm., on preponderating evidence (A B Μ). —Ver. 8. τοῦ Ἰεραμή] is wanting in A B Μ, Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Cyr. Fulg., and deleted by Lachm. But, as it was quite obvious of itself, it was more readily passed over than added.—Ver. 11. οἰκοδόμων] so, correctly, Lachm. and Tisch., according to important authorities. The usual οἰκοδομόνων is from Matt. xxi. 42; comp. LXX. Ps. orvii. 22.—Ver. 12. οὗτε] A B Μ, min. Did. Theodoret. Bas. have οὐτί, which is recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. And rightly, as in Luke xx. 36, xii. 26. Born., following D, has merely οὐ.—Ver. 16. ποιήσομεν] A E Μ, min. have ποιήσωμεν. Recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Lachm. But the deliberative subjunctive appeared more in keeping with the sense. Comp. on ii. 37.—Ver. 17. ἀπελθομεθα] D, min. have ἀπεληφθόμεθα. So Born. But the future was introduced in order that it might correspond to the question τι ποιήσομεν. The preceding ἀπελήγ is wanting in A B D Μ, min. most vss. and some Fathers; deleted by Lachm. and Born. It might very easily be omitted by an oversight of the transcriber.—Ver. 18. After παρήγγ. Elz. Scholz. Born. have οὖντις. A common, but here weakly attested insertion.—Ver. 24. ὁ Θεός] is wanting in A B Μ, Copt. Vulg. Ath. Did. Ambr. Hilar. Aug. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But as it might be dispensed with so far as the sense was concerned, how easily might a transcriber pass over from the first to the second ἦν! On the other hand, there is no reason why it should have been inserted.—Ver. 25. ὃ διὰ στόματ. Δ. παιδὸς σον εἰπὼν] There are very many variations, among which ὃ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἀγίου στόματος Δ. παιδὸς σον εἰπὼν has the greatest attestation (A B E Μ, min.), and is adopted by Lachm., who, however, considers πνεύματος as spurious (Praef. p. VII.). An aggregation of various amplifying glosses; see Fritzsche, de conform. Lachm. p. 55.—Ver. 27. εἰς τῷ πόλει ῥαυνότερα] is wanting in Elz., but has decisive attestation. Rejected by Mill and Whitby as a gloss, but already received by Bengel. The

1 See besides Tisch., especially Born. in loc., who reads after D: ὃ (D: διὰ) διὰ πν. ἂν, διὰ τῶν ἑον. καθήμενος δεικν. παιδὸς σον.
omission may be explained from the circumstance, that in the passage of the Psalm no locality is indicated. — Ver. 36. 'Ἰονής] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read Ἰονῆς, according to A B D E *, min. Chrys. Epiph. and several vss. A mechanical alteration, in conformity with i. 23. — ὑπό] Lachm. and Tisch. read ὑπό, according to A B E *, min. Theophyl. Rightly; ὑπό appeared to be necessary.

Vv. 1, 2. 'Επετήσθαν] stood there beside them. The sudden appearance is implied in the context (λαλοῦντ. δὲ αὐτ., and see ver. 3). See on Luke ii. 9, xx. 1. — oi iereis] The article signifies those priests who were then serving as a guard at the temple. — ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ] the leader on duty of the Levitical temple-guard (of the iereis), and himself a priest; different from the προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ.'—As the concourse of people occurred in the temple-court, it was the business of the temple-guard officially to interfere. Therefore the opinion of Lightfoot, Erasmus Schmid, and Hammond, that the στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱερ. is here the commander of the Roman garrison of the castle of Antonia, is to be rejected. — καὶ oi Σάδδουκαι] see on Matt. iii. 7 (π). The Sadducees present in the temple-court had heard the speech of Peter, chap. iii., at least to ver. 15 (see ver. 2), had then most probably instigated the interference of the guard, and hence appear now taking part in the arrest of the apostles. — διαπονοθέων . . . νεκρῶν] refers to oi Σάδδουκαι. For these denied the resurrection of the dead, Matt. xxii. 22. "Sadduceai negant dicunque: deficit nubes atque abit; sic descendens in sepulcrum non rebit," Tanquam, i. iii. 1. διαπονοθέμι. here and in xvi. 18 may be explained either according to classical usage: who were active in their exertions, exerted their energies, my former interpretation, or according to the LXX., who were grieved, afflicted, the usual view, following the Vulgate and Luther. The latter meaning is most natural in the connection, is sufficiently justified in later usage by those passages, and therefore is to be preferred. Sorrow and pain come upon them, because Peter and John taught the people, and in doing so announced, etc. That was offensive to their principles, and so annoyed them. — ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ] in the person of Jesus, i.e. in the case of His personal example. For in the resurrection of Jesus the anástasis ex νεκρ. in general—although the latter is not expressly brought forward by Peter—was already inferentially maintained, since the possibility of it and even an actual instance were therein exhibited (1 Cor. xv. 13). — We may add that, as the apostles made the testifying of the Risen One the foundation of their preaching, the emergence of the Sadducees is historically so natural and readily conceivable (comp. v. 17), that Baur's opinion, as to an à priori combination having without historical ground attributed this rôle to them, can only appear frivolous and uncritical.

2 Ecclus. x. 9; Aq. Gen. vi. 6; 1 Sam. xx. 20 (Eusebius, διαπονοθέων: λαυτήθησαι).
3 The classical writers use the simple verb ἐκ τῆς διάπονησις in this sense, whether the pain felt may be bodily or mental. See Krüger on Thuc. ii. 51. 4; Lobeck, ad A.J. p. 305; Duncan, Lex. Hom. ed. Reit. p. 909. Accordingly, in the above passages διαπονοθέων is the strengthened ἐκ τῆς διάπονησις in this sense.
however zealously Zeller has sought to amplify and establish it. See in opposition to it, Lechler, *Apost. Zeit.* p. 326 ff.

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

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

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

1 Comp. Thuc. vii. 86. 1; Acts v. 18.
3 Comp. Winer, p. 128 (B. T. 185).
4 See the particulars, as well as the unsatisfactory shifts which have been resorted to, on Luke iii. 2. Comp. Zeller, p. 127.
seen in Lightfoot *in loc.*; and concerning the latter, that he was the brother of Philo, in Mangey,1 — *ἐν γένοις ἀρχιερατ.* of the high-priestly family. Besides Caiaphas, John, and Alexander, all the other relatives of the high priest were brought into the assembly,—a proceeding indicative of the special importance which was ascribed to the pronouncing judgment on the dangerous prisoners.

Ver. 7. The apostles were placed in the midst (ἐν τῷ μέτω, comp. Matt. xiv. 6; John viii. 3), so that they might be seen by all; and, for the purpose of ascertaining the state of matters which had occasioned the popular tumult of yesterday, the question is first of all submitted to them for their own explanation: *By what kind of power,* 8 which was at your command, or by what kind of name, which ye have pronounced, *have ye done this?*—the cure which, they were aware, was the occasion of the discussion. Erroneously, Morus, Rosenmüller, and Olshausen have referred τοῦτο to the public teaching. For the judicial examination had to begin at the actual commencement of the whole occurrence; and so Peter correctly understood this τοῦτο, as vv. 9, 10 prove. — ἐν τούτῳ ὄνοματι] The Sanhedrim certainly knew that the apostles had performed the cure ἐν ὄνοματι Ἰ. Χριστοῦ (iii. 6), and they intended to found on the confession of this point partly the impeachment of heresy and blasphemy—as the Jewish exorcists were accustomed to use names of an entirely different kind in their formulæ, namely, those of the holy patriarchs, or of the wise Solomon, or of God Himself9—and partly the charge of effort at rebellion, which might easily be based on the acknowledgment of the crucified insurgent as the Messiah. — ὤμεις] you people! with depreciating emphasis at the close.

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

---

8 Observe the qualitative interrogative pronouns.
9 Bornem. ad Xen. Symp. 4. 3, p. 101; Reissig, Conject. in Aristoph. L p. 113; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 195.
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with Erasmus, as masculine, so that after the twice-repeated ἐν κ.τ.λ. there comes in instead of the ὅνωμa 'I. X., as the solemnity of the discourse increases (''verba ut libera, its plena gravitatis,' Grotius), the concrete Person (on this one it depends, that, etc.), of whom thereupon with οὗτος, ver. 11, further statements are made. — ὅ ὃς ἔγειρεν ἐκ νεκρ.] a rhetorical asyndeton, strongly bring out the contrast without μὲν . . . δὲ. — οὗτος παρέδωκεν κ.τ.λ.] Thus the man himself who had been cured was called into the Sanhedrim to be confronted with the apostles, and was present; in which case those assembled certainly could not at all reckon beforehand that the sight of the man, along with the παράβολα of the apostles (ver. 13), would subsequently, ver. 14, frustrate their whole design. This quiet power of the man's immediate presence operated instantaneously; therefore the question, how they could have summoned the man whose very presence must have refuted their accusation (Zeller, comp. Baur), contains an argumentum ex extra which forms no proper ground for doubting the historical character of the narrative.

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

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

1 See Dissen, Ecc. II. ad Pind. p. 975.
2 Winer, p. 149 (E. T. 190).
3 Moreover, see on Matt. xxii. 48, and comp.
The reading ootros γάρ would not signify namque non, but would indicate that a further clause corresponding to the ἐν was meant to follow it up, which, however, does not suit here, where the address is brought to a weighty close. The use generally doubtful, at least with prose writers, of oivos...ootros instead of oivos...ootros, is here excluded by γάρ, which makes the notion of neither—nor inapplicable. — έπερον a name different from that name. On the other hand previously: ἐν ἄλλω οἶδ., in no one but in Him. Comp. on Gal. i. 7. — τὸ δεδομ. ἐν ἀνδρ. which is granted by God—given for good among men, in human society. The view adopted by Wolf and Kuinoel, that ἐν ἀνδρ. stands for the simple dative, is erroneous. — ἀνδρώποι, in this generic reference did not require the article. ἵνα τ. οὑραν., which might in itself be dispensed with, has solemn emphasis. Comp. ii. 5.—ἐν φ.] as formerly ἐν ἄλλῳ. The name is to be conceived as the contents of the believing confession. Fides implicita, in opposition to the Catholics, cannot here be meant; iii. 19, 26.—δει] namely, according to God's unalterable destination.

Vv. 13-15. Θεωρούντες: Inest notio contemplandi cum attentione aut admiratione. ὧν καὶ καταλαβόμενοι and when they had perceived, when they had become aware. They perceived this during the address of Peter, which was destitute of all rabbinical learning and showed to them one γράμματον ἀπερον. ἀγράμματος denotes here the want of rabbinic culture. Ίδιώται is the same: laymen, who are strangers to theological learning. The double designation is intended to express the idea very fully; ἀνδρώποι has in it, moreover, something disparaging: unlearned men. On ἴδιωται, which, according to the contrast implied in the connection, may denote either a private man, or a plebeian, or an unlearned person, or a common soldier, or one inexperienced in gymnastic exercises, one not a poet, not a physician, and other forms of contrast to a definite professional knowledge, see Valcken. in loc.; Hemsterhuis, ad Lucian. Necyom. p. 484; Ruhnken, ad Long. p. 410. Here the element of contrast is contained in ἀγράμματος: hence the general meaning plebeiana is to be rejected. They were μωροί τῶν λόγων, 1 Cor. i. 27. Comp. John vii. 15. — ἐπείγοντας τὰ αὐτοῖς, τὴν κ.τ.λ.] and recognised them, namely, that they were, at an earlier period, with Jesus. Their astonishment sharpened now their recollection; and therefore Baur and Zeller have taken objection to this remark without sufficient psychological reason. ἐπείγοντας is incorrectly taken (even by Kuinoel) as the pluperfect. The two imperfects, ἴδαμας, and ἐπείγοντας, are, as relative tenses, here entirely in place. — τῶν δὲ ἀνδρώπ.] emphatically put first.—οὐνιθαλώ] they conferred among themselves.

---

1 So Hermann, Opusc. III. p. 158.
2 Klotz, ad Devar. p. 716; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 2. 31; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 444 f.
3 Baumelein, Partik. p. 392.
4 Winer, p. 304 (E. T. 278).
5 See Ast., Lex. Plat. i. p. 177 f.; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 4. 14; Stallb. ad Plat. Ort. p. 51 A; Prot. p. 355 A.
6 Tittmann, Synon. N. T. p. 121.
7 X. 34; Eph. iii. 13; Plat. Phaedr. p. 269
8 D.; Polyb. vili. 4. 6; Dion. Hal. ii. 66.
9 Plat. Apol. p. 36 D.
10 Xen. Mem. iv. 3. 30; Plat. Ort. p. 109 D.
12 Comp. Lyra. acc. Niceom. 26, and Bremi in loc.
13 Kuinoel and Olshausen, comp. Baumgar.
14 See Winer, p. 263 (E. T. 387).
14 Comp. xvii. 18; Plat. Mor. p. 223 C.
Ver. 16. The positive thought of the question is: We shall be able to do nothing to these men. What follows contains the reason: for that a notable miracle, a definite proof of divine co-operation, has happened through them, is evident to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and we are not in a position to deny it. — To the µυ corresponds ἀλλ', ver. 17; to the γνωστόν is opposed the mere δοκεῖτον.1

Vv. 17, 18. In order, however, that it be not further brought out among the people, i.e. spread by communication hither and thither among the people, even beyond Jerusalem. The subject is τὸ σημεῖον, not διδαχή; but the former is conceived of and dreaded as promoting the latter. εἰπὶ πλεῖον, magis, i.e. here ulterior.2 — Observe that the confession of ver. 16, made in the bosom of the council, in confidential deliberation, and without the presence of a third party, is therefore by no means "inconceivable" (in opposition to Zeller). The discussion in the council itself may have been brought about in various ways, if not even by secret friends of Jesus in the Sanhedrim (Neander, Lange). — ἀπειλή ἀπειλημα emphatically threaten.3 — λαλεῖν is quite general, to speak; for it corresponds to the two ideas, φθιγγοσθαι4 and διδάσκειν, ver. 18. — εἰπὶ τῷ ὀνόμα τοῦτον so that the name uttered is the basis on which the λαλεῖν rests. Comp. on Luke xxiv. 47. They do not now name the name contemptuously, but do so only in stating the decision, ver. 18. — The article before the infinitive brings into stronger prominence the object.5 Concerning µή in such a case, see Baeumlein, Partik. p. 296 f.

Vv. 19–22. 'Ενώπιον τ. Θεοῦ] coram Deo, God as Judge being conceived as present: "multa mundus pro justis habet, quae coram Deo non sunt justa," Bengel. We may add, that the maxim here expressed, founded on Matt. xxii. 21, takes for granted two things as certain; on the one hand, that something is really commanded by God; and, on the other hand, that a demand of the rulers does really cancel the command of God, and is consequently immoral; in which case the rulers actually and wilfully abandon their status as organs of divine ordination, and even take up a position antagonistic to God. Only on the assumption of this twofold certainty could that principle lead Christianity, without the reproach of revolution, to victory over the world in opposition to the will of the Jewish and heathen rulers.6 For analogous expressions from the Greek and Latin writers and Rabbins, see Wetstein. The µᾶλλον ή is: rather (potius, Vulgate) than, i.e. instead of listening to God, rather to listen to you.7 The meaning of ἀκολούθειν is similar to πισταρχεῖν, ver.

1 Plat. Pol. v. p. 479 D, vi. p. 510 A.  
2 See xx. 9, xxiv. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9; Plat. Phædr. p. 361 B; Gory. p. 458 A; and Stallb. in loc.; Phædr. p. 95 B; Xen. de vect. 4. 3. Comp. εἰ µᾶλλον, Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 45.  
4 On µή φθιγγοσθαι, not to become audible, Erasmus correctly remarks: "Plures est quam we ignonerae: q. d. ne ascenent aut ullam nonnominerent." Comp. Castalio, See on φθιγγοσθαι, Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 409.  
5 Bernhardy, p. 586; Winer, p. 508 (E. T. 406).  
6 Comp. Wettike, Sittenl. § 810. Observe withal, that it is not the magisterial command itself and per se that is divine, but the command for its observance is a divine one, which therefore cannot be connected with immorality without doing away with its very idea as divine.  
7 Plat. Apol. p. 29 D; Arian. Epist. i. 20.  
8 Inconsistently the Vulg. has, at v. 29, magis. See Baeuml. Partik. p. 196.
29. — γὰρ] Ver. 20 specifies the reason, the motive for the summons: κρίνατε in ver. 19. For to us it is morally, in the consciousness of the divine will, impossible not to speak,1 i.e. (v) we must speak what we saw and heard — namely, the deeds and words of Jesus, of which we were eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses. — ἡμεῖς we on our part. — προσαγελθαμενοι] after they had still more threatened them, namely, than already in the prohibition of ver. 18, in which, after ver. 17, the threatening was obviously implied.2 — μηδὲν εἰρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κ.τ.λ.] because they found nothing, namely how they were to punish them. The article before whole sentences to which the attention is to be specially directed.3 — πῶς is not, with Kuinoel and others, to be explained qua specie quo praetextu ; the Sanhedrin, in fact, did not know how to invent any kind of punishment, which might be ventured upon without stirring up the people. Therefore ὀν ἰδίων, on account of the people, i.e. in consideration of them, is not to be referred, as usually, to ἀπέλευσαν αὐτούς, but to μηδὲν εἰρίσκοντες κ.τ.λ. — ἔτων γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] So much the greater must the miracle of healing have appeared to the unprejudiced people, and so much the more striking and worthy of praise the working of God in it. πλεύων τεσσαράκ. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 53.4

Vv. 23, 24. ἠγέτος τῶν ἰδίων] to those belonging to them, i.e. to their fellow-apostles. This explanation (Syr. Beza) is verified partly by ver. 31, where it is said of all, that they proclaimed the doctrine of God; partly by ver. 32, where the multitude of believers are contrasted with these. Hence neither are we to understand, with Kuinoel, Baumgarten, and others, the Christian church in general, nor, with Olshausen, the church in the house of the apostles, or an assembly as in xii. 12.5 — ὁμοθυμαδόν ἣπαν] Thus all with one accord spoke aloud the following prayer; and not possibly Peter alone. The attempts to explain this away (Kuinoel, comp. Bengel: that the rest accompanied the speaker with a subdued voice; de Wette: that they spoke after him mentally; Olshausen: either that one prayed in the name of all, or that in these words is presented the collective feeling of all) are at variance with the clear text.6 It is therefore to be assumed (comp. also Hildebrand) that in vv. 24–30 there is already a stated prayer (q) of the apostolic church at Jerusalem, which under the fresh impression of the last events of the life of Jesus, and under the mighty influence of the Spirit received by them, had shaped and moulded itself naturally and as if involuntarily, according to the exigency which engaged their hearts; and which at this time, because its contents presented to the pious feeling of the suppliants a most appropriate application to what had just happened, the assembled apostles joined in with united inspiration, and uttered aloud. With this view the contents of the prayer quite accord, as it expresses the memories of that time (ver. 25 ff.) and the exigencies (vv. 29, 30) of the

1 Winer, p. 664 (E. T. 636).
2 Comp. Ecclus. xiii. 8, ed. Compl.; Dem. 544. 26; Zosim. i. 70.
3 Comp. Kühner, ii. p. 188; Mark ix. 23; Luke i. 68; Acts xxii. 30.
5 Van Hengel, Glos d. talen, p. 68.
6 This holds also in opposition to Baumgarten's view, that the whole assembly sang together the second Psalm, and then Peter made an application of it to the present circumstances in the words here given.
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threatened church in general with energetic precision, but yet takes no special notice of what had just happened to Peter and John. — The address continues to the end of ver. 26. Others supply εἰ after σὺ, or before ὁ... εἰδον (Bengel), but less in keeping with the inspired fervour of the prayer. The designation of God by διάστορα and ὁ ποιήσας κ.τ.λ., serves as a background to the triumphant thought of the necessary unsuccessfulness of human opposition. Comp. Neh. ix. 6; Rev. xiv. 7, al.

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

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

1 Vulgate, Beza, Castello, Calvin, de Wette, and many.
2 Bernhardy, p. 346. Comp. x. 54; Luke iv. 25; Dem. 530; Polyb. i. 84. 6. 4 Acts x. 38; Luke iii. 21, 22.
3 See Wesseling, ad Diod. iv. 74.
of the discourse the disposing power of God. A σευγμα is contained in προφήτης, inasmuch as the notion of the verb does not stand in logical relation to the literal meaning of ψ χειρ σου — with which some such word as προφητεύματα would have been in accord — but only to the attribute of God thereby symbolized. — The death of the Lord was not the accidental work of hostile caprice, but the necessary result of the divine predetermination, to which divine δει, the personally free action of man had to serve as an instrument. Οὐκ αυτός ισχύει, ἀλλὰ σὺ εἰ ὁ τὸ πᾶν ἐπιτρέψας καὶ εἰς πέρας ἀγαθῶν, ὁ εὐφημίσαν καὶ σοφός συνήλθον μὲν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ώς ἐχθροὶ . . . , ἐποίουν δὲ ὁ σὺ ἐβούλον, Oecumenius. Beza aptly says: ποιησα refers not to the consilia et voluntates Herodis, etc., but to the eventus consiliorum.

Vv. 29, 30. Καὶ ταῦτα and now, as concerns the present state of things. In the N. T. only in the Book of Acts; often in classical authors. — ἐφεδρ ἐπὶ τ. ἀπειλ. ait. : direct thine attention to their threatenings, that they pass not into reality. On ἐφοράω in the sense of governing care, see Schneel. App. ad Dem. V. p. 31. Comp. Isa. xxxvii. 17. αὐτῶν, according to the original meaning of the prayer (see on ver. 24), refers to the Ἑρώδης . . . Ἰσραήλ, named in ver. 27, from whom the followers of Jesus, after His ascension, feared continued persecution. But the apostles then praying, when they uttered the prayer in reference to what had just occurred, gave to it in their conception of it a reference to the threatenings uttered against Peter and John in the Sanhedrin. — τοῖς δούλοις σου i.e. us apostles. They are the servants of God, who execute His will in the publication of the gospel. But the παῖς Θεοῦ καὶ ἐξοχήν is Christ. Comp. on iii. 13. — μετὰ πάρθησιν τῶν with all possible freedom. — εἰ τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ μετὰ τῆς κατάξεως ] i.e. whilst Thou (for the confirmation of their free-spoken preaching; comp. xiv. 3; Mark xvi. 20) causeth Thy power to be active for (εἰς, of the aim) healing, and that signs and wonders be done through the name (through its utterance), etc. — καὶ σ. κ. τ. γίνεσθαι ] is infinitive of the aim, and so parallel to εἰς ἱστον, attaching the general to the particular; not, however, dependent on εἰς, but standing by itself. To supply εἰς τὸ again after καὶ (Beza, Bengel) would unnecessarily disturb the simple concatenation of the discourse, and therefore also the clause is not to be connected with δός.

Ver. 31. Ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος] This is not to be conceived of as an accidental earthquake, but as an extraordinary shaking of the place directly affected by God, a σημείο — analogous to what happened at Pentecost — of the filling with the πνεύμα, which immediately ensued. This filling once more with the Spirit (comp. ver. 8) was the actual granting of the prayer δός . . . λόγοι σου, ver. 29; for the immediate consequence was : ἐλάλουν τῇ λεγ. τ. Θεοῦ μετὰ παρθησιάς, namely in Jerusalem, before the Jews, so that the threatenings

---

1 Comp. ver. 30, vili. 50, xili. 11; 1 Pet. v. 6; Herod. viii. 140. 2; Herm. ad Viger. p. 732.
2 Comp. ii. 23, liii. 18; Luke xxii. 22, xxiv. 36.
3 Comp. Flacius, Chae. i. p. 818.
4 Verse 28, xviii. 30, xx. 33, xxvii. 22.
5 Is to be so written with Tisch. and Lechm., comp. on Phil. ii. 23.
6 For examples of δός in prayers, see Elmer, p. 381; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. 1. p. 427.
7 See Thelle, ad Juc. p. 7; and on Phil. i. 30.
8 Viewed by Zeller, no doubt, as an invention of plous legend, although nothing similar occurs in the gospel history, to afford a connecting link for such a legend.
against Peter and John (vv. 19, 21) thus came to nothing. Luke, however, has not meant nor designated the free-spoken preaching as a glossolalia (van Hengel).¹

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

Ver. 33. And with this unity of love in the bosom of the church, how effective was the testimony of the apostles, and the divine grace, which was imparted to all the members of the church (! — τῆς ἀναστ. τ. κυρ. Ἰησοῦ). This was continually the foundation of the whole apostolic preaching; comp. on i. 22. They bore their witness to the resurrection of Christ, as a thing to which they were in duty bound. Hence the compound verb ἀπεστάλλον.⁶ Observe, moreover, that here, where from ver. 32 onwards the internal condition of the church is described, the apostolic preaching within the church is denoted. — The χάρις μεγάλη is usually understood (according to ii. 47) of the favour of the people. Incorrectly, as οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδείξεις κ.τ.λ. ver. 34, would contain no logical assignation of a reason for this. It is the divine grace, which showed itself in them in a remarkable degree (1 Cor. xv. 10). So, correctly, Beza, Wetstein, de Wette, Baumgarten, Hackett. — ἦν εἰς πάντα ἀναστ. αὐτ.] upon them all: of the direction in which the presence of grace was active. Comp. Luke ii. 40.

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

¹ As extra Biblical analogies to the extraordinary ἰδιαιτ. ἡ τίτων, comp. Virg. Aen. iii. 80 ff.; Ovid. Met. xvi. 672. Other examples may be found in Doughtaeus, Anal. II. p. 71, and from the Rabbins in Schoettgen, p. 621.
² Comp. Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 250.
³ Phil. ii. 2, 20. Comp. 1 Chron. xili. 38; Phil. i. 27. See examples in Elsner, p. 317; Kypke, II. p. 31.
⁴ Comp. Luke viii. 3; Tob. lv. 8; Plat. Ald. L p. 104 A.
⁵ Which (see Wyttenbach, Bibli. crit. III. 2, 55 ff.) ἑαυτός ἐγκαιρείζοντας αὐτοὺς τα δείκνυται καὶ ἐκ περι ἀφήματος λέγει αὐτό. Oecumenius. Comp. 4 Macc. vi. 32; Dem. 284. 5.
which the χάρις μεγάλη was apparent. For there was found no one needy among them, because, namely, all possessors, etc.—πωλοῦντες κ. τ. λ.] The present participle is put, because the entire description represents the process as continuing: being wont to sell, they brought the amount of the price of what was sold, etc. Hence also πιπρασκοῦμ. is not incorrectly (de Wette) put instead of the aorist participle.\(^1\) The aorist participle is in its place at ver. 37.—παρε τοῦς πάσος. The apostles are, as teachers, represented sitting (comp. Luke ii. 46); the money is brought and respectfully\(^8\) placed at their feet as they sit.\(^3\)—καθότι ἐν κ. τ. λ.] See on ii. 45.

Vv. 36, 37. Δέ] autem, introduces, in contradistinction to what has been summarily stated in vv. 34, 35, the concrete individual case of an honourably known man, who acted thus with his landed property. The idea in the δέ is: All acted thus, and in keeping with it was the conduct of Jones.—ἀνά (see the critical remarks)]: as at ii. 22.—νιὼς παρακλησά.[ἡμὼν ἐν, son of prophetic address, i.e. an inspired instigator, exhorter. Barnabas was a prophet (Acts xiii. 1), and it is probable that (at a later period) he received this surname on the occasion of some specially energetic and awakening address which he delivered; hence Luke did not interpret the name generally by νιὼς προφητείας, but, because the προφητεία had been displayed precisely in the characteristic form of παράκλησις (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 3), by νιὼς παρακλ. At Acts xi. 23 also, παράκλησις appears as a characteristic of Barnabas. We may add, that the more precise description of him in this passage points forward to his labours afterwards to be related.—Δευτερο[Jer. xxxii. 7] proves that Levites might possess lands in Palestine.\(^4\) Hence the field is not to be considered as beyond the bounds of the land (Bengel).—ἐπάρχῃ ἀν. ἄγρος] Genitive absolute.—τὸ χρήμα] in the singular: the sum of money, the money proceeds, the amount received.\(^8\)

**NOTES by AMERICAN EDITOR.**

**(N) Sadducees. V. 1.**

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

---

\(^1\) See, on the contrary, Köhner, II. § 675. 5.
\(^2\) Comp. Chrysostom: πολλῆς ἕ τιμῆς.
\(^3\) The delivery of the funds to the apostles is not yet mentioned in ii. 45, and appears only to have become necessary when the increase of the church had taken place. With the alleged right of the clergy personally to administer the funds of the church, which Sepp still finds sanctioned here, this passage has nothing to do.
\(^4\) See Ewald, Allerth. p. 406
\(^8\) Herod. iii. 88; Poll. 9. 87; Wesselung, ad Diod. Sic. v. p. 436
and a future state—the reality of direct divine influence, and strongly insisted on the perfect freedom of the human will. Their name is probably derived from a certain Zadok, pupil of a distinguished rabbi, whose followers held that “there was nothing for them in the world to come.”

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

Caiaphas, son-in-law of Anna, at this time held the office of high priest, a fact which doubtless was known to Luke; but as Anna had been high priest, and even now wielded very great influence, the title is given to him. In the Gospel by Luke he is named along with Caiaphas, and that first in order, “Anna and Caiaphas being the high priests” (Luke iii. 1). On this passage Meyer writes: “But Anna retained withal very weighty influence, so that not only did he, as did every one who had been ἀρχιερεύς, continue to be called by the name, but, moreover, he also partially discharged the functions of high priest. Anna, whose son-in-law, and five sons besides, filled the office, was accustomed to keep his hand on the helm.” It is also probable that Anna was president of the Sanhedrin, an office of equal importance with that of high priest, who was usually made president. Caiaphas was made high priest by Valerius Gratus, A.D. 24, and held office for twelve years. He was entirely under the influence of Anna, his father-in-law.

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

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

(q) A stated prayer. V. 24.

Some suppose that this was a liturgical form already introduced into the infant church, and used on this occasion as peculiarly appropriate. With this supposition Meyer agrees. But the prayer seems to have been the natural and sudden outburst of devotion and desire. Nor does the language used imply that all necessarily spoke aloud. It might be a concert of hearts rather than of voices, though all, as was customary, may have assented vocally at the close. Nor have we any intimation elsewhere of any forms of prayer, or of liturgical service at so early a period in the Christian Church. No evidence is found in the record that even the Lord’s Prayer was publicly used in the assemblies of Christians.
(b) All things common. V. 32.

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

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

VER. 2. After γνωνεῖς, Elz. Scholz have αὑρέω, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have rightly deleted, as it is wanting in A B D* Ν, min., and has evidently slipped in from ver. 1. — Ver. 5. After ἐκάυοντας, Lachm. Tisch. Born. have deleted the usual reading ταῦτα; it is wanting in A B D* Ν, min. Or. Lucif. and several vss., and is an addition from ver. 11. — Ver. 9. Others] is very suspicious, as it is wanting in B D Ν, min. Vulg.; in other witnesses it varies in position, and Or. has ψῆμον. Deleted by Lachm. Born. and Tisch. — Ver. 10. παρὰ τ. π. Lachm. and Tisch. read πρὸς τ. π., according to A B D Ν, Or.; other witnesses have ἐπὶ τ. π.; others, ὑπὸ τ. π.; others, ἐνώπιον. Born. also has πρὸς τ. π. But as Luke elsewhere writes παρὰ τ. π. (Luke viii. 41, xvii. 16), and not πρὸς τ. π. (Mark v. 22, vii. 25; Rev. i. 17), the Recepta is to be retained. — Ver. 15. παρὰ ταῦτα πλ. Lachm. reads καὶ εἰς ταῦτα πλ. after A B D* Ν, min. D* has only κατὰ πλ. ; and how easily might this become, by an error of a transcriber, καὶ ταῦτα πλ., which was completed partly by the original κατά and partly by εἰς! Another correction was καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις (E). No version has καὶ. Accordingly the simple κατὰ πλατ., following D*, is to be preferred. — Instead of κλίνουσιν, Lachm. Tisch. Born. have rightly κλίνοντιν (so A B D Ν); κλίνου was inserted as the wanted form. — Ver. 16. εἰς Ἰεροσολ. eli is wanting in A B D Ν, 103, and some vss. Deleted by Lachm. But the retention of εἰς has predominant attestation; and it was natural to write in the margin by the side of τῶν πόρων πόλεων the locally defining addition Ἰεροσολήμη, which became the occasion of omitting the εἰς Ἰεροσ. that follows. — Ver. 18. τ. χειρ. αὐτῶν] αὐτῶν is wanting in A B D Ν, min. Syr. Erp. Arm. Vulg. Cant. Theophyl. Lucif., and omitted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. But see iv. 3. — Ver. 23. ἐστώτας] Elz. has ἐστὶν ἐστιν. But ἐστὶν has decisive evidence against it, and is a more precisely defining addition occasioned by the following ἐστα. — πρὸ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐπὶ, according to A B D Ν, 109; πρὸ is an interpretation. — Ver. 24. δ' ἔρευς καὶ τὸ στρατ. τ. ἱεροῦ κ. οἱ ἄρχετερ.] A B D Ν, min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. Cant. Lucif. have merely δ' τὸ στρατ. τ. ἱεροῦ κ. οἱ ἄρχετερ. So Lachm. Rinck, and Born. But ἵππος being not understood, and being regarded as unnecessary setting that οἱ ἄρχετερ followed, might very easily be omitted; whereas there is no reason for its having been inserted. For the genuineness of ἵππος also the several other variations testify, which are to be considered as attempts to remove the offence without exactly erasing the word, namely, οἱ ἵππος κ. ὁ στρ. τ. ἱερ. κ. οἱ ἄρχες, and δ' τὸ ἄρχετερς οἱ ὁ στρ. τ. ἱερ. κ. οἱ ἄρχες. — Ver. 25. After αἴτωσι Elz. has λέγων, against decisive evidence. An addition, in accordance with ver. 22 f. — Ver. 26. ἢν μη] Lachm. Born. have μη, according to B D E Ν, min. But the omission easily appeared as necessary on account of ἐφοβ. Comp. Gal. iv. 11. — Ver. 28. οἶδα is wanting in A B D*, Copt. Vulg. Cant. Ath. Cyr. Lucif. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., as the transforming of the sentence into a question was evidently occasioned by ἢν μη. — Ver. 32. After ἢμεν, Elz. Scholz. Tisch. have αὐρέω, which
A D* K, min., and several vss. omit. It is to be defended. As μαρτυρεῖς is still defined by another genitive, αὐτῷ became cumbrous, appeared inappropriate, and was omitted. B has καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτυρεῖς (without τοὺς), etc. But in this case EN is to be regarded as a remnant of the τοὺς, the half of which was easily omitted after ἡμεῖς; and thereupon αὐτῷ was transformed into αὐτῷ. The less is any importance to be assigned to the reading of Lachm. : καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτυρεῖς τοὺς κ.τ.λ. — Ver. 33. ἰσβολέων] Lachm. reads ἰσβολοῦντο, according to A B E, min. An interpretation, or a mechanical interchange, frequent also in ms. of the classics; see Born. ad xv. 37. — Ver. 34. βασάνοι τις] τι, according to decisive evidence, is to be deleted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. — ἀποστόλους] A B K, 80, Vulg. Copt. Arm. Chrys. have ἄνθρωπους. So Lachm. Tisch.; and rightly, as the words belong to the narrative of Luke, and therefore the designation of the apostles by ἄνθρωπος appeared to the scribes unworthy. It is otherwise in vv. 35, 38. — Ver. 36. προσεκληθη] Elz. Griesb. Scholz. read προσεκληθῆ, in opposition to A B C** K, min., which have προσεκλήθη; and in opposition to C* D* E H, min. Cyr., which have προσεκλήθη (so Born.). Other witnesses have προσετῇ, also προσεκληθῆ. Differing interpretations of the προσεκληθῆ, which does not elsewhere occur in the N. T., but which Griesb. rightly recommended, and Matth. Lachm. Tisch. have adopted. — Ver. 37. ἰκανίν] to be deleted with Lachm. and Tisch., as it is wanting in A* B K, 81, Vulg. Cant. Cyr., in some others stands before λαὸς, and in C D, Eus. is interchanged with πολίν (so Born.). — Ver. 38. Instead of ἓσσατε, Lachm. has ἑσσε, following A B C K. A gloss. — Ver. 39. ὁνομασθῇ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. have ὄνομασθῇ, according to B C D E K, min., and some vss. and Fathers. Mistaking the purposely chosen definite expression, men altered it to agree with the foregoing future. — Instead of αὐτοῦ, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have, Elz. and Scholz read αὐτῷ, against decisive testimony. An alteration to suit τῷ ἐργοῦ. — Ver. 41. After ὄνομας Elz. has αὐτῷ, which is wanting in decisive witnesses, and is an addition for the sake of completeness. Other interpolations are: 'Ἰησοῦ, — τοῦ Χριστοῦ, — Ἰησοῦ Ἰησοῦ, — τοῦ κυρίου, — τοῦ Θεοῦ.

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

---

1 Ἰάννης. *God pliss*; Jer. xxviii. 1; Dan. 1. 6; LXX. Tob. v. 12. It may, however, be the Hebrew name Ἰάννης (Neh. iii. 23, LXX.), i.e. *God covers*. — The name Σαφείρα is apparently the Aramaic מַיִם, *formw*. Derived from the Greek σάφειρος, *saphira*, it would have probably been Σαφείρα.
Peter, though taking place by divine arrangement (so Ammon; Stolz, Heinrichs, and others). For, apart from the supposition, in this case necessary, of a similar susceptibility in husband and wife for such an impression of sudden terror, the whole narrative is opposed to it; especially ver. 9, the words of which Peter could only have uttered with the utmost presumption, if he had not the consciousness that his own will was here active. If we should take ver. 9 to be a mere threat, to which Peter found himself induced by an inference from the fate of Ananias, this would be merely an unwarranted alteration of the simple meaning of the words, and would not diminish the presumptuousness of a threat so expressed. Nearly allied to this natural explanation is the view mingling the divine and the natural, and taking half from each, given by Neander, the holy earnestness of the apostolic words worked so powerfully on the terrified conscience; and by Olshausen, the word of Peter pierced like a sword the alarmed Ananias, and thus his death was the marvel arranged by a higher disposing power. But this view is directly opposed to the contents and the design of the whole representation. According to Baur, nothing remains historical in the whole narrative except that Ananias and his wife had, by their covetousness, made their names so hated, "that people believed that they could see only a divine judgment in their death, in whatever way it occurred;" all the rest is to be explained from the design of representing the πνεῦμα δύνας as the divine principle working in the apostles. Comp. Zeller, who, however, despair of any more exact ascertainment of the state of the case. Baumgarten, as also Lange (comp. Ewald), agrees in the main with Neander; whilst de Wette is content with sceptical questions, although recognising the miraculous element so far as the narrative is concerned. Catholics have used this history in favour of the two swords of the Pope. — The severity of the punishment, with which Porphyry reproached Peter, is justified by the consideration, that here was presented the first open venture of deliberate wickedness, as audacious as it was hypocritical, against the principle of holiness ruling in the church, and particularly in the apostles; and the dignity of that principle, hitherto unoffended, at once required its full satisfaction by the infliction of death upon the violators, by which "awe-inspiring act of divine church-discipline," at the same time, the authority of the apostles, placed in jeopardy, was publicly guaranteed in its inviolableness ("ut poena duorum hominum sit doctrina multorum," Jerome). — ἵνα ἐν οἰκείῳ ὅπου ἐν φυσικῇ, purloined. — ἀπὸ τῆς τιμᾶς] ac. τε.¹

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

¹ Jerome, Eph. 8.
² Thierisch, Kirche im apost. Zeitablauf. p. 46.
³ Tit. ii. 10; 2 Macc. iv. 39; Josh. vii. 1; Xen. Cyr. iv. 2. 42; Pind. Nem. vi. 106; Valck. p. 395 f.
(Jas. iv. 7; 1 Pet. v. 9), ought not to have permitted this, but should have allowed his heart to be filled with the Holy Spirit; hence the question, διαὶ ἐπιλύσας τὸν πνεῦμα τῷ ἄγιον] that thou shouldst by lying deceive the Holy Spirit: this is the design of ἐπιλύσας. The explanation is incorrect which understands the infinitive εἰκάσασθαι, and takes it only of the attempt: unde accidit, ut πνεῦμα ἄγιον decipere tarentes (Heinrichs, Kuinoel). The deceiving of the Holy Spirit was, according to the design of Satan, really to take place; and although it was not in the issue successful, it had actually taken place on the part of Ananias. — τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἄγιον] Peter and the other apostles, as overseers of the church, were pre-eminently the bearers and organs of the Holy Spirit (comp. xiii. 2, 4); hence through the deception of the former the latter was deceived. — For examples of ψεύδονται, of de facto lying, deception by an act, see Kypke, II. p. 32 f. The word with the accusative of the person occurs only here in the N. T., often in the classical writers. — This instantaneous knowledge of the deceit is an immediate perception, wrought in the apostle by the Spirit dwelling in him.

Ver. 4. When it remained, namely, unsold; (the opposite, πραθῶν), did it not remain to thee, thy property? and when sold, was it not in thy power? — That the community of goods was not a legal compulsion, see on ii. 48. — ἐν τῷ σώφρονι τῷ ἀγάπηι] εἴ τις ἡ τιμή, which is to be taken out of πραθῶν. It was in the disposal of Ananias either to retain the purchase-money entirely to himself, or to give merely a portion of it to the common use; but not to do the latter, as he did it, under the deceitful semblance as if what he handed over to the apostles was the whole sum. The sin of husband and wife is cleverly characterized in Constitt. ap. vii. 2. 4: ἀλφαντρετ ὅλον. — ἐν ὑμῖν] quid est quod, i.e. cur? Comp. on Mark ii. 17. Wherefore didst thou fix this deed in thy heart? i.e. wherefore didst thou resolve on this deed (namely, on the instigation of the devil, ver. 3)? — οὐκ ἐφθάσω ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ. The state of things in itself relative: not so much . . . but rather, is in the vehemence of the address conceived and set forth absolutely: not to men, but to God. "As a lie against our human personality, thy deed comes not at all into consideration; but only as a lie against God, the supreme Ruler of the theocracy, whose organs we are." The taking it as non tam, quam is therefore a weakening of the words, which is unsuited to the fiery and decided spirit of the speaker in that moment of deep excitement. The datives denote the persons, to whom the action refers in hostile contradiction. — Examples of the absolute ψεύδονται with the dative are not found in Greek writers, but in the LXX. Josh. xxiv. 27; 3 Sam. xxii. 45; Ps. xviii. 44, lxxviii. 38. By τῷ Θεῷ Peter makes the deceiver sensible of his fatal guilt, for his sin now appeared as blasphemy. This τῷ Θεῷ is quite

1 Isa. lvii. 11; Deut. xxxiiii. 22; Hos. ix. 2.
3 Comp. xiii. 21; the Heb. יָֽעַר יְֽהוָּֽה (Dan. i. 8; Mal. ii. 3), and the classical expression ὁρᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν, and the like.
4 Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 8; Winer, p. 421 f. (K. T. 621).
5 See also Fritzschhe, ad Marc. p. 781.
warranted, for a lying to the Spirit (ver. 3, τὸ πνεῦμα) is a lie against God
(τῷ Θεῷ), whose Spirit was lied to. Accordingly the divine nature of the
Spirit and his personality are here expressed, but the Spirit is not called God.

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

1 See Mosheim, de reb. Christ. ante Const. p. 114.
2 See also Walch, Dias. p. 79 f.
3 Comp. Land.: covaluerunt (sic); Castal.: comovierunt; 1 Cor. vii. 29.
4 Hom. Od. xxiv. 299; Plat. Hipp. mag. p. 291 D; Dioc. Sic. xix. 12; Joseph. Anti. xix. 4. 1; Tob. xil. 14; Esclus. xxxviii. 17.
5 Vulgate Erasmus, Luther, Beza, and others.
Ver. 7. But it came to pass—about an interval of three hours—and his wife came in. The husband had remained away too long for her. A period of three hours might easily elapse with the business of the burial, especially if the place of sepulture was distant from the city (see Lightfoot). After ἔγερεν δὲ ἡ comma is to be put, and ὡς ἦπ. τπ. διὰστ. is a statement of time inserted independently of the construction of the sentence.1 The common view: but there was an interval of about three hours, and his wife came in, is at variance with the use, especially frequent in Luke, of the absolute ἔγερεν.2 As to the καὶ after ἔγερεν, see on Luke v. 12. On διαστήμα used of time, comp. Polyb. ix. 1. 1.

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

Vv. 9, 10. Wherefore was it agreed by you (dative with the passive, see on Matt. v. 21) to try the Spirit of the Lord (God, see vv. 4, 5) i.e. to venture the experiment, whether the πνεύμα ὑποῦ, ruling in us apostles, was infallible.5 The περάς[ς] challenges by his action the divine experimental proof. — οἱ πόδες] a trait of vivid delineation;6 the steps of those returning were just heard at the door7 outside (ver. 10). — πρός τὸν ἀνδρὰ αὐτῆς] beside her (just buried) husband.

Ver. 11. Φόβος] quite as in ver. 5, fear and dread at this miraculous, destroying punitive power of the apostles. — ἵνα δλήν τ. ἵκλ. καὶ ἐν πάνω ἑκτ. τ. Ἱερουσα] upon the whole church (in Jerusalem), and (generally) on all (and so also on those who had not yet come over to the church, ver. 13) to whose ears this occurrence came.

Vv. 12–16. After this event, which formed an epoch as regards the preservation of the holiness of the youthful church, there is now once more8 introduced as a resting-point for reflection, a summary representation of the prosperous development of the church, and that in its external relations. — οὗ is the simple μεταβατικόν, carrying on the representation.—By the hands of the apostles, moreover, occurred signs and wonders among the people in great number. And they were all9 with one accord in Solomon's porch, and there-

---

1 See on Matt. xv. 28; Luke ix. 28; Schaefer, ad Dem. V. p. 396.
3 Schol. in Luc. p. 165.
5 Comp. Mal. iii. 15; Matt. iv. 7.
6 Comp. Luke i. 73; Rom. iii. 15, x. 15.
7 See on John v. 2; Acts iii. 10.
8 Comp. ii. 49 f., iv. 22 ff.
9 All Christians, comp. ii. 1, in contrast to τῶν δὲ λαῶν. The limitation of ἀναστη to the apostles (Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others) is by Baur urged in depreciation of the authenticity of the narrative. The apostles are assumed by Baur to be presented as a group standing isolated, as superhuman, as it were magical beings, to whom people dare not draw nigh: from which there would result a conception of the apostles the very opposite of that which is found everywhere in the N. T. and in the Book of Acts itself! Even Zeller has, with reason, declared himself opposed to this interpretation on the part of Baur.
fore publicly: of the rest, on the other hand, no one ventured to join himself to them; but the people magnified them, the high honour in which the people held the Christians, induced men to keep at a respectful distance from them: and the more were believers added to the Lord, great numbers of men and women; so that they brought out to the streets, etc. The simple course of the description is accordingly: (1) The miracle-working of the apostles continued abundantly, ver. 12: ἄω ... πολλά. (2) The whole body of believers was undisturbed in their public meetings, protected by the respect of the people (καὶ ἄων, ver. 12 ... ὁ λαὸς, ver. 18), and the church increased in yet greater measure; so that under the impression of that respect and of this ever increasing acceptance which Christianity gained, people brought out to the streets, etc., vv. 14, 15. Ziegler, entirely mistaking the unartificial progress of the narrative, considered καὶ ἄων ... γυναικῶν as a later insertion; and in this Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel agree with him; while Laurent recognizes the genuineness of the words, but looks on them as a marginal remark of Luke. Beck declared even ver. 15 also as spurious. It is unnecessary even to make a parenthesis of ver. 14 (with Lachmann), as οὕτω in ver. 14 is not necessarily confined in its correct logical reference to ἀλλ' ἐμεγ. ἄων. ὁ λαὸς alone, but may quite as fitly refer to vv. 13 and 14 together. — ὁ λαὸς ἄων] are the same who are designated in the contrast immediately following as ὁ λαὸς, and therefore those who had not yet gone over to them, the non-Christian population. It is strangely perverse to understand by it the newly converted (Heinrichs), or the more notable and wealthy Christians like Ananias (Beza, Morus, Rosenmüller). By the τῶν λαων, as it forms the contrast to the ἄων, Christians cannot at all be meant, not even as included (Kuinoel, Baur). — καλλάθαι: aitōs] to join themselves to them, i.e. to intrude into their society, which would have destroyed their harmonious intercourse. This aitōs and aitōs in ver. 13 must refer to the ἄων, and so to the Christians in general, but not to the apostles alone, as regards which Luke is assumed by de Wette to have become "a little confused." — μᾶλλον δὲ] in the sense of all the more, etc. The bearing of the people, ver. 13, promoted this increase. — τῷ κυρίῳ would admit grammatically of being construed with κυρίους (xvi. 34); but xi. 24 points decisively to its being connected with προσερχέσθω. They were added to the Lord, namely, as now connected with Him, belonging to Christ. — pluralis: jam non initur numeros uti iv. 4," Bengel. — καὶ πλασθῆαι (see the critical remarks) emphatically placed first: so that they (the people) through streets, along the streets, brought out their sick from the houses, etc.

1 "Est enim in sancta disciplina et in sincero pietatis cultu arcanam quas maios etiam invités consingit," Calvin. It would have been more accurate to say: "quae profanum vulgus et maius etiam," etc.


4 Obser. exeg. crit. V. p. 17.


6 Comp. ix. 26, x. 29, xvii. 84; Luke xv. 15.

7 See Nægelsbach on the Ἰησοῦ, p. 287, ed. 3.

8 Comp. on the comparatively rare plural ἔλεος, not again occurring in the N. T., Bremi, ad Aeschin. adv. Cleopph. p. 961.
—ἐνὶ κλω. κ. κραβτ. ] denotes generally: small beds and couches. The distinction made by Bengel and Kuinoel with the reading κλων, that the former denotes soft and costly, and the latter poor and humble, beds, is quite arbitrary. — ἵπποι. Πετρου] genitive absolute, and then ἰ σκιῆ: the shadow cast by him. — κατ] at least is to be explained as an abbreviated expression: in order that, should Peter come, he might touch any one, if even merely his shadow (τ) overshadowed him. That cures actually took place by the shadow of the apostle, Luke does not state; but only the opinion of the people, that the overshadowing would cure their sick. It may be inferred, however, from ver. 6 that Luke would have it regarded as a matter of course that the sick were not brought out in vain, but were cured by the miraculous power of the apostle. As the latter was analogous to the miraculous power of Jesus, it is certainly conceivable that Peter also cured without the medium of corporeal contact; but if this result was in individual instances ascribed to his shadow, and if men expected from the shadow of the apostle what his personal miraculous endowment supplied, he was not to be blamed for this superstition. Zeller certainly cannot admit as valid the analogy of the miraculous power of Jesus, as he does not himself recognise the historical character of the corresponding evangelical narrative. He relegates the account to the domain of legend, in which it was conceived that the miraculous power had been, independently of the consciousness and will of Peter, conveyed by his shadow like an electric fluid. An absurdity, which in fact only the presupposition of a mere legend enables us to conceive as possible. — τὸ πληθοῦς] the multitude (vulgus) of the neighbouring towns. — oλίνεισ] as well those labouring under natural disease as those demoniacally afflicted; comp. Luke iv. 40 f. —Then follows ver. 17, the contrast of the persecution, which, however, was victoriously overcome.

Vv. 17, 18. Ἀνάσσα] The high priest stood up; he raised himself: a graphic trait serving to illustrate his present interference. “Non sibi quiescendum ratus est,” Bengel. The ἀρχηγοῖς is, according to iv. 6, Ἄννας, not Καίσαρας, although the latter was so really. — καὶ πάντες οἱ συν αὐτῷ, ἴ σφαλμα αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκ. and all his associates, which were the sect of the Sadducees. This sect had allied itself with Ἄννας, because the preaching of Christ as the Risen One was a grievous offence to them. See iv. 1, 2. The participle ἰ σφαλμα (not οἱ ὀνεισ is put) adjusts itself to the substantive belonging to the predicate, as is often the case in the classical writers. Luke does not affirm that the high priest himself was a Sadducee, as Olshausen, Ewald, and others assert. This remark also applies in opposition to Zeller, who adduces it as an objection to the historical character of the narrator, that Luke makes Ἄννας a Sadducee. In the Gospels also there is no trace of the Sadoceism of Ἄννας. According to Josephus, he had a son who be-

---

1 κλων, see the critical remarks, and comp. Epict. iii. 5. 13.
2 κατ εἶα, see Herm. ad Viger. p. 388.
3 Comp. Fritzsche, Diss. in 2 Cor. ii. p. 120, and see on 2 Cor. xi. 16.
4 Comp. vi. 9, xxiii. 9; Luke xv. 18, al.
5 His whole adherents, ver. 21; Xen. Athab. iii. 2 11, al.
6 See Kühner, § 439; Stallb. ad Plat. Rep.
7 Ant. xx. 9. 1.
longed to that sect. — ἐν τῷ ἡσυχίῳ δημοσίῳ. τίμημα. as in iv. 3. The public prison is called in Thuc. v. 18. 6 also merely τὸ δημοσίου; and in Xen. Hist. vii. 36. ἀείνα δημοσία.

Vv. 19, 20. The historical state of the case as to the miraculous mode of this liberation,—the process of which, perhaps, remained mysterious to the apostles themselves,—cannot be ascertained. Luke narrates the fact in a legendary interpretation of the mystery; but every attempt to refer the miraculous circumstances to a merely natural process (a stroke of lightning, or an earthquake, or, as Thiess, Eck, Eichhorn, Eckermann, and Heinrichs suggest, that a friend, perhaps the jailer himself, or a zealous Christian, may have opened the prison) utterly offends against the design and the nature of the text. It remains matter for surprise, that in the proceedings afterwards (ver. 27 ff.) nothing is brought forward as to this liberation and its circumstances. This shows the incompleteness of the narrative, but not the unhistorical character of the fact itself (Baur, Zeller), which, if it were an intentional invention, would certainly also have been referred to in the trial. Nor is the apparent uselessness of the deliverance, for the apostles are again arrested, evidence against its reality, as it had a sufficient ethical purpose in the very fact of its confirming and increasing the courage in faith of the apostles themselves. On the other hand, the hypothesis that Christ, by His angel, had wished to demonstrate to the Sanhedrim their weakness (Baumgarten), would only have sufficient foundation, provided the sequel of the narrative purported that the judges had really recognised the interposition of heavenly power in the mode of the deliverance. Lange refers the phenomenon to a visionary condition: the apostles were liberated "in the condition of genius-life, of second consciousness." This is extravagant fancy introducing its own ideas. — ἀγγέλος] not the angel, but an angel. — διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς] per noctem, i.e. during the night; so that the opening, the bringing out of the prisoners, and the address of the angel, occurred during the course of the night, and toward morning-dawn the apostles repaired to the temple. The expression is thus more significant than διὰ τὴν νύκτα would be, and stands in relation with ἐν τῷ νυκτί, ver. 21. Hence there is no deviation from Greek usage. — ἵκασι.] But on the next day the doors were again found closed (ver. 28), according to which even the keepers had not become aware of the occurrence. — Ver. 20. ἱσταθήσεσθε] take your stand and speak; in which is implied a summons to boldness. Comp. ii. 14. — τὰ βήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης] the words of this life. What life it was, was self-evident to the apostles, namely, the life, which was the aim of all their effort and working. Hence: the words, which lead to the eternal Messianic life, bring about its attainment. Comp. John vi. 68. See on ταύτης, Winer, p. 203 (E. T. 207 f.) We are not to think here of a hypallage, according to which ταύτης refers in sense to τ. βήματα.

¹ Ewald also discovers here a legendary form 
² Comp. Neander, p. 726. 
³ ἄριστος. 
⁴ Winer, p. 118 (E. T. 155). 
⁵ Nägelebach on the Näd. p. 233, ed. 3. 
⁶ Winer, Fritzsche. 
⁷ Bengel, Kinoel and many others. Comp. xiii. 26; Rom. vii. 24.
Vv. 21-23. *Τὸ τῶν ὄρθρων* about the dawn of day. The ἅκοισαντες is simply a continuation of the narrative: after they heard that, etc., as in ii. 37, xi. 18, and frequently. — παραγενόμενοι] namely, into the chamber where the Sanhedrin sat, as is evident from what follows. They resorted thither, unacquainted with the liberation of the apostles which had occurred in the past night, and caused the Sanhedrin and the whole eldership to be convoked, in order to try the prisoners. — καὶ πάνω τῶν γερουσίων] The importance which they assigned to the matter (comp. on iv. 6) induced them to summon not only those elders of the people who were likewise members of the Sanhedrin, but the whole body of elders generally, the whole council of representatives of the people. The well-known term γερουσία is fittingly transferred from the college of the Greek gerontes to that of the Jewish presbyters. Heinrichs 4 considers πάνω τ. γερουσιος as equivalent to τὸ συνέδριον, to which it is added as honorificissima compellatio. Warranted by usage; 6 but after the quite definite and well-known τὸ συνέδριον, the addition would have no force.—Ver. 23 contains quite the artless expression of the official report.

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

Vv. 26-28. Οὐ μετὰ βιάς] without application of violence. Comp. xxiv. 7 and the passages from Polybius in Raphel. More frequent in classical writers is βία, ἐκ βιάς, πρὸς βιάς. — ἡμι ὁ λιβαδιος] contains the design of ἱφθασθαι γὰρ τ. λαόν. They feared the people, in order not to be stoned. How easily might the enthusiasm of the multitude for the apostles have resulted in a tumultuous stoning of the στρατηγὸς and his attendants (ὑψηλὸς), if, by

---

1 On ὄρθρως, see Lobeck, *adb Phryn. 275 f.*; and ὦκε, used of nearness in time, see Bernhardy, p. 297. Often so in Thuc.; see Krüger on i. 100. 3. Comp. 3 Macc. v. 2; Tob. viii. 11.

2 Although nowhere else in the N. T.; hence here, perhaps, to be derived from the source used by Luke.

3 Dem. 489. 19: Polyb. xxxviii. 5. 1; Herm. Staatsallerk. § 24, 186.


5 1 Macc. xii. 6; 2 Macc. i. 10, iv. 44; Judith iv. 8, xi. 14, xv 8; Loeuner, p. 178.

6 So also in 1 Macc. xv. 1; Bar. i. 7; Heb. v. 6; and see Krebs, p. 178.
any compulsory measures, such as putting them in chains, there had been
defears disregard of the popular feeling! It is erroneous that after verbs
of fearing, merely the simple μη, μήτως k.t.l., should stand, and that there-
fore ἢν μη λαθ. is to be attached to ἡγαγεν... βιας, and ἐφοβ. k. π. λ. to be
taken parenthetically. Even among classical writers those verbs are found
connected with δεισ. μη. — Assuming the spuriousness of ὁ, ver. 28 (see
the critical remarks), the question proper is only to be found in καὶ βουλέσθε
κ.τ.λ., for which the preceding (παραγγελια... διαχεις ὑμῖν) paves the way.
—παραγγ. παραγγ. see iv. 17, 18. — καὶ τ. άνόμ. τ. ] as in iv. 17. — βουλέσθε]
your efforts go to this; "verbam invidiosum," Bengel. — ἐπαγαγεἱν κ.τ.λ.] to
bring about upon us, i.e. to cause that the shed blood of this man be avenged on
us (by an insurrection of the people). "Pro confesso sumit Christum jure
occisione suisse," Calvin. On the (contemptuous) τοιῶ... τοιῶν Bengel
rightly remarks: "fugit appellare Jesum; Petrus appellat et celebrat, vv.
30, 31."—Observe how the high priest prudently leaves out of account the
mode of their escape. Disobedience towards the sacred tribunal was the ful-
crum.

Ver. 29. Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι] and, generally, the apostles. For Peter spoke
in the name of all; hence also the singular ἀποκριθ. — ἐπιθαμβεῖτε κ.τ.λ.]
"ubi enim jussa Domini et servi concurrent, oportet illa prius exsequi." The
principle is here still more decidedly expressed than in iv. 19, and in
all its generality.

Vv. 30–32 now present, in exact reference to the previous Θεός μᾶλλον,
the teaching activity of the apostles as willed by God. — ὁ Θεὸς τ. πατ. ἡμ.]
Comp. iii. 18. — ἡγεῖται is, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and
others, to be referred to the raising from the dead, as the following relative
sentence contains the contrast to it, and the exaltation to glory follows
immediately afterwards, ver. 31. Others, such as Calvin, Bengel, de
Wette, hold that it refers generally to the appearance of Christ, whom God
has made to emerge . — διαχείρισθαι to murder with one's own hands. This
purposely chosen significant word brings the execution of Christ, which
was already in iv. 10 designated as the strict personal act of the instigators,
in prominent view with the greatest possible force as such. So also in the examples in Kypke, II. p. 34. The following aorist κρεμάω.
is synchronous with διαχειρ. as its modal definition. — καὶ ζηλοῦν] on
a tree: an expression, well known to the hearers, for the stake, on
which criminals were suspended. The cross is here designedly so
called, not because the σταυρός was a Roman instrument of death, but in
order to strengthen the representation, because καὶ ζηλοῦν reminded them of

1 So Winers, p. 471 (E. T. 684), de Wette.
Harteneg, Paral. II. p. 118; Kühner, ad
Epist. Rom. ii. 9. 8; Krüger on Thuc. vi. 13. 1.
3 Comp. Matt. xxiii. 36, xxvii. 36; Acts
xviii. 6; Josh. xxiii. 15; Judg. ix. 94; Lev.
xvii. 14.
on iv. 19.
6 iii. 22, 23, xxiii. 23; Luke i. 69, vili. 15.
7 See xxvi. 21; Polybh. vili. 35. 8. Comp.
διαχείρισθαι, Job xxx. 94.
8 ὡς. Gen. x. 19; Deut. xxi. 22; Isa. x. 26;
comp. Acts x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 94; Gal. iii. 12.
9 See, on the other hand, ii. 56, iv. 10.
the accursed (see on Gal. iii. 13).—Ver. 31. Him has God exalted by His right hand to be the Leader (not as in iii. 15, where a genitive stands alongside), i.e. the Ruler and Head of the theocracy, a designation of the kingly dignity of Jesus,¹ and a Saviour (the author and bestower of the Messianic salvation). On the idea, comp. ii. 36. As to τῇ δὲ ἀν., see on ii. 23. —δόξαν μετάνοιαν κ.τ.λ. contains the design of τοῦν . . . τῇ δὲ ἤμιθ αὐτῶν: in order to give repentance to the Israelites and the forgiveness of sins. With the exaltation of Christ, namely, was to commence His heavenly work on earth, through which He as Lord and Saviour, by means of the Holy Spirit, would continually promote the work of redemption to be appropriated by men, would draw them to Him, John xii. 32, 33, in bringing them by the preaching of the gospel (1 Pet. i. 23) to a change of mind (comp. xi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 25), and so, through the faith in Him which set in with the μετάνοια, making them partakers of the forgiveness of sins in baptism (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 21). The appropriation of the work of salvation would have been denied to them without the exaltation of Christ, in the absence of which the Spirit would not have operated (John vii. 39, xvi. 7); but by the exaltation it was given² to them, and that, indeed, primarily to the Israelites, whom Peter still names alone, because it was only at a later period that he was to rise from this his national standpoint to universalism (chapter x.).—With the reading ἀν. υἱ. (see the critical remarks), υἱ. governs two genitives different in their reference, the one of a person and the other of a thing,³ and ἀν. could not but accordingly precede; but the emphasis lies on the bold ἡμεῖς, to which then τὸ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ. is added still more defiantly.—τῶν βοηθ. τούτων] of these words, i.e. of what has just been uttered. See on Matt. iv. 4. Peter means the raising and exaltation of Jesus. Of the latter the apostles were witnesses, in so far as they had already experienced the activity of the exalted Jesus, agreeably to His own promise (i. 5), through the effusion of the Spirit (ii. 33 f.). But Luke, who has narrated the tradition of the externally visible event of the ascension as an historical fact, must here have thought of the eye-witness of the apostles at the ascension.—καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπὲρ τὸ ἄγιον] as well we . . . as also the Spirit,⁴ in which case ὑπὲρ, according to the Attic usage, is placed after the emphasized idea.⁵ The Holy Spirit, the greater witness, different from the human self-consciousness, but ruling and working in believers, witnesses with them (συμμαρτυρεῖ, Rom. viii. 16). Comp. xv. 28.—τοῖς περιφρ. αὐτῶ] to those who obey Him. In an entirely arbitrary manner this is usually restricted by a mentally supplied ἤμιθ merely to the apostles; whereas all who were obedient to God, in a believing recognition of the Messiah

¹ Comp. Thuc. i. 132. 2; Aesch. Agam. 250; and τιμ. ἄρρητοι, Eur. Th. 196.
² Not merely the actual impulse and occasion given, as, after Heinrichs, Kaiser, and de Wette, also Weiss, Petr. Lehrbegr. p. 307 (comp. his bibl. Theol. p. 138), would have us take it. Against this view may be urged the appended καὶ ἄφεσιν ἄμαρτωλος, which is not compatible with that more free rendering of ἀν.⁶
³ See Winer, p. 180 (B. T. 239); Diss. ad Plut. Ot. i. 94; Pyth. ii. 56.
⁴ On the other hand, see Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 161.
⁵ Baemkel, Partik. p. 169.
COUNSEL OF GAMALIEL. 115

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

Ver. 33. Διατριβαὶ not: they gnashed with the teeth, which would be διατριβὴν ροϊς ὀδοντῶν; but dissecabantur (Vulgate), comp. vii. 54: they were seen through, cut through as by a saw,—a figurative expression (comp. ii. 37) of deeply penetrating painful indignation. It is stronger than the non-figurative διακωνισθέναι, iv. 2, xvi. 18. — ἐξοικειόμενοι they consulted, Luke xiv. 31; Acts xv. 37. The actual coming to a resolution was averted by Gamaliel.

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

1 Lucian, Calumna. 94.
2 Plut. Conv. p. 192 A; Aristoph. Eq. 788;
3 Alberti, Gloss. p. 67; ἐξαιρετοὶ ἐξακοινοῦν.
4 Lightf. Hor. ad Math. p. 83.
5 See already Recogn. Clem. i. 65; Beda,
6 Cornelia a Lapide.
7 Phot. cod. 171, p. 199.
8 See Thilo, ad Cod. apocr. p. 501.
9 Baur, see also Zeller.
10 Moreover, Baur puts the alternative: Either the previous miracles, etc., actually took place, and then Gamaliel could not have given an advice so problematic in tenor, whether he might have regarded them as divine miracles or not. Or, if Gamaliel gave this counsel, then what is said to have taken place could not have occurred as it is related. But this dilemma proves nothing, as there is a third alternative possible, namely, that Gamaliel was by the miracles which had occurred favorably inclined towards Christianity, but not decided; and therefore, as a prudent and conscientious man, judged at least a further waiting for light to be necessary. This favorable inclination is evidently to be recognised in the mode in which he expresses his advice; see on vv. 38, 39.
is the mention of Theudas, ver. 36 (but see on ver. 36), while there is further assumed the set purpose of making Christianity a section of orthodox, or in other words Pharisaic Judaism, combated by Sadduceism. As if, after the exaltation of Christ, His resurrection must not really have stood in the foreground of the apostles' preaching! and by that very fact the position of parties could not but necessarily be so far changed, that now the main interests of Sadduceism were most deeply affected. — γνωμοδότασις a νομικός, one skilled in the law (canonist) as a teacher. — βραχύ a short while. — On ἐκ ποιεῖν to put without. — τ. ἀνθρώπουs (see the critical remarks): thus did Gamaliel impartially designate them, and Luke reproduces his expression. The order of the words puts the emphasis on ἐκ; for the discussion was to be one conducted within the Sanhedrin. Comp. iv. 15.

Ver. 35. 'Εν τοῖς ἀνθρώπιν. τούτοις] in respect of these men* might be joined to προσήκουσα ἡνοίας (Lachm.), as Luther, Castalio, Beza, and many others have done (whence also comes the reading ἀπὸ τῶν κ.κ.λ. in E); yet the currency of the expression πρᾶσσειν τι εἰ ἐπὶ τινί is in favour of its being construed with τι μέλλετε πρᾶσσειν. The emphasis also which thus falls on εἰ τοῖς ἀνθρωπίν. is appropriate. — πρᾶσσειν (not ποιεῖν): agere, what procedure ye will take. Comp. iii. 17, xix. 36; and see on Rom. i. 32. Gamaliel will have nothing προσερεῖς (xix. 36) done; therefore they must be on their guard (προσερεῖς. ι.τ.τ.).

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

---

1 See on Matt. xxiii. 35.
2 Thuc. v. 12; Polyb. iii. 96. 2; 2 Sam. xix. 36.
3 Comp. Xen. Cyrop. iv. 1. 8; Symm. Pa. cxiiil. 7.
4 Bernhardy, p. 261.
6 Erasmus well paraphrases it: "Ex praeteritis sumite consistium, quid in futurum oporteat decernere."
7 Not before A.D. 44; see Anger, de temp. ref. p. 44.
Alexander succeeded Cuspius Fadus about A.D. 46; whereas Gamaliel's speech occurred about ten years earlier, in the reign of Tiberius. Very many, therefore, suppose, that it is not the Theudas of Josephus who is here meant, but some other insurgent chief or robber-captain acting a religious part, who has remained unknown to history, but who emerged in the turbulent times either of the later years of Herod the Great or soon after his death. This certainly removes all difficulties, but in what a violent manner! especially as the name was by no means so common as to make the supposition of two men of that name, with the same enterprise and the same fate, appear probable, or indeed, in the absence of more precise historical warrant, otherwise than rash, seeing that elsewhere historical mistakes occur in Luke (comp. iv. 6; Luke ii. 1, 2). Besides, it is antecedently improbable that tradition should not have added an admontory example thoroughly striking, from a historical point of view, such as was that of Judas the Galilean. But the attempts to discover in our Theudas one mentioned by Josephus under a different name, amount only to assumptions incapable of proof, and are nevertheless under the necessity of leaving the difference of names unaccounted for. But inasmuch as, if the Theudas in our passage is conceived as the same with the Theudas mentioned by Josephus, the error cannot be sought on the side of Josephus; as, on the contrary, the exactness of the narrative of Josephus secures at any rate the decision in its favour for chronological accuracy over against Luke; there thus remains nothing but to assume that Luke—or in the first instance, his source—has, in the reproduction of the speech before us, put into the mouth of Gamaliel a proleptic mistake. This might occur the more easily, as the speech may have been given simply from tradition. And the tradition which had correctly preserved one event adduced by Gamaliel, the destruction of Judas the Galilean, was easily amplified by an anachronistic addition of another. If Luke himself composed the speech in accordance with tradition, the error is in his case the more easily explained, since he wrote the Acts so long after the insurrection of Theudas,—in fact, after the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth,—that the chronological error, easy in itself, may here occasion the less surprise, for he was not a Jew, and he had been for many years occupied with efforts of quite another kind than the keeping freshly in mind the chronological position of one of the many passing enthusiastic attempts at insurrection. It has been ex-

---

1 Origen, c. Cels. 1. 6, Scaliger, Casaubon, Bessar, Grotius, Calovius, Hammond, Wolf, Bengel, Heumann, Krebs, Lardner, Morna, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Kuhnau, Guevicke, Anger, Olshausen, Ebrard.

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

3 Wieseler, Synops. p. 108 ff., and Baumgarten, also Köhler in Herzog's Encycl. XVI. p. 40 f., holding it to refer to the scribe Mat.

4 Baronius, Reland, Michaelis, Jahn, Archäol. II. 2, § 127.
plained as a proleptic error by Valesius,1 Lud. Cappellus, Wetstein, Ottius,2 Eichhorn, Credner, de Wette, Neander, Bleek, Holtzmann, Keim,3 as also by Baur and Zeller, who, however, urge this error as an argument against the historical truth of the entire speech. Olshausen considers himself prevented from assenting to the idea of a historical mistake, because Luke must have committed a double mistake,—for, first, he would have made Gamaliel name a man who did not live till after him; and, secondly, he would have put Judas, who appeared under Augustus, as subsequent to Theudas, who lived under Claudius. But the whole mistake amounts to the simple error, that Luke conceived that Theudas had played his part already before the census of Quirinius, and accordingly he could not but place him before Judas.4—elvai ἐνα] giving out himself for one of peculiar importance.5—ὡς προσεκλίθη] to whom leaned, i.e. adhered, took his side: πολλοὶς ἡπάτασσον, Josephus, l.c.—ιεννυόρο εἰς οἰκίν] ad nihilum redacti sunt.6 They were, according to Josephus, l.c., broken up (ἰσειδησαν) by the cavalry of Fadus, and partly killed, partly taken prisoners.—The two relative sentences ὡς προσεκλ. and δὲ ἀναφέρεται are designed to bring out emphatically the contrast. Comp. iv. 10.

Ver. 37. 'Ιουνία ὁ Γαλιλαῖος] Joseph. Antt. xviii. 1. 1, calls him a Gaulan-

1 Ad. Faseb. H. E. li. 11.
2 Spicileg. p. 336.
3 According to Lange, Apost. Zeiltlt. I. p. 94, the difficulty between Luke and Josephus remains "somewhat in suspense." Yet he inclines to the assumption of an earlier Theudas, according to the hypothesis of Wieseler. According to this hypothesis, the Greek name (see Wetstein) Theudas (ὁ θεῦδας = ὁ θεοῦ δόρος), preserved still on coins in Mioonet, must be regarded as the Greek form of the name θεῦδας. But why should Gamaliel or Luke not have retained the name Matthias? Or what could induce Josephus to put Matthias instead of Theudas? especially as the name Δεοῦ α] was not strange in Hebrew (Schoettg. p. 428), and Josephus himself mentions the later insurgent by no other name.
4 Entirely mistaken is the—even in a linguistic point of view erroneous—interpretation of μετὰ τοῦτον (ver. 37) by Calvin, Wet-

τιν αἱ ἀντιπαθείς] a notice which supplements Josephus. Accord-

11 Attraction: Hermann, ad Fig. p. 692.
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ing to Joseph. Antt. xx. 5. 2, two some of Judas perished at a later period, whom Tiberius Alexander, the governor of Judaea, caused to be crucified. Still later a third son was executed. 3 — διεκσυρονον ησαν they were scattered, —which does not exclude the continuance of the faction, whose members were afterwards very active as zealots, and again even in the Jewish war; therefore it is not an incorrect statement (in opposition to de Wette).

Vr. 38-40. Καὶ is the simple copula of the train of thought; τῶν νῦν as in iv. 29. — εἰς άνθρωπον of human origin (comp. Matt. xxi. 35), not proceeding from the will and arrangement of God (not εἰ καὶ θεοῦ). — ἡ βούλη αὕτη ἣ τὸ λόγο τοῦτο. "Disjunctiv non ad diversas res, sed ad diversa, quibus res appellatur, vocabula pertinet." 4 This project or (in order to denote the matter in question still more definitely) this work (as already in the act of being executed). — καταλογοθηται namely, without your interference. This conception results from the antithesis in the second clause: οὕτω δικαίωμα καταλογοθηται αὐτῶις. For similar expressions from the Rabbins, see Schoettgen. 5 The reference of καταλογοθηται to persons (αὐτῶις, see the critical remarks) who are ovethrnon, ruined, is also current in classical authors. — Notice, further, the difference in meaning of the two conditional clauses: οὐ δὲ καὶ εἰ . . . εἰστιν, according to which the second case put appeared to Gamaliel as the more probable. — μάρτυρε καὶ θεωμάχω εὔπρεπήρε μuitablegrammatically to be explained by a εκπέμπειν, προσίχεις εἰσών (Luke xxii. 34), or some similar phrase floating before the mind, is an independent warning: that ye only be not found even fighters against God. 6 Valckenae and Lachmann (after Priceus and Hammond) construe otherwise, referring μάρτυρε to ἐάσατε αὐτῶς, and treating εἰς . . . αὐτῶις as a parenthesis. A superfluous interruption, to which also the man reference of θεωμάχω to the directly preceding εἰ δὲ εἰς θεοῦ εἰσίν κ.τ.λ. is opposed. — καὶ is to be explained elliptically: not only with men, but also further, in addition. 7 — θεωμάχω. — εἰκόθεναν even if only in tantum; and yet how greatly to their self-conviction on account of their recent condemnation of Jesus! — δειπνάτες] The Sanhedrin would at least not expose themselves, as if they had instituted an examination wholly without result, and therefore they order the punishment of stripes, usual for very various kinds of crime—here, proved dissimulation—but very ignominious (comp. xvi. 37, xxii.). — Concerning the counsel of Gamaliel generally, the principle therein expressed is only right conditionally, for interference against a spiritual development must, in respect of its admissibility or necessity, be morally judged of according to the nature of the cases; nor is that counsel to be considered as an abso-

1 Comp. Bell. ii. 8. 1.
2 Bell. ii. 17. 8 f.; Vitr. v. 11.
3 Joseph. Bell. ii. 17. 7.
4 Frizache, ad Marc. p. 277.
6 οὐ καὶ...ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν οἷς...en ἐν θεοῦ, ἐνίκησεν εὐθυμίων... En. Hippol. 476.
7 Com. Gal. 1. 8. 9; and see Winer, p. 277 f. (E. T. 369); Stallb. ad Plut. Phaed. p. 90 B.
8 See Hom. ii. 1. 28, ii. 196; Matt. xxv. 9 (Elz.). Rom. xi. 31; Baenmlein, Partik. p. 969; Nägelsb. on the Mad, p. 16, ed. 3.
9 See Hartung, Partikell. i. p. 194.
hute maxim of Gamaliel, but as one which is here presented to him by the critical state of affairs, and is to be explained from his predominant opinion that a work of God may be at stake, as he himself indeed makes this opinion apparent by εἰ . . . ιτων, ver. 39 (see above).

Ver. 41 f. Χαίροντες ... with emphasis: for the name, for its glorification. For the scourging suffered tended to that effect, because it was inflicted on the apostles on account of their steadfast confession of the name. Comp. ix. 16. "Quam reputarent causam, prævalebat gaudium," Calvin. The absolute τὸ δόμα denotes the name καὶ ζηκὴν,—namely, "Jesus Messiah" (iii. 6, iv. 10), the confession and announcement of which was always the highest and holiest concern of the apostles. Analogous is the use of the absolute δῷ (Lev. xxiv. 11, 16), in which the Hebrew understood the name of his Jehovah as implied of itself. Comp. 3 John 7. — κατηγιώθη, ἀτιμασθ. ] An olympion. — πᾶσαν ἡμέραν] every day the οἶκος ἐπαύνυν in preaching took place. They did it day after day without cessation. — καὶ οἶκον] domi, in the house, a contrast to εν τῷ λεω. See on ii. 46. — ἀνεπαύνυν διδάκοντες]. — καὶ εἴω ἔθηλ. Ἰσα. τ. X.] and announcing Jesus as the Messiah, a more specific definition of διδάκοντες as regards its chief contents.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(s) Ananias. V. 1.

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

1 Comp. Phil. i. 29; 2 Cor. xi. 36-30; Gal. vi. 14, 17, at.; 1 Pet. ii. 19. 2 See Herm. ad Vigcr. p. 771; Bernhardy, p. 477. 3 See Winer, p. 165 (H. T. 214).
imposture or to punish it; a complication and accumulation of gratuitous and aggravated crimes, which certainly must constitute a heinous sin—if not the unpardonable sin—against the Holy Ghost." (Alexander.) The sin of Ananias was an aggravated combination of all iniquity—vanity and hypocrisy, covetousness and fraud, impiety, and contempt of God. As analogous instances refer to the fate of Nadab and Abihu; Korah and his company; the man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day, and Achan.

(vi) Peter’s shadow. V. 15.

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

(vi) Theudas. V. 36.

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

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

Vers. 3. 'Aγίου] is wanting in B D Β, 137, 180, vss. Chrys. Theophyl. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. ; the Syr. expresses κυρίου. A more precisely defining addition (comp. ver. 5), which is also found inserted at ver. 10. — καταστήσομεν] Elz. has καταστήσωμεν, against decisive evidence. An over-hasty correction. — Ver. 5, πληρη[ A C* D E H W, min. have πλήρης, which, although adopted by Lachm., is intolerable, and is to be regarded as an old error of transcription. — Ver. 8, χάριτος] Elz. has πιστεως, contrary to decisive evidence. From ver. 5. — Ver. 9, και 'Ασίας[ is deleted by Lach., following A D* Cant. It was easily overlooked after Καλκίας; whereas it would be difficult to conceive a reason for its being inserted. — Ver. 11. βλάσφημα] D has βλασφημίας. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Born. But ρήμα το αυτώς was explained by the weakly-attested βλασφημίας (blasphemies) as a gloss; and this, taken as a genitive, thereupon suppressed the original βλάσφημα. — Ver. 13. After ρήματα, Elz. has βλάσφημα, against a great predominance of evidence. From ver. 11. — After ἀγίου, Elz. has τοιςω, which, it is true, has in its favour B C, Tol. Sahid. Syr. utr. Chrys. Theophyl. 2, but was added with reference to ver. 14, as the meeting of the Sanhedrim was conceived as taking place within the area of the temple court.

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

Ver. 1. Δι[ Over against this new victory of the church without, there now emerges a division in its own bosom. — εν ταῖς ἡμερ. ταύτ.] namely, while the apostles continued, after their liberation, to devote themselves unmolested to their function of preaching (v. 42). Thus this expression (ἐν ταῖς ἡμερ. ταύτ.) finds its definition, although only an approximate one, always in what precedes. Comp. on Matt. iii. 1. — πληθυνόντων[ as a neuter verb (Bernhardy, p. 339 f.): amidst the increase of the Christian multitude, by which, consequently, the business of management referred to became the more extensive and difficult. — Ελληνικά, elsewhere only preserved in Phot. Bibli (see Wetstein), according to its derivation, from ἔλληνες, to present oneself in Grecian nationality, and particularly to speak the Greek language, and according to its contrast to Ἑβραίως, is to be explained: a Jew, and so non-Greek, who has Greek nationality, and particularly speaks Greek: ix. 29. Comp. Chrysostom and Oecumenius. As both appellations are here transferred to the members of the Christian church at Jerusalem, the Ἑβραίως are undoubtedly: those Christians of the church of Jerusalem, who, as natives of Palestine, had the Jewish national character, and spoke

1 Comp. Aesch. Ag. 869; Polyb. iii. 105. 7; Herodian, iii. 8. 14, often in the LXX. and Apocr.

2 Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 380.
the sacred language as their native tongue; and the Ἑλληνισταὶ are those members of this church, who were Greek-Jews, and therefore presented themselves in Greek national character, and spoke Greek as their native language. Both parties were Jewish Christians; and the distinction between them turned on the different relation of their original nationality to Judaism. And as the two parties (v) embraced the whole of the Jews who had become Christian, it is a purely arbitrary limitation, when Camerarius, Beza, Salmasius, Pearson, Wolf, Morus, Ziegler,¹ would understand exclusively the Jewish proselytes who had been converted to Christianity. These are included among the Greek-Jews who had become Christian, but are not alone meant; the Jews by birth who had been drawn from the διασπορά to Jerusalem are also included. The more the intercourse of Greek-Jews with foreign culture was fitted to lessen and set aside Jewish narrow-mindedness, so much the more easy it is to understand that many should embrace Christianity.² — πρὸς] denotes, according to the context, the antagonistic direction, as in Luke v. 30. Comp. Acts ix. 29. — ἐν τῷ δικτ. τῷ καθύπ.] in the daily service (2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 13), here: with provisions, in the daily distribution of food. Ver. 2 requires this explanation. — καθυστέρως only here in the N. T., more frequently in Plutarch, etc., belongs to the later Greek.³ — The neglect of due consideration, παραθεωρεῖν,⁴ which the widows of the Hellenists met with, doubtless by the fault not of the apostles, but of subordinates commissioned by them, is an evidence that the Jewish self-assertion of the Palestinian over the Greek-Jews,⁵ so much at variance with the spirit of Christianity,⁶ had extended also to the Christian community, and now on the increase of the church, no longer restrained by the fresh unity of the Holy Spirit, came into prominence as the first germ of the later separation of the Hebrew and Hellenistic elements;⁷ as also, that before the appointment of the subsequently named Seven, the care of the poor was either exclusively, or at least chiefly, entrusted to the Hebrew.⁸ The widows are not, as Olshausen and Lekebusch, p. 98, arbitrarily assume, mentioned by synecdoche for all the poor and needy, but simply because their neglect was the occasion of the γογγυσμός. We may add, that this passage does not presuppose another state of matters than that of the community of goods formerly mentioned (Schleiermacher and others), but only a disproportion as regards the application of the means thereby placed at their disposal. There is nothing in the text to show that the complaint as to this was unfounded (Calvin).

Ver. 2. Τῷ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν the mass of the disciples; i.e. the Christian multitude in general, not merely individuals, or a mere committee of the church. Comp. iv. 32. It is quite as arbitrary to understand, with Light-

² Comp. Reuss in Herzog's Encycl. V. p. 708 f.
³ Judith xii. 15; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 55.
⁴ Not elsewhere in the N. T., nor in the LXX. and Apoc., but see Kypke, II. p. 36.
⁵ Lightl. Hor. ad Joh. p. 1031.
⁶ Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Rom. x. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 13.
foot, only the 120 persons mentioned in i. 15, as, with Mosheim and Kuinoel, to suppose that the church of Jerusalem was divided into seven classes, which assembled in seven different places, and had each selected from their midst an almoner. As the place of meeting is not named, it is an over-hasty conclusion that the whole church could not have assembled all at once. — οὐκ ἀφετέων ἱστιν] non placet.¹ The Vulgate, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Casaubon, Kuinoel, incorrectly render: non aequum est, which the word never means, not even in the LXX. It pleased not the apostles to leave the doctrine of God—its proclamation—just because the fulfilment of the proper duty of their calling pleased them. — καταλεῖψ.] A strong expression under a vivid sense of the disturbing element (to leave in the lurch).² — διακονεῖν τραπέζας] to serve tables, i.e. to be the regulators, overseers, and dispensers in reference to food. The expression, which contains the more precise definition for τῷ διακονῷ of ver. 1, betrays "indignitatem aliquam" (Bengel). — The reference which others have partly combined with this, partly assumed alone, of τράπεζα to the money-changers' table,³ is excluded, in the absence of any other indication in the text, by the διακονεῖν used statedly of the ministration of food.⁴ Moreover, the designation of the matter, as if it were a banking business, would not even be suitable. The apostles would neither be τραπεζοφόροι nor τραπεζοποιοὶ.⁵ They may hitherto in the management of this business have made use, without fixed plan, of the assistance of others, by whose fault, perhaps, the murmuring of the Hellenists was occasioned.

Ver. 3. Accordingly (οὖν), as we, the apostles, can no longer undertake this business of distribution, look ye out, i.e. direct your attention to test and select, etc. — ἐκτίθη] (w) the sacred number. — σοφίας] quite in the usual practical sense: wisdom, which determines the right agency in conformity with the recognised divine aim. With a view to this required condition of fulness of the Spirit and of wisdom, the men to be selected from the midst of the church were to be attested; i.e. were to have the corresponding testimony of the church in their favour.⁶ — οὓς καταστέφασον ἐπὶ τῷ χριστίᾳ τραπεζῆς] whom we (the apostles) will appoint,⁷ when they are chosen, over the business in question.⁸ This officium, ministration,⁹ is just that, of which the distributing to the widows was an essential and indeed the chief part, namely, the care of the poor in the church, not merely as to its Hellenistic portion.¹⁰ The limitation to the latter would presuppose the existence of a special management of the poor already established for the Hebrew

¹ xii. 3; John viii. 29; Herod. i. 119; Plato, Def. p. 415 A.
² On the form, see Lobecck, ad Phryn. p. 718 F.
⁴ Weist. ad Matth. iv. 11.
⁵ Athen. IV. p. 170.
⁶ Comp. xvi. 2 and on Luke iv. 29; Dion. Hal. Anti. ii. 30.
⁷ The opposite of καταστήσω. ἔστω τὸς χριστία τραπεζῆς (comp. 1 Macc. x. 37) is: μεταστέφασεν ἀνεβάζω τῷ χριστίᾳ τραπεζῆς, Polyb. iv. 87. 9; 1 Macc. xi. 63.
⁸ On ἐστω with the genitive, in the sense of official appointment over something, see Lobecck, ad Phryn. p. 474; Rühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 3. 2.
¹⁰ Vitr. de Synag. ii. 2. 5; Mosheim, Heinrichs, Kuinoel.
CHOOSE THE SEVEN.

portion, without any indication of it in the text; nor is it supported by the Hellenic names of the persons chosen (ver. 5), as such names at that time were very common also among the Hebrews. Consequently the hypothesis, that pure Hellenists were appointed by the impartiality of the Hebrews, is entirely arbitrary; as also is the supposition of Gieseler, that three Hebrews and three Hellenists, and one proselyte, were appointed; although the chosen were doubtless partly Hebrews and partly Hellenists. — Observe, moreover, how the right to elect was regarded by the apostles as vested in the church, and the election itself was performed by the church, but the appointment and consecration were completed by the apostles; the requisite qualifications, moreover, of those to be elected are defined by the apostles. From this first regular overseership of alms, the mode of appointment to which could not but regulate analogically the practice of the church, was gradually developed the diaconate, which subsequently underwent further elaboration (Phil. i. 1). It remains an open question whether the overseers corresponded to the διακώνεις of the synagogue — τῇ διακονιᾷ τοῦ λόγου — contrasting with the διακονεῖ τοῖς ποιμένασι in ver. 2. The apostolic working was to be separated from the office of overseer; while, on the other hand, the latter was by no means to exclude other Christian work in the measure of existing gifts, as the very example of Stephen (vv. 8–10) shows; comp. on viii. 5.

Ver. 5. Παντὸς τοῦ πάντων] “pulcher consensus cum obsequio,” Bengel. The aristocracy of the church was a μετ’ εὐδοξίας πλήθους ἀριστοκρατία. — τίτνευς] is not, with Wetstein, Kuinoel, and others, to be interpreted honesty, trustworthiness; for this qualification was obvious of itself, and is here no peculiar characteristic. But the prominent Christian element in the nature of Stephen was his being distinguished by fulness of faith of the two functions was from the very first the regulative point of view. The presbyterate retained the oversight and guidance of the diaconate (Phil. i. 1); comp. also xi. 30; but the latter sprang, by reason of the emerging exigency, from the former, not the converse.

As Leyrer, in Herzog’s Encykl. XV. p. 813, thinks. The ecclesiastical overseership arose out of the higher need and interest of the new present, but the synagogal office might serve as a model that offered itself historically. The requirements for the latter office pointed merely to “well-known trustworthy” men.

Gilbruta; on the other side Rhenfeld, see Wolf, Curiae.

Observe, however, that it is not said: τῇ διακονίᾳ τῷ προστασίῳ καὶ τοῦ λόγου, and therefore it is not to be inferred from our passage, with Ahrens (Amst d. Schöll, p. 57 f.), that by τῇ προστασίᾳ a part of “the office of the keys” is meant. See, in opposition to this, Dästerdieck in the Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 762 f.

Plat. Menex. p. 238 D.
(comp. xi. 24), on which account the church united in selecting him first. — ἐφικτήρων] At a later period he taught in Samaria, and baptized the chamberlain (viii. 5 ff.). Concerning his after life and labours (see, however, xxi. 8) there are only contradictory legends. — Νικόλαον] neither the founder of the Nicolaitans; nor the person from whom the Nicolaitans had borrowed their name in accordance with his alleged immoral principles; Thiersch wishes historically to combine the two traditions. — Νικολαιται, Rev. ii. 6, is an invented Greek name, equivalent to κρατοῦντες τὴν δίδαξιν Βαλαάμ (ver. 14), according to the derivation of δύναμις, perdidit populum. Of the others mentioned nothing further is known. — προσήλυτον 'Αντιοχ.] From this it may be inferred, with Heinicus, Gieseler, de Wette, Ewald, and others, that only Nicolas had been a proselyte, and all the rest were not; for otherwise we could not discern why Luke should have added such a special remark of so characteristic a kind only in the case of Nicolas. But that there was also a proselyte among those chosen, is an evidence of the wisdom of the choice. — 'Αντιοχία] but who dwelt in Jerusalem. — The fact that Stephen is named at the head of the Seven finds its explanation in his distinguished qualities and historical significance. Comp. Peter at the head of the apostles. Chrysostom well remarks on ver. 8: καὶ εἰς τοῖς ἐπτά ἡν τις πρόκριτος καὶ τὰ πρωτεία εἶχεν εἰ γάρ καὶ ἡ χειροτονία κοινῆ, ἄλλ' δι' ὅς οὖν ἐπετεπάκισεν χάριν πλειον. Nor is it less historically appropriate that the only proselyte among the Seven is, in keeping with the Jewish character of the church, named last.

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

---

1 As, after Iren. Haer. ii. 27, Epiph. Haer. 23, Calvin, Grostius, and Lightfoot assumed.
2 Constitt. ap. vi. 8. 2; Clem. Al. Strom. ii. p. 177, iii. p. 187.
4 See Ewald and Düsterdieck, i.e.
5 See, on the imposition of hands, Bauer in the Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 548 ff.; Hoeleman in his neues Bibelstud. 1866, p. 328 ff., where also the earlier literature, p. 383, is noted.
7 θέρτης, Virtinga, Synag. p. 336 ff.
8 Num. xxvii. 19; Deut. xxiv. 9; Ewald, Alterth. p. 37 f.
yet ensues a special and higher communication.—Observe, moreover, that here also (comp. viii. 17, xiii. 8) the imposition of hands occurs after prayer, and therefore it was not a mere symbolic *accompaniment of prayer* without collative import, and perhaps only a “*ritus ordinis et decorum congruens*” (Calvin). Certainly its efficacy depended only on God's bestowal, but it was associated with the act representing this bestowal as the medium of the divine communication.

Ver. 7, attaching the train of thought by the simple *kai*, now describes how, after the *installing of the Seven*, the *cause of the gospel continued to prosper*—“*The word of God grew*”—it increased in diffusion. How could the re-established and elevated love and harmony, sustained, in addition to the apostles, by upright men who were full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom (ver. 3), fail to serve as the greatest recommendation of the new doctrine and church to the inhabitants of the capital, who had always before their eyes, in the case of their hierarchs, the curse of party spirit and sectarian hatred? Therefore—and what a significant step towards victory therein took place!—a great multitude of the priests became obedient to the faith, that is, they submitted themselves to the faith in Jesus as the Messiah, they became believers; comp. as to ἵππακος πιστεις, on Rom. i. 5. The better portion of the so numerous (Ezra ii. 36 ff.) priestly class could not but, in the light of the Christian theocratic fellowship which was developing itself, recognise and feel all the more vividly the decay of the old hierarchy. Accordingly, both the weakly attested reading Ἰουνάιων, and the conjecture of Cassaubon, approved by Beza: καὶ τῶν ἵππων, sc. τινές, are to be entirely rejected; nor is even Elsner's view, which Heinsius anticipated, and Wolf and Kuinoel followed, to be adopted, viz. that by the ἅγιος τῶν ἱερών, the *sacerdotes ex plebe, plebeii sacerdotes*, ἰουναίων ἱερέων, are meant in contradiction to the theologically learned priests, ἱερεῖς τῶν ἁγίων. The text itself is against this view; for it must at least have run: τοῖς τε ἱερεῖς τοῦ ἅγιον. Besides, such a distinction of priests is nowhere indicated in the N. T., and could not be presumed as known. Compare, as analogous to the statement of our passage, John xii. 42.

Vv. 8, 9. Yet there now came an attack from without, and that against that first-named distinguished overseer for the poor, *Stephen*, who became the *σταυρομάρτυρ*.* The new narrative is therefore not introduced abruptly (Schwanbeck). — *χάρις* is, as in iv. 83, to be understood of the *divine grace*, not as Heinrichs, according to ii. 47, would have it taken: *gratia, quam apud permultos interret.* This must have been definitely conveyed by an addition.—*διάναιων*] power generally, *heroism*; not specially: *miraculous power*, as the following *eisocrē τραπα κ.τ.λ. expresses a special exercise of the generally characteristic χάρις and δύναμις. — τινὲς τῶν εἰς τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐν Λεβ.τ.] some of those who belonged to the so-called Libertine-synagogue. The number of synagogues in Jerusalem was great, and is estimated by the

---

1 Lake has not expressed himself in some such way as this: καὶ ἰουνάιων αὐτοῖς τῆς ἱεροπραγματείας.

2 This also in opposition to Weiss, *bibl.*

3 Theol. p. 144.

4 xii. 24, xix. 20, etc. Comp. the parable of the mustard-seed, Matt. xiii. 31, 32.

5 Const. op. ii. 49. 2.
Rabbins, at the fanciful number 480 (i.e. 4 × 10 × 13). Chrysostom, already correctly explains the Διμερίσματα: οἱ Ρωμαῖοι ἀπελεύθεροι. They are to be conceived as Jews by birth, who, brought by the Romans, particularly under Pompey, as prisoners of war to Rome, were afterward emancipated, and had returned home. Many also remained in Rome, where they had settled on the other side of the Tiber. They and their descendants after them formed in Jerusalem a synagogue of their own, which was named after the class-designation which its originators and possessors brought with them from their Roman sojourn in exile, the synagogue of the freedmen (libertinorum). This, the usual explanation, for which, however, further historical proof cannot be adduced, is to be adhered to as correct, both on account of the purely Roman name, and because it involves no historical improbability. Grotius, Vitringa, Wolf, and others understand, as also included under it, Italic, who as freedmen had become converts to Judaism. But it is not at all known that such persons, and that in large numbers, were resident in Jerusalem. The Roman designation stands opposed to the view of Lightfoot, that they were Palestinian freedmen, who were in the service of Palestinian masters. Others, suppose that they were Jews, natives of Libertum, a (problematical) city or district in proconsular Africa. If there was a Libertum, the Jews from it, of whom no historical trace exists, were certainly not so numerous in Jerusalem as to form a separate synagogue of their own. — καὶ Κυρ. καὶ Ἀλεξ.] Likewise two synagogue communities. Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Heumann, and Klos, were no doubt of opinion that by ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ... καὶ Ἀσίας there is meant only one synagogue, which was common to all those who are named. But against this may be urged, as regards the words of the passage, the circumstance that τ. λαγωτής only suits Διμερίσματα, and as regards matter of fact, the great number of synagogues in Jerusalem, as well as the circumstance that of the Libertini, Cyrenaecans, etc., there was certainly far too large a body in Jerusalem to admit of them all forming only one synagogue. In Cyrene, the capital of Upper Libya, the fourth part of the inhabitants consisted of Jews, and in Alexandria two of the five parts into which the city was divided were inhabited by them. Here was also the seat of Jewish-Greek learning, and it was natural that those removing to Jerusalem should bring with them in some measure this learning of the world without, and prosecute it there in their synagogue. Wieseler, p. 63, renders the first καὶ and indeed, so that the Cyrenaecans, Alexandrians, and those of Cilicia and Asia, would be designated as a mere part of the so-called Libertine synagogue. But how arbitrary, seeing that καὶ in the various other instances of its being used

1 Mapill. f. 78, 4; Estuardo f. 105, 1. 2 Sueton. Tiber. 36; Tacit. Ann. II. 85; Philo, Leg. ad Cat. p. 1014 C. 3 See particularly Gerdes in the Miscell. Groning. I. 8, p. 592 ff. 4 Suidas: Διμερίσματα ἄνων ἔθνους. 5 Conjectures: Διμερίσματα, Libyans (Oecumenius, Lyra, Beza, ed. 1 and 2, Clericus, Gothofredus, Valckenaer), and Διμερίσματα τῶν κατὰ Κυρ. (Schulthees, de charism. Sp. St. p. 162 ff.). See Wetzstein, who even considers Διμερίσματα another form (inflexio) of the name Διμερής. The Arm. already has Libyorum. 6 Exem. emendat. Vallis. in N. T. p. 48. 7 Joseph. Ant. xiv. 7, 2, xvi. 6, 1; c. Apion. II. 4. 8 Joseph. Ant. xiv. 7, 2, xiv. 10, 1, xix. 5, 2; Bell. Jud. II. 18, 7.
throughout the representation always expresses merely the simple and! The Synagoga Alexandrinorum is also mentioned in the Talmud.\(^1\) Winer and Ewald divide the whole into two communities: (1) Κυρην. and Ἀλεξ., joined with the Libertines; and (2) the synagogue formed of the Cilician and Asiatic Jews. But against this view the above reasons also militate, especially the τῆς λεγομένης, which only suits Διεσπεριν. The grammatical objection against our view, that the article τῶν is not repeated before Κυρην., and before Ἀλεξ., is disposed of by the consideration, that those belonging to the three synagogues, the Libertine-synagogue, the Cyrenaeans, and the Alexandrians are conceived together as one hostile category,\(^2\) and the two following synagogal communities are then likewise conceived as such a unity, and represented by the καὶ τῶν prefixed.\(^3\) We have thus in our passage three synagogues, to which the τῶν belonged, — namely, three of Roman and African nationality, and two Asiatic. The two categories — the former three together, and the latter two together — are represented as the two synagogal circles, from which disputants emerged against Stephen. To the Cilician synagogue Saul doubtless belonged. — Ἀσία is not to be taken otherwise than in ii. 9. — συζυγοῦντες\(^4\) as disputants, ix. 29. The συζυγοῦντες had already begun with the rising up (ἀνέστησαν).\(^4\)

Vv. 10, 11. The σοφία is to be explained, not of the Jewish learning, but of the Christian wisdom,\(^5\) to which the Jewish learning of the opponents could not make any resistance.\(^6\) The πνεῦμα was the πνεῦμα,\(^7\) with which he was filled, vv. 3, 5. — ω Ἐν τοίς Dative of the instrument. It refers, as respects sense, to both preceding nouns, but is grammatically determined according to the latter, Matthæi, page 991. — τῶν] then, namely, after they had availed nothing in open disputation against him. “Hic agnosce morem improborum; ubi veritate decidunt impares, ad mendacia confugiunt,” Erasmus. Paraph. — ἐπιβαλον] they instigated, secretly instructed.\(^8\) — ἄγριος. quæs. k.r.l.] provisional summary statement of what these men asserted that they had heard as the essential contents of the utterances of Stephen in question. For their more precisely formulated literal statement, see vv. 13, 14.

Vv. 13–14. The assertion of these ἵπτομεν\(^8\) served to direct the public opinion against Stephen; but a legal process was requisite for his complete overthrow, and prudence required the consent of the people. Therefore they stirred up the people, and the elders of the people and the scribes, etc. — συζυγοῦντες\(^8\) they drew them into the movement with them, stirred up them also. Often in Plut., Polyb., etc. — καὶ ἵπτομεν\(^8\) as in iv. 1. The subject is still those hostile τῶν. — συζυγοῦντες\(^8\) they drew along with them, as in xix. 29. — μάρτυρας συζυγοῦντες\(^8\) Consequently, Stephen had not spoken the

---

1 [Mgll. f. 78, 4.]
2 See Krüger, ad Xen. Anab. II. 1. 7; Sauppe and Köhler, ad Xen. Mem. I. 1. 19; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 573 f.
3 Vulg.: “et soror quem gerunt.”
5 Luke xxii. 15; and see on Eph. I. S. 17.
6 Comp. 1 Cor. I. 17 ff., II. 6 ff.
7 But τῷ ἄγριῳ not added; for “adversarii sentientem Spiritum esse in Stephano; Spiritum sanctum in eo esse non celebant,” Bengel.
8 Comp. Appian. I. 74, ἐπιβαλλόμενος κατῆγορος. The Latin subornans, or, as the Vulg. has it, submissant (Suet. Ner. 26).
same words, which were then adduced by these witnesses, ver. 14, as heard from him. Now, namely, in presence of the Sanhedrim, it concerned them to bear witness to the blasphemy alleged to have been heard according to the real state of the facts, and in doing so those ἄνδρες ὑποβλητοί dealt as false witnesses. As formerly a saying of Jesus was falsified in order to make Him appear as a rebel against the theocracy; so here also some expression of Stephen now unknown to us,—wherein the latter probably had pointed, and that in the spirit of Jesus himself, to the reformatory influence of Christianity leading to the dissolution of the temple-worship and legal institutions, and the consummation of it by the Parousia, and had indeed, perhaps, quoted the prophecy of the Lord concerning the destruction of Jerusalem,—was so perverted, that Stephen now appears as herald of a revolution to be accomplished by Jesus, directed against the temple and against the law and the institutions of Moses. Against the view of Krause, that an expression of other, more inconsiderate, Christians was imputed to Stephen, may be urged not only the utter arbitrariness of such a supposition, but also the analogy of the procedure against Jesus, which very naturally presented itself to the enemies of Stephen as a precedent. Heinrichs, after Heumann and Morus, thinks that the μᾶρτυρες were in so far ψευδεις, as they had uttered an expression of Stephen with an evil design, in order to destroy him; so also Sepp. p. 17. But in that case they would not have been false, but only malicious witnesses; not a ψευδος, but a bad motive would have been predominant. Baur also and Zeller maintain the essential correctness of the assertion, and consequently the incorrectness of the narrative, in so far as it speaks of false witnesses. But an antagonism to the law, such as is ascribed by the latter to Stephen, would lack all internal basis and presupposition in the case of a believing Israelite full of wisdom and of the Holy Spirit; as regards its true amount, it can only be conceived as analogous to the subsequent procedure of Paul, which, as in xviii. 13, xxi. 21, was misrepresented with similar perversity; nor does the defensive address, vii. 44-53, lead further. Nevertheless, Rauch has maintained that Stephen actually made the assertion adduced by the witnesses, ver. 14, and that these were only false witnesses, in so far as they had not themselves heard this expression from the mouth of Stephen, which yet was the purport of their statement. This is at variance with the entire design and representation, see particularly ver 11. And the utterance itself, as the witnesses professed to have heard it, would, at any rate,

1 Matt. xxvi. 61; John ii. 19.
2 Comp. Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 148. But that Stephen, as Reuss thinks (in Herzog's Encycl. XV. p. 78), preached something which the apostles had not previously taught, is all the more uncertain an assumption, seeing that already in the sayings of Jesus Himself sufficient materials for the purpose were given. Comp. e.g. John iv. 21 ff., the sayings of Jesus concerning the Sabbath, concerning the Levitical purifications, concerning the ἁπλασίαι of the law, concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Parousia, etc. But Stephen (in τῆς ἐκκλησίας ζωής, Constitt. ap. viii. 46. 9) may have expressed himself in a more threatening and inclusive manner than others, and thereby have directed the persecution to himself. In so far he was certainly the forerunner of Paul.
3 Comment. in Histor. aliquor orat. Steph., Gott. 1790.
4 Comp. Baumgarten, p. 195.
5 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1867, p. 256.
even if used as a veil for a higher meaning, be framed after a manner so alien to Israelite piety and so unwise, that it could not be attributed at all to Stephen, full as he was of the Spirit. Oecumenius has correctly stated the matter: ἐπειδὴ ἄλλως μὲν ἤκονοιαν, ἄλλως δὲ νῦν αὐτοὶ προνυχώρουν, εἰς τὰς καὶ φενδομάρτυρες ἀναγράφονται. — τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἁγίου] the holy place κατ' ἱζῃν τὸν ναὸν ναών.] The false witnesses represent the matter, as if Stephen had thus spoken pointing to the temple. 1 — Ver. 14. ὁ Ἅζωρ. οὗτος] is not to be considered as part of the utterance of Stephen, but as proceeding from the standpoint of the false witnesses who so designate Jesus contemptuously, and blended by them with the words of Stephen. And not only is ὁ Ἅζωρ, an expression of contempt, but also οὗτος: Jesus, this Nazarene! — τὸν τόπον τοῦ ναῶν] The false witnesses represent the matter, as if Stephen had thus spoken pointing to the temple.

Ver. 15. All the Sanhedrists 2 saw the countenance of Stephen angelically glorified; a superhuman, angel-like δόξα became externally visible to them on it (κατ' ἱζῃν). So Luke has conceived and represented it with simple definiteness; so the serene calm which astonished even the Sanhedrists, and the holy joyfulness which was reflected from the heart of the martyr in his countenance, have been glorified by the symbolism of Christian legend. But it would be arbitrary, with Kuinoel (comp. Grotius and Heinrichs), to rationalize the meaning of εἰδον . . . ἀγγέλου to this effect: “Os animi tranqvsitatem summam referebat, adeo ut sum intuitibus reverentiam inicerebat;” according to which the expression would have to be referred, with Neander and de Wette, to a poetically symbolic description, which does not correspond with the otherwise simple style of the narrative. The phenomenon was certainly “an extraordinary operation of the Spirit of Jesus;” 4 but the form of it is added by tradition, which betrays the point of view of the miraculous also by the πάντες. The parallel adduced afresh by Olshausen (3 Sam. xiv. 17) is utterly unsuitable, because there the comparison to an angel relates to wisdom, and not to anything external. Nor is the analogy of the δόξα in the face of Moses (3 Cor. iii. 7) suitable, on account of the characteristic πρόσωπον. ἀγγέλου. For Rabbinical analogies, see Schoettgen and Wetstein.

Notes by American Editor.

(v) A murmuring. V. 1.

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

1 3 Mac. ii. 14.
3 αἰνεισιν εἰς αἰνόν: “nautatum est in judicis oculos in reum convertere, quam expectatur ejus defenso.” Cæs. 25. 4
4 Baumgarten, p. 190.
different races, nationalities, and languages prevail, as in our own land, where
dwell together natives of almost every country in the world. There is need
for the exercise of enlarged and enlightened charity, for the exhibition of
Christian wisdom and apostolic tact, and for the cultivation of a spirit of mu-
tual forbearance and brother-love.

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

(w) Seven men. V. 3.

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER VII.

VER. 1. ἄρα is wanting in A B C Ψ, min. Vulg. Cant. Germ. Bed. Deleted by Lachm. But if not genuine, it would hardly have been added, as it was so little necessary for the sense that, on the contrary, the question expressed in a shorter and more precise form appears to be more suitable to the standpoint and the temper of the high priest. — Ver. 3. τὴν γήν] The article is wanting in Elz. Scholz, against far preponderant attestation. A copyist’s error. Restored by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 5. αὐτῷ δοῦναι] δοῦναι αὐτῷ is decidedly attested; so Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 7. δουλεύσωσοι] Tisch. reads δουλεύσωσιν, in accordance, no doubt, with A C D, vss. Ir., but it is a mechanical repetition from ver. 6. — Ver. 11. τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου] A B C D* (which has ἐφ’ ὀλής τῆς Αἰγ.) Ψ, 81, vss. have τὴν Αἰγύπτου. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. But how easily might ΘΝ be passed over after ΘΝ! and then the change ΑἰγύπτΟΝ became necessary. — Ver. 12. Instead of στα, στίς is to be received with Lachm. Tisch. Born. — in Αἰγύπτω] Lachm. Tisch. read εἰς Αἰγύπτου, following A B C E Ψ, 40. εἰς Αἰγ. is an explanatory supplement to ὄρα. — Ver. 14. After συγγέν. Elz. has αὐτοῦ, in opposition to witnesses of some importance (also Ψ), although it is defended by Born. A prevalent addition. — Ver. 15. δὲ] A C E Ψ, 15, 18, vss. have καὶ κατέβη, which Griesb. has recommended, Rinck preferred, and Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. D, 40, Syr. p. Cant. have no conjunction at all; so Born., but from the LXX. Deut. x. 22; καὶ κατέβη is to be preferred as best attested. — Ver. 16. ἧ] Elz. reads ἦ, against decisive testimony. Mistaking the attraction. — τοῦ Συκίμν] Lachm. reads τοῦ ἐν Σ., according to A E Ψ** min. Capt. Syr. p. Tol. B C Ψ min. Sahid. Arm. have merely ἐν Σ. An alteration, because this Συκίμν was apprehended, like the preceding, as the name of a town, and the parallel with Gen. xxiii. 19 was not recognized. — Ver. 17. ὁμολόγησεν] So Tisch. Lachm. But Elz. and Scholz have ὁμοδεν, against A B C Ψ, 36, and some vss. A more precisely defining gloss from the LXX. instead of which D E have ἐπηγεῖλατο (so Born.). — Ver. 18. After ἐτερος Lachm. has ἐτ’ Αἰγύπτου, according to A B C Ψ, min. and several vss. An exegetical addition from the LXX. — Ver. 20. After παρός Elz. has αὐτοῦ. See on ver. 14. — Ver. 21. ἐκτείνετας δὲ αὐτόν] Lachm. Born. read ἐκτείνετος δὲ αὐτῶν, according to A B C D Ψ min. A correction in point of style. — Ver. 22. πᾶσα σοφία] A C E Ψ, vss. Or. (twice) Bas. Theodoret have ἐν πᾶσα σοφ. So Tisch. D* has πᾶσα τὴν σοφίαν. So Born. Interpretations of the Reception, in favour of which is also the reading πᾶσας σοφίας in B, which is a copyist’s error. — ἐν before ἔργ. (Elz. Scholz) is as decidedly condemned by external testimonies as the αὐτοῦ after ἔργοις, omitted in Elz., is attested. — Ver. 26 συνήλασεν] B C D Ψ, min. and some vss. have συνῆλθασαν or συνῆλθασεν. Valck. has preferred the former, Griesb. recom-

1 How often στίς is exchanged in vss. with στις and αὐτον, may be seen in Fritscher, ad Hler. ill. 11; Heind. ad Plat. Phaed. p. 64 D; Krüger, ad Xen. Anab. vil. 1. 33.
mended the latter, and Lachm. Born. (comp. also Fritzsche, de conform. Lachm. p. 31) adopted it. Gloss on the margin for the explanation of the original συνηλασαν... εἰς εἰρήνην. On its reception into the text, the εἰς εἰρήνην, separated from συνηλασαν, by αὐτοῖς, was retained. — Ver. 27. ἐσ᾿ ἡμᾶς] A B C H Ν, min. Theophyl. have ἐσʾ ἡμῶν. So Tisch. and Lachm. From LXX. Ex. ii. 14. — Ver. 30. κυρίον] is to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch., following A B C W, Copt. Sahid. Vulg. A current addition to ἄγγελος generally, and here specially occasioned by the LXX. Ex. iii. 2. — Instead of φλογι πυρός, Tisch. has πυρὶ φλογός, after A C E, min. Syr. Vulg. The reading similarly varies in the LXX., and as the witnesses at our passage are divided, we cannot come to any decision. — Ver. 31. ἐδαύμαζεν] So Griesb. Scholz, Tisch. Born. But Elz. and Lachm. have ἐδαύμαζεν. Both have considerable attestation. But the suitableness of the relative imperfect was, as often elsewhere, not duly apprehended. — After κυρίον Elz. Scholz have πρὸς αὐτῶν, which, however, Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted, following A B W, min. Copt. Arm. Syr. p. An exegetical amplification, instead of which D, after καταν., continues by: ὁ κύριος εἰπεν αὐτῷ λέγων. — Ver. 32. Lachmann’s reading: ὁ θεὸς Ἀδραίῳ κ. Ἰσαὰκ κ. Ἰσαὰκ (so also Tisch.), has indeed considerable attestation, but it is an adaptation to iii. 13. — Ver. 33. εἰ σὰ] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐσʾ σὰ, which is to be preferred on account of preponderant attestation by A B C D** (D* has σὰ, so Born.) Ν; εἰ σὰ is from the LXX. — Ver. 34. ἀποστέλω] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἀποστέλλω, which is so decidedly attested by A B C D. Chrys., and by the transcriber’s error ἀποστὲλω in E and Ν, that it cannot be considered as an alteration after the LXX. Ex. iii. 10. The Recepta is a mistaken emendation. — Ver. 35. Instead of ἀποστέλλων, ἀποστέλλετο is to be read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to decisive evidence. — εἰ σειρὶ] Lachm. Tisch. Born., read σὺν σειρὶ, which is so decidedly attested, and might so easily give place to the current εἰ σειρὶ, that it must be preferred. — Ver. 36. γὰρ] Lachm. reads γάρ, according to B C, min. Sahid. Cant. A transcriber’s error. The originality of γὰρ is supported also by the Λιγύπτων (instead of Λιγύπτῳ) adopted by Elz. and Born. after D, which, however, has preponderating testimony against it. — Ver. 37. After θεὸς Elz. has ἐμῶν, against decisive testimony. κυρίος and αὐτῶν ἀνωτέρωθε are also to be rejected (Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted both), as important authorities are against them, and as their insertion after the LXX. and iii. 22 is more natural than their omission. — Ver. 39. ταῖς καρδ.] Lachm. reads εἰ ταῖς καρδ., according to A B C Ν. This is evidently an explanatory reading. On the other hand, τῇ καρδίᾳ (in H, min. and some vss. Chrys. Oec. Theoph.), preferred by Rinck and Tisch., would unhesitatingly be declared genuine, were it not that almost all the uncials and vss support the plural. — Ver. 43. ἄνω] is wanting in B D, min. vss. Or. Ir. Philast. Rightly erased by Lachm. and Tisch. From the LXX. — 'Ρεφαὶν] a great variety in the orthography. Lachm. and Tisch. have 'Ρεφαῖν, according to A C E. But Elz. Scholz have 'Ρεφαῖν; Born. 'Ρεφαῖν (D, Vulg. Ir.); B has 'Ροφαῖν; Ν, 'Ροφαῖν; Ν**, 'Ραφαῖν. — Ver. 44. The usual εἰ before ταῖς, which Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted (after A B C D** H Ν, min. Chrys. and some vss.), is an explanatory addition. — Ver. 46. θεῶ] B D H Ν, Cant. have οἶκος. Adopted by Lachm. and Born. But in accordance with ver. 48 it appeared contradictory to the idea of Stephen, to designate the temple as the dwelling of God; and hence the alteration. — Ver. 48. After χριστοῦ Elz. has ναοῖς, against A B C D E Ν, min. and most vss. An exegetical addition. Comp. xvii. 24. — Ver. 51. τῇ καρδίᾳ] Lachm. and Born. read καρδίας. But the
plural, which is found partly with and partly without the article in A C D E, min. and several vss. Chrys. Jer., was occasioned by the plural of the subject. B has ἐκπλήσιας, which, without being a transcriber’s error (in opposition to Butt. neust. Gr. p. 148 [E. T. 170]), may be either singular or plural, and therefore is of no weight for either reading. — Ver. 52. γεγραμμένος. The reading γέροντες in Lachm. Tisch. Born. is decidedly attested, and therefore to be adopted.

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

Vv. 2–53. On the speech of Stephen.²—This speech bears in its contents and tone the impress of its being original. For the long and somewhat prolix historical narrative, vv. 2–47, in which the rhetorical character remains so much in the background, and even the apologetic element is discernible throughout only indirectly, cannot—so peculiar and apparently even irrelevant to the situation of much of its contents³—be merely put into the mouth of Stephen, but must in its characteristic nature and course have come from his own mouth. If it were sketched after mere tradition or acquired information, or from a quite independent ideal point of view, then either the historical part would be placed in more direct relation to the points of the charge and brought into rhetorical relief, or the whole plan would shape itself otherwise in keeping with the question put in ver. 1; the striking power and boldness of speech, which only break forth in the smallest portion (vv. 48–53), would be more diffused over the whole, and the historical mistakes—which have nothing surprising in them in the case of a discourse delivered on the spur of the moment—would hardly occur.

—But how is the authentic reproduction of the discourse, which must in the main be assumed, to be explained? Certainly not by supposing that the whole was, either in its main points (Krause, Heinrichs) or even verbally (Kuinoel), taken down in the place of meeting by some person unknown.⁴ It is extremely arbitrary to carry back such shorthand-writing to the public life of those times. The most direct solution would no doubt be given, if we could assume notes of the speech made by the speaker himself, and preserved. But as this is not here to be thought of, in accordance with the whole spirit of the apostolic age and with vi. 12, it only remains as the

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

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

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

¹ Olshausen, e.g., refers to vl. 7; Luger and Baumgarten to the intervention of Saul.
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relation of the contents to the points of complaint contained in vi. 13, 14. Among the older interpreters—the most of whom, such as Augustine, Beza, and Calvin, have recourse to merely incidental references, without any attempt to enter into and grasp the unity of the speech—the opinion of Grotius is to be noted: that Stephen wished indirectly, in a historical way, to show that the favour of God is not bound to any place, and that the Jews had no advantage over those who were not Jews, in order thereby to justify his prediction concerning the destruction of the temple and the call of the Gentiles.\(^1\) But the very supposition, that the teaching of the call of the Gentiles was the one point of accusation against Stephen, is arbitrary; and the historical proofs adduced would have been very ill-chosen by him, seeing that in his review of history it is always this very Jewish people that appears as distinguished by God. The error, so often committed, of inserting between the lines the main thoughts as indirectly indicated, vitiates the opinion of Heinrichs, who makes Stephen give a defence of his conversion to Christ as the true Messiah expected by the fathers; as well as the view of Kuinoel, that Stephen wished to prove that the Mosaic ceremonial institutions, although they were divine, yet did not make a man acceptable to God; that, on the contrary, without a moral conversion of the people, the destruction of the temple was to be expected. Olshausen stands in a closer and more direct relation to the matter, when he holds that Stephen narrates the history of the O. T. so much at length, just to show the Jews that he believed in it, and thus to induce them, through their love for the national history, to listen with calm attention. The nature of the history itself fitted it to form a mirror to his hearers, and particularly to bring home to their minds the circumstance that the Jewish people, in all stages of their development and of the divine revelation, had resisted the Spirit of God, and that, consequently, it was not astonishing that they should now show themselves once more disobedient. Yet Olshausen himself does not profess to look upon this reference of the speech as “with definite purpose aimed at.” In a more exact and thorough manner, Baur, whom Zeller in substance follows, has laid down as the leading thought: “Great and extraordinary as were the benefits which God from the beginning imparted to the people, equally ungrateful in return and antagonistic to the divine designs was from the first the disposition of that people.”\(^2\) In this case, however, as Zeller thinks, there is brought into chief prominence the reference to the temple in respect to the charges raised, and that in such a way that the very building of the temple itself was meant to be presented as a proof of the perversity of the people,—a point of view which is foreign to Stephen, and arbitrarily forced on his words, as it would indeed in itself be unholy and impious.\(^3\) With reason, Luger, who yet goes too far in the references of details, Thiersch, Baumgarten, and F. Nitzsch have adhered to the historical standpoint given in vi. 13, 14, and kept strictly in view the apologetic aim of the speech;\(^4\) along with which, how-

\(^1\) Comp. Schneckenburger, p. 184, who considers the speech, as respects the chief object aimed at, as a preparation for xxviii. 25 ff.

\(^2\) Comp. already Bengel: “Vos autem sem-per mali fulsit,” etc.

\(^3\) 2 Sam. vii. 13; 1 Kings v. 5, vi. 12; 1 Chron. xviii. 12; comp. on vv. 49, 50.

\(^4\) Comp. also de Wette.
ever, Thiersch and Baumgarten not without manifold caprice exaggerate, in the histories brought forward by Stephen, the typical reference and allegorical application of them—by which they were to serve as a mirror to the present—as designed by him, as is also done in the Erlang. Zeitschr. 1859, p. 311 ff. Rauch is of opinion that the speech is directed against the meritoriousness of the temple-worship and of the works of the law, inasmuch as it lays stress, on the contrary, upon God's free and unmerited grace and election; a similar view was already held by Calvin; but to this there remains the decisive counter-argument, that the assumed point, the non-meritorious nature of grace and election, is not at all expressly brought out by Stephen or subjected to more special discussion. Moreover, Rauch starts from the supposition that the assertion of the witnesses in vi. 14 was true, inasmuch as Stephen had actually said what was adduced at vi. 14.—But if the assertion in vi. 14 is not adduced otherwise than as really false testimony, then it is also certain that the speaker must have the design of exposing the groundlessness of the charges brought against him, and the true reason for which he was persecuted. And the latter was to the martyr the chief point, so that his defence throughout does not keep the apologetic line, but has an offensive character; at first indirectly and calmly, and then directly and vehemently; the proof that the whole blame lay on the side of his judges was to him the chief point even for his own justification. Accordingly, the proper theme is to be found in vv. 51, 52, and the contents and course of the speech may be indicated somewhat as follows: I stand here accused and persecuted, not because I am a blasphemer of the law and of the temple, but in consequence of that spirit of resistance to God and His messengers, which you, according to the testimony of history, have received from your fathers and continue to exhibit. Thus, it is not my fault, but your fault. To carry out this

1 Thus, for example, according to Thiersch, even in the very command of God to Abraham to migrate, ver. 2 ff., there is assumed to be involved the application: "To us also, to whom God in Christ has appeared, there has been a command to go out from our kindred." In ver. 7, Stephen, it is affirmed, wishes to indicate: So will the race of oppressors, before whom he stood, end like Pharaoh and his host, and the liberated church will then celebrate its new independent worship. In the envy of Joseph's brethren, etc. (ver. 9 ff.), it is indicated that Christ also was from envy delivered up to the Gentiles, and for that God had destined Him to be a Saviour and King of the Gentiles. The famine (ver. 11) signifies the affliction and spiritual famine of the hostile Jews, who, however, would at length (ver. 13), after the conversion of the Gentiles, acknowledge Him whom they had rejected. Moses' birth at the period of the severest oppression, points to the birth of Christ at the period of the census. Moses' second appearance points to the (in the N. T. not elsewhere occurring) second appearance of Christ, which would have as its consequence the restoration of the Jews. Aaron is the type of the high priest in the judgment hall, etc.—According to Luger, the speech has the three main thoughts: (1) That the law is not a thing rounded off in itself, but something added to the promise, and bearing even in itself a new promise; (2) That the temple is not exclusively the holy place, but only stands in the rank of holy places, by which a perfecting of the temple is prefigured; (3) That from the rejection of Jesus no argument can be derived against him (Stephen), as, indeed, the ambassadors of God in all stages of revelation had been reviled. These three main thoughts are not treated one after the other, but one within the other, on the thread of sacred history; hence the form of repetition very often occurs in the recital (vv. 4, 5, 7, 12, 14, 18, 26, etc.).

2 See, against this, on vi. 18.

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

Very different judgments have been formed concerning the value of the speech, according as its relation to its apologetic task has been recognised and appreciated. Even Erasmus (ad ver. 51) gave it as his opinion, that there were many things in it "quae non sita multitum pertinere videtur ad id quod instituit." He, in saying so, points to the interruption after ver. 53. Recently Schwanbeck, p. 231, has scornfully condemned it as "a compendium of Jewish history forced into adaptation to a rhetorical purpose, replete with the most trifling controversies which Jewish scholasticism ever invented." Baur, on the other hand, has with justice acknowledged the aptness, strikingness, and profound pertinence of the discourse, as opposed to the hostile accusations,—a praise which, doubtless, is intended merely for the alleged later composer. Ewald correctly characterizes the speech as complete in its kind; and F. Nitzsch has thoroughly

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

2 Ver. 27 f., ver. 30 ff.

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

4 What Stephen would still have said or left unsaid, if he had spoken further, cannot be ascertained. But the speech is broken off; with ver. 53 he had just entered on a new stream of reproaches. And certainly he would still have added a prophetic threatening of punishment, as well as possibly, also, the summons to repentance.
and clearly done justice to its merits. It is peculiarly important as the only detailed speech which has been preserved from one not an apostle, and in this respect also it is a "documentum Spiritus pretiosum," Bengel (v).

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

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

1 Comp. the Latin Patres and the Hebrew דת in respectful address to kings, priests, prophets, and teachers; Lightfoot, ad Marc. p. 654.
2 Comp. ver. 55; Ex. xxiv. 16; Isa. vii. 3; Ps. xxiv. 7, xxix. 8; and on 1 Cor. ii. 8.
3 Herodian. iv. 13. 7; Ptol. v. 18; Strab. xvi. 1. p. 747.
5 [Epck. XI. 291 ff.
6 See Mannert, Geogr. V. 2, p. 290 ff.; Ritter, Ewald explains the many deviations in this speech from the ordinary Pentateuch, by the supposition that the speaker followed a later text-book, then much used in the schools of learning, which had contained such peculiarities. This is possible, but cannot be otherwise shown to be the case; nor can it be shown how the deviations came into the supposed text-book.
7 Comp. Neb. ix. 7; Philo, de Abr. II. pp. 11, 16, ed. Mang.; Joseph. Antt. i. 7. 1; see Kranuse, i. a. p. 11.
8 See Luger after Beza, Calvin, and others.
anticipation in Gen. xi. 31, according to which the vision contained in xii. 1 is supposed to have preceded the departure from Ur (א'); or, by what
professes to be a more profound entering into the meaning, to the arbitrary
assumption "that Abraham took an independent share in the transmigra-
tion of the children of Terah from Ur to Haran," to which primordial
hidden beginning of the call of Abraham the speaker goes back. — ἵνα ὁ
Moses] for the land of Ur* was situated in northern Mesopotamia, which
the Chaldeans inhabited; but is not to be identified with that Ur, which
Ammianus Marc. xxv. 8, mentions as castellum Persicum, whose situation
must be conceived as farther south than Haran.—πρὶν ἤ] see on Matt. i.
18. — ἵνα οὐ δεῖξῃ] quamcunque tibi monstravero. "Non norat Abram,
quae terra foret," Heb. xi. 8, Bengel.

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

1 Baumgarten, p. 134.
2 Deut. vii. 9, Gen. xi. 28.
3 See, after Tuch and Knobel on Genesis, Arnold in Herzog’s Enzykl. XVI. p. 735.
5 That the narrative of the death of Terah, Gen. I.c., would indicate that for the com-
 mencement of the new relation of God to men Abraham alone, and not in connection with
 his father, comes into account. Thus cer-
 tainly all tallies.
6 Natively enough, Knatchbull, p. 47, was of opinion that, if this alteration of the Hebrew
brew text could not be admitted, it was better "cum Scaligero nodum hunc solvendum re-
linquere, dum Elias venerit." According to Beelen in loc., Abraham need not have been
the first-born of Terah, in spite of Gen. xi. 26, 37.
7 De concil. Monti et Steph. circa canses
Abr., Viteb. 1710.
* Michaelis, Kranse, Kuinoel, Lugner, Olshausen.
* Lightf. in loc.; Michael. de chronol. Mos.
post diluv. sec. 15.
at least, was intended to protect the patriarch from the suspicion of 
violating his filial duty!—which opinion Michaelis incorrectly ascribes also 
to Philo. According to this view, ἀποθανεῖν would have to be understood 
spiritually, which the context does not in the least degree warrant, and 
which no one would hit upon, if it were not considered a necessity that no 
deviation from Genesis l.c. should be admitted. — μετάφικαν] namely, God. 
Rapid change of the subject; comp. on vi. 6. — εἰς ἡν υμεῖς 
viv katou.] i.e. 
into which ye having moved now dwell in it. A well-known brachylogy by 
combining the conception of motion with that of rest.¹ The εἰς ἡν calls 
to mind the immigration of the nation (which is represented by υμεῖς) from 
Egypt.

Ver. 5. Κληρονομία, πατριαρχία, hereditary possession. Heb. xi. 8. — βῆμα τοῦδε.]² 
Καὶ is the copula. He gave not . . . and promised, the former he omitted, 
and the latter he did.—καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ] καὶ is the simple and, not 
namely (see Gen. l.c.). The promise primarily concerned Abraham as the 
participant father of the race himself. Comp. Luke i. 71.—This verse, 
too, stands apparently at variance with Genesis, where, in chap. xxiii., we 
are informed that Abraham purchased a field from the sons of Heth. But 
only apparently. For the remark οὖν ἐδώκεν αὐτῷ . . . τοῦδε refers only to 
the first period of Abraham’s residence in Palestine’ before the institution 
of circumcision (ver. 8), while that purchase of a field falls much later. It 
was therefore quite superfluous, either ³ to emphasize the fact that Abraham 
had not in fact acquired that field by divine direction, but had purchased 
it, or ⁴ to have recourse to the erroneous assumption, not to be justified 
either by John vii. 8 or by Mark xi. 13, that οὖν stands for ὑπέρ.

Vv. 6, 7. By the continuative δὲ there is now brought in the express 
declaration of God, which was given on occasion of this promise to Abraham 
concerning the future providential guidance destined for his posterity. 
But God, at that time, spoke thus: “that his seed will dwell as strangers in a 
foreign land,” etc. The δὲ does not depend on ἐκλαλ., nor is it the recitative, 
but it is a constituent part of the very saying adduced.⁵ This is Gen. xv. 13, 
but with the second person (thy seed) converted into the third, and also 
otherwise deviating from the LXX.; in fact, καὶ λατρ. μοι εἰν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτῳ 
is entirely wanting in the LXX. and Hebrew, and is an expansion suggested 
by Ex. iii. 12,—ἐστι τοῦτοι πάροικοι] την ἡ. Comp. on Luke xxiv. 18; Eph. ii. 
19.—δούλωσονσ.ν αὐτό] namely, the ἀλλήλων. —τετρακώσια] Here, as in an 
oracle, the duration is given, as also at Gen. l.c., in round numbers; but in 
Ex. xii. 40 this period of Egyptian sojourning and bondage ⁶ is historically 
specified exactly as 430 years (c’). In Gal. iii. 17 (see in loc.), Paul has 
inappropriately referred the chronological statement of Ex. xii. 40 to the 
space of time from the promise made to Abraham down to the giving of

¹ With Drusius, Schoetgen, Bengel. 
² With Kalmeol and Olshausen. 
³ LXX. Deut. ii. 5 (ἥτις—ἡ), spatium, quod 
planitas pedis calcatur. Comp. on βῆμα in the 
sense of vestigium, Hom. H. Merc. 222, 945. 
⁴ With Drusius, Schoetgen, Bengel. 
⁵ LXX.: γεγονόκεν γεγογην ὃτι πάροικον κ.τ.λ. 
⁶ ἔτη τετρακ. belongs to the whole ἐστιν 
... κακίσχουσιν.
the law. — Ver. 7. As in the LXX. and in the original Heb. the whole passage vv. 6, 7 is expressed in direct address (τὸ στέπαμα σου), while Stephen in ver. 6 has adduced it in the indirect form; so he now, passing over to the direct expression, inserts the εἰς κύριον τὸν σωτῆρα, which is not in the LXX. nor in the Heb. — And, after this 400 years' bondage, the people . . . I shall judge; εἰς τὸν κύριον τὸν σωτῆρα, of judicial retribution, which, as frequently in the N. T., is seen from the context to be punitive. — ἔγω] has the weight of the authority of divine absoluteness. Comp. Rom. xii. 19. — εἰς τὸν κύριον τὸν σωτῆρα, namely, where I now speak with thee (in Canaan). There is no reference to Horeb, as we have here only a freely altered echo of the promise made to Moses, which suggested itself to Stephen, in order to denote more definitely the promise made to Abraham. Arbitrary suggestions are made by Bengel and Baumgarten, who find an indication of the long distance of time and the intervening complications. Stephen, however, here makes no erroneous reference (de Wette), but only a free application, such as easily presented itself in an extemporaneous speech.

Ver. 8. Διαβροχαὶ πεντετέρων] a covenant completed by means of circumcision. Abraham was bound to the introduction of circumcision; and, on the other hand, God bound Himself to make him the father of many nations. — ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ τὰς ἔννοιας αὐτοῦ, namely, έννοιαν κ. περίτρ. τ. ἡμ. τ. ὧν. δὲ. Vv. 9-13. Ζηλοδαινείς] here of envious jealousy, as often also in classical writers. Certainly Stephen in this mention has already in view the similar malicious disposition of his judges towards Jesus, so that in the ill-used Joseph, as afterwards also in the despised Moses, both of whom yet became deliverers of the people, he sees historical types of Christ. — ἐπεισόδος εἰς Αἴγι.] they gave him away to Egypt. For analogous examples to ἐπεισόδος, see Elsner, p. 390.—The following clauses, rising higher and higher with simple solemnity, are linked on by καί. — χάριν κ. σοφίαν] It is simplest to explain χάριν of the divine bestowal of grace, and to refer ἐννοιαν θαρ. merely to σοφίαν: He gave him grace, generally, and in particular, wisdom before Pharaoh, namely, according to the history which is presumed to be well known, in the interpretation of dreams as well as for other counsel. — ἄνθρωπον] "vice regis cuncta regentem," Gen. xlii. 48, Grotius. — κ. ὡς τ. δια. αὐτ.] as high steward. — χορτάσματα] fodder for their cattle. So throughout with Greek writers. A scarcity of fodder, to which especially belongs the want of cereal fodder, is the most urgent difficulty, in a failure of crops, for the possessors of large herds of cattle. — ὄρα αἰεία that there was corn. The question, Where? finds its answer from the context and the familiar history. The following εἰς Αἴγυπτον (see critical remarks) belongs to εἰς παστοσ., and is, from its epoch-making significance, emphatically placed first. On

---

1 Ex. iii. 12: εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα, τούτων.  
2 Gen. xxiv. 10. Comp. on Rom. iv. 11.  
3 Comp. on Eph. v. 33.  
4 By saš, comp. v. 8; Gen. xlv. 4, LXX.  
5 Comp. Gen. xxxix. 21.  
6 And comp. LXX. Gen. xxiv. 25, 33, xili.  
7 Judg. xix. 19; Ecclus. xxxiii. 29, xxviii. 20.
absolute, to learn, with the predicative participle, see Winer; frequent also in Greek writers.—ἀνεγνωρισθην he was recognised by his brethren, to be taken passively, as also Gen. xlv. 1, when the LXX. thus translates Πνεύμαντο τὸ γένος του Ἰσραήλ the name is significantly repeated; a certain sense of patriotic pride is implied in it.

Vv. 14, 15. Ἐν ψ. ἔβδομη πέντε] in 75 souls, persons, he called his father and, in general, the whole family, i.e. he called them in a personal number of 75, which was the sum containing them. The expression is a Hebraism (3), after the LXX. Deut. x. 22. In the number Stephen, however, follows the LXX. Gen. xlv. 27, Ex. i. 5, where likewise 75 souls are specified, whereas the original text, which Josephus follows, reckons only 70. aυτὸς κ. οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν] he and our patriarchs, generally. A very common epanorthosis. See on John ii. 12.

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

---

1 p. 295 (E. T. 436).
3 Instead of the simple αὐτός, as A E. 40. Arm. Vulg. read.
4 Bornem. ad Xen. Symp. 7. 84; Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 7. 11.
5 ii. 41, xxvii. 37.
6 At Deut. i.e. also Codex A has the reading 75, which is, however, evidently a mere alteration by a later hand in accordance with the two other passages. Already Philo (see Loesner, p. 185) mentions the two discrepant statements of number (75 according to Gen. i.e. and Ex. i.e., and 70 according to Deut. i.e.) and allegorizes upon them.
7 Antt. ii. 7, 4, vi. 5, 6.
8 According to the Hebrew, the number 70 is thus made up: all the descendants of Jacob who came down with him to Egypt are fixed at 66, Gen. xlv. 26, and then, ver. 27, Joseph and his two sons and Jacob himself (that is, four persons more) are included. In the reckoning of the LXX., influenced by a discrepant tradition, there are added to those 66 persons (ver. 26) in ver. 27 (contrary to the original text), victi de Ισραήλ οἱ ἔννομοι αὐτῆς ἐν γῇ Αἰγυπτῷ ψυχαὶ ἐστίν, so that 75 persons are made out. It is thus evidently contrary to this express mode of reckoning of the LXX., when it is commonly assumed (also by Wetzstein, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Olshausen) that the LXX. had added to the 70 persons of the original text 5 grandchildren and great-grandchildren of Joseph (who are named in the LXX. Gen. xlv. 20). But in the greatest contradiction to the above notice of the LXX. stands the view of Seb. Schmid, with whom Wolf agrees, that the LXX. had added to the 66 persons (ver. 26) the wives of the sons of Jacob, and from the sum of 78 thereby made up had again deducted 3 persons, namely, the wife of Judah who had died in Canaan, the wife of Joseph and Joseph himself, so that the number 75 is left. Entirely unhistorical is the hypothesis of Krebs and Loesner: "Stephanum apud Luc. (et LXX.) de ilia loqui, qui in Aegyptum initiatu fuerint, Mosen de his, qui co venerint, quorum non nisi 70 fuerunt." Besa conjectured, instead of πέρατε in our passage: περιτε (1); and Mas- sonius, instead of the numeral signs ΟΕ (75), the numeral signs ΣΗ (66). For yet other views, see Wolf.
9 See also Hackett.
11 Josh. xxiv. 33, comp. Gen. i. 35.
self, in unconscious deviation, as respects the latter, from Gen. xlix. 30 (D). Perhaps the Rabbinical tradition, that all the brethren of Joseph were also buried at Sychem, was even then current, and thus more easily suggested to Stephen the error with respect to Jacob. It is, however, certain that Stephen has not followed an account deviating from this, which transfers the burial of all the patriarchs to Hebron, although no special motive can be pointed out in the matter; and it is entirely arbitrary, with Kuinoel, to assume that he had wished thereby to convey the idea that the Samaritans, to whom, in his time, Sychem belonged, could not, as the possessors of the graves of the patriarchs, have been rejected by God. — ῥωθαρτο Ἀβραὰμ, formerly, Abraham bought. But according to Gen. xxxiii. 19, it was not Abraham, but Jacob, who purchased a piece of land from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem. On the other hand, Abraham purchased from Ephron the field and burial-cave at Hebron (Gen. xxiii.). Consequently, Stephen has here evidently fallen into a mistake, and asserted of Abraham what historically applied to Jacob, being led into error by the fact that something similar was recorded of Abraham. If expositors had candidly admitted the mistake so easily possible in the hurry of the moment, they would have been relieved from all strange and forced expedients of an exegetical and critical nature, and would neither have assumed a purchase not mentioned at all in the O. T., nor, a combining of two purchases, and two burials; nor, against all external and internal critical evidence, have asserted the obnoxious Ἀβραὰμ to be spurious, either supplying ἴαος as the subject to ῥωθαρτο, or taking ῥωθαρτο as impersonal; nor would Ἀβραὰμ, with unprecedented arbitrariness, have been explained as used in a patronymic sense for Abrahamides, i.e. Jacobus. Conjectural emendations are: ἴαος, ὁ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ[. Other forced attempts at reconciliation may be seen in Grotius and Calovius. — τοῦ Συχεῦ] the father of Sychem. The relationship is presupposed as well known. — ῥωθαρτο[ is later Greek. — τοῦ ἡρῴα ἡρώης] the genitive of price: for a purchase-money consisting of silver. The LXX. (Gen. xxxiii. 19) has ἵκατον ἕμνων, for which Stephen has adopted a general expression, because the precise one was probably not present to his recollection.

1 Lightf. and Wetst. in loc.
2 Joseph. Antt. ii. 8. 2.
3 Plut., Bengel, comp. Lenger.
4 Gen. xxiii., xxxiii.
5 Gen. l.; Josh. xxiv.
7 Comp. Calvin.
8 Basel, Bochart.
9 Quod suntam erant, Kuinoel.
10 Gies, Passol, Surenhusius, Krebs.
11 Clericus.
12 Cappellus.
13 Not the son of Sychem, as the Vulgate, Erasmus, Castello, and others have it. See Gen. xxxiii. 19. Lachmann reads τοῦ ἵς, in accord doubtless with important witnesses, of which several have only ἵς, but evidently an alteration arising from the opinion that Συχεῦ was the city. The circumstance that in no other passage of the N.T. the genitive of relationship is to be explained by ψάρπας, must be regarded as purely accidental. Entirely similar are the passages where with female name ψάρπας is to be supplied, as Luke xxiv. 10. See generally, Winer, p. 178 f. (E. T. 287). If ἴαος were to be supplied, this would yield a fresh historical error; and not that quite another Hamor is meant than at Gen. l.c. (in opposition to Beelen).
14 Lobec, ad Phryn. p. 187 f.
15 Probably the name of a coin, see Bochart, Hieros. I. p. 473 f.; Gesenius, Theol. Int. p. 1841, s.v. θεοτοκία.
Vv. 17, 18. Καθὼς is not, as is commonly assumed, with an appeal to the critically corrupt passage 2 Macc. i. 31, to be taken as a particle of time cum, but as quernadmodum. In proportion as the time of the promise, the time destined for its realization, drew nigh, the people grew, etc. — ἡ ὑμολογία, κ.τ.λ. which God promised (ver. 7). ὑμολογία, often so used in Greek writers; comp. Matt. xiv. 7. — ἀνίστησι βασιλείας ἐπερχόμεθα τῆς βασιλείας ἵνα ἀλλοι ἄλλου ἀτομοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, as Joseph. Antt. ii. 9. 1. — δός εἰκόνι τινος τοῦ Ἰωάνη ταῖς κατακαμήκτισιν, theo knew not Joseph, his history and his services to the country. This might be said both in Ex. i. 8 and here with truth; because, in all the transactions of Pharaoh with Moses and the Israelites, there is nothing which would lead us to conclude that the king knew Joseph. Erroineously Erasmus and others, including Krause, hold that oūδα and ἐντο here signify to love; and Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Hackett render: who did not regard the merits of Joseph. In 1 Thess. v. 12, also, it means simply to know, to understand.

Ver. 19. Κατασφοβίζομαι] to employ cunning against any one, to beguile, LXX. Ex. i. 10. Only here in the N. T. — τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκτενα τὰ βρέφη αὐτῶν] a construction purely indicative of design; comp. on iii. 12. But it cannot belong to κατασφοβίζομαι, but only to ἔκτενα. Comp. 1 Kings xvii. 20. He maltreated them, in order that they should expose their children (κινέσθαι), i.e. to force upon them the exposure of their children. — εἰς τὸ μῆν νῦν.] ne vivi conservaretur, the object of ποιεῖν ἔκτενα τ. βρ. αὐτ. —

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

Vv. 21, 22. 'Εκτεθ. δὲ αὐτῶν, ἀνειλ. αὐτῶν] Repetition of the pronoun as in Matt. xxvi. 71; Mark ix. 28; Matt. viii. 11. — ἀνειλασθεῖσα] took him up (sustulit, Vulg.). So also often among Greek writers, of exposed children; see Wetstein. — κατ᾽ αὐτῷ] in contrast to his own mother. — εἰς νῦν] Ex. ii. 10, for a son, so that he became a son to herself. So also in classical Greek with

1 Comp. also Grimm on 2 Macc. i. 31.
2 The previous dynasty was that of the Hyksos; the new king was Αἴμας, who expelled the Hyksos. See Knobel on Ex. i. 8.
3 But see Kypke, P. p. 37; and from Philo, Loesener, p. 186. Αἰορθίν, participle, as in L. 94.
4 So Fritzsche, ad Matt. p. 846.
5 On τοῦ εἰδέσθαι = εἰκόνια, comp. τοῦ εἰδότων = εἰδέσθαι. Herod. iii. 1; on εἰδότος, Eur. Andr. 70.
6 Comp. LXX. Ex. i. 17; Luke xvii. 33. See on 2 Cor. viii. 6; Rom. i. 90.
7 Comp. Judith xi. 28.
8 Comp. Winer, p. 382 (E. T. 810).
9 See also 9 Cor. x. 4. Heald, "Eag. 885: ἀνέιλασθαι ἀνειλασθεῖσα, and Aesch. Agam. 352: θεός ἀνειλασθεῖσας, are parallel; as are from the O. T., Gen. x. 9, Jonah iii. 3.
10 Ex. ii. 2; comp. Heb. xi. 33. [p. 377.
11 See on Matt. viii. 1, Fritzsche, ad Marc.
verbs of development. — πάσης σοφία Αιγ.] Instrumental dativae. The notice itself is not from the O. T., but from tradition, which certainly was, from the circumstances in which Moses was placed, true. The wisdom of the Egyptians extended mainly to natural science, with magic, astronomy, medicine, and mathematics; and the possessors of this wisdom were chiefly the priestly caste, which also represented political wisdom. — δυνατὸς εἰν λόγ. ἐν ἑργ.] see on Luke xxiv. 19. εἰν ἑργ. refers not only to his miraculous activity, but generally to the whole of his abundant labours. With ὅσι εἰν λόγος, Ex. iv. 10 appears at variance; but Moses in that passage does not describe himself as a stammerer, but only as one whose address was unskillful, and whose utterance was clumsy. But even an address not naturally fluent may, with the accession of a higher endowment, be converted into eloquence, and become highly effective through the Divine Spirit, by which it is sustained, as was afterwards the historically well-known case with the addresses of Moses. Thus, even before his public emergence, for to this time the text refers, a higher power of speech may have formed itself in him. Hence δύο εἰν λόγ. is neither to be referred, with Krause, to the writings of Moses, nor to be regarded, with Heinrichs, as a once-current general eulogium; nor is it to be said, with de Wette, that admiration for the celebrated lawgiver had caused it to be forgotten that he made use of his brother Aaron as his spokesman.

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

Vv. 24, 25. See Ex. ii. 11, 12. — ἀνομισθαν] to be unjustly treated. Error-neously Kuinoel holds that it here signifies verberari. That was the maltreatment. — ἡμιναρ] he exercised retaliation. Only here in the N. T., often in classic Greek. Similarly ἀνεθεσθαν.] — κ. ἐποίησ. ἐκδικ.] and procured revenge (Judg. xi. 36). He became his ἐκδικος, vindex. — τῷ καταπληθοῦν.] for him who was on the point of being overcome, present participle. — παράζει] mode of the ἡμιναρ κ. ἐποίησ. κ.τ.λ. Wolf aptly says: “Percussionem vio-

---

1 Bernhardy, p. 318 f.
2 Philo, Vit. Mose.
3 Ian. xix. 13.
4 Comp. Justin. xxxvi. 2.
5 Comp. Joseph. Ant. iii. 1, 4: κλέφθει διαλογισμός
6 Comp. Luke xxii. 15.
7 Comp. Joseph. Ant. ii. 12, 2. 
8 Ben. f. 115, 3; Soh. Rabb. f. 118, 3.

See Lightfoot in loc. Bengal says: “Mosis vita ter 40 annis, vv. 30, 36.”
9 Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 9.
10 “Potest aliquid esse in profundo animae, quod postea emergit et in cor... ascendit,” Bengal.
11 See Poppe, ad Thuc. i. 42; Herm. ad Soph. Ant. 689. [xvi. 6, xiii. 56.
12 Comp. Polyb. xxi. 11, 11, xi, 7, 3; Diod.
lentam causa factam hic innui indubium est." Comp. Matt. xxvi. 31, and see ver. 28. — The inaccuracy, that τὸν Διάβολον has no definite reference in the words that precede it, but only an indirect indication 1 in ἀδικομένον, which presupposes a maltrator, is explained from the circumstances of the event being so universally known.— Ver. 25. But he thought that his brethren would observe that God by his hand (intervention) was giving them deliverance. — διδον] the giving is conceived as even now beginning; the first step toward effecting the liberation from bondage had already taken place by the killing of the Egyptian, which was to be to them the signal of deliverance.

Vv. 26, 27 f. See Ex. ii. 18 f. — ἄφθον] he showed himself to them,—when, namely, he arrived among them "rursus invisorus suos." Well does Bengel find in the expression the reference ultero, ex improviso. 2 — aliqua] refers back to ἀδικομένος. It is presumed in this case as well known, that there were two who strove. — συνήλασεν αὐτῷ. εἰς εἰπ.] he drove them together, by representations, to (eis, denoting the end aimed at) peace. 3 The aorist does not stand de conatu, 4 but the act actually took place on Moses' part; the fact that it was resisted on the part of those who strove, alters not the action. Grotius, moreover, correctly remarks: "vox quasi visum significans agentis instantiam significat." — οἱ ἄδικοι τῷ πλησίον] but he who treated his neighbour, one by nationality his brother, unjustly, was still in the act of maltrating him. — ἀπέστησεν thrust him from him. On κατέστησαν, has appointed, comp. Bremi, ad Dem. Ol. p. 171; and on αὐστησός, who judges according to the laws, as distinguished from the more general κριτής, Wytenbach, Ep. crit. p. 219. — μὴ ἀνελείν κ.τ.λ. thou wilt not surely despatch (ii. 28, v. 33) me? To the pertinence of the question belongs also the στ.

Vv. 29, 30. See Ex. ii. 15–22, iii. 2. — εἰν τῇ λόγῳ τόσῳ. on account of this word, denoting the reason which occasioned his flight. 4 — Μαδαμ] Ἡρ, a district in Arabia Petraea. Thus Moses had to withdraw from his obstinate people; but how wonderfully active did the divine guidance show itself anew, ver. 30! On πάροικος, comp. ver. 6. — καὶ πλησίον. ἐπὶ τῶν τεσσαράκτων] traditionally, but comp. also Ex. vii. 7: "Moses in palatio Pharsonis degit XL annos, in Mediane XL annos, et ministravit Israel annos XL." 5 — εἰν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὀρ. Σ.] in the desert, in which Mount Sinai is situated, Ἕρ τῆς Ἑρ, Ex. xix. 1, 2; Lev. vii. 28. From the rocky and mountainous base of this desert Sinai rises to the south (and the highest), and Horeb more to the north, both as peaks of the same mountain ridge. Hence there is no contradiction when, in Ex. iii., the appearance of the burning bush is transferred to the neighbourhood of Horeb, as generally in the Pentateuch the names Sinai and Horeb are interchanged for the locality of the giving of the law, except in Deut. xxxiii. 2, where only Horeb is mentioned, as also in Mal. iv. 4; whereas in the N. T. and in Josephus only Sinai is named. The latter name specially denotes the locality of the giving of the law, while

1 Winer, p. 587 (E. T. 786).
2 Eranus. Comp. 1 Kings iii. 16.
3 Comp. ii. 3, vii. 2, ix. 17, al.; Heb. ix. 28.
4 The opposite: ἐρήμῳ ἐγκαταστάσεως, Hom. Il.

xx. 194.

* Grothius, Wolf, Kuinoel.
* Winer, p. 393 (E. T. 484).
* Berthe. Rabl. f. 115. 8.
Horeb was also the name of the entire mountain range. — ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάρων in the flame of fire of a thorn bush. Stephen designates the phenomenon quite as it is related in Exodus, i.e., as a flaming burning bush, in which an angel of God was present, in which case every attempt to explain away the miraculous theophany, a meteor, lightning, must be avoided.  

Vv. 31–33. See Ex. iii. 3–5. — τὸ δραμα[τ]ο[σ]τ[α]κ[τ]ο[ν] spectaculum. See on Matt. xvii. 9. — κατανοέω to contemplate, Luke xii. 24, 27; Acts xi. 6. — φωνὴ κυρίου as the angel represents Jehovah Himself, so is he identified with Him. When the angel of the Lord speaks, that is the voice of God, as it is His representative servant, the angel, who speaks. To understand, with Chrysostom, Calovius, and others, the angelus increatus — i.e. Christ as the λόγος — as meant, is consequentially unnecessary, and also not in keeping with the anarthrous ἄγγελος, which Hengstenberg wrongly denies (p. 1). Comp. xii. 7, 23. — λισσοῦ τὸ ὑπόθεμα τῶν πολ. σων.] The holiness of the presence of God required, as it was in keeping generally with the religious feeling of the East, that he who held intercourse with Jehovah should be barefooted, lest the sandals charged with dust should pollute (Josh. v. 15) the holy ground (γῆ ὅια); hence also the priests in the temple waited on their service with bare feet. 

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

Vv. 35–37. The recurring τοῦτον is emphatic: this and none other.  
Also in the following vv. 36, 37, 38, ὦτος . . . ὦτος . . . ὦτος are always emphatically prefixed. — ἐν ἐρημωσωτ[ο]ρ[α] το[ς] τομα[ς] that time, ver. 27, denied, namely, as ἀρχηγον καὶ δικαστὴν. The plural is purposely chosen, because there is meant the whole category of those thinking alike with that one (ver. 27). This one is conceived collectively. — ἀρχ. κ. λιτωρ[[ω]]ν[τ][η]ν observe the climax introduced by λιτωρ[ω]ν, in relation to the preceding δικαστ. It is introduced because the obstinacy of the people against Moses is type of the antagonism to Christ and His work (ver. 51); consequently, Moses in his work of deliverance is a type of Christ, who has effected the λεπτομέρεια of the people in the highest sense. — According to the reading σὺν χειρί (see the critical remarks), the meaning is to be taken as: standing in association with the

---

1 See the particulars in Knobel on Ex. xix. 2. 
2 On ἄκρον νηρὸς, comp. 2 Thes. i. 8, Lachmann; Heb. i. 7; Rev. i. 14, ii. 18, xix. 19; Isa. xxix. 5, lv. 15; Psal. xxv. iv. 400. 
3 Christol. III. 2, p. 70. 
4 Even in the present day the Arabs, as is well known, enter their mosques barefooted. The precept of Pythagoras, ἀνακοκκορὸς τῶν καλῶν σποράων, was derived from an Egyptian custom. Jamblich. Phit. Pyth. 29. The Samaritan truth barefooted the holiest place on Gerizim, Robinson, III. p. 283. [789 ff. 
5 See Wetstein; also Carpzov. Appar. p. 
7 See on 1 Cor. ii. 1; Lobeck, Calvin. p. 532. ἰδὼν εἰδον is found in Lucian, Dial. Mar. iv. 2. 
8 Isa. lxvi. 1; Matt. v. 34. Comp. Gen. xi. 7, xviii. 21; Ps. cxliv. 5. 
9 See Ewald. ad Eur. Bacch. 341, Mod. 1842. 
10 See Bornemann in the Stich. Stud. 1842, p. 66. 
12 Luke i. 64, ii. 38; Heb. ix. 12; Tilt. ii. 14.
hand, i.e. with the protecting and helping power, of the angel. Comp. the classical expression σών θεοίς. This power of the angel was that of God Himself (ver. 34), in virtue of which he wrought also the miracles, ver. 36. — As to the gender of βαπτός, see on Mark xii. 26. — After the work of Moses (ver. 38), ver. 37 now brings into prominence his great Messianic prophecy, which designates himself as a type of the Messiah;1 whereupon in ver. 38 his exalted position as the receiver and giver of the law is described, in order that this light, in which he stands, may be followed up in ver. 39 by the shadow—the contrast of disobedience towards him.

Ver. 38. This is he who . . . had intercourse with the angel . . . and our fathers, was the mediator (Gal. iii. 19) between the two. — ἐν τῷ Ἰς κλωνῳ ἐν τῷ ἱππῳ in the assembly of the people, held for the promulgation of the law, in the desert, Ex. xix. This definite reference is warranted by the context, as it is just the special act of the giving of the law that is spoken of. — λόγων [κώρων] i.e. utterances which are not dead, and so ineffectual, but living, in which, as in the self-revelations of the living God, there is effective power (John vi. 51), as well with reference to their influence on the moulding of the moral life according to God's will, as also especially with reference to the fulfilment of the promises and threatenings thereto annexed.2 Incorrectly Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Kuinoel, and others hold that ζην stands for ζωοειν. Even according to Paul, the law in itself is holy, just, good, spiritual, and given for life (Rom. vii. 12, 14); that it nevertheless kills, arises from the abuse which the power of sin makes of it,3 and is therefore an accidental relation.

Vv. 39, 40. They turned with their hearts to Egypt, i.e. they directed their desires again to the mode of life pursued in Egypt, particularly, as is evident from the context (ver. 40), to the Egyptian idolatry. Ex. xx. 7, 8, 24. Others, including Cornelius a Lapide, Morus, Rosenmiller: they wished to return back to Egypt. But the ως προσπερισσαναι ἡμῶν in ver. 40 would then have to be taken as: "who shall go before us on our return,"—which is just as much at variance with the historical position at Ex. xxxii. 1 as with Ex. xxxii. 4, 1 Kings xii. 28, and Neh. ix. 18, where the golden bull appears as a symbol of the God who has led the Israelites out of Egypt. — θεοίς] the plural, after Ex. xxxii. 1, denotes the category,4 without reference to the numerical relation. That Aaron made only one idol was the result of the universally expressed demand; and in accord with this universal demand is also the expression in Ex. xxxii. 4. — ως προσπερ. borne before our line of march, as the symbols, to be revered by us, of the present Jehovah. — δὲ γάρ. M. οὔτως] γάρ gives the motive of the demand. Moses, hitherto our leader, has in fact disappeared, so that we need another guidance representative of God. — οὔτως] spoken contumely.5 — The nominative absolute is designedly chosen, in order to concentrate the whole

1 Dent. xviii. 15 (comp. above, lil. 22).
2 On προσαμετονόμασε, see Horaei, which is no Hebrew, comp. ix. 19, xx. 18; Mark xvi. 10; Ast. Lex. Pat. I. p. 384.
3 Comp. 1 Pet. i. 23; Heb. v. 12; Dent. xxxii. 47.
4 Rom. vii. 1, 13 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 53.
5 See on Matt. ii. 80.
6 See on v. 14.
attention on the conception. For this Moses ... we know not what has happened to him, since he returns not from the mount.

Ver. 41. ‘Εμοιητιστσαν] they made a bull, Ex. xxxii. 4 : ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ μυσχὸν χόνευτον. The word does not elsewhere occur, except in the Fathers, and may have belonged to the colloquial language. The idol itself was an imitation of the very ancient and widely-spread bull-worship in Egypt, which had impressed itself in different forms, e.g. in the worship of Aapis at Memphis, and of Μειρισ at Heliopolis. Hence μυσχὸς is not a calf, but an equivalent to ταύρος, a young bull already full-grown, but not yet put into the yoke. — Examples of ἀνάγεται — namely, to the altar, 1 Kings iii. 15 — θυσίαν may be seen in Elsner, p. 398, and from Philo in Loesner, p. 189. — εὐφραίνων] they rejoiced in the works of their hands. By the interpretation: “they held sacrificial feasts” (Kuinoel), the well-known history (Ex. xxxii. 6), to which the meaning of the words points, is confounded with that meaning itself. — ἵγοι] plural of the category, which presented itself in the golden calf. On εὐφραίν. ἔν, to denote that on which the joy is causally based, compare χαίρειν ἔν, Luke x. 20; see on Phil. i. 18.

Ver. 49. ἐστρέψει δὲ θεός but God turned,—a figurative representation of the idea: He became unfavourable to them. The active in a neuter sense; there is nothing to be supplied. Incorrectly Vitringa, Morus, and others hold that ἐστρέψει connected with παρέδω, denotes, after the Hebrew בֵּית,ῦרԵ syslog tradi-
dit. This usage has not passed over to the N. T., and, moreover, it is not vouched for historically that the Israelites at an earlier period practised star-worship. Heinrichs connects ἐστρ. with αἱρέως: “convertit animos eorum ab una idololatria ad aliam.” But the expression of divine disfavour is to be retained on account of the correlation with ver. 39. — καὶ παρέδω. αἱρέως λατρ. and gave them up to serve, an explanatory infinitive. The falling away into star-worship, ἄστρα. τ. εὐφραίων = ἀστρατος, in which, from the worshipper’s point of view, the sun, moon, and stars are conceived as living beings, is apprehended as wrought by an angry God by way of punishment for that bull-worship, according to the idea of sin being punished by sin. The assertion, often repeated since the time of Chrysostom and Theophylact, that only the divine permission or the withdrawal of grace is here denoted, is at variance with the positive expression and the true biblical conception of the divine retribution. Self-surrender (Eph. iv. 19) is the correlative moral factor on the part of man. — μὴ σφαγα κ.τ.λ. ] Amos v. 25—27, freely after the LXX. Ye have not surely presented unto me sacrifices and offerings, offerings of any kind, for forty years in the wilderness? The question supposes a negative answer; therefore without an interrogation the meaning is: Ye cannot maintain that ye have offered ... to me. The apparent contradiction with the accounts of offerings, which were actually presented to Jehovah in the desert, disappears when the pro-

2 Comp. Heb. ix. 12, 13, 19; Herod. ii. 28.
3 Ecclus. xiv. 5, xxxix. 31, li. 29; Xen. Hier. i. 15.
4 1 Macc. ii. 63; Acts v. 22, xv. 16; Kühner, II. pp. 9, 10.
5 See on Rom. i. 34.
6 Ex. xxiv. 4 f.; Num. vii., ix. 1 ff.
prophetic utterance, understood by Stephen as a reproach, is considered as a sternly and sharply significant divine verdict, according to which the ritual offerings in the desert, which were rare and only occurred on special occasions (comp. already Lyra), could not be taken at all into consideration against the idolatrous aberrations which testified the moral worthlessness of those offerings. Usually μοι is considered as equivalent to μιθι σοι. But this is incorrect on account of the enclitic pronoun and its position, and on account of the arbitrarily intruded μονον. Fritzche puts the note of interrogation only after προσκυνείν αὐτοίς, ver. 48: "Sacrane et victimas per XL annos in deserto mihi obtulistis, et in pompa tulistis aedem Molochi, etc.?" In this way God’s displeasure at the unsteadfastness of His people would be vividly denoted by the contrast. But this expedient is impossible on account of the μὴ presupposing a negation. Moreover, it is as foreign to the design of Stephen, who wishes to give a probative passage for the λατρείαν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ ισραήλ, to concede the worship of Jehovah, as it is, on the other hand, in the highest degree accordant with that design to recognise in ver. 43 the negative element of his proof, the denial of the rendering of offering to Jehovah, and in ver. 43 the positive proof, the direct reproach of star-worship.

Ver. 48. Καί ... προσκυνείν αὐτοίς] is the answer which God Himself gives to His question, and in which kai joins on to the negation implied in the preceding clause: No, this ye have not done, and instead of it ye have taken up from the earth, in order to carry it in procession from one encampment to another, the tent, ἀναπόστασις τοῦ Ισραήλ, the portable tent-temple, of Moloch.—τοῦ Μολόχ] so according to the LXX. The Hebrew has דָּבָר יִרְאֶה, of your king, i.e. your idol. The LXX. puts instead of this the name of the idol, either as explanatory or more probably as following another reading. ὁ Μολόχ, Hebrew יִרְאֶה (Rez), called also דָּבָר יִרְאֶה and דָּבָר יִרְאֶה, was an idol of the Ammonites, to whom children were offered, and to whom afterwards even the Israelites sacrificed children. His brazen image was, according to Rabbinical tradition, especially according to Jarchi on Jer. vii. 31, hollow, heated from below, with the head of an ox and outstretched arms, into which the children were laid, whose cries were stifled by the sacrificing priests with the beating of drums. The question whether Moloch corresponds to Kronos or Saturn, or is to be regarded as the god of the sun, is

---

1 According to another view, the period of forty years without offerings appears in the prophet as the “golden age of Israel,” and as a proof how little God cares for such offerings. See Ewald, Proph. in loc.
2 As by Morus, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Oehler, similarly Kuenen.
3 Ad Marc. p. 65 f.
4 דָּבָר יִרְאֶה, comp. LXX. 2 Kings xxvii. 13.
5 Whether the children were burned alive, or first put to death, might seem doubtful from such passages as Ezek. xx. 26, 31. But the burning alive must be assumed according to the notices preserved concerning the Carthaginian procedure at such sacrifices of children (see Knobel on Lev. xviii. 21).—The extravagant assertion that the worship of Moloch was the orthodox primitive worship of the Hebrews (Vatke, Daumer, Gilliany), was a folly of 1836–42. Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2; 1 Kings xi. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. viii. 21.
6 Comp. the description, agreeing in the main, of the image of Kronos in Dion. Sic. xx. 14.
7 Theophylact, Spencer, Deyling, and others, including Heinrichs, Kuenen, Oehler, Münster, Creuzer.
settled for our passage to this extent, that, as here by Moloch and Rephan two different divinities from the host of heaven must be meant, and Rephan corresponds to Kronos, the view of Moloch as god of the sun receives thereby a confirmation, however closely the mythological idea of Kronos was originally related to the notion of a solar deity \(^1\) and consequently also to that of Moloch. See, moreover, for Moloch as god of the sun, Müller in Herzog’s Encycl.\(^{1}\)—καὶ ὁ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ἤμ. Πεφάν and the star (star-image) of your (alleged) god Rephan, i.e. the star made the symbol of your god Rephan. Πεφάν is the Coptic name of Saturn, as Kircher \(^2\) has proved from the great Egyptian Scala. The ancient Arabs, Phoenicians, and Egyptians gave divine honours to the planet Saturn; and in particular the Arabic name of this star, كوكب, corresponds entirely to the Hebrew form מ"ע, \(^4\) which the LXX. translators \(^*\) have expressed by Rephan, the Coptic name of Saturn known to them.\(^4\)—We may add, that there is no account in the Pentateuch of the worship of Moloch and Rephan in the desert; yet the former is forbidden in Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2; Deut. xviii. 10. It is probable, however, that from this very name arose a tradition, which the LXX. followed in Amos, l.c.—τοῖς τύποις] apposition to τὴν σκην. τ. Μολ. κ. τ. ἄστρον τ. θεοῦ ἤμ. Πεφ. It includes a reference to the tent of Moloch, in so far as the image of the idol was to be found in it and was carried along with it. For examples in which the context gives to τύποις the definite sense of idol, see Kypke, II. p. 38, and from Philo, Loesner, p. 192. —ἐπικείμενα beyond Babylon. Only here in the N. T., but often in classic writers.—Βασιλ.] LXX.: λαμακοί, so also in Hebrew. An extension in accordance with history, as similar modifications were indulged in by the Rabbins; see Lightfoot, p. 75.

Ver. 44. Ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτ.] not a contrast to ver. 48, for the bringing out of the culpability, “hic ostendit Steph., non poese ascribi culpam Deo.” Calvin, comp. Olshausen and de Wette, which there is nothing to indicate; but after the giving of the law (ver. 88) and after the described backsliding and its punishment (vv. 39–48), Stephen now commences the new section of his historical development,—that of the tabernacle and of the temple,—as he necessarily required this for the subsequent disclosure of the

---

\(^1\) Comp. Pfeiffer, Griech. Mythol. I. p. 43 f.
\(^2\) IX. p. 716 f.
\(^3\) Lingua Aeg. restituta, p. 49, 557.
\(^4\) See Winer, Realw. II. p. 867, and generally Müller in Herzog’s Encycl. XII. p. 788.

\(^*\) In general, the LXX. has dealt very freely with this passage. The original text runs according to the customary rendering: and ye carried the tent of your king and the frame (י"נ) of your images, the star of your divinity, which ye made for yourselves. See Hitzig in loc.; Gesenius, Theo. II. p. 669. The LXX. took י"נ, which is to be derived from יין, as a proper name (Πεφάν), and transposed the words as if there stood in the Hebrew יין ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייинן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן ייינן יי

Moreover, it is to be observed that the words of the original may be taken also as future, as a threat of punishment (E. Meier, Ewald): so shall ye take up the tent (Ewald: the pole) of your king and the platform of your images, etc. According to this, the fugitives are conceived as taking on their backs the furniture of their gods, and carrying them from one place of refuge to another. This view corresponds best with the connection in the prophet; and in the threat is implied at the same time the accusation, which Dästerdieck in the Stud. u. Krit. 1849, p. 910, feels the want of, on which account he takes it as present (but ye carry, etc.).—The speech of Stephen, as we have it, simply follows the LXX.

\(^*\) See Movers, Phöniker, L. p. 289 f., Müller, l.c.
guilt of his opponents precisely in respect to this important point of charge.
—The Hebrew מֶשֶׂךְ means tent of meeting, of God with his people, i.e. tent of revelation, not tent of the congregation,¹ but is in the LXX., which the Greek form of this speech follows, incorrectly rendered by ἡ σκήνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου, the tent in which God bears witness of Himself, as if derived from Ἡ, a witness. For the description of this tabernacle, see Ex. xxv.–xxvii. — κατὰ τὸν τῶν ὑπώρ.] see Ex. xxv. 9, 40.²

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

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

¹ See Ewald, Alterth. p. 167.
² Comp. Heb. viil. 5, and thereon Lünemann and Delitzsch, p. 337 f.
³ 4 Mac. iv. 15; Dem. 1218, 23. 1045, 10; Polyb. ii. 4. 7; xxxi. 13. 7; Lucian. Dial. M. xil. 3.
⁴ LXX., Apocr., Joseph., Vulgate, Calvin, Grotius, Kuinoel, and others.
⁵ Comp. LXX. Ex. xxxiv. 9: Deut. xil. 23. On the aorist form ἐξώσεως, from ἐξώθυμειν, see Winer. p. 86 (E. T. 111).
⁶ 2 Sam. viil. 2; 1 Chron. xviii. 1.
THE TEMPLE AND THE PROPHETS.

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

Vv. 48-50. Nevertheless this φιλοδοξία, αὐτῷ οἶκον (ver. 47) is not to be misused, as if the presence of the Most High—observe the emphatic prefixing of οὗ τιμητικός, in which lies a tacit contrast of Him who is enthroned in the highest heavens to heathen gods—were bound to the temple! The temple-worship, as represented by the priests and hierarchs, ran too much into such a misuse.1 — χειροποιητός] neuter: in something which is made by hands, xvi. 24.8 — Vv. 49, 50 contain Isa. lxvi. 1, 2, slightly deviating from the LXX. — οὗ τιμητικός: . . . ποιμῶν μου] a poetically moulded expression of the idea: heaven and earth I fill with my all-ruling presence.8 Thus there cannot be for God any place of His rest (τόπος τῆς καταφύσεως), any abode of rest to be assigned to Him. — οἰκοδομήσατε] The future used of any possible future case. Baur* and Zeller have wrongly found in these verses a disapproving judgment as to the building of the temple, the effect of which had been to render the worship rigid; holding also what was above said of the tabernacle—that it was made according to the pattern seen by Moses—as meant to disapprove the temple, the building of which is represented as “a corruption of the worship of God in its own nature free, bound to no fixed place and to no rigid external rites” (Zeller). Such thoughts are read between the lines not only quite arbitrarily, but also quite erroneously, as is evident from ver. 46, according to which the building of Solomon appears as fulfillment of the prayer of David, who had found favour with God.8 The prophetic quotation corresponds entirely to the idea of Solomon himself, 1 Kings vii. 27. The quotation of the prophetic saying was, moreover, essentially necessary for Stephen, because in it the Messianic reformation, which he must have preached, had its divine warrant in reference to the temple-worship.

Vv. 51. The long-restrained direct offensive now breaks out, as is quite in keeping with the position of matters brought to this point.8 This against Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others, who quite arbitrarily suppose that after ver. 50 an interruption took place, either by the shouts of the hearers, or at least by their threatening gestures; as well as against Schwanbeck, p. 352, who sees here “an omission of the reporter.” Stephen has in ver. 50 ended his calm and detailed historical narrative. And now it is time that the accused should become the bold accuser, and at length throw in the face of his judges the result, the thoughts forming

1 Comp. John iv. 90 ff.
2 Comp. LXX. Isa. xvi. 12; 3 Chron. vi. 18.
3 Comp. Matt. v. 94; 1 Kings viii. 27.
4 With whom Schneckenburger in the Stud.
5 u. Kriil. 1855, p. 538 ff., concurred, ascribing to Stephen a view akin to Esseniism.
6 Comp. 1 Kings viii. 94.
7 Comp. Baur, I. p. 58, ed. 2; Ewald, p. 913.
which were already clearly enough to be inferred from the previous historical course of the speech. Therefore he breaks off his calm, measured discourse, and falls upon his judges with deep moral indignation, like a reproving prophet: Ye stiff-necked! etc. — ἀπείρται. τῇ καρδ. κ. τ. ὄπως] an upbraiding of them with their unconverted carnal character, in severe contrast to the Jewish pride of circumcision. The meaning without figure is: Men whose management of their inner life, and whose spiritual perception, are heathenishly rude, without moral refinement, not open for the influence of the divine Spirit. — ἰμαίνεις] with weighty emphasis. — αἰτεῖ] always; even yet at this day! — ὡς οἱ πατέρες ἤμων καὶ ἰμαίνεις] sc. αἰτεῖ τῷ ν. ἐ. ἀντιτ. ; for the fathers are thought of in their resistance to God and to the vehicles of His Spirit, and therefore not the bare ἵστε is to be supplied. — The term ἀντιπάπτειν, not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., is here chosen as a strong designation. Bengel well puts it: “in adversum ruitis.”

Ver. 52. Proof of the ὡς οἱ πατέρες ἤμων καὶ, αἰτεῖ, ἰμαίνει.— καὶ ἀπείρται] καὶ is the climactic even; they have even killed them. — The characteristic more special designation of the prophets: τοῦς προκαταγεγείλαντας k. τ. λ., augments the guilt. — τοῦ ἱκανοῦ] κατ’ ἐξοχῶν of Jesus, the highest messenger of God, the (ideal) Just One. — Contrast to the relative clause that follows. — νῦν] in the present time, opposed to the times of the fathers; ἰμαίνει is emphatically placed over against the latter as a parallel. — προδόται] betrayers (Luke vi. 16), inasmuch as the Sanhedrists, by false and crafty accusation and condemnation, delivered Jesus over to the Roman tribunal and brought Him to execution.

Ver. 53. ὥσπερ qui. Stephen desires, namely, now to give the character, through which the foregoing οὗ νῦν ἰμαίνει προδόται k. τ. λ., as founded on their actually manifested conduct, receives its explanation. — ἐλάβετε] ye have received, placed first with emphasis. — εἰς διαγγέλλων] upon arrangements with angels, i.e. so that the arrangements made by angels, the direct servants of God, which accompanied the promulgation of the law, made you perceive the obligation to recognise and observe the received law—comp. the contrast, κ. οὐκ ἠφελᾶς,—as the ethical aspect of your ἐλάβετε. Briefly, therefore: Ye received the law with reference to arrangements of angels, which could not leave you doubtful that you ought to submit obediently to the divine institution. — εἰς denotes, as often in Greek writers and in the N. T.,' the direction of the mind, in view of. — διαγγέλλω is arrangement, regulation, as in Rom. xiii. 2, with Greek writers διάραγες. At variance with linguistic usage, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Eijsen, Hammond, Wolf, Krause,
Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, taking διαγγέλα in the above signification, render: accepsistis legem ab angeliis promulgatum, as if εἰς stood for in. Others—Grotius, Calovius, Er. Schmid, Valckenaer, and others—explain διαγγέλα as agmen disposition, because διαγγέλα is often, also in the classics, used of the drawing up of armies, and διαγγελις of the divisions of an army, and translate præsentibus angelorum ordinibus, so that εἰς is likewise taken for in. But against this view, with which, moreover, εἰς would have to be taken as respectu, there is the decisive fact, that there is no evidence of the use of διαγγέλα in the sense assumed; and therefore the supposition that διαγγέλα = διαγγελις in this signification is arbitrary, as well as at variance with the manifest similarity of the thought with Gal. iii. 19. Bengel renders: Ye received the law for commands of angels, i.e. as commands of angels, so that εἰς is to be understood as in ver. 21. But the Israelites did not receive the law as the commands of angels, but as the commands of God, in which character it was made known to them δι' ἀγγέλων. —Moreover, the mediating action of the angels not admitting of more precise definition, which is here adverted to, is not contained in Ex. xix., but rests on tradition, which is imported already by the LXX. into Deut. xxxiii. 2. Comp. on Gal. iii. 19. It was a mistaken attempt at harmonizing, when earlier expositors sought to understand by the angels either Moses and the prophets or the seniores populi; indeed, Chrysostom even discovers here again the angel in the bush.

Vv. 54–56. Ταῦτα] The reproaches uttered in vv. 51–53. — διεκρ. ῥαίς καρδ.] see on v. 33. — ἐβρυχοῦ τ. ὄρν.] they gnashed their teeth, from rage and spite. — εἰς αἰτίαν] against him. — πλήρ. πνεύμ.] which at this very moment filled and exalted him with special power, iv. 8. — εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν] like Jesus, John xvii. 1. The eye of the suppliant looks everywhere toward, looks, and what he beheld he saw in the spírit (πλήρ. πνεύμ. ἁγίον); he only and not the rest present in the room. — τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] up to the highest. — μὴ τῆς θεοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ: the brightness in which God appears. — ἵνα] Why not sitting? He beheld Jesus, as He has raised Himself from God’s throne of light and stands ready for the saving reception of the martyr. Comp. ver. 59. The prophetic basis of this vision in the soul of Stephen is Dan. vii. 13 f. Chrysostom erroneously holds that it is a testimony of the resurrection of Christ. Rightly Oecumenius: ὅπειρας τὴν ἀνεμόλυντος τὴν τοῖς αἰτίας. Comp. Bengel: “quasi obvium Stephano.” De Wette finds no explanation satisfactory, and prefers to leave it unexplained; while Borne-
manner is disposed only to find in it the idea of morandi et existendi, as formerly Beza and Knapp, Scr. var. arg. — ewise] is to be apprehended as mental seeing in ecstasy. Only of Stephen himself is this seeing related; and when he, like an old prophet, gives utterance to what he saw, the rage of his adversaries—who therefore had seen nothing, but recognised in this declaration mere blasphemy—reaches its highest pitch, and breaks out in tumultuary fashion. The views of Michaelis and Eckermann, that Stephen had only expressed his firm conviction of the glory of Christ and of his own impending admission into heaven; and the view of Hezel, that he had seen a dazzling cloud as a symbol of the presence of God,—convert his utterance at this lofty moment into a flourish of rhetoric. According to Baur, the author’s own view of this matter has objectivised itself into a vision, just as in like manner vi. 15 is deemed unhistorical. — ewise . . . ἰδε] he saw . . . I behold. As to ὁ νῦς τάν άνθρ., the Messianic designation in accordance with Dan. vii. 13, see on Matt. viii. 20.

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

---

1 In the Sächs. Stud. 1848, p. 73 f.
2 Lobeck, ad Aj. 199.
3 Comp. John xii. 41.
4 Following older commentators, in Wolf.
5 See Tittmann’s Synon. pp. 116, 120.
6 Gloss in Babyl. Sanhedr. f. 42. 2.
7 Which Bornemann has added, following D and vas.
8 Comp. LXX. Ex. xxiii. 47.
9 Deut. xvii. 7; Sanhedr. v. 4.
10 Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 313.
Stephen's Death.

...oning, which as the punishment of blasphemy was inflicted on Stephen, seeing that no formal sentence preceded it, and that the execution had to be confirmed and carried out on the part of the Roman authorities, is to be regarded as an illegal act of the tumultuary outbreak. Similarly, the murder of James the Just, the Lord's brother, took place at a later period. The less the limits of such an outbreak can be defined, and the more the calm historical course of the speech of Stephen makes it easy to understand that the Sanhedrists should have heard him quietly up to, but not beyond, the point of their being directly attacked (ver. 51 ff.), so much the less warrantable is it, with Baur and Zeller, to esteem nothing further as historical, than that Stephen fell "as victim of a popular tumult suddenly arising on occasion of his lively public controversial discussions," without any proceedings in the Sanhedrim, which are assumed to be the work of the author.

Vv. 59, 60. 'Επικαλομένον] while he was invoking. Whom? is evident from the address which follows. — κύριε ᾿Ισαώ] both to be taken as vocatives, according to the formal expression κύριος ᾿Ισαώς, with which the apostolic church designates Jesus as the exalted Lord, not only of His church, but of the world, in the government of which He is installed as σινθρονος of the Father by His exaltation (Phil. ii. 6 ff.), until the final completion of His office. Stephen invoked Jesus; for he had just beheld Him standing ready to help him. As to the invocation of Christ generally, relative worship, conditioned by the relation of the exalted Christ to the Father. — δίπα το πνεύμα μου] namely, to thee in heaven until the future resurrection. "Feci mi victorem, recipe me in triumphum," Augustine. — φωνή μεγάλη] the last expenditure of his strength of love, the fervour of which also discloses itself in the kneeling. — μη στήσῃς αὐτοῖς τ. ἡμαργ. taub.] fix not this sin (of my murder) upon them. This negative expression corresponds quite to the positive: ἀφίναι τιν ἡμαριαν, to let the sin go as regards its relation of guilt, instead of fixing it for punishment. The notion, "to make availing" (de Wette), i.e. to impute, corresponds to the thought, but is not denoted by the word. Linguistically correct is also the rendering: "weigh not this sin to them," as to which the comparison of ἐρυθρός is not needed. In this view the sense would be: Determine not the weight of the sin (comp. xlv. 7), consider not how heavy it is. But our explanation is to be preferred, because it corresponds more completely to the prayer of Jesus, Luke xxi. 34, which is evidently the pattern of Stephen in his request, only saying negatively what that expresses positively. In the case of such

1 Luke xxiv. 16; Sanhedr. vii. 4.
2 Ewald supposes that the Sanhedrin might have appealed to the permission granted to them by Pilate in John xviii. 31. But so much is not implied in John xviii. 31; see its ke. And ver. 57 sufficiently shows how far from "calmly and legally" matters proceeded at the execution. See Joseph. Ant. xx. 9. 1, and on John xviii. 31.
3 Rev. xxii. 30.
5 1 Cor. xv. 23; comp. x. 36.
6 See on Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. i. 2; Phil. ii. 10.
7 Comp. on Phil. i. 36, remark.
8 Comp. Rom. x. 3; Ecclus. xlv. 21, 22; 1 Mac. xiii. 58; xiv. 26, xiv. 4, a.d.
as Saul what was asked took place.¹ In the similarity of the last words of Stephen, ver. 59 with Luke xxiii. 34, 40, as also of the words διέκα το πν. μον with Luke xxiii. 46, Baur, with whom Zeller agrees, sees an indication of their unhistorical character; as if the example of the dying Jesus might not have sufficiently suggested itself to the first martyr, and proved sufficient motive for him to die with similar love and self-devotion.—ἐκομμεθύ] "lugubre verbum et suave," Bengel; on account of the euphemistic nature of the word, never used of the dying of Christ. See on 1 Cor. xv. 18.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(y) Stephen’s speech. V. 2.

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

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

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

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

(2) Historical errors. V. 3.

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

(a1) Abraham’s call. V. 3.

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

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

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

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

(3) Four hundred years. V. 6.

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

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

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

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

\( m^1 \) Cast out . . . children. V. 19.

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

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

\( r^1 \) An angel. V. 30.

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

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

1 Instead of which, however, he (Præfac. p. viii.) conjectures πολλά.
GENERAL PERSECUTION.

struction. — After ver. 36, Elz. has (ver. 37): ἐπε ἐδ ὁ Φιλιππος ἐλ πιστεύεις ἓξ δἰ ἡς τῆς καρδίας, ἔστιν. Ἦποκρίθησε δὲ ἐπε πιστεύω τὸν νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ Χριστοῦ. This is wanting in decisive witnesses; and in those which have the words there are many variations of detail. It is defended, indeed, by Born., but is nothing else than an old (see already Iren. iii. 12; Cypr. ad Quir. iii. 43) addition for the sake of completeness. — Ver. 39. After πνεῦμα Α*, min. and a few vss. and Fathers have ἄγιον ἐπέσεσαν ἐπὶ (or εἰς) τῶν ἐννοίαντων, ἄγιος δὲ. A pious expansion and falsification of the history, induced partly by ver. 26 and partly by x. 44.

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

Vv. 2, 3. The connection of vv. 1–3 depends on the double contrast,
that in spite of the outbreak of persecution which took place on that day, the dead body of the martyr was nevertheless honoured by pious Jews; and that, on the other hand, the persecuting zeal of Saul stood in stern opposition thereto. On that day arose a great persecution, ver. 1. This, however, prevented not pious men from burying and lamenting Stephen, ver. 2; (ii') but Saul laid waste, in that persecution which arose, the church (of Jerusalem, ver. 3). The common opinion is accordingly erroneous, that there prevails here a lack of connection—ver. 2 is a supplementary addition, according to de Wette—which is either\(^1\) to explained by the insertion of extracts from different sources, or\(^2\) betokens that ἵγεντο δὲ ... ἀποστάλων is an interpolation, or\(^3\) at least makes it necessary to hold these words as transposed, so that they had originally stood after ver. 2.\(^4\) — συγκομιζον] to carry together, then, used of the dead who are carried to the other dead bodies at the burial-place, and generally: to bury.\(^5\) According to the Scholiast on Soph. l.c. and Phavorinus, the expression is derived from gathering the fruits of harvest. Comp. Job v. 26. — The ἀνδρεῖς εὐλαβεῖς are not, in opposition to Heinrichs and Ewald, Christians, but, as the connection requires, religious Jews who, in their pious conscientiousness (comp. ii. 5), and with a secret inclination to Christianity,\(^6\) had the courage to honour the innocence of him who had been stoned. Christians would probably have been prevented from doing so, and Luke would have designated them more distinctly. — κοπτός: θρήνος μετὰ φοβόν χειρῶν, Hesychius.\(^7\) — ἐλημαίνετο] he laid waste, comp. ix. 21; Gal. i. 13. The following sentence informs us how he proceeded in doing so; therefore a colon is to be placed after τ. ἵκλα. — κατὰ τοὺς οἰκ. εἰσπορ.] entering by houses, house by house, Matt. xxiv. 7.\(^8\) — σῶρων] dragging.\(^9\)

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

---

\(^1\) Olshausen, Bleek.
\(^2\) Ziegler in Gabler’s Journ. f. theol. Lit., I.
\(^3\) Heinrichs, Kuhnol.
\(^4\) According to Schwanbeck, p. 325, v. 1 is to be regarded as an insertion from the biography of Peter.
\(^5\) Soph. Aj. 1048; Plut. Sull. 28. [mus.]
\(^6\) Comp. Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus.
\(^7\) See Gen. 1. 10; 1 Macc. ii. 70; Nicarch. 80; Plut. F ud. 17; Heyne, Obs. in Tibbon. p. 71.
\(^8\) Winer, p. 374 (E. T. 500).
\(^10\) The οἱ μὲν οὖν διασταράσσοντες is resumed at xl. 19,—a circumstance betokening that the long intervening portion has been derived from special sources here incorporated.
\(^11\) Illy. 81, 2, v. 94. 1; see, on the contrary, vv. 1, 14, and generally, Zeller, p. 184 ff.; Ewald, p. 383 f.
PHILIP IN SAMARIA.

quired, under the guidance of the Spirit. — κατελθ.] from Jerusalem. — τῆς πόλεως τῆς Σαμαρ.] into a city of Samaria. What city it was (Grotius and Ewald think of the capital, Olshausen thinks that it was perhaps Sichem) is to be left entirely undetermined, and was probably unknown to Luke himself. Comp. John iv. 5. Kuinoel, after Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, and others, takes τῆς Σαμαρ. as the name, not of the country, but of the capital. In that case, indeed, the article would not have been necessary before πόλιν, as Olshausen thinks. πόλις, too with the genitive of the name of the city, is a Greek idiom; but ver. 9, where τῆς Σαμαρ. is evidently the name of the country (τὰ ἔθνος), is decidedly opposed to such a view. See also on ver. 14. — αὐτοῖς] namely, the people in that city.

Vv. 6, 7. Προσεθηκαίον] they gave heed thereto, denotes attentive, favourably disposed interest, xvi. 14; Heb. ii. 1; 1 Tim. i. 4; often in Greek writers. The explanation fidel praedebant, Krebs, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, confounds the result of the προσέθηκαν (ver. 12) with the προσέθηκαν itself, — a confusion which is committed in all the passages adduced to prove it. — ἐν τῇ ἑρεμίᾳ αὐτοῖς κ. κ. τ. λ. ] in their hearing, etc., while they heard. — In ver. 7, more than in v. 16, those affected by natural diseases (παραλείπ. κ. χωλοτ.), who were healed (ἐθεραπεύετο), are expressly distinguished from the possessed, whose demons came out (ἐξηράντου) with great crying. — Notice the article before ἵπτοντων: of many of those who, etc., consequently, not of all. As regards the construction, πολλῶν is dependent on the τὰ πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα to be again tacitly supplied after πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα. 4

Ver. 9. Σιμὼν] is not identical, in opposition to Heumann, Krebs, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Neander, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, 7 with the Simon of Cyprus in Joseph., 8 whom the Procurator Felix, at a latter period, employed to estrange Drusilla, the wife of Azizus king of Emesa in Syria, from her husband. For (1) Justin, 9 expressly informs us that Simon was from the village Githon in Samaria, and Justin himself was a Samaritan, so that we can the less suppose, in his case, a confusion with the name of the Cyprian town Κιτον. 10 (2) The identity of name cannot, on account of its great prevalence, prove anything, and as little can the assertion that the Samaritans would hardly have defied one of their own countrymen, ver. 10. The latter is even more capable of explanation from the national pride, than it would be with respect to a Cyprian. — προσέθηκαν he was formerly, even before the appearance of Philip, in the city. The following μαγεύων κ. τ. λ. then adds how he was occupied there; comp. Luke xxiii. 12. — μαγεύων] practising magical arts, only here in the N. T. 11 The magical exercises of the wizards, who at that time very frequently wandered about in

1 Schott, which was also called Samarina, Joseph. Antt. xviil. 6. 2.
5 Comp. Luke iv. 40 f.
6 See Matthaei, p. 1568; Küthner, II. p. 608.
7 See also Gieseler's Kirchengesch. I. sect. 18, 3, and others.
8 Antt. xx. 7. 2. Neander, p. 107 f., has entirely misunderstood the words of Josephus. See Zeller, p. 164 f.
10 Thuc. i. 112. 1.
11 But see Kehr. Iph. T. 1387; Mela, 12; Ciechrm. in Athen. vi. p. 366 E; Jacobs, ad Anthol. VI. p. 29.
the East, extended chiefly to an ostentatious application of their attainments in physical knowledge to juggling conjurings of the dead and demons, to influencing the gods, to sorceries, cures of the sick, soothisings from the stars, and the like, in which the ideas and formulae of the Oriental-Greek theosophy were turned to display.\(^1\)

We are not, accordingly, to put any more definite claim into the mouth of Simon; the text relates only generally his boasting self-exaltation, which may have expressed itself very differently according to circumstances, but always amounted to this, that he **himself was a certain extraordinary person.** Perhaps Simon designedly avoided a more definite self-designation, in order to leave to the praises of the people all the other scope in the designating of that (ver. 10) which he himself wished to pass for. — ἐαυτόν\(^1\)

He thus acted quite differently from Philip, who preached Christ, ver. 5. Comp. Rev. ii. 20.

Ver. 10. Προειθον] just as in ver. 6. — ἀπὸ μικρὸν ὡς μεγάλον\(^2\) A designation of the whole body, from little and up to great, i.e. young and old.\(^3\) — ὁ ὅστις ἐστὶν ἡ δίνῃ τ. Θεοῦ ἡ καλ. μεγ.\(^4\) this is the God-power called great. The Samaritans believed that Simon was the power emanating from God, and appearing and working among them as a human person, which, as the highest of the divine powers, was designated by them with a specific appellation κατ' ἓξοχήν as the μεγάλη. Probably the Oriental-Alexandrine idea of the world-creating manifestation of the hidden God, the Logos, which Philo also calls μορφότος πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ Θεοῦ, had become at that time current among them, and they saw in Simon this effluence of the Godhead rendered human by incarnation,—a belief which Simon certainly had been cunning enough himself to excite and to promote, and which makes it more than probable that the magician, to whom the neighbouring Christianity could not be unknown, designed in the part which he played to present a phenomenon similar to Christ; comp. Ewald. The belief of the Samaritans in Simon was thus, as regards its tenor, an analogue of the ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο, and hence served to prepare for the true and definite faith in the Messiah, afterwards preached to them by Philip: the former became the bridge to the latter. Erroneously Philastr. Haer. 29, and recently Olshausen, de Wette, and others, put the words ἐπὶ δύναμις κ.τ.λ. into the mouth of Simon himself, so that they are held only to be an echo of what the sorcerer had boastingly said of himself.\(^5\) This is con-

---


\(^2\) Comp. Heb. viii. 11; Acts xxvi. 22; Bar. i. 4; Judith xiii. 4, 13; 1 Mac. v. 45; LXX. Gen. xix. 11; Jer. xiii. 1, al.

\(^3\) According to Jerome on Matth. xxiv., he asserted of himself: "Ego sum sermo Del, ego sum speciosus, ego paraceltus, ego omnipotens, ego omnium Del." Certainly an invention of the later Simonians, who transferred specifically Christian elements of faith to Simon. But this and similar things which were put into the mouth of Simon (that he was ἐπιτάγης τις δύναμις καὶ αὐτῷ τῶν κόσμων κτιστος Θεοῦ, Clem. Hom. ii. 22, 25; that he was the same who had appeared among the Jews as the Son, but had come among the Samaritans as the Father, and among other nations as the Holy Spirit, Iren. i. 23), and were wonderfully diffused on by opponents, point back to a relation of incarnation analogous to the incarnation of the Logos, under which the adherents of Simon conceived him. De Wette incorrectly denies this, referring the expression, "the great power of
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trary to the text, which expressly distinguishes the opinion of the infatuated people here from the assertion of the magician himself, ver. 9. He had characterized himself *indefinibly*; they judged *definitely* and *confessed* (*λέγοντες*) the highest that could be said of him; and, in doing so, accorded with the intention of the sorcerer.

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

Ver. 13. Ἐκτός των also on his part (κ. αὐτοῦ), like the other Samaritans, he became believing, namely, likewise τῷ Φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ κ.τ.λ. (1). Entirely at variance with the text is the opinion 2 that Simon regarded Jesus only as a great magician and worker of miracles, and not as the Messiah, and only to this extent believed on Him. He was, by the preaching and miracles of Philip, actually moved to faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Yet this faith of his was only historical and intellectual, without having as its result a change of the inner life;3 hence he was soon afterwards capable of what is related in vv. 18, 19. The real μετάνοια is not excited in him, even at ver. 24. Cyril aptly remarks: εἰςπίστισθαι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτισθην.—ἐξιστατο] he, who had formerly been himself ἐγίστων τὸ ἔνοχον!

Vv. 14–17. Οι ἐν Ισραηλ. ἀπέστ. also applies, according to ver. 1, to all the

God.4 to the notion of an angel. This is too weak; all the ancient accounts concerning Simon, as well as concerning his alleged companion Helena, the all-bearing mother of angels and powers, betoken a Messianic part which he played; and which also the name Ἔρους, by which he designated himself according to the Clementines, points. This name (hardly correctly explained by Ritschl, *altkath. Kirke*, p. 193 f., from ἀναστήσεις, Deut. xviii. 13, 18) denotes the imperishable and unchangeable. See, besides, concerning Simon and his doctrine according to the Clementines, Uhlhorn, *die Homil. u. Recognit. des Clemens Rom. p. 291 f.; Zeller, p. 159 f.; and concerning the entire diversified development of the old legends concerning him, Müller in Herzog's *Encycl. XIV. p. 781 f.; concerning his doctrine of the Aeons and Syzygies, *Philosop. Orig. vi. 7 f.* According to Baur and Zeller, the magician never existed at all; and the legend concerning him, which arose from Christian polemics directed against the Samaritan worship of the sun-god, the Oriental Heroes (Baal-Melkart), is nothing else than a hostile *transesse of the Apostle Paul* and his antimanotheism. Comp. also Hilgenfeld, *d. dem. Recognit.* p. 819 f.; Volckmar in the *Jahrb. 1886, p. 279 f.* The Book of Acts has, in their view, admitted this legend about Simon, but has cut off the reference to Paul. Thus the state of the case is exactly reversed. The history of Simon Magus in our passage was amplified in the Clementines in an anti-Pauline interest. The Book of Acts has not cut off the hostile reference to Paul; but the Clementines have added it, and accordingly have dressed out the history with a view to combat Paulinism and Gnosticism, indeed have here and there caricatured Paul himself as Simon. We set to work unhistorically, if we place the simple narratives of the N. T. on a parallel with later historical excrescences and disfigurations, and by means of the latter attack the former as likewise fabulous representations. Our narrative contains the historical germ, from which the later legends concerning Simon Magus have luxuriantly developed themselves; the Samaritan worship of the sun and moon has nothing whatever to do with the history of Simon.

1 But see Rom. 1. 8; Josephus, *Antt. xv. 7. 2.*

2 Grotius, Clericus, Rosenmüller, Kulnoel.

3 Bengel well remarks: "Agnovit, virtutem Del non esse in se, sed in Philippo. . . . Non tamen pertigit ad fidem plenam, justificantem, cor purificantem, salvantem, tametali ad eam pervenisse speculose videretur, donec se alter prodidit."
apostles, to the apostolic college, which commissioned two of its most distinguished members, Gal. ii. 9.—Σαμαρεία] here also the name of the country; see vv. 5, 9. From the success which the missionary labours of Philip had in that single city, dates the conversion of the country in general, and so the fact: διδέκται ἡ Σαμαρεία τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ (v.1).—The design of the mission of Peter and John ¹ (x'i) is certainly, according to the text, in opposition to Schneckenburger, to be considered as that which they actually did after their arrival, ver. 15: to pray for the baptised, in order that (ὅτως) they might receive the Holy Spirit (v.1). Not as if, in general, the communication of the Spirit had been exclusively bound up with the prayer and the imposition of the hands (vv. 17, 18) of an actual apostle; nor yet as if here under the Spirit we should have to conceive something peculiar:² but the observation, ver. 16, makes the baptism of the Samaritans without the reception of the Spirit appear as something extraordinary: the epoch-making advance of Christianity beyond the bounds of Judaea into Samaria was not to be accomplished without the intervention of the direct ministry of the apostles.³ Therefore the Spirit was reserved until this apostolic intervention occurred. To explain the matter from the designed omission of prayer for the Holy Spirit on the part of Philip,⁴ or from the subjectivity of the Samaritans, whose faith had not yet penetrated into the inner life,⁵ has no justification in the text, the more especially as there is no mention of any further instruction by the apostles, but only of their prayer, and imposition of hands,⁶ in the effect of which certainly their greater εἰςωτερικά, as compared with that of Philip as the mere evangelist, was historically made apparent, because the nascent church of Samaria was not to develop its life otherwise than in living connection with the apostles themselves.⁷ The miraculous element of the apostolic influence is to be recognised as connected with the whole position and function of the apostles, and not to be referred to a sphere of view belonging to a later age (Zeller, Holtzmann).—διδέκται] has received.⁸—καταβάνετε] namely, to Samaria situated lower.—οἶδας ὅτι ἤν] for as yet not at all, etc.—μόνον δὲ

¹ Which Baur (I. p. 47, ed. 2) derives from the interest of Judaism to the new churches in a position of dependence on Jerusalem, and to prevent too free a development of the Hellenistic principle. See, on the other hand, Schneckenburger in the Stud. u. Krit. 1855, p. 548 ff., who, however, likewise gratuitously imports the opinion that the conversion of the Samaritans appeared suspicious and required a more exact examination.
² ἔν τῷ συνείς, Chrysostom, comp. Beza, Calvin.
³ Comp. Baumgarten, p. 175 ff.
⁴ Hofmann, Schriften, II. 2, p. 32.
⁵ Neander, p. 80 f., 104.
⁶ Ver. 15, comp. with vv. 17, 18, shows clearly the relation of prayer to the imposition of hands. The prayer obtained from God the communication of the Spirit, but the imposition of hands, after the Spirit had been prayed for, became the vehicle of the communication. It was certainly of a symbolical nature, yet not a bare and ineffective symbol, but the effective conductor of the gifts prayed for. Comp. on vi. 6. In xix. 5 also it is applied after baptism, and with the result of the communication of the Spirit. On the other hand, at x. 48, it would have come too late. If it is not specially mentioned in cases of ordinary baptism, where the operation of the Spirit was not bound up with the apostolic imposition of hands as above (see 1 Cor. 14-17, xvi. 13; Tit. iii. 5), it is to be considered as obvious of itself (Heb. vi. 3).
⁷ Surely this entirely peculiar state of matters should have withheld the Catholics from grounding the doctrine of confirmation on our passage (as even Beelen does).
⁸ See xvii. 7; Winer, p. 346 (B. T. 355); Valcken. p. 427.
but they found themselves only in the condition of baptized ones, not at the same time also furnished with the Spirit.

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

Vv. 20, 21. Thy money be along with thee unto destruction; i.e. let perdition, Messianic penal destruction, come upon thy money and thyself! The simmone, in the lofty strain of the language, is set forth as something personal, capable of ἀπολεία. —εἰς εἰς ἀπώλ. a usual attraction: fall into destruction and be in it. —τὴν τῷ ποιμήν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταῖτην, i.e. κατ. ver. 19. Observe the antithetically chosen designation. —ἐνώμια[ς] thou wast minded, namely, in the proposal made. —μερίς σοῦ ὁ λάχυς] synonyms, of which the second expresses the idea figuratively: part nor lot. The utterance is earnest. —ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῖνω] in this word, i.e. in the ἐξουσία to be the medium of the Spirit, which was in question. Lange gratuitously imports the idea: in this word, which flows from the hearts of believers moved by the Spirit. λόγος of the “ipse causa, de qua disceptatur,” is very current also in classical writers. Others, as Olshausen and Neander after Grotius, explain λόγος of the gospel, all share in whose blessings is cut off from Simon. But then this reference must have been suggested by the context, in which, however, there is nothing at all of doctrine. —εὐθεία straight, i.e. upright, for Simon thought to acquire (κράτησαι) an ἐξουσία not destined for him, from immoral motives, and by an unrighteous means. Herein lies the immoral nature of simony, whose source is selfishness.

Vv. 22, 23. Ἀπὸ τῆς κακ. i.e. turning thee away from, Heb. vi. 1. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 8. —εἰ ἀρα ἄφθοςτοι] entreat the Lord (God,  

1 See Winer, p. 366 f. (E. T. 516 f.). Comp. ver. 28.
2 Comp. Dem. xl. 12, xlv. 27, 29; Isa. vii. 6.
3 Ast, lex. Plut. II. p. 256; Brunnck, ad Sept. 1. 1266; Wolf, ad Dem. Lex. p. 277; Nigelaub. on the Hltd. p. 41 f. ed. 3.
4 Comp. Wlad. ix. 8; Ecclus. viii. 8.
5 Comp. the ethical ἐκκλησία (Luke iii. 5), ii. 40; Phil. ii. 15. “Cor arx boni et mal.” Bengel; Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 290.
ver. 21), and try thereby, whether perhaps, as the case may stand, there will be forgiven, etc. Comp. on Mark xi. 13; Rom. i. 10. Peter, on account of the high degree of the transgression, represents the forgiveness on repentance still as doubtful. 1 Kuinoel, after older expositors, 2 thinks that the doubt concerns the conversion of Simon, which was hardly to be hoped for. At variance with the text, which to the fulfilment of the μετανόησεν, without which forgiveness was not at all conceivable, annexes still the problematic εἰ ἀφα. Concerning the direct expression by the future, see Winer, p. 289 (E. T. 376). — ἢ ἰπινωα] the (conscious) plan, the project, is a vox media, which receives its reference in bonam, 3 or as here in malm partem, entirely from the context. 4 — For I perceive thee fallen into and existing in gale of bitterness and in band of iniquity, i.e. for I recognise thee as a man who has fallen into bitter enmity against the gospel as into gall, and into iniquity as into binding fetters. Both genitives are to be taken alike, namely, as genitives of opposition; hence χολὴ πικρίας is not fel amarum, as is usually supposed, in which case, besides, πικρίας would only be tame and self-evident. On the contrary, πικρία is to be taken in the ethical sense, a bitter, malignant, and hostile disposition; 5 often in the classical writers, 6 which, figuratively represented, is gall, into which Simon had fallen. In the corresponding representation, ἄδικα is conceived as a band which encompassed him. Comp. Isa. lviii. 6. Others render σύνεσμος, bundle. 7 So Alberti, Wolf, Wetstein, Valckenaer, Kuinoel, and others, including Ewald. But in this way the genitive would not be taken uniformly with πικρίας, and we should expect instead of ἄδικα a plural expression. Ewald, moreover, concludes from these words that a vehement contest had previously taken place between Peter and Simon,—a point which must be left undetermined, as the text indicates nothing of it. — εἰπον εἰς] stands as in ver. 20. 8 Lange, 9 at variance with the words, gratuitously imports the notion: “that thou wilt prove to be a poison . . . in the church.”

Ver. 24. Τῷμετ] whose prayer must be more effectual. On δεήθω, with προς, comp. Ps. lxiv. 1. — ἐποικ ὑπὲρ ἐκ τ. λ.] “poenae metum, non culpae horrorem fatetur,” Bengel. A humiliation has begun in Simon, but it refers to the apostolic threat of punishment, the realization of which he wishes to avert, not to the ground of this threat, which lay in his own heart and could only be removed by a corresponding repentance. Hence, also, his conversion, which even Calvin conjectures to have taken place, 10 does not ensue. It

1 Not as if it were thereby made dependent on the caprices of God (de Wette’s objection), but because God, in presence of the greatness of the guilt, could only forgive on the corresponding sincerity and truth of the repentance and believing prayer; and how doubtful was this with such a mind! The whole greatness of the danger was to be brought to the consciousness of Simon, and to quicken him to the need of repentance and prayer.

2 Comp. Heinrichs and de Wette.

3 2 Macc. xii. 45; Ar. Thess. 766. al.

4 See the passages in Kyuke, II. p. 43, and from Philo in Loesner, p. 196 f.

5 Rom. iii. 14; Ec. h. lv. 31.


7 Comp. Herodian. lv. 13. 11.

8 See Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 296 (E. T. 333).

9 Comp. also Thiersch, Kirche im apost. Zeit. p. 91.

10 Comp. Ebrard.
would, as a brilliant victory of the apostolic word, not have been omitted; and in fact the ecclesiastical traditions concerning the stedfastly continued conflict of Simon with the Jewish-apostolic gospel, in spite of all the strange and contradictory fables mixed up with it down to his overthrow by Peter at Rome, testify against the occurrence of that conversion at all.

Vv. 25, 26. Τὸν λόγον τῆς τῶν θεοῦν, iv. 29, 31, vi. 2, and frequently. — πολλὰς τε κόμας . . . εἰναι. [n.].] namely, on their way back to Jerusalem. — εἰναι τε κόμας, with the accusative of the person, is rare, and belongs to the later Greek. [— οὐκ εἰναι τε κόμας] is neither to be rationally with Eichhorn to the effect, that what is meant is the sudden and involuntary rise of an internal impulse not to be set aside; nor with Olshausen to the effect, that what is designated is not a being appearing individually, but a spiritual power, by which a spiritual communication was made to Philip; the language is, in fact, not figurative, as in John i. 33, but purely historical. On the contrary, Luke narrates an actual angelic appearance, that spoke literally to Philip. This appearance must, in respect of its form, be left undefined, as a vision in a dream, is not indicated in the text, not even by ἀναστάσει, which rather (raise yourself) belongs to the pictorial representation; comp. on v. 17. Philip received this angelic intimation in Samaria, in opposition to Zeller, who makes him to have returned with the apostles to Jerusalem, while the two apostles were on their way back to Jerusalem. — Γαζα, τῆς, i.e. the strong, a strongly fortified Philistine city, situated on the Mediterranean, on the southern border of Canaan. It was conquered, and destroyed, by Alexander the Great, a fate which, after many vicissitudes, befell it afresh under the Jewish King Alexander Jannaeus, in B.C. 96. Rebuilt as New Gaza farther to the south by the Proconsul Gabinius, B.C. 58, the city was incorporated with the province of Syria. Its renewed, though not total destruction by the Jews occurred not long before the siege of Jerusalem. 10 It is now the open town Ghuweir. — αὐτή ἑκάστη ἡ ἐπίστολος] applies to the way, von Raumer, Robinson, Winer, Buttmann, Ewald, Baumgarten, Lange, and older commentators, as Castalia, Beza, Bengel, and others. As several roads led from Jerusalem to Gaza, and still lead, the angel specifies the road, which he means, more exactly by the statement: this way is desolate, i.e. it is a desert way, leading through solitary and little cultivated districts. Such a road still exists; see Robinson, l.c. The object of this more precise specification can according to the text only be this, that Philip should take no other road

1 Comp. XIII. 49 f., xvi. 35 f., xix. 10. 29.
2 Luke iii. 18; Acts xlii. 21, xvi. 10.
3 See Lobbeck, ad Phryn. p. 367 f.
4 Eichhorn, Heinrichs, Kunioel.
5 Gen. x. 19; Josh. xv. 45; Judg. iii. 2, xvi. 21; 1 Mac. xii. 16.
7 Plut. Alex. 25; Curt. iv. 6.
8 Strabo, xvi. 2. 30, p. 759.
9 Joseph. Antiq. xiii. 18. 3. Bell. i. 4. 2.
11 See Robinson, II. p. 748.
12 Comp. 2 Sam. ii. 24. LXX.
than that on which he would not miss, but would really encounter, the Ethiopian. The angel wished to direct him right surely. Other designs are imported without any ground in the text, as, e.g., that he wished to raise him above all fear of the Jews, or to describe the locality as suitable for undisturbed evangelical operations, and for deeper conversation, or even to indicate that the road must now be spiritually prepared and constructed (Lange). εἰρήνως stands without the article, because it is conceived altogether qualitatively. If αἵρης is to be referred to Gaza, and the words likewise to be ascribed to the angel, we should have to take εἰρήνως as destroyed, and to understand these words of the angel as an indication that he meant not the rebuilt New Gaza, but the old Gaza lying in ruins. But this would be opposed, not indeed to historical correctness (see Stark), but yet to the connection, for the event afterwards related happened on the way, and this way was to be specified. Others consider the words as a gloss of Luke. But if αἵρης is to be referred to the way, is is difficult to see what Luke means by that remark. If it is to indicate that the way is not, or no longer, passable, this has no perceptible reference to the event which is related. But if, as Wieseler, p. 401, thinks, it is meant to point to the fact that the Ethiopian on this solitary way could read without being disturbed, and aloud, no reader could possibly guess this, and at any rate Luke would not have made the remark till ver. 28. If, on the other hand, we refer αἵρης in this supposed remark of Luke to the city, we can only assume, with Hug and Lekebusch, p. 419 f., that Luke has meant its destruction, which took place in the Jewish war. But even thus the notice would have no definite object in relation to the narrative, which is concerned not with the city, but with the way as the scene of the event. Hug and Lekebusch indeed suppose that the recent occurrence of the destruction induced Luke to notice it here on the mention of Gaza; but it is against this view in its turn, that Luke did not write till a considerable time after the destruction of Jerusalem. Reland, Wolf, Krebs, inappropiately interpret εἰρήνως as unfortified, which the context must have suggested, and which would yield a very meaningless remark. Wassenberg, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel take refuge in the hypothesis of an interpolated gloss.

Ver. 27. Καὶ ἰδὼν] And behold (there was) a man. Comp. on Matt. iii. 17. — εἰνοίχος δύνασθαι] is, seeing that δύνασθαι is a substantive, most simply taken, not conjointly, a power-wielding eunuch, after the analogy of Herod. ii. 32: ἀνδρῶν δύνασθω παῖς, but separately: a eunuch, one wielding power, so that there is a double apposition. The more precise description what kind of wielder of power he was, follows, chief treasurer, γαλατιδὴς. The express mention of his sexual character is perhaps connected with the

---

1 Chrysostom, Occumenius.
2 Baumgarten.
3 Ewald, Jahrb. V. p. 237.
4 So Stark, Lc. p. 510 ff., following Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others.
5 De Wette, Wieseler, and others, following older interpreters.
6 Joseph. Bell. ii. 18. 1.
7 See Introduction, sec. 3.
8 As in the passages in Sturz, Lex. Xen. II. p. 339.
9 Comp. Eccles. viii. 1.
10 See Bornemann in loc.
11 Plut. Mor. p. 283 C; Athen. vi. p. 261 B.
universalism of Luke, in contrast to Deut. xxiii. 1. In the East, eunuchs were taken not only to be overseers of the harem, but also generally to fill the most important posts of the court and the closet,¹ hence εἰνοτότος is often employed generally of court officials, without regard to corporeal mutilation.² Many therefore, Cornelius a Lapide, de Dieu, Kuinoel, Olahauen, suppose that the Ethiopian was not emasculated, for he is called αὐτός and he was not a complete Gentile, as Eusebius and Nicephorus would make him, but, according to ver. 30 ff., a Jew, whereas Israelish citizenship did not belong to emasculated persons.³ But if so, εἰνοτότος, with which, moreover, the general word αὐτός ⁴ is sufficiently compatible, would be an entirely superfluous term. The very fact, however, that he was an officer of the first rank in the court of a queen, makes it most probable that he was actually a eunuch; and the objection drawn from Deut. l.c. is obviated by the very natural supposition that he was a proselyte of the gate, comp. on John xii. 20. That this born Gentile, although a eunuch, had been actually received into the congregation of Israel (Baumgarten), and accordingly a proselyte of righteousness, as Calovius and others assumed, cannot be proved either from Isa. lvi. 3–6, where there is a promise of the Messianic future, in the salvation of which even Gentiles and eunuchs were to share; nor from the example of Ebedmelech, Jer. xxxviii. 7 ff., considered by Baumgarten as the type of the chamberlain, of whom it is not said that he was a complete Jew; nor can it be inferred from the distant journey of the man and his quick reception of baptism,⁵ which is a very arbitrary inference. Eusebius, ii. 1, also designates him as πρωτός ἔξι ἐθνών, who had been converted. Κανόνις was, like Pharaoh among the Egyptian kings, the proper name in common of the queens of Ethiopia, which still in the times of Eusebius was governed by queens.⁶ Their capital was ἱπερεία.⁷—On γάζα, a word received from the Persian, "pecuniam regiam, quam gazam Persae vocant," ⁸ into Greek and Latin.⁹—ἰνπί, as in vi. 3. Nepos, Datam. 5: "gazae custos regiae."—Tradition,¹⁰ with as much uncertainty as improbability,¹¹ calls the Ethiopian Indich and Judich, and makes him,—what is without historical proof, doubtless, but in itself not improbable, though so early a permanent establishment of Christianity in Ethiopia is not historically known,—the first preacher of the gospel among his countrymen, whose queen the legend with fresh invention makes to be baptized by him.¹²

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

---

¹ Pignor. de servio, p. 371 f.; Winer, Realw. a.v. Forschungen.
³ Dei. xxvii. 1; Michaels, Mos. R. II. § 95, IV. § 195; Ewald, Aith. p. 218.
⁴ He might even have been married. See Gen. xxxix. 1, and Knobel in loc.
⁵ Lange, apost. Zeitschr. II. p. 169.
⁶ See Strabo, xvii. 1. 54, p. 890; Dio Cass. liv. 5; Plin. N. H. vi. 85. 7. [140 f.]
⁷ See particularly Laurent, neuest. Stud. p. 84. [135]
⁸ Curt. iii. 18. 5.
¹⁰ Basovius, Annal. ad a. 1594, p. 549.
¹² Niceph. ii. 6.
on the way with Isaiah in particular, the Evangelist among the prophets, and with this very section concerning the Servant of God. Ver. 34 is not opposed to this. — εἰς τὸ τ. πνεύμα denotes the address of the Holy Spirit inwardly apprehended. Comp. x. 19. — κολλάζων] attach thyself to, separate not thyself from.¹ — ἄρα γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις.] For instances of a similar paronomasia,² see Winer, p. 591 [E. T. 794 f.]. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 11. ἀπα, num (with the strengthening γε), stands here as ordinarily: "ut aliquid sive verae sive fictae dubitationis admisceat."³ Philip doubts whether the Aethiopian was aware of the Messianic reference of the words which he read. — πῶς γάρ ἂν δυναίμεν κ.τ.λ.] an evidence of humility and susceptibility. ἀν, with the optative, denotes the subjective possibility conditionally conceived and consequently undecided.⁵ γάρ is to be taken without a no to be supplied before it: How withal, as the matter stands. See on Matt. xxvii. 23.

Vv. 32, 33. But the contents of the passage of Scripture which he read was this. τῆς γραφῆς] is here restricted by ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν to the notion of a single passage, as also, ver. 35, by ταύτης.⁷ Luther has given it correctly. But many others refer ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν to ἡ περιοχή: "locus autem scripturae, quem legebant, hic erat," Kinoel, following the Vulgate. But it is not demonstrable that περιοχή signifies a section; even in the places cited to show this,⁸ it is to be taken as here: what is contained in the passage, and this is then verbally quoted.⁹ — ὡς πρόβατον κ.τ.λ.] Isa. liii. 7, 8, with unimportant variation from the LXX.¹⁰ The subject of the whole oracle is the ἰησοῦς, Ἰησοῦς, i.e. according to the correct Messianic understanding of the apostolic church, the Messiah.¹¹ The prophetic words, as Luke gives them, are as follows: As a sheep He has been led to the slaughter; and as a lamb, which is dumb before its shearer, so He opens not His mouth. In His humiliation His judgment was taken away; i.e. when He had so humbled Himself to the bloody death, comp. Phil. ii. 8, the judicial fate imposed on Him by God¹² was taken from Him, so that now therefore the culmination and crisis of His destiny set in, comp. Phil. ii. 9. But His offspring who shall describe? i.e. how indescribably great is the multitude of those belonging to Him, of whom He will now be the family Head, comp. Phil. ii. 10! for ground of the origin of this immeasurable progenies, His life is taken away from the earth, so that He enters upon His heavenly work relieved from the trammels of earth.¹³ γενεά does not, any more than ἰησοῦς, signify duration of life.¹⁴

¹ Comp. Ruth ii. 8; Tob. vi. 17; 1 Macc. vii. 21.
² Compare the well-known saying of Julian:
³ ἀνέγινωσκεν, ἔγκυνω, κατέγινω.
⁵ See Kühner, § 457. [xli. 10.
⁶ Comp. i. 16; Luke iv. 31; and on Mark
⁸ Hesych. Suld.: ὑπόθεσις.
⁹ Comp. the use of περιοχής, 1 Pet. ii. 6, and
¹⁰ Huther in loc.
¹¹ Which, however, deviates considerably, and in part erroneously, from the original Hebrew.
¹² Matt. viii. 17; Mark xv. 38; John xii. 38 ff., i. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 22 ff. Comp. the ἅδη τοῦ Θεοῦ, iii. 13, 25, iv. 27, 30.
¹³ The designation of His destiny of suffering as ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ presupposes the idea of its vicarious and propitiatory character.
¹⁴ Comp. John xii. 32; Rom. v. 10, vili. 29, 34, xiv. 9.
¹⁵ Luther, Beza, Calvin, and others.
The explanation, also, of the indescribably wicked race of the contemporaries of Christ, who proved their depravity by putting Him to death (ὅτι αἰτεται κ.τ.λ.), is inappropriate. Such is the view I have previously taken, with de Wette and older commentators. But in this way the prophecy would be diverted from the person of the Messiah, and that to something quite obvious of itself; whereas, according to the above explanation, the αἰτεται ἀνίπτω τ. γ. ἡ κυρίων αὐτ. stands in thoughtful and significant correlation to ἡ κυρίων αὐτοῦ ἡρμήν. In these correlates lies the δικαιοσύνη of the Humbled one, John xvi. 10. The Fathers have explained γένεα in the interest of orthodoxy, but here irrelevantly, of the eternal generation of the Son.  

Vv. 34-38. Ἀποκριθεὶς for Philip had placed himself beside him in the chariot, ver. 31; and this induced the eunuch, desirous of knowledge and longing for salvation, to make his request, in which, therefore, there was so far involved a reply to the fact of Philip having at his solicitation joined him. The question is one of utter unconcealed ignorance, in which, however, it is intelligently clear to him on what doubtful point he requires instruction. ἅνωτας κ.τ.λ. [a pictorial trait, in which there is here implied something salient in reference to the following weighty announcement. — κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν] along the way. — τι κυλίν[σ] σφόδρα ψυχῆς τοῦτο ἐκκαιομένης, Chrysostom. — βαπτισθήναι] Certainly in the εὐγενείᾳ τοῦ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ there was comprehended also instruction concerning baptism. — Ver. 38. Observe the simply emphatic character of the circumstantial description. — ἐκλεισμοῦ to the charioteer. — Beza erroneously supposes that the water in which the baptism took place was the river Eleutherus. According to Jerome, de locis Heb., it was at the village Bethsaron. Robinson, Π. Η. 749, believes that he has discovered it on the road from Beit Jibrin to Gaza. For other opinions and traditions, see Hackett, p. 157; Sepp., p. 34.  

Vv. 39, 40. Luke relates an involuntary removal of Philip affected by the Spirit of God (κυνοῦν). He now had to apply himself to further work, after the design of the Spirit (ver. 29) had been attained in the case of the Ethiopian. The Spirit snatched him away (comp. John vi. 15), in which act not only the impulses and the impelling power, but also the mode, is conceived of as miraculous—as a sudden unseen transportation as far as Aṣhad, ver. 40. The sudden and quick hurrying away which took place on the impulse of the Spirit is the historical element in the case, to which tradition, and how easily this was suggested by the O. T. conception, annexed, in addition to the miraculous operative cause, also the miraculous mode of the event. But to go even beyond this admission, and to allow merely the country and person of the converted Ethiopian to pass as historical (Zeller), is wholly without warrant with such an operation of angel and Spirit as the narrative contains, when viewed in connection with the
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1 See Salier, Thek. I. p. 744.  
2 See on Matt. v. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 11. Comp. Acts x. 34.  
3 See Winer, p. 374 (R. T. 499).  
4 The excellent Bengel strangely remarks: "that one or other of the apostles may have gone even to America" part trajecta."  
6 Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Ezek. iii. 14; 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; also what happened to Habakkuk in Bel and the Dragon, 33.  
7 Kninoel, Olshausen, Comp. also Lange, apost. Zeitv. II. p. 118.  
8 In 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16.
supersensuous causal domain of N. T. facts in general.—ιποπέθετο γάρ κ.τ.λ.] he obtained no further sight of Philip, for he made no halt, nor did he take another road in order to seek again him who was removed from him, but he went on his way with joy, namely, over the salvation obtained in Christ (comp. xvi. 34). He knew that the object of his meeting with Philip was accomplished. —εἰς Ἀσχόδον] He was found removed to Ashdod. Transported thither, he again became visible. —Ἀσχόδος — Ἅρμαν, Josh. xiii. 8, 1 Sam. v. 5, was a Philistine city, the seat of a prince; after its destruction by Jonathan rebuilt by Gabinius, 4 270 stadia to the north of Gaza, to the west of Jerusalem, now as a village named Edud. —Κασάπεια is the celebrated Kaos. Σεβαστή, so called in honour of Augustus, built by Herod I. on the site of the Castellum Stratonis,—the residency of the Roman procurators, on the Mediterranean, sixty-eight miles north-west of Jerusalem; it became the abode of Philip; see xxi. 8. He thus journeyed northward from Ashdod, perhaps through Ekron, Ramah, Joppa, and the plain of Sharon. There is no reason to regard the notice έκ . . . Κασάπειαν as prophetic, and to assume that Philip, at the time of the conversion of Cornelius, x. 1 ff., was not yet in Caesarea, 4 seeing that Cornelius is by special divine revelation directed to Peter, and therefore has no occasion to betake himself to Philip.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

1 A great persecution. V. 1.

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

2 Comp. xxi. 18; Esth. i. 5; Xen. Anab. iii. 4. 18: εἰς τούτον δὲ τῶν σταθμῶν Τυσσαφίου ἔστησαν, 2 Mach. i. 33.
3 Herod. ii. 157; Diod. xix. 55; in Strabo, xvi. 396, p. 769; oxytone, incorrectly; see Lip-
NOTES.

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

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

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

(ri) Simon believed. V. 13.

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

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

(xv) Mission of Peter and John. V. 14.

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

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

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

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

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

VER. 3. ἀπὸ] A B C G Μ, min. have ἐκ, which is, no doubt, recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Born., but is inserted from xxii. 6 to express the meaning more strongly.—Instead of περιήγησας. Lachm. has περιήγησα. A weakly attested error of transcription.—Ver. 5. κύριος εἶπεν] Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., after A B C, min. Vulg. In some other witnesses (including Μ), only κύριος is wanting; and in others, only εἶπεν. The Recepta is a clumsy filling up of the original bare ὁ δὲ.—After διώκεις, Eliz., following Erasm., has (instead of ἀλλά, ver. 6) αἰκηρὸς σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. Τρέμων τε καὶ βαμβῶν εἶπεν κύριε, τὰ μὲ θέλεις ποιῆσαι; καὶ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν, against all Greek cods. Chrys. Theoph. and several vss. 1 An old amplification from xxi. 10, xxvi. 14.—Ver. 8. οὐδένα] A Μ B Ψ, Syr. utr. Ar. Vulg. have οὐδὲν. So Lachm. Tisch. Born. The Recepta has originated mechanically from following ver. 7.—Ver. 10. The order ὑπὸ ὀραματις ὁ κύριος. (Lachm. Tisch. Born.,) has the decisive preponderance of testimony.—Ver. 12. ἐν ὀραματις] is wanting in A Μ, loq. Copt. Aest. Vulg. B C have it after ἀνέφα (so Born.). Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An explanatory addition to εἶδον. —Instead of χειρα, Lachm. and Born. have τὰ χεῖρας, after B E, vss.; also A C Μ, loq. which, however, do not read τὰς. From ver. 17, and because ἐπιτῆς τὰς χεῖρας is the usual expression in the N. T. (in the active always so, except this passage). —Ver. 17. ἀγκώσα] Lachm. Born. read ἱκουσα, which is decidedly attested by A B C E Μ, min.—Ver. 18. After ἀνεβλεψέ τε Eliz. has παραχρῆμα, which is wanting in decisive witnesses, and, after Erasm. and Bengel, is deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. A more precisely defining addition.—Ver. 19. After ἐγέρετο δὲ Eliz. has ὁ Σαῦλος, against decisive testimony. Beginning of a church-lesson.—Ver. 20. Ἰσοῦν] Eliz. reads Χριστόν, against A B C E Μ, min. vss. Iren. Amid the prevalent interchange of the two names this very preponderance of authority is decisive. But Ἰσοῦν is clearly confirmed by the following δέι οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ οἶδα τ. Θεοῦ, as also by ver. 22, where οὖν necessarily presupposes a preceding Ἰσοῦς. —Ver. 24. παρετήρουν τε] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read παρετηροῦντο δὲ καὶ, which is to be preferred according to decisive testimony. —αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ, after A B C F Μ, loq. 2 Or. Jcr. This reading has in its favour, along with the preponderance of witnesses, the circumstance that before (ver. 19) and after (ver. 26) the μαθηταί are mentioned absolutely, and the expression οἱ μαθ. αὐτοῦ might appear objectionable. In what follows, on nearly the same evidence, διὰ τοῦτο καθήκαν αὐτὸν is to be read.—Ver. 26. After παραγ. δὲ Eliz. has ὁ Σαῦλος, E, ὁ Παῦλος. An addition. —εἰς] B E G H, min. Occ. Theophyl. have ἵνα recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The evidence leaves it doubtful; but considering the frequency of παραγεν. with εἰς

1 The words are found in Vulg. Ar. pol. Aeth. Arm. Syr. p. (with an asterisk) Slav. Theophyl. 2 Occ. Hil. in Ps. ii., but with many variations of detail.
(xiii. 14, xv. 4; Matt. ii. 1; John viii. 2), whereas it does not further occur with ἐν in the N. T., ἐν would be more easily changed into εἰς than the converse. — ἤπειραίοι] Lachm. and Born. read ἤπειραίον (after A B C Μ, min.), which was easily introduced as the usual form (πειράματι only again occurs in the N. T. in xxvi. 21; Heb. iv. 15?). — Ver. 28. ἐν Ἰερουσ. Lachm. Tisch. Born. have rightly adopted εἰς Ἰερου., which already Grieb. had approved after A B C E G Μ, min. Chrys. Oec. Theophyl. ἐν was inserted as more suitable than εἰς, which was not understood. Accordingly, καὶ before πάφης. is to be deleted with Lachm. and Tisch., following A B C Μ, min. vss. An insertion for the sake of connection. — Ver. 29. Ἐλληνισταῖς] A has Ἐλληνισ. From xi. 20. — Ver. 31. Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἡ ἐκκλησία . . . εἶχεν εἰς ἀρχον τοιούτων. . . τολμᾶν, after A B C Μ, min. and several vss., including Vulg. Rightly. The original ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία, κ.τ.λ., in accordance with the apostolic idea of the unity of the church, was explained by αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι (so E), which πάσαι was again deleted, and thus the Recepiata arose. — Ver. 33. Instead of κραβθάτω, κραβθάτων is to be adopted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., on preponderating evidence. — Ver. 38. ὡς κυριοὶ . . . αὐτῶν], Lachm. and Tisch. read ὡς κυριοὶ . . . ἡμῶν, after A B C E Μ, 104 Vulg., which with this preponderance of evidence is the more to be preferred, as internal grounds determine nothing for the one reading or the other.

(κ' Vv. 1, 2. Ἐβρ.] See viii. 9, hence the narrative does not stand isolated (Schleiermacher). — οἵτινές ἐπείλιθα κ. φῶν εἰς τ. μαθ.] out of threatening and murder breathing hard at the disciples, whereby is set forth the passionateness with which he was eager to terrify the Christians by threats, and to hurry them to death. In ἤπειραίον, observe the compound, to which the εἰς τ. μαθ. belonging to it corresponds; so that the word signifies: to breathe hard at or upon an object; as often also in classical writers, yet usually with the dative instead of with εἰς. The expression is stronger than if it were said πνεύμων ἄπειλθα κ.τ.λ.1 The genitives ἄπειλθα and φῶν denote whence this ἤπειραίον issued; threatening and murder, i.e. sanguinary desire (Rom. i. 29), was within him what excited and sustained his breathing hard. — τὸ ἀρχετέρον?
If the conversion of Paul occurred in the year 85,4 then Caiaphas was still high priest, as he was not deposed by Vitellius until the year 88.4 Jonathan the son of Ananus (Joseph. Antt. xviii. 4. 3) succeeded him; and he, after a year, was succeeded by his brother Theophilus.5—(κ'') Δαμασκόν, ρηθῆναι, the old capital of Syria, in which, since the period of the Seleucidae, so many Jews resided that Nero could cause 10,000 to be executed.6 It was specially to Damaseus that the persecuting Saul turned his steps, partly, doubtless, because the existence of the hated sect in that city was well known to him—the church there may have owed its origin and its enlargement as well to the journeys of the resident Jews to the feasts, as to visits of the dispersed from Jerusalem; partly, perhaps, also, because personal connections promised
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1 Lobeck, ad Až. p. 343; Boeckh, Expl. Find. p. 341.
2 Comp. ἡμεῖς τοιαύτης, Jos. x. 40; φῶν χριστιανά, Nom. Dut. 36; Aristop. Μθ. p. 437; Winer, p. 192 (E. T. 358).
3 Introduction, sec. 4.
4 Anger, de temp. lat. p. 184.
5 Joseph. Antt. xviii. 5. 3.
for his enterprise there the success which he desired. — πρὸς τὰς συναγωγ.];
from which, consequently, the Christians had not as yet separated them-
Selves. — The recognition of the letters of authorization at Damascus was not
to be doubted, as that city was in the year 35 still under Roman dominion;
and Roman policy was accustomed to grant as much indulgence as possible
to the religious power of the Sanhedrim, even in criminal matters, only the
execution of the punishment of death was reserved to the Roman authority.
— γὰς ὅσῳ διανο.] who should be of the way. The way, in the ethical sense, is
here κατὰ ἐξοχὴν the Christian, i.e. the characteristic direction of life as de-
termined by faith on Jesus Christ (ὁ δὲ κυρίον, xviii. 25),—an expression in
this absolute form peculiar to the Book of Acts, but which certainly was
in use in the apostolic church. Oecumenius indicates the substantial mean-
ing: τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν εἰπε πολεμεῖαν — εἶναι, with the genitive in the sense of
belonging to. 3

Vv. 3–9. The conversion of Saul does not appear, on an accurate considera-
tion of the three narratives, which agree in the main points, to have had
the way psychologically prepared for it by scruples of conscience as to his perse-
cuting proceedings. On the contrary, Luke represents it in the history at
our passage, and Paul himself in his speeches, as in direct and immediate
contrast to his vehement persecuting zeal, amidst which he was all of a
sudden internally arrested by the miraculous fact from without. Moreover,
previous scruples and inward struggles are ē priori, in the case of a char-
acter so pure—at this time only erring—firm, and ardently decided as he
also afterwards continued to be, extremely improbable: he saw in the
destruction of the Christian church only a fulfilment of duty and a merito-
rious service for the glory of Jehovah. 7 For the transformation of his firm
conviction into the opposite, of his ardent interest against the gospel into
an ardent zeal for it, there was needed—with the pure resoluteness of his
will, which even in his unwearied persecutions was just striving after a
righteousness of his own—a heavenly power directly seizing on his inmost
conscience; and this he experienced, in the midst of his zealot enterprise,
on the way to Damascus, when that perverted striving after righteousness
and merit was annihilated. The light which from heaven suddenly shone
around him brighter than the sun 8 was no flash of lightning (ō'). The
similarity of the expression in all the three narratives militates against this
assumption so frequently made, and occurring still in Schrader; and Paul
himself certainly knew how to distinguish in his recollection a natural
phenomenon, however alarming, from a φως ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄραμαν associated with
a heavenly revelation. 10 This φῶς was rather the heavenly radiance, with

2 ix. 8, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14, 22.
3 See Bernhardy, p. 182; Winer, p. 184 (E.
7 34).
4 [x., xxii., xxvi.
5 xxii. and xxvi.; comp. also Gal. 1. 14, 15;
Phil. iii. 13.
86, p. 291 f.
7 xxii. 8; comp. Gal. 1. 14; Phil. III. 6.
8 Phil. iii. 6.
9 xxvi. 12.
10 This applies in the main, also, against
Ewald, p. 275, who assumes a dazzling celestial
phenomenon of an unexpected and terrible
nature, possibly a thunder-storm, or rather a
deadly scirocco in the middle of a sultry day,
etc.
which the exalted Christ appearing in His ὄψις is surrounded. In order to a scripturally true conception of the occurrence, moreover, we may not think merely in general of an internal vision produced by God;¹ nor is it enough specially to assume a self-manifestation of Christ made merely to the inner sense of Saul,—although externally accompanied by the miraculous appearance of light,—according to which by an operation of Christ, who is in heaven, He presented Himself to the inner man of Saul, and made Himself audible in definite words.² On the contrary, according to 1 Cor. xv. 8, Christ must really have appeared to him in His glorified body.³ For only the objective, this also against Ewald, and real corporeal appearance corresponds to the category of appearances, in which this is placed at 1 Cor. xv. 8, as also to the requirement of apostleship, which is expressed in 1 Cor. ix. 1 most definitely, and that in view of Peter and the other original apostles, by τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν τὸν Χριστόν.⁴ The Risen One Himself was in the light which appeared, and converted Saul, and hence Gal. i. 1: τὸν ἐγείραν τὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, with which also Gal. i. 16 fully agrees; comp. Phil. iii. 12. This view is rightly adopted, after the old interpreters, by Lyttleton,⁵ Hess, Michaelis, Haselius,⁶ and by most modern interpreters except the Tübingen School; as well as by Olshausen and Neander, both of whom, however, without any warrant in the texts, assume a psychological preparation by the principles of Gamaliel, by the speech of Stephen, and by the sight of his death. For the correct view comp. Baumgarten; Diestelmaier;⁷ Oertel,⁸ who also enlarges on the connection of the doctrine of the apostle with his conversion.⁹ On the other hand, de Wette does not go beyond an admission of the enigmatical character of the matter; Lange¹⁰ connects the objective fact with a visionary perception of it; and Holsten,¹¹ after the example of Baur, attempts to make good the vision, which he assumes, as a real one, indeed, but yet as an immanent psychological act of Saul’s own mind,—a view which is refuted by the necessary resemblance of the fact to the other Christophanies in 1 Cor. xv.¹² All the attempts of Baur and his

¹ Welles, Schweitzer, Schenkel, and others.
³ Comp. ix. 1.
⁴ Comp. ix. 17, 27.
⁵ Comp. Paul in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitachr. 1861, p. 188 ff.
⁶ See in loc.
⁷ On the conversion, etc., translated by Hahn, Hannov. 1731.
⁸ Ludg. Bat. 1806.
⁹ Jugendzettel des Paulus, 1866, p. 57 ff.
¹¹ See also Hofstedt de Groot, Pauli consecratio præcipuæ theologæ Pauli. Jonas, Groening. 1866, who, however, in setting forth this connection mixes up too much that is arbitrary.
¹³ In Hilgenfeld’s Zeitachr. 1861, p. 203 ff.
CONVERSION OF SAUL.

school to treat the event as a visionary product from the laboratory of Saul's own thoughts are exegetical impossibilities, in presence of which Baur himself at last stood still acknowledging a mystery. It is no argument against the actual bodily appearance, that the text speaks only of the light, and not of a human form rendered visible. For, while in general the glorified body may have been of itself inaccessible to the human eye, so, in particular, was it here as enclosed in the heavenly radiance; and the texts relate only what was externally seen and apparent also to the others,—namely, the radiance of light, out of which the Christ surrounded by it made Himself visible only to Saul, as He also granted only to him to hear His words, which the rest did not hear. Whoever, taking offence at the diversities of the accounts in particular points as at their miraculous tenor, sets down what is so reported as unhistorical, or refers it, with Zeller, to the psychological domain of nascent faith, is opposed, as regards the nature of the fact recorded, by the testimony of the apostle himself in 1 Cor. xv. 8, ix. 1, with a power sustained by his whole working, which is not to be broken, and which leads ultimately to the desperate shift of supposing in Paul, at precisely the most decisive and momentous point of his life, a self-deception as the effect of the faith existing in him; in which case the narrative of the Book of Acts is traced to a design of legitimating the apostleship of Paul, which in the sequel is further confirmed by the authority of Peter.—Hardly deserving now of historical notice is the uncritical rationalism of the method that preceded the critical school of Baur, by which the whole occurrence was converted into a fancy-picture, in which the persecutor's struggles of conscience furnished the psychological ground and a sudden thunderstorm the accessories,—a view with which some associate the exegetical blunder of identifying the fact with 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.; while Brenecke makes Jesus, who was only apparently dead, appear to Saul to check his persecuting zeal. These earlier attempts to assign the conversion of the apostle to the natural sphere are essentially distinguished, in respect

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

1 See his Christenth. d. drei ersten Jahr. p. 6, ed. 2.
2 See xxii. 9. The statement, ix. 7: αὐτοῦ τινας mιν ἀφέων, is evidently a trait of tradition already disfiguring the history, to which the apostle's own narrative, as it is preserved at xiii. 9, must without hesitation be preferred.
3 After Vitringa, Obes. p. 370, and particularly Eichhorn, Ammon, Boehme, Heinrichs, Kninoel, and others.
4 Emmerling and Breuschneider.
5 After Bahrdt and Venturiini.
of their basis, from those of the critical school of Baur and Holsten, by the circumstance that the latter proceed from the postulates of pantheistic, and the former from those of theistic, rationalism. But both agree in starting from the negation of a miracle, by which Saul could have come to be among the prophets, as they consign the resurrection of the Lord Himself from the dead to the same negative domain. In consequence of this, indeed, they cannot present the conversion of Paul otherwise than under the notion of an immanent process of his individual mental life. — ἀπὸ τ. ὅψαυσθεί—belongs to περίστερα.¹

Vv. 4, 5. The light shone around him, and not his companions. Out of the light the present Christ manifested Himself at this moment to his view: he has seen the Lord,² who afterwards makes Himself known also by name; and the persecutor, from terror at the heavenly vision, falls to the ground, when he hears the voice speaking in Hebrew:³ Saul, Saul, etc.—τί με διόκεσις; τί παρ’ ἐμοί μέγα ἡ μικρὴν ἡδύκομον ταύτα ποιεῖς; Chrysostom. Christ Himself is persecuted in His people. Luke x. 16. "Caput pro membris clamabat," Augustine.—τίς εἰ, κύριε;]. On the question whether Saul, during his residence in Jerusalem, had personally seen Christ⁴ or not, comp. on 2 Cor. v. 16, no decision can at all be arrived at from this passage, as the form in which the Lord presented Himself to the view of Saul belonged to the heavenly world and was surrounded with the glorious radiance, and Saul himself, immediately after the momentary view and the overwhelming impression of the incomparable appearance, fell down and closed his eyes. —Observe in ver. 5 the emphasis of ἵναι and σοί.

Ver. 6. Ἀλλὰ] breaking off.—According to chap. xxvi., Jesus forthwith gives Saul the commission to become the apostle of the Gentiles, which, according to the two other narratives, here and chap. xxii., is only given afterwards through the intervention of Ananias. This diversity is sufficiently explained by the fact that Paul in the speech before Agrippa abridges the narrative, and puts the commission, which was only subsequently conveyed to him by the instrumentality of another, at once into the mouth of Christ Himself, the author of the commission; by which the thing in itself, the command issued by Christ to him, is not affected, but merely the exactness of the representation, the summary abbreviation of which on this point Paul might esteem as sufficient before Agrippa.⁵

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

¹ Comp. xxvii. 6, xxvi. 13; Xen. Cypr. iv. 2. 15: ὡς εἰς τοῖς ὅψαυσθείς. On περίστερα, comp. Juvenec. in Stob. cxvii. 9; 4 Mac. iv. 10.
² (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8), Acts x. 17, 27.
³ xxvi. 14.
⁴ Schrader, Oehleransen, Ewald, Kelm, Beyerlich, and others.
⁵ See on Mark xvi. 7, and Baumlein, Portilh. p. 15.
⁶ In opposition to Zeiler, p. 198.
⁷ ἴνεος, dumb, speechless (here, from terror), is to be written with one υ (not ἴνεος), as is done by Lachm. Tisch. Born. after ABCHE MT. See on the word, Valck. ad A. L.; Bornem, ad Xen. Anab. iv. 5 83; Ruhnke. ad Thes. p. 102.
SAUL FASTING IN DAMASCUS.

essential non-agreement of the several accounts, whereby both the main substance of the event itself, and the impartial conscientiousness of Luke in not arbitrarily harmonizing the different sources, are simply confirmed (p). — ἀκοόμενος μὲν τῆς φωνῆς] does not agree with xxii. 9. The artificial attempts at reconciliation are worthless, namely: that τῆς φωνῆς, by which Orkist's voice is meant, applies to the words of Paul; or, that φωνή is here a noise (thunder), but in xxii. 9 an articulate voice; or, that ἢκονων in xxii. 9 denotes the understanding of the voice, or the definite giving ear in reference to the speaker, which is at variance with the fact, that in both places there is the simple contradistinction of seeing and hearing; hence the appeal to John xii. 28, 29 is not suitable, and still less the comparison of Dan. x. 7. — μὴ δέ τε θεωρ. But seeing no one, from whom the voice might have come; μὴ δένα is used, because the participles contain the subjective cause of their standing perplexed and speechless. It is otherwise in ver. 8: οἴδας ἐβλέπε. Vv. 8, 9. Ἀνεφυγόντων δὲ τῶν ὄρθωλ. Consequently Saul had lain on the ground with closed eyes since the appearance of the radiance (ver. 4), which, however, as the appearance of Jesus for him is to be assumed as in and with the radiance, cannot prove that he had not really and personally seen the Lord. — οἴδας ἐβλέπε] namely, because he was blinded by the heavenly light, and not possibly in consequence of the journey through the desert, see xxii. 11. The connection inevitably requires this explanation by what immediately follows; nor is the Recepta oídeva ἔβλ. (see the critical remarks) to be explained otherwise than of being blinded, in opposition to Haselaar and others, who refer oídeva to Jesus. — μὴ βλέπων] he was for three days without being able to see, i.e. blind, so that he had not his power of vision. Hence here μὴ from the standpoint of the subject concerned; but afterwards οἶκ and oíde, because narrating objectively. — οἶκ ἐφαγεν oíde ἐπεν] an absolute negation of eating and drinking, and not "a cibi potusve largsiorius usu abstinebat," Kuinoel. By fasting Saul partly satisfied the compunction into which he could not but now feel himself brought for the earlier wrong direction of his efforts, and partly prepared himself by fasting and prayer (ver. 11) for the decisive change of his inward and outward life, for which, according to ver. 6, he waited a special intimation. See ver. 18.

1 See the note on ver. 3 ff.
2 So, against the context, Chrysostom, Ammonius, Oecumenius, camerarius, Castalio, Bza, Valarius, Clarus, Erasmus Schmid, Heumann, and others.
3 So erroneously, in opposition to ver. 4, Hammond, Elmer, Fabricius, ad Cod. Apor. N. T., p. 468, Rosenmüller, Morris, Heinrichs.
4 So, after Grotius and many older interpreters, in Wolf, Kuinoel, and Hackett.
5 Bengel, Baumgarten.
6 That the blinding took place as a symbol of the previous spiritual blindness of Saul (Calvis, Grotius, de Wette, Baumgarten, and others) is not indicated by anything in the text, and may only be considered as the edifying application of the history, although Baur makes the formation of the legend attach itself to this idea. That blinding of Saul was a simple consequence of the heavenly radiance, and served (as also the fasting) to withdraw him for a season wholly from the outer world, and to restrict him to his inner life. And the blindness befell Saul alone: ἵνα μὴ κοινών καὶ ὡς ἠδὸν τήν ημερῶν μνήμην ἐλλα θείας φρονήσεως, Oecumenius.
7 John ix. 39; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. (i. p. 308.
8 Comp. Winer, p. 463 (E. T. 610).
9 John iii. 7; Esth. iv. 16.
Ver. 10. 'O σπινως] Christ. — ἐν ὅραμασ] in a vision;* whether awake or asleep, the context does not decide, not even by ἀναπαύγ, ver. 11. Eichhorn's view, with which Kuinoel and partially also Heinrichs agree,—that Saul and Ananias had already been previously friends, and that the appearance in a dream as naturally resulted in the case of the former from the longing to speak with Ananias again and to get back sight by virtue of a healing power which was well known to him, as in the case of Ananias, who had heard of his friend's fate on the way and of his arrival and dream,—is a fiction of exegetical romance manufactured without the slightest hint in the text, and indeed in opposition to vv. 11 f., 14. The course of the conversion, guided by Christ directly revealing Himself, is entirely in accordance with its commencement (vv. 3–9): "but we know not the law according to which communications of a higher spiritual world to men living in the world of sense take place, so as to be able to determine anything concerning them" (Neander). According to Baur, the two corresponding visions of Ananias and (ver. 12) Saul are literary parallels to the history of the conversion of Cornelius. And that Ananias was a man of legal piety (xxii. 12), is alleged by Schneckenburger and Baur to be in keeping with the tendency of Luke, although he does not even mention it here; Zeller, p. 196, employs even the frequent occurrence of the name to call in question whether Ananias "played a part" in the conversion of the apostle at all.

Vv. 11, 12. There is a "straight street," according to Wilson, still in Damascus.* — Σαλον γνωματι] Saul by name, Saul, as he is called.* — ἵνα γὰρ . . . ἀναστήθη ψυ] contains the reason of the intimation given: for, behold, he prays, is now therefore in the spiritual frame which is requisite for what thou art to do to him, and—he is prepared for thy very arrival to help him—he has seen in a vision a man, who came in and, etc. — Imposition of hands' is here also the medium of communication of divine grace. — ἀναπαύμενος ἀνανιας] This is put, and not the simple ὁ, to indicate that the person who appeared to Saul had been previously entirely unknown to him, and that only on occasion of this vision had he learned his name, Ananias.

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

1 See vv. 13, 14, 17.
2 x. 3, xvi. 9, al.; differently vii. 31.
3 p. 168 f.
4 Chap. v. and xxxii. 2, xxxiv. 1.
5 The house in which Paul is said to have dwelt is still pointed out. See also the Ausland, 1866, No. 94, p. 564. Comp. Hackett in loc., and Petermann, Relig im Orient, I. p. 98.
6 Comp. Xen. Anab. 1. 4. 11: κόλας . . . Οὐσισσεσ ἐκλείδυμεν. Tob. vi. 10; 4 Macc. v. 2.
7 Comp. on viii. 15.
* Wolf, Rosenmüller.
* Kuinoel.
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minded. — τοὺς ἄγιους σου] to the saints belonging to Thee, i.e. to the Christians: for they, through the atonement appropriated by means of faith, having been separated from the κόσμος and dedicated to God, belong to Christ, who has purchased them by His blood (xx. 28). — εἰς Ἰερον. belongs to καὶ ἐποίην. — Ver. 14. As to the ἐπικαλείσθαι of Christ, see on vii. 59. It is the distinctive characteristic of Christianity. — Ver. 15. σκεῖος ἐκλογής] a chosen vessel (instrument). In this vessel Christ will bear, etc. The generic of quality emphatically stands in place of the adjective. — τού βαστάσας κ.τ.λ.] contains the definition of σκ. ἐκλ. μοι ἵστιν ὦνος: to bear my Messianic name, by the preaching of the same, before Gentiles, and Kings, and Israelites. Observe how the future work of converting the Gentiles is presented as the principal work (εἰθὼν κ. βασιλ.). to which that of converting the Jews is related as a supplemental accessory; hence ιέρον Ἰερ. is added with τι. — The γὰρ, ver. 16, introduces the reason why He has rightly called him σκεῖος ἐκλογὴς κ.τ.λ.; for I shall show him how much he must suffer for my name, for its glorification. — The γιόω placed first has the force of the power of disposal in reference to σκεῖος ἐκλ. μοι ἵστιν: I am He, who will place it always before his eyes. On this Bengel rightly remarks: "Re ipsa, in toto ejus cursa,"—even to his death. According to de Wette, the reference is to revelation: the apostle will suffer with prophetic foresight. But such revelations are only known from his later ministry, whereas the experimental ἐπικαλεῖται commenced immediately, and brought practically to the consciousness of the apostle that he was to be that σκεῖος ἐκλογής amidst much suffering.

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

---

1. Comp. on Rom. i. 7.
2. Ver. 21; 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 10 ff.
4. Comp. Gal. i. 16.
5. The apostle's practice of always attempting, first of all, the work of conversion among the Jews is not contrary to this, as his destination to the conversion of the Gentiles is expressly designated without excluding the Jews, and accordingly was to be followed out without abandoning the historical course of salvation: 'Ενωδεῖς τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἐλληνις, Rom. i. 16. And what Paul was to attain in this way, entirely corresponds to the expression in our passage.
7. See on v. 41.
8. Comp. xx. 23, 25, xxii. 11.
9. Comp. Tob. x. 18.
10. See Aristot. ETH. x. 9; 1 Macc. vii. 28; 3 Macc. ii. 29; Test. XII. Patr. p. 533; and examples in Kypke, II. p. 44, and from the LXX. in Schleusner, II. p. 367 f.
Vv. 19, 20 f. But he continued some days with the Christians there, and
then he immediately preached Jesus in the synagogues, at Damascus, namely,
that He was the Son of God.¹ This is closely connected, and it is only with
extreme violence that Michaelis and Heinrichs have referred ver. 19 to the
time before the journey to Arabia,² and ver. 20 to the time after that
journey. Pearson placed the Arabian journey before ver. 19, which is at
variance with the close historical connection of vv. 18 and 19; just as the
connection of vv. 21 and 22 does not permit its being inserted before ver.
23 (Laurent). The εἶδον as in Gal. i.c. is decisive against Kuinoel, Olshausen,
Ebrard, Sepp, p. 44 f., and others, who place this journey and the return
to Damascus after ver. 25. The Arabian excursion, which certainly was but
brief, is historically—for Luke was probably not at all aware of it, and has
at least left it entirely out of account as unimportant for his object, which
has induced Hilgenfeld and Zeller to impute his silence to set purpose—
most fitly referred with Neander to the period of the ἡμέρας ικαναί, ver. 23.³
The objection, that Saul would then have gone out of the way of his
opponents and their plot against him would not have taken place,⁴ is
without weight, as this hostile project may be placed after the return from
Arabia.⁵ It is, however, to be acknowledged⁶ that the time from the
conversion to the journey to Jerusalem cannot have been known to Luke
as so long an interval as it actually was—three years, Gal. i. 18—seeing
that for such a period the expression indefinitely, no doubt, but yet measured
by days (it is otherwise at ver. viii. 11), ἡμέρας ικαναί, ver. 23,¹¹ is not
sufficient.—ἐν ταῖς συναγ. ὁ Χρυσόστομος—ὁ παρθένος-seen on
Gal. i. 18.—καὶ ὅσον κ.τ.λ. and hither, to Damascus, he had come for the
object, that he, etc. How contradictory to his conduct now!⁸ On the
subjunctive ἀγάπη, see Winer.⁹

Vv. 22, 23. But Saul, in presence of such judgments, became strong in
his new work all the more.¹⁰—ἀνελευθέρωσε made perplexed, put out of countenance,
ἐπεστάλευσεν, ὁ εἰς τι εἰσείρειν.¹¹ The form χίνα instead of χεῖρ belongs to late
Greek.—σωματικά.² Term proving,—ἐπληροῦντο, as in vii. 23. ἰκαναί, as in ver. 43,
xi. 18, xvii. 7, of a considerable time,¹⁴ especially common with Luke (q.²)

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

¹ ó εἶδον τοῦ Ἰουδαίου occurs only here (xiii. 38 is
a quotation from the O. T.) in the narrative
of the Book of Acts. The historical fact is:
Paul announced that Jesus was the Messiah,
see ver. 22. He naturally did not as yet enter
on the metaphysical relation of the Sonship of
God; but this is implied in the conception of
Luke, when he from his fully formed Pauline
standpoint uses this designation of the Mes-
siah.
² Gal. i. 17.
³ Comp. on Gal. i. 17 and Introduction to
Romans, sect. 1.
⁴ De Wette.
⁵ With this agrees also the εἶδον, Gal. i.
16, which requires the Arabian journey to be
put very soon after the conversion, conse-
quently at the very commencement of the
ἡμέρας ικαναί, ver. 23. If this is done, that
εἶδον is not opposed to our view given above
(in opposition to Zeller, p. 203).
⁶ Comp. Baur.
⁷ Comp. ver. 43, xvii. 18, xvii. 7.
⁸ "Quasi dicerent: At iliam Saul Inter pro-
phetas," 1 Sam. x. 11, Grotius.
⁹ p 270 (E. T. 269).
¹⁰ Nægelsd. on the Ἰδιαίο, p. 227, ed. 3.
¹¹ Chrysostom. Comp. on ii. 6.
¹² Lobech, ad Phryn. p. 726.
¹³ Comp. i Cor. ii. 16; Schleusner, Theol. c. c.;
Jamblich. 60.
¹⁴ Plat. Legg. p. 736 C.
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in ver. 23. The subject is the Jews; they did it—and thereby the apparent
difference with 2 Cor. xi. 33 is removed—on the obtained permission or
order of the Arabian ethnarch. More artificial attempts at reconciliation
are quite unnecessary. —  αἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶ (see the critical remarks), opposed to
the ἰουδαίοι, ver. 22. Saul had already gained scholars among the Jews of
Damascus; they rescued him from the plot of their fellow Jews, in opposition
to de Wette’s opinion, that disciples of the apostle were out of the
question. — διὰ τοῦ τείγοντος through the wall: whether an opening found in it, or
the window of a building abutting on the city-wall, may have facilitated
the passage. The former is most suited to the mode of expression. —  ἐν
στερείῳ see on Matt. xv. 87.

Vv. 26, 27. Three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), Paul went for
the first time back to Jerusalem. Thus long, therefore, had his first
labours at Damascus lasted, though interrupted by the Arabian journey.
For the connection admits of no interruption between vv. 25 and 26, the
flight, ver. 25, and the παραγωγὴν στὶς εἰς Ἰερούσαλημ, ver 26, stand in close relation
to each other. Driven from Damascus, the apostle very naturally and
wisely directed his steps to the mother-church in Jerusalem, in order to enter
into connection with the older apostles, particularly with Peter, Gal.
i. 18. — τοῖς μαθηταῖς to the Christians. — καὶ πάντες ἐφοβοῦσιν: καὶ is the simple
and, which annexes the unfavourable result of the ἐπειράοντος. Observe,
moreover, on this statement— (1) that it presupposes the conversion
to have occurred not long ago; (2) that accordingly the ἤμωρα ἰσακῶν, ver.
23, cannot have been conceived by Luke as a period of three years; (3) but
that—since according to Gal. i. 18 Paul nevertheless did not appear till
three years after at Jerusalem—the distrust of all, here reported, and the
introduction by Barnabas resting on that distrust as its motive, cannot be
historical, as after three years’ working the fact that Paul was actually a
Christian could not but be undoubtedly in the church at Jerusalem.—  ὅτι
ἰστιν μαθὴς] to be annexed with Rinck and Bornemann, ἵστιν. — ἑρωνᾶρ] see on iv. 36. Perhaps he was at an earlier period acquainted with the
apostle. — ἐν θήλει,] graphically: he grasped him by the hand, and led him;
ἀνέβη, however, is governed by ἡγαγε, for ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι is always conjoined
with the genitive.—  πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστ. an approximate and very indefinite

1 Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 55.
2 Comp. Wieseler, p. 143.
3 On the spelling στερείῳ, attested by Κ W, see Lobeck, ad Phryg. p. 115.
4 According to Laurent, nearest. Stud. p. 70 ff, the journey to Jerusalem in our passage is
different from the journey in Gal. i. 18. The latter is to be placed before ix. 26. But in that
case the important journey, ix. 26, would be left entirely unmentioned in the Epistle to the
Galatians (for it is not to be found at Gal. i. 22, 23), which is absolutely irreconcilable
with the very object of narrating the journeys in that Epistle.
5 To explain the distrust from the enigmatical disappearance and re-emergence
of the apostle (Lange, Apost. Zeitschr. I. p. 98) is quite against the context of the Book of
Acts, in which the Arabian journey has no place. The distrust may in some measure be explained
by a long retirement in Arabia (comp. Ewald, p. 403), especially if, with Neander
and Ewald, we suppose also a prolonged interruption of communication between Da-
mascus and Jerusalem occasioned by the war of Aretas, which, however, does not admit of
being verified.
statement, expressed by the plural of the category; for, according to Gal. i. 18, only Peter and James the Lord’s brother were present; but not at variance with this, especially as Luke betrays no acquaintance with the special design of the journey—a design with which, we may add, the working related in vv. 28–30, although it can only have lasted for fifteen days, does not conflict. A purposely designed fiction, with a view to bring the apostle from the outset into closest union with the Twelve, would have had to make the very most of ἵστοριν. — καί διαγνάγον] not Paul, so Beza and others, as already Abdias⁵ appears to have taken it, but Barnabas, which the construction requires, and which alone is in keeping with the business of the latter, to be the patron of Paul. — δεί not δ, τι. — ἐν τ’ ὑπὸ τ. Ἰεροῦ] the name—the confession and the proclamation of the name—of Jesus, as the Messiah, was the element, in which the bold speaking ἰπάρχοντα ἑαυτῷ had free course.⁴

Vv. 28–30. Μετ’ αἰτῶν εἰσεπορ. κ. ἑπορ.] See on i. 21. According to the reading eis Ἰεροῦ., and after deletion of the following καί (see the critical remarks), eis Ἰεροῦ. is to be attached to παρερ. : He found himself in familiar intercourse with them, while in Jerusalem he spoke frankly and freely in the name of the Lord Jesus. Accordingly eis Ἰεροῦ. is to be taken as in ἐκῆλεσεν eis (Mark i. 39), λέγειν eis (John viii. 26), μαρτυρεῖν eis (Acts xxiii. 11), and similar expressions, where eis amounts to the sense of coram. Comp. Matthiae, § 578, 3 b; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 534. With ἐλάλει τικ. λ. (which is only to be separated from the preceding by a comma) there is annexed to the general eis Ἰεροῦ. παρερ. a special portion thereof, in which case, instead of the participle, there is emphatically introduced the finite tense.⁶ — πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήν.] with (against) the Greek-Jews, see on vi. 1. — ἐπεξείρων αὐτῶν ἀνέλειν] does not exclude the appearance of Christ, xxii. 17, 18, as Zeller thinks, since it is, on the contrary, the positive fulfilment of the υπὸ παραδίδοντα k. l. negatively announced in chap. xxii. — ἐκατστελλαν] they sent him away from them to Tarsus, after they had brought him down to Caesarea. On account of Gal. i. 27 it is to be assumed that the apostle journeyed from Caesarea to Tarsus, not by sea, but by land, along the Mediterranean coast through Syria; and not, with Calovius and Olshausen, that here Caesarea Philippi on the borders of Syria is to be understood as meant. The reader cannot here, any more than in vii. 40, find any occasion in the text to understand Ἰουδαία otherwise than as the celebrated capital; it is more probable, too, that Paul avoided the closer vicinity of Damascus. — How natural it was to his heart, now that he was recognised by his older colleagues in Jerusalem but persecuted by the Jews, to bring the salvation in Christ, first of all, to the knowledge of his beloved native region! And doubtless the first churches of Cilicia owed their origin to his abode at that time in his native country.

² ἰστοριναί Πέτρων, Gal. I. c.
³ Tit. ap. ii. 2.
⁴ From this is dated the ἄνδρα Ἰερουσαλημ Χ.
⁵ Comp. Eph. vi. 90.
⁶ Winer p. 588 (E. T. 717).
⁷ See on viii. 40.
VISITS JERUSALEM AND TARSUS.

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

Vv. 32-35. (r) This journey of visitation and the incidents related of Peter to the end of chap. x. occur, according to the order of the text, in the period of Paul’s abode in Cilicia after his departure from Jerusalem, ver. 30. Olshausen, in an entirely arbitrary manner, transfers them to the time of the Arabian sojourn, and considers the communication of the return to Jerusalem, at ix. 26 ff., as anticipated. — διὰ πάντων] namely, τῶν ἄχριν, as necessarily results from what follows. — Αἰδώλα, in the O. T. LORD, a village resembling a town, not far from the Mediterranean, near Joppa (ver. 38), at a later period the important city of Diospolis, now the village of Ludd. — A ἄντικ was, according to his Greek name, perhaps a Hellenist; whether he was a Christian, as Kuinoel thinks, because his conversion is not afterwards related, or not, in favour of which is the anything but characteristic designation ἀνθρωπὸν τίμα, remains undetermined. — ιάραις αἰ] actually, at this moment. — Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός] Jesus the Messiah. — σπρῶν σαρώνιων] Erroneously Heumann, Kuinoel: "Lectum, quem tibi hactenus alii

1 De Wette, ibid. 21; Rom. xii. 13; comp. on 2 Cor. xii. 16.
2 As in vi. 1, 7, vii. 17, xii. 94; hence not: it was filled with, etc. Vulgate, Baumgarten, and others.
3 As in iv. 25, xiii. 15, xv. 31; Phil. ii. 1.
4 Comp. xvi. 14.
5 Vulgate and others.
6 Gal. i. 22. Comp. xvi. 5.
7 Comp. also Wieseler, p. 146.
8 Comp. Rom. xv. 28.
9 1 Chron. ix. 12; Ezra ii. 33.
10 Joseph. Antt. xx. 6, 2; Bell. ii. 12. 6, iii. 3. 5.
12 The name Aroes (not to be identified with that of the Trojan Aries) is also found in Thuc. iv. 119. 1; Xen. Anab. iv. 7. 13, Hell. vii. 3. 1; Pind. Ol. vi. 140. Yet Aroes instead of Aries is found in a fragment of Sophocles (348 D) for the sake of the verse.
straverunt, in posterum tute tibi ipse sterne." The imperative aorist denotes the immediate fulfilment; hence: make thy bed, on the spot, for thyself; perform immediately, in token of thy cure, the same work which hitherto others have had to do for thee in token of thine infirmity. — ὀπέρνυμι, used also in classical writers absolutely, for εἰνας or the like. —
Saron, [ἡσα] a very fruitful; ἅ plain along the Mediterranean at Joppa, extending to Caesarea. — οἱ ἡσαὶ ἐκεῖπη ἐπὶ τ. κ. ἐπὶ τ. κ. The aorist does not stand for the pluperfect, so that the sense would be: all Christians; but: and there saw him, after his cure, all the inhabitants of Lydda and Saron, they who (quippe qui), in consequence of this practical proof of the Messiahship of Jesus, turned to the Lord. The numerous conversions, which occurred in consequence of the miraculous cure, are in a popular hyperbolical manner represented by πάντες οἱ κ.τ.λ. as a conversion of the population as a whole. — Since Peter did not first inquire as to the faith of the sick man, he must have known the man's confidence in the miraculous power communicated to him as the ambassador and announcer of the Messiah (ver. 34), or have read it from his looks, as in iii. 4. Chrysostom and Oecumenius adduce other reasons.

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

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

---

1 Eimal. ad Soph. A j. 1180; Kühner, II. p. 90.
2 Hom. Od. xix. 598; Plat. Ar. 22.
3 Not to be accentuated Žapovas, with Lachmann, but Žápov. See Bornemann in loc. Comp. Lobbeck, Paralip. p. 555.
4 Jerome, ad Jos. xxxiii. 19.
5 See Lightfoot, ad Mat. p. 38 f.; Arnold in Herzog's Encycl. XI. p. 10.
6 Kuinoel.
8 But probably a widow. To this point vāras ai ἱκές of ver. 39; all the widows of the church, who lamented their dead companion.
12 Thiereck, Sepp.
13 Anal. II. p. 77 ff.
14 Privatallerth. § 99. 5.
having *usually* served as the chamber for the dead; perhaps the room for privacy and prayer was chosen in this particular instance, because they from the very first thought to obtain the presence and agency of Peter. — ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθῶς κ. τ. λ. Comp. Num. xxii. 18. "Fides non tollit civilitatem verborum," Bengel. On the classical ἰκνεῖν, only here in the N. T., see Ruhnken, Jacobs. Thou mayest not hesitate to come to us. On διελθ., comp. Luke ii. 15.

Ver. 38. The widows, the recipients of the ἀγαθῶν ἵματ. κ. ἐπιτάφιοι, ver. 36, exhibit to Peter the under and upper garments, which they wore as gifts of the deceased, who herself, according to the old custom among women, had made them,—the eloquent utterance of just and deep sorrow, and of warm desire that the apostolic power might here become savingly operative; but, according to Zeller, a display calculated for effect. — ἦ δισεκέκατός The proper name expressed in Greek is, as the most attractive for non-Jewish readers, and perhaps also as being used along with the Hebrew name in the city itself, here repeated, and is therefore not, with Wassenberg, to be suspected.

Vv. 40-43. The putting out of all present took place in order to preserve the earnestness of the prayer and its result from every disturbing influence. — τῷ σώματι the dead body. See on Luke xvii. 37. On ἀνεκάθισε, comp. Luke vii. 15. — The explanation of the fact as an awakening from apparent death is exegetically at decided variance with ver. 37, but is also to be rejected historically, as the revival of the actually dead Tabitha has its historical precedents in the raisings of the dead by Jesus. Ewald's view also amounts ultimately to an apparent death (p. 245), placing the revival at that boundary-line, "where there may scarcely be still the last spark of life in a man." Baur, in accordance with his foregone conclusions, denies all historical character to the miracles at Lydda and Joppa, holding that they are narratives of evangelical miracles transferred to Peter; and that the very name Ταβίθα is probably derived simply from the ταιλθά κοντά, Mark v. 40, for Ταβίθα properly (?) denotes nothing but maiden. — κατά and in particular. — Ver. 42. ἐπί direction of the faith, as in xi. 17, xvi. 31, xxii. 19; Rom. iv. 24. — Ver. 43. θυσάμενοι although the trade of a tanner, on account of its being occupied with dead animals, was esteemed unclean, which Peter now disregarded. — The word θυσάμενος, in Artemidorus and others, has also passed into the language of the Talmud (תָּנָכָה). The more classical term is βυσσαδέφις.
The first section of the ninth chapter furnishes a record of an event in the early history of the church of Christ, second in interest and importance only to the wonders of the day of Pentecost—the sudden, miraculous conversion of Saul of Tarsus. He was a man of rare endowments, varied attainments, great influence, and indomitable energy; and he became the mightiest champion, and most zealous and successful missionary of the faith he had so fiercely undertaken to overthrow. More than any, or than all of the apostles, he has impressed his spirit and personality on evangelical Christianity; and thus he has wielded a more potent influence in the world than any man of his own, or of any other age, unless, indeed, we except that mighty man of God, the great emancipator and lawgiver of Israel. Of this marked event we have three distinct accounts in the Acts—one in the narrative of Luke, two in speeches delivered by Paul himself—and numerous allusions in his epistles. These accounts agree in all principal points, and only differ in subordinate details. The variety furnishes the highest evidence of the credibility of the history. The separate accounts mutually supplement each other, and give completeness to the record. Farrar says: "It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of Paul's conversion as one of the evidences of Christianity. That the same man who just before was persecuting Christianity with the most violent hatred should come, all at once, to believe in him whose followers he had been seeking to destroy, and that in this faith he should become a 'new creature'—what is this but a victory which Christianity owed to nothing but the spell of its own inherent power? Of all who have been converted to the faith of Christ, there is not one in whose case the Christian principle broke so immediately through everything opposed to it, and asserted so absolutely its triumphant superiority. Henceforth to Paul Christianity was summed up in the one word, Christ."

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

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

(p1) Stood speechless. V. 7.

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

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

(q1) Many days. V. 23.

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

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

VER. 1. After τις, Elz. Scholz have ἡν, which Lachm. Tisch. and Born. have deleted. It is wanting in A B C E G Ε, min., in the vss. and Theophyl.; it was inserted (after ix. 36), because the continuous construction of vv. 1–3 was mistaken. Almost according to the same testimony the usual τί, ver. 2, after ποιῶν is condemned as an insertion. — Ver. 3. Ὁσεῖ] Lachm. and Born. read ὅσει περὶ, after A B C E Ε, min. Dam. Theophyl. 2. Rightly; the περὶ after ὅσει was passed over as superfluous. — Ver. 5. After Σιμώνα read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., τίνα, according to A B C, min. Copt. Arm. Syr. p. (in the margin) Vulg. The indefinite τίνα appeared not suited to the dignity of the prince of the apostles, and was therefore omitted. — After ver. 6, Elz. (following Erasm.) has οὖσις λαλήσεις σου, τί σε δεί ποιεῖν, which, according to decisive testimony, is to be rejected as an interpolation from ix. 6, x. 32. The addition, which some other witnesses have instead of it: ὡς λαλήσεις ἡματα πρὸς σε, ἐν οἷς συνήγα ὁ μόνος σου, is from xi. 14. — Ver. 7. αὐτῷ] Elz. has τῷ Κορνηλίῳ, against decisive testimony. On similar evidence αὐτῷ after ὁμέροις. (Elz. Scholz) is deleted. — Ver. 10. αὐτῶν] So Lachm. Born. Tisch. instead of the usual ἐκεῖνων, which has far preponderant evidence against it, and was intended to remedy the indefiniteness of the αὐτῶν. — ἐπέσεσεν] A B C Ε, min. Copt. Or. have ἡγέτης, which Griesb. approved, and Lachm. Tisch. Born. have adopted, and that rightly, as it is preponderantly attested, and was easily replaced by the more definite ἐπέσεσεν (Clem.: ἐπεσεν) as its gloss. — Ver. 11. After κατοβαίνων, Elz. has ἐν' αὐτῶν, which is wanting in A B C E Ε, min. vss. Or. Defended, indeed, by Rinck (as having been omitted in conformity to xi. 5); but the very notice καὶ ἡλέν τοῖς ἑμοῖς, xi. 5, has here produced the addition ἐν' αὐτῶν as a more precise definition. — ὁδειμένον καὶ] is wanting in A B C E Ε, min. Arm. Aeth. Vulg. Or. Cyr. Theodoret. Deleted by Lachm. But see xi. 5. — Ver. 12. τῷ γῆς] is wanting in too few witnesses to be regarded as spurious. But Lachm. and Tisch. have it after ἐρετά, according to A B C E Ε, min. vss. and Fathers. Rightly; see xi. 6, from which passage also the usual καὶ τὰ θηρία before καὶ τὰ ἔρετα is interpolated. τὰ before ἔρετα and πεπερατα is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted. — Ver. 16. εἴδους] So Lachm. and Tisch. after A B C E Ε, min. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. But Elz. Scholz have πάλιν, which is introduced from xi. 10, although defended by Born. (who places it after ἀνεφάλ. on account of its appearing superfluous. — Ver. 17. καὶ ἰδοὺ] Lachm. reads ἰδον, after A B Ε, min.; but καὶ was unnecessary, and might appear disturbing. — Ver. 19. διενδυμασμένον] Elz. has ἐνθυμ. against decisive evidence. Neglect of the double compound, elsewhere not occurring in the N. T. — ἀνήρες] Elz. Lachm. Scholz. add to this τρεῖς, which is wanting in D G H min. vss. and Fathers. An addition, after ver. 7, xi. 11; instead of which B has δύο (ver. 7), which Buttmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 357, unsatisfactorily defends by the artificial assumption—not confirmed by the expression in ver. 8—that the soldier was only taken with him as escort and attendant. — Ver. 20. Instead
CRITICAL REMARKS.

of Ö, Elz. has διότι, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 21. After ἀνάφασ, Elz. has τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου πρὸς αὐτῶν, against A B C D E G Ν, min. and most vs., Chrys. An addition, because ver. 21 commences a church-lesson. — Ver. 23. ἀναστάς] is wanting in Elz., but is just as certainly protected by decisive testimony, and by its being apparently superfluous, as οὐ Πέτρος, which in Elz. stands before ἐξῆλθε, is condemned by A B C D Ν, min. and several vs. as the subject written on the margin. — Ver. 25. τοῦ εἰσελθεὶν] Elz. has merely εἰσελθείν. But τοῦ is found in A B C E G Ν, min. Chrys. Bas. Theophyl. See the exegetical remarks. — Born. reads ver. 25 thus: προσεγγιζόντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου αἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν, προδραμῶν εἰς τῶν δουλῶν διεξάφησεν παραγγελοῦντας αὑτῶν ὁ δὲ Κορνηλίος ἐκπρότομος καὶ συναντήσας αὐτῷ πέσων πρὸς τοὺς πόλεις προσεκύνησεν αὐτῶν, only after D, Syr. p. (on the margin); an apocryphal attempt at depicting the scene, and how much of a foil to the simple narrative in the text! — Ver. 30. After εἰκάτην, Elz. has ἔραν, which, according to preponderant testimony, is to be rejected as a supplementary addition. Lachm. has also deleted ἡμεῖς καὶ, after some important codd. (including Ν) and several vs. But the omission is explained by there being no mention of fasting in ver. 3. — Ver. 32. δὲ παραγγέλων. λαλήσει σοι] is wanting in Lachm., after A B Ν, min. Copt. Ath. Vulg. But the omission took place in accordance with ver. 6. — Ver. 33. Instead of οὗτος, read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. according to preponderating evidence, ἀπό (Ε παρά). — Instead of θεοῦ, Lachm. and Tisch. have παράκλησιν, according to predominant attestation; θεοῦ is a mechanical repetition from the preceding, in which the reading εἰκάτης. σοι. (Born.) is, on account of too weak atestatation, to be rejected. — Ver. 36. δὲ] is wanting in A B Ν *, loü. Copt. Sahid. Ath. Vulg. Ath. Deleted by Lachm.; but the omission very naturally suggested itself, in order to simplify the construction. — Ver. 37. ἀφάνεν] A C D E H Ν, min. have ἀφάνεν, which Lachm. has on the margin. A D Vulg. Cant. Ir. add γάρ, which Lachm. puts in brackets. Born. has ἁπάνεν γάρ. But ἁπάνεν is necessary, according to the sense. — Ver. 39. After ἡμεῖς, Elz. has ἐμεῖς, against decisive testimony. A supplementary addition. — Ver. 42. αὐτῶν] B C D E G, min. Syr. utr. Copt. Sahid. have οὖν. Recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Lach. and Born. An erroneous correction. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 48. αὐτοῖς] αὐτοῖς is neither strongly enough attested (A Ν), nor in accordance with the sense. — τοῦ κεφάλου] A B E Ν, min. vs. Fathers have Ἰσακοῦ Χριστοῦ. So Lachm. An alteration, in order to denote the specific character of the baptism more definitely. Hence some codd. and vs. have both together. So Born. after D.

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

satisfied a deeper pious want in the earnest private worship of Jehovah along with all his family. Judaism, as Stoicism and the like in the case of others, was for him the philosophical-religious school, to which he, although without being a proselyte, addicted himself in his heart and devotional life. Hence his beneficence (ver. 2) and his general esteem among the Jews (ver. 22.) Comp. the centurion of Capernaum, Luke vii. Others consider him, with Mede, Grotius, Fecht, Deyling, Hammond, Wolf, Ernesti, Ziegler, Paulus, Olshausen, Neander, Lechler, and Ritschl, as a proselyte of the gate.* But this is at variance with vv. 28, 34, 35, xi. 1, 18, xv. 7, where he is simply put into the class of the Gentiles, a circumstance which cannot be referred merely to the want of circumcision, as the proselytes of the gate also belonged to the communion of the theocracy, and had ceased to be non-Jews like absolute foreigners. And all the great importance which this event has in a connected view of the Book of Acts, has as its basis the very circumstance that Cornelius was a Gentile. Least of all can his proselytism be proved from the expression φωτισθεμένος τὸν Ὀρᾶον itself, as the general literal meaning of this expression can only be made by the context to apply to the worship of proselytes; but here we are required by ver. 35 to adhere to that general literal meaning without this particular reference. It is to be considered, moreover, that had Cornelius been a proselyte of the gate, it would have, according to xv. 7, to be assumed that hitherto no such proselyte at all had been converted to Christianity, which, even apart from the conversion of the Ethiopian, chap. viii., is—considering the many thousand converts of which the church already consisted—incredible, particularly as often very many were admitted simultaneously, and as certainly the more unprejudiced proselytes were precisely the most inclined to join the new theocracy. Accordingly the great step which the new church makes in its development at chap. x. consists in this, that by divine influence the first Gentile, who did not yet belong to the Jewish theocratic state, becomes a Christian, and that directly, without having first made the transition in any way through Mosaism. The extraordinary importance of this epoch-making event stands in proportion to the accumulated miraculous character of the proceedings. The view, which by psychological and other assumptions and combinations assigns to it along with the miraculous character also a natural instrumentality, leads to deviations from the narrative, and to violations which are absolutely rejected by the text. The view which rejects the historical reality of the narrative, and refers it to a set purpose in the author, seeks its chief confirmation in the difficulties which the direct admission of the Gentiles had for long still to encounter, in what is narrated in chap. xv., and in the conduct of Peter at Antioch. But, on the other
hand, it is to be observed, that not even miracles are able at once to remove in the multitude deeply rooted national prejudices, and to dispense with the gradual progress of psychological development requisite for this end, comp. the miracles of Jesus Himself, and the miracles performed on him; that further, in point of fact the difficulties in the way of the penetration of Christianity to the Gentiles were exceedingly great;¹ and that Peter’s conduct at Antioch, with a character so accessible to the impressions of the moment, comp. the denial, is psychologically intelligible as a temporary obscuration of his better conviction once received by way of revelation, at variance with his constant conduct on other occasions,² and therefore by no means necessitates the presupposition that the extraordinary divine disclosure and guidance, which our passage narrates, are unhistorical. Indeed, the reproach which Paul makes to Peter at Antioch, presupposes the agreement in principle between them in respect to the question of the Gentiles; for Paul designates the conduct of Peter as ἀνάκρυσις, Gal. ii. 18.

Ver. 8. Εἶδεν is the verb belonging to ἀνάρχειας . . . Κορήλας, ver. 1, and ἐπισκεύαζε is in apposition to Κορήλας. — The intimation made to Cornelius is a vision in a waking condition, caused by God during the hour of prayer, which was sacred to the centurion on account of his high respect for Judaism, i.e. a manifestation of God made so as to be clearly perceptible to the inner sense of the pious man, conveyed by the medium of a clear (φανεράς) angelic appearance in vision, which Cornelius himself, ver. 30, describes more precisely in its distinctly seen form, just as it at once on its occurrence made the corresponding impression upon him; hence ver. 4: ἐν σοφίᾳ γενόμενος and τί ἔστι, κύριο; ³ Eichhorn rationalized the narrative to the effect that Cornelius, full of longing to become acquainted with the distinguished Peter now so near him, learned the place of his abode from a citizen of Joppa at Caesarea, and then during prayer felt a peculiar elevation of mind, by which, as if by an angel, his purpose of making Peter's acquaintance was confirmed. This is opposed to the whole representation; with which also Ewald's similar view fails to accord, that Cornelius, uncertain whether or not he should wish a closer acquaintance with Peter, had, “as if irradiated by a heavenly certainty and directed by an angelic voice,” firmly resolved to invite the apostle at once to visit him. — ἦσθι περί ἡμ. i. ν. εἰ. (see the critical remarks): as it were about the ninth hour. Circumstantiality of expression.⁴

Ver. 4. Εἰς μνήμην διάνωτας ἐσπν. τ. Θεοῦ] is to be taken together, and denotes the aim or the destination of ἀνέβοντας: to be a mark, i.e. a token of remembrance, before God, so that they give occasion to God to think on thee. Comp. ver. 31. The sense of the whole figurative expression is: "Thy prayers and thine aims have found consideration with God; He will fulfil the former* and reward the later." See ver. 31. — ἀνέβοντας is strictly

¹ See Ewald, p. 250 ff.; Ritschel, alikath. K. [p. 185 ff.]
² See on Gal. ii. 14.
³ Comp. Luke xxiv. 5
⁴ See Bornemann in loc.
⁵ Comp. Matt. xxvi. 18.

* Assuredly from the heart of the devout Gentile there had arisen for the most part prayers for higher illumination and sanctification of the inner life; probably also, seeing that Christianity had already attracted so
suited only to αἰ προσευχαί, which, according to the figurative embodiment of the idea of granting prayer, ascend from the heart and mouth of man to God; but it is by a zeugma referred also to the alma, which have excited the attention of God, to requite them by leading the pious man to Christ. The opinion that ἀνέβη is based on the Jewish notion that prayers are carried by the angels to the throne of God, is as arbitrarily imported into the text as is the view that εἰς μνημόσυνον signifies instar sacrificial, because forsooth, the LXX. express τοῦ ἀνέβημεν by μνημόσυνον. In all these passages the sense of a memorial-offering is necessarily determined by the context, which is not the case here with the simple ἀνέβημεν. — On the relation of the good works of Cornelius to his faith, Gregory the Great already correctly remarks that he did not arrive at faith by his works, but at the works by his faith. The faith, however, cordial and vivid it was, was in his case up till now the Old Testament faith in the promised Messiah, but was destined amidst this visitation of divine grace, to complete itself into the New Testament faith in Jesus as the Messiah who had appeared. Thus was his way of salvation the same as that of the chamberlain, chap. viii. Comp. also Luther’s gloss on ver. 1.

Vv. 5–7. The tanner, on account of his trade, dwelt by the [Mediterranean] sea, and probably apart from the city, to which his house belonged: “Caedera et sepulcra separant et coriarum quinquaginta cubitos a cicitate.”—The τινά is added to Σιμών (see the critical remarks) from the standpoint of Cornelius, as to him Peter was one unknown. — εἰσερχόμενος the soldier, one of the men of the cohort specially attached and devoted to Cornelius (τῶν προσκαρτ. αὐτῷ), had the same religious turn of mind as his master, ver. 2.

Vv. 9, 10. On the following day, for Joppa was thirty miles from Caesarea, shortly before the arrival of the messengers of Cornelius at Peter’s house, the latter was, by means of a vision effected by divine agency in the state of ecstasy, prepared for the unhesitating acceptance of the summons of the Gentile; while the feeling of hunger, with which Peter passed into the trance, served the divine revelation as the medium of its special form. — ἐκ τῶν κατεύθυνει the flat roof’s were used by the Hebrews for religious exercises, prayers, and meditations. Incorrectly Jerome, Luther, Præconius, Erasmus, Hehnrichs, hold that the ἐπερθείω is meant. At variance with N. T. usage; even the Homeric δῶμα (hall) was something different; and why should Luke not have employed the usual formal word ἐπερθείω?
the subsequent appearance is most in keeping with an abode in the open air.
— ἵπτω] See on i. i. ἐρέσειν, hungry, is not elsewhere preserved; the Greeks say ἐρείπλατος. — ἤθελε γενσασθαι] he had the desire to eat—and in this desire, whilst the people of the house (αὐτῶν) were preparing food, παρεκαλεῖσθων, the ἐκτασθας came upon him (εὐνεο, see the critical remarks), by which is denoted the involuntary setting in of this state. The ἐκτασθας itself is the waking but not spontaneous state, in which a man, transported out of the lower consciousness (2 Cor. xii. 2, 3) and freed from the limits of sensuous restriction as well as of discursive thought, apprehends with his higher pneumatic receptivity divinely presented revelations, whether these reach the inner sense through visions or otherwise.

Vv. 11–13. Observe the vividly introduced historical present θεωπεῖ. — τίσαρον ἀρχαίς δεῦτε. [attached with four ends, namely, to the edges of the opening which had taken place in heaven. Chap. xi. 5 requires this explanation, not the usual one: “bound together at the four corners.”] Nor does the text mention anything of ῥοπες, bound to which it was let down. The visionary appearance has something marvellous even in the way of its occurrence. We are to imagine the vessel—whose four corners, moreover, are without warrant explained by Augustine, Wetstein, Bengel, Lange, and others as pointing to the four quarters of the world—looking like a colossal four-cornered linen-cloth (ὁδύνη), letting itself down, while the corners attached to heaven support the whole. On ἀρχαί, extemitates, see Jacobs. — πάντα τὰ τετράποδα] The formerly usual interpretation: “four-footed beasts of all sorts, i.e. of very many kinds,” is linguistically erroneous. The phenomenon in its supernatural visionary character exhibits as present in the σκῖος (ἐν ὑ ὑπρήχε) all four-footed beasts, reptiles, and birds, all kinds of them, without exception. In a strangely arbitrary manner Kuinoel, after Calovius and others, holds that these were only unclean animals. See on ver. 14. — τῶν ὑφαινοῦ] See on Matt. vi. 26. — ἀνασθῆ] Perhaps Peter lay during the trance. Yet it may also be the mere call to action: arise. — ἔσονται; ὁ θυσία, not: sacrifice, see ver. 10.

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

1 For examples of the absolute γενσασθας, see Kypke, II. p. 47. 2 See Elmer, Obs. p. 496; Kypke, I.c. 3 Comp. v. 5, 11; Luke i. 65, iv. 37. 4 Comp. Graf in the Stud. u. Krit. 1869, p. 221 ff.; Deitersch, Psychol. p. 285. 5 Ad Ant. XX. I p. 50. 6 That fishes (those without fins and scales were forbidden) are not included in the vision, is explained from the fact that the σκῖος was like a cloth. Fishes would have been unsuitable for this, especially as the animals were presented as living (ὁδύνη). According to Lange, it is “perhaps a prophetic omission, wherein there is already floating before the mind the image of fishes as the souls to be gathered.” A fanciful notion. 7 ix. 11, 39, viii. 26, and frequently; comp. on viii. 26. 8 Vulg. 9 As in 1 Macc. i. 47 (Thiersch). 10 Schwegler, Zeller.
1 ff. — ὅτι οὐδὲποτε ἦσαν πᾶν κοινὸν ἡ ἀκάθαρτον.] for never ate I anything common or unclean, the Talmudic ἄναφ ὑλοῖς, i.e. for any profane thing I have always left unclean. ἡ does not stand for καὶ, but appends for the exhaustion of the idea another synonymous expression. κοινὸς = βέβηλος; the opposite of ἁγιός (Ezek. xiii. 20). — καὶ φωνῇ and a voice, not ἠ φωνῇ, because here other words were heard, came again the second time to him, πάλιν εἰ δευτέρων, pleonastically circumstantial. — ἄ δ θεὸς ἵκαθαρισε, εἰ μὴ κοινῷ] what God has cleansed, make not thou common, unclean. The miraculous appearance with the divine voice (ver. 18) had done away the Levitical uncleanness of the animals in question; they were now divinely cleansed; and thus Peter ought not, by his refusal to obey that divine bidding, to invest them with the character of what is unholy — to transfer them into the category of the κοινῶν, Rom. xiv. 14. This was man’s doing in opposition to God’s deed. — εἰς τρίς] for thrice, which “ad confirmationem valuit” (Calvin); εἰς denotes the terminus ad quem. — The object aimed at in the whole vision was the symbolical divine announcement that the hitherto subsisting distinction between clean and unclean men, that hedge between Jews and Gentiles I was to cease in Christianity, as being destined for all men without distinction of nation, vv. 34, 35. But in what relation does the ἀ δ θεὸς ἵκαθαρισε stand to the likewise divine institution of the Levitical laws about food? This is not answered by reference to “the effected and accomplished redemption, which is regarded as a restitution of the whole creation,” for this restoration is only promised for the world-period commencing with the Parousia; but rather by pointing out that the institution of those laws of food was destined only for the duration of the old theocracy. They were a divine institution for the particular people of God, with a view to separate them from the nations of the world; their abolition could not therefore but be willed by God, when the time was fully come at which the idea of the theocracy was to be realized through Christ in the whole of humanity. The abolition therefore does not conflict with Matt. v. 17, but belongs to the fulfilment of the law effected by Christ, by which the distinction of clean and unclean was removed from the Levitical domain and raised into the sphere of the moral idea.

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

1 Ewald, Allerth. p. 194 ff.; Saaßchütz, Mor. R. p. 251 ff.
2 Which Lachm. and Tisch. read, after A B Ν, min. vss. Clem. Or.; perhaps correctly, see xi. 6.
3 Fritzsch. ad Marc. p. 277; Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xii f.
4 See on Matt. xxvi. 42; comp. on John iv. 54.
5 Bernhardy, p. 252. Comp. et τρίς, Herod. i. 86; Xen. Anab. vi. 4. 10; and Weststein.
6 Olahanen.
7 iii. 20; Matt. xix. 28; Rom. viii. 19 ff.
8 Ver. 35; Rom. iii.; Gal. iii. 38; Col. iii. 11; John x. 16. Comp. Matt. xv. 17, 19.
9 Comp. Rom. ii. 28, 29. See also on Rom. xv. 14; Matt. v. 17.
10 Comp. Luke viii. 9, xv. 25.
MESSENGERS AT JOPPA.

δεῦρο] as in v. 24, ii. 12. — καὶ ἵδε] See on i. 10. — ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν] at the door. See on Matt. xxvi. 71. — φωνήσαντες] Kuinoel quite arbitrarily: "sc. τοῖς, εὐογματίᾳ quod Judaei domum intrere metuebant, ver. 18." They called below at the door of the house, without calling on or calling forth any particular person, but in order generally to obtain information from the inhabitants of the house, who could not but hear the calling. That Peter had heard the noise of the men and the mention of his name, that he had observed the men, had recognised that they were not Jews, and had felt himself impelled by an internal voice to follow them, etc., are among the many arbitrary additions, "of a supplementary kind," which Neander has allowed himself to make in the history before us.— ἀλλὰ ἀνασάς κατάζηκ] ἀλλὰ with the imperative denotes nothing more than the adversative at. 1 "Men seek thee: but, do not let yourself be sought for longer and delay not, but rather arise and go down." The requisition with ἀλλὰ breaks off the discourse and renders the summons more urgent. 2 — μηδὲν διακρινοῦ.] in no respect wavering; 3 for I, etc. The πνεῦμα designatthos Himself as the sender of the messengers, inasmuch as the vision (vv. 3–7) did not ensue without the operation of the divine Spirit, and the latter was thus the cause of Cornelius sending the messengers: — ἔγὼ with emphasis. Chrysostom rightly calls attention to the κύριον and the ἐξονεία of the Spirit.

Vv. 22–25. Ἱαπτρυγόμου.] as in vi. 3. — ἔχρημαρ.] 4 The communication on the part of the angel (vv. 4–7) is understood as a divine answer to the constant prayer of Cornelius (ver. 2).— Peter and his six (xi. 12) companions had not traversed the thirty miles from Joppa to Caesarea in one day, and therefore arrived there only on the day after their departure. The messengers of Cornelius, too, had only arrived at Peter's abode on the second day, 5 and had passed the night with him, 6 so that now, τῇ ἐπαύρων, it was the fourth day since their departure from Caesarea. Cornelius expected Peter on this day, for which, regarding it as a high family-festival, he had invited his certainly like-minded relatives and his intimate friends. 7 — ως δὲ ἔγενετο τοῦ εἰσελθεὶ τῶν Π.] but when it came to pass that Peter entered. This construction is to be regarded as a very inaccurate, improper application of the current infinitive with τοῦ. No comparison with the Hebrew וְיָתֳנְה, Gen. xv. 12, 10 is to be allowed, because וְיָתֳנְה does not stand absolutely, but has its subject beside it, and because the LXX. has never imitated this and similar expressions 10 by ἔγενετο τοῦ. The want of corresponding passages, and the impossibility of rationally explaining the expression, mark it as a completely isolated 11 error of language, which Luke either

1 As ver. 13.
2 See Pritzel, ad Marc. p. 370; Baemumleink. Pusl. p. 17 f.
3 Jak. i. 6; Bernhardy, p. 886.
4 See on Rom. iv. 20.
5 See on Matt. ii. 12.
6 τυ. 9. 9.
7 Ver. 33.
8 Ver. 54.
9 [Π. p. 50.]
11 Gesenius, l.c.
12 Even at Rev. xii. 7 it is otherwise, as there, if we do not ascribe to the conjecture of Disteldeuck. ἔγενετο must be again mentally supplied with ὁ Μωσα, but in the altered meaning: there came forward, there appeared (comp. on Mark i. 4; John i. 6), so that it is to be translated: And there came (i.e. there set in, there resulted) war in heaven; Michael.
himself committed or adopted from his original source,—and not a corruption of the transcribers, seeing that the most important witnesses decide in favour of τοῖς, and its omission in the case of others is evidently a correction. — εἰς τ. πόδας at the feet of Peter. — προσεκύνησε] See on Matt. ii. 2. He very naturally conjectured, after the vision imparted to him, that there was something supernormal in the person of Peter, comp. on Luke v. 8; and to this, perhaps, the idea of heroes, to which the centurion had not yet become a stranger, contributed.

Vv. 28-29. Καὶ ἐγώ αὐτός] also I myself, I also for mine own part, not otherwise than you. See on Rom. vii. 25. — συνυμβ. αὐτῷ] in conversation with him. The word occurs elsewhere in Tzetz. — εἰσηλθέτω] namely, into the room. In ver. 25, on the other hand, τοῖς εἰσαλκέοντι τ. Π. II. was meant of the entrance by the outer door into the house. — Ye know how, how very unallowed it is, etc.— ἀδέμπτω] is a later form for the old classical ἀδέμπτω. The prohibition to enter into closer fellowship with men of another tribe, or, even but, to come to them, comp. xi. 3, is not expressly found in the Pentateuch, but easily resulted of itself from the lofty consciousness of the holy people of God contrasted with the unholy heathen, and pervades the later Judaism with all the force of contempt for the Gentiles. The passage Matt. xxiii. 5, and the narrative of the conversion of Izates king of Adiabene in Josephus, appear to testify against the utterance of Peter in our passage, and therefore Zeller, p. 187, holds it as unhistorical. But Peter speaks here from the standpoint of the Judaistic theory and rule, which is not invalidated by exceptional cases and by abuses, as in the making of proselytes. Not even if Cornelius had been a proselyte of the gate could the historical character of the saying be reasonably doubted; for the Rabbinical passages adduced with that view (according to which the proselyte is to regard himself as a member of the theocracy,) apply only to complete converts, proselytes of righteousness, "quamvis factus sit proselytus, attamen nisi observet praecepta legis, habendus adhuc est pro ethnico," and are, moreover, outweighed by other expressions of contempt towards proselytes, as, e.g., "Proselyti sunt sicut scabies Israelici." It is erroneous to derive the principle which Peter here expresses from Pharisa-
ism, or to limit it to an intentional going in quest of them, or, according to xi. 3, to the eating, which must have been made clear from the context. — ἀναπεριφέρον] without contradiction. — καὶ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς ἐδείξε] Contrast to ἰμιείς ἐκκαταράκτη. The element of contrast lies not in the copula, but in the relation of the two clauses: Ye know . . . and to me God has showed. Very often so in John. The ὁ θεὸς ἐδείξε took place through the disclosure by means of the vision, ver. 3 ff., the allegorical meaning of which Peter understood. — μὴ δὲν κ.τ.λ.] namely, in and for itself. — τίνι λόγῳ] with what reason, i.e. wherefore. See examples from classical writers in Kypke. Comp. on Matt. v. 32. The dative denotes the mediate cause.

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

Ver. 33. Ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου (see critical remarks), νῦν ἐν, in conspectu Dei. Cornelius knows that it is God, who so wonderfully arranged everything, before whose eyes this assembly in the house stands. He knows Him to be present as a witness. — ἀπὸ (see the critical remarks), on the part of, divinitus.

Vv. 34, 35. Ἀνοίξας κ.τ.λ.] as in viii. 35. — With truth, so that this insight, which I have obtained, is true. I perceive that God is not partial, allowing Himself to be influenced by external relations not belonging to the moral sphere; but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness

---

1 Schöttgen.
2 Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 39.
3 Ehrard, Lange, Ewald.
4 Polyh. xxxii. 3, 11, vi. 7, 7, xxviii. 11, 4.
5 Comp. Scheer, W.B. Lucian, Cat. 6, Consœw. 9.
6 Sanctum ædel silentium," Calvin.
7 Comp. Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 102; Hartung, Persepolis. II. p. 147; Kühner, ad Lex. Mon. III. 7. 6.
8 See Winer, p. 347 f. (E. T. 348 f.).
9 Comp. on Mark xii. 14, and Fritzsche, Quaest. Luc. p. 137 f.
10 Acts rightly, comp. Ps. xv. 2; Heb. xi. 33; Luke i. 80; the opposite, Matt. vii. 32.
is acceptable to Him,—namely, to be received into the Christian fellowship with God. Comp. xv. 14. Peter, with the certainty of a divinely-obtained conviction, denies in general that, as regards his acceptance, God goes to work in any way partially; and, on the other hand, affirms in particular that in every nation—ἀν τε ἀκροβυστῶς ἐστιν, ἀν τε ἐμπεριομένος, Chrysostom—etc. To take this contrast, ver. 35, as no longer dependent on ἐν, but as independent, makes its importance the more strongly apparent. What is meant is the ethico-religious preliminary frame requisite for admission into Christianity, which must be a state of fellowship with God similar to the piety of Cornelius and his household, however different in appearance and form according to the degree of earlier knowledge and morality in each case, yet always a being given or a being drawn of God, according to the Gospel of John, and an attitude of heart and life toward the Christian salvation, which is absolutely independent of difference of nationality. The general truth of the proposition, as applied even to the heathen and sinners among Jews and Gentiles, rests on the necessity of μετάνοια as a preliminary condition of admission. It is a misuse of this expression when, in spite of ver. 43, it is often adduced as a proof of the superfluousness of faith in the specific doctrines of Christianity; for δεκτός αὐτῷ ἔστι in fact denotes (ver. 36 ff.) the capability, in relation to God, of becoming a Christian, and not the capability of being saved without Christ. Bengel rightly says: "non indifferentismus religionum, sed indifferentia nationum hic asseritur."—Respecting προσωπολήπτης, not found elsewhere, see on Gal. ii. 6 (ν').

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

Vv. 36-38. The correct construction is, that we take the three accusatives: τῶν λόγων, ver. 36, τὸ γενόμ. ἤμα, ver. 37, and Ἰησοῦν τῶν ἀπὸ Ναζαρ. ver 38, as dependent on ὑμεῖς οἰδατε, ver. 37, and treat οὗτος ἐστι πάντων κύριος as a parenthesis. Peter, namely, in the τῶν λόγων already has the ὑμεῖς οἰδατε in view; but he interrupts himself by the insertion οὗτος... κύριος, and now resumes the thought begun in ver. 36, in order to carry it out more amply, and that in such a way that he now puts ὑμεῖς οἰδατε first, and then attaches the continuation in its extended and amplified form by Ἰησοῦν τῶν ἀπὸ Ναζ. by way of apposition. The message, which He (God, ver. 35) sent to the Israelites, when He made known salvation through Jesus Christ, He is Lord of all!—ye know the word, which went forth through all Judaea, having begun from Galilee after the baptism which John preached—Jesus of Nazareth, ye know how God anointed Him, consecrated Him to be the Messianic King, with the

1 Luther, Castalio, and many others.
2 ii. 38, liv. 19, cf.
4 Comp. xiii. 26.
5 See on iv. 27.
Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good and healing, etc. This view is quite in keeping with the hurriedly aggregated and inartistic mode of expression of Peter, particularly at this urgent moment of extraordinary and profound emotion. The most plausible objection to this construction is that of Bengel: Geld. "Noverant auditores historiam, de qua mox, non item rationes interiores, de quibus hoc versu." But the contents of the λόγος is, in fact, stated by εἶφην διὰ Ἰ. X. so generally and, without its rationes interiores, so purely historically, that in that general shape it could not be anything strange to hearers, to whom that was known, which is said in vv. 37 and 38. Erasmus, Er. Schmid, Homberg, Wolf, Heumann, Beck, Heinrichs, Kuinoel make the connection almost as we have given it; but they attach ὅμεις οἶδατε to τὸν λόγον, and take τὸ γενόμενον ἡμια as apposition to τὸν λόγον,—by which, however, αὐτὸς ἐστι πάντων κύριος makes its weight, in keeping with the connection, far less sensibly felt than according to our view, under which it by the very fact of its high significance as an element breaks off the construction. Others refer τὸν λόγον ὑν κ.τ.λ. to what precedes, in which case, however, it cannot be taken either as for ὑν λόγον, Beza, Grotius, comp. Bengel and others, or with Olshausen, after Calvin and others, for κατὰ τὸν λόγον ὑν κ.τ.λ.; but would have, with de Wette, to be made dependent on καταλαμβάνει, or to be regarded as an appositional addition, and consequently would be epexegetical of ὅτι οἰκ ἐστι... δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστιν. In this case εἶφην would have to be understood of peace between Jews and Gentiles. But even apart from this inadmissible explanation of εἶφην (see below), the λόγος of ver. 36, so far as it proclaims this peace, is something very different from the doctrine indicated in ver. 35, in which there is expressed only the universally requisite first step towards Christianity. Moreover, Peter could not yet at this time say that God had caused that peace to be proclaimed through Christ—for this he required a further development starting from his present experience—for which a reference to I. 8 and to the universalism of Luke's Gospel by no means suffices. Pfeiffer, likewise attaching it to what precedes, explains thus: he is in so far acceptable to him, as he has the destination of receiving the message of salvation in Christ; so that thus εἰσαγεῖται would be passive, and τὸν λόγον, as also εἶφην, would be the object to it. But this is linguistically incorrect, inasmuch as it would require at least the infinitive instead of εἰσαγεῖσθαιμενος; and besides, εἰσαγεῖσθαι τί, there is something proclaimed to me, is foreign to the N. T. usage. Weisse gives the meaning: "Every one who fears God and does right, by him the gospel may be accepted," so that τὸν λόγον would stand by attraction for ὅ λόγος, which is impossible. According to Ewald, p. 248, τὸν λόγον κ.τ.λ. is intended to be nothing but an explanation to δικαιοσύνην. A view which is the more harsh, the further τ. λόγον stands removed from ἀκούσας, the less τὸν λόγον ὑπὸ κ.τ.λ. coincides as regards the notion of it with

---

1 Comp. on Eph. ii. 1; Winer, p. 535 (E. T. 706).
2 Comp. de Wette.
3 Obs. crit. exeg. I. p. 18.
4 Comp. Baumgarten and Lange.
5 Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 184 (E. T. 158).
6 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 401 ff.
8 Petri Lehrbegr. p. 151 f.
9 In 1 Pet. ii. 7 it is otherwise.
And the more the expression ἐργάζομαι λόγον is foreign to the N. T. — ἐργάζομαι is explained by many, including Heinrichs, Seyler, de Wette, of peace between Jews and Gentiles (Eph. ii. 17), but very arbitrarily, since no more precise definition is annexed, although the Jews are just named as the receivers of the gospel. Nor is there in what follows any mention of that peace. Hence it is to be generally taken as Διδώσετε, salvation, and the whole Messianic salvation is meant, which God has made known through Christ to the children of Israel; not specially peace with God, which yet is the basis of salvation. — διὰ Ι. Χ. belongs to εἰσαγγ., not to εἰρήνην; for εἰσαγγ. εἰρήνην. διὰ Ι. Χ. contains the more precise explanation of the τοῦ λόγου. ἐν αὐτῷ, consequently must also designate Jesus as the sent of God, through whom the λόγος is brought. — πάντων] not neuter, but masculine. Christ is Lord of all, of Jews and Gentiles, like God Himself, whose σωθηdrops Ης. He is. The aim of this emphatically added remark is to make the universal destination of the word primarily sent to the Jews to be felt by the Gentile hearers, who were not to regard themselves as excluded by ἐν αὐτῷ. τοῖς νοίος Ἰσραήλ. — ἰχθὺς] word, not the things, de Wette and older expositors, which it does not mean even in v. 32; Luke ii. 15. It resumes the preceding τοῦ λόγου. On γενέκα, comp. Luke iii. 2. Concerning the order of the words, instead of τοῦ καθ' ὅλην τ. Ἰσραήλ. γενέκα, see Kühner. — In ver. 38 the discourse now passes from the word, the announcement of which to the Jews was known to the hearers, to the announcer, of whose Messianic working they would likewise have knowledge. — ὡς εὐαγγελίζετε αὐτόν] renders prominent the special divine Messianic element in the general Ἰσραήλ τοῦ ἀπὸ Ναζ., οἰδατε. As to the idea of this εὐαγγελίζετε, see on iv. 27. — ὡς ἐπιλεξαίτε] him (αὐτόν), who, after receiving this anointing, went through, Galilee and Judea, ver. 37, doing good, and in particular healing, etc. — In the compound verb κατακακός is implied hostile domination. — μετ' αὐτόν is not spoken according to a “lower view,” de Wette, against which, see on ii. 36; but the metaphysical relation of Christ to the Father is not excluded by this general expression, although in this circle of hearers it did not yet demand a specific prominence. Comp. Bengel: “Parcius loquitur pro auditorum capitu de majestate Christi.”

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

---

1. Rom. v. 1, Calvisius, and others.
2. Comp. on Rom. x. 15.
3. Bengel and others.
4. Luther and others.
5. Rom. iii. 29, x. 13.
6. Comp. Rom. x. 12, xiv. 9; Eph. iv. 5 f.
7. Comp. ver. 48.
8. Comp. on Matt. iv. 4.
10. On 2 Cor. ἀποκρίθατε, Bengel correctly remarks: “Spiritua sancti mentio esse ita
11. Jaa. ii. 6; Wisd. ii. 10, xv. 14; Eccles. xlviii. 12; Xen. Symph. ii. 8; Strabo, vi. p. 270; Joseph. Ant. xii. 3. 3; Plut. de Is. et Osir. 41: κατακακούσετε κατακακοῦσεν. Comp. κατακακούσεως.
12. Comp. John xvi. 32.
13. Partikel. i. p. 185.
in ii. 23. — ἐνὶ ἐξιλου] as in v. 30. — καὶ ἐδωκέν κ.τ.λ.] and granted 1 that He should become manifest, by visible appearances, i. 3; John xxi. 1, not to all the people, but to witnesses who (quippe qui) are chosen before of God, namely, to us, who, etc.—τοῖς προκεχειρ. ἤπο τοῦ Θεοῦ] Peter with correct view regards the previous election of the apostles to be witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, 2 as done by God; 3 they are apostles διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, 4 ἀφωριστέναι ἢ ἐναγ. Θεοῦ. 5 And with the προ in προκεχειρ. he points back to the time of the previous choice as disciples, by which their election to be the future witnesses of the resurrection in reality took place. On προκεχειρονείν, only here in the N. T, comp. Plat. Legg. vi. p. 705 B. — μετὰ τὸ ἀναστ. αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν] is not, with Cameron and Bengel, to be connected with ἐμφανῆ γνώθαι, ver. 40, 6 so that οἱ παντὶ . . . αὐτῷ would have to be arbitrarily and violently converted into a parenthesis; but with οἱ τινες συνεφ. κ. συνετ. αὐτῷ, which even without the passages, i. 4, Luke xxiv. 41, 43, John xxi. 13, would have nothing against it, as the body of the Risen One was not yet a glorified body. 7 The words clearly exhibit the certainty of the attested bodily resurrection, but annexed to ver. 40 they would contain an unimportant self-evident remark. The apparent inconsistency of the passage with Luke xxii. 18 is removed by the more exact statement to Matt. xxvi. 29; see on that passage.

Ver. 42. Τῷ λαῷ] can only denote the Jewish people, seeing that the context speaks of no other (ver. 41), and cannot include the Gentiles also (Kuinoel). But the contents of ὁτὶ . . . νεκρῶν is so different from Matt. xxviii. 29, also Acts i. 8, that there must be here assumed a reference to another expression of the Risen One, for Ἡ is the subject of παρῆγγελε, unknown to us. — ὁτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν . . . νεκρῶν] that Ἡ, no other, is the Judge ordained by God, in His decree, over living, who are alive at the Parousia, 8 and dead, who shall then be already dead. 9—Incorrectly Olschausen, resting on Matt. xxii. 32!—understands by ἔκνωτον κ. νεκρ. the spiritually living and dead. This meaning would require to be suggested by the context, but is here quite foreign to it. 10

Vv. 43, 44. Now follows the divinely attested way of salvation unto this Judge of the living and dead. — πάντης οἱ προφ.] comp. iii. 24. — That every one who believes on Him receives forgiveness of sins by means of His name, of the believing confession of it, by which the objectively completed redemption is subjectively appropriated. 11 The general πάντα τῶν πιστ. eis αὐτ., which lays down no national distinction, is very emphatically placed at the end, Rom. iii. 22. Thus has Peter opened the door for further announcing to his hearers the universalism of the salvation in Christ. But

1 Comp. ii. 27.
2 i. 3, ii. 23, iii. 23, al.
3 John xvii. 6, 9, 11, vi. 27.
4 i Cor. i. 1; Gal. i. 1, al.
5 Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 15.
6 So also Baur, I. p. 101, ed. 2, who, at the same time, simply passes over, with quite an arbitrary evasion, the difficulty that the criterion of apostleship in this passage is as little suitable for the alleged object of vindicating Paul as it is in i. 21, 22.
8 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.
9 Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5.
10 Comp. Rom. xiv. 19, 20; Acts xvii. 31.
11 Rom. iii. 25, x. 10, al.
already the living power of his words has become the vehicle of the Holy Spirit, who falls upon all the hearers, and by His operations makes the continuation of the discourse superfluous and—impossible. Here the unique example of the outpouring of the Spirit before baptism—treated, indeed, by Baur as unhistorical and ascribed to the set purpose influencing the author—is of itself intelligible from the frame of mind, now exalted after an extraordinary manner to the pitch of full susceptibility, in those present. The appropriate degree of receptivity was there; and so, for a special divine purpose, the πνεῦμα communicated itself according to the free will of God even before baptism. Olshausen thinks that this extraordinary circumstance took place for the sake of Peter, in order to make him aware, beyond a doubt, in this first decisive instance, that the Gentiles would not be excluded from the gift of the Spirit. But Peter had this illumination already, ver. 34 f.; and besides, this object would have been fully attained by the outpouring of the Spirit after baptism. We may add that the quite extraordinary and, in fact, unique nature of the case stands decidedly opposed to the abuse of the passage by the Baptists.

Vv. 45, 46. Οἱ ἐκ περιτ. πιστῶν] those who were believers from the circumcision, i.e. believers who belonged to the circumcised, the Jewish-Christians. — δοὺς συνήθεις τ. Π.] see ver. 23. — εἰς τὰ θύμα] Cornelius and his company now represented, in the view of those who were astonished, the Gentiles as a class of men generally; for the article signifies this. Observe also the perfect; the completed fact lay before them. — γὰρ] reason assigned ab effectu. — λαλοῦντων γλώσσια] γλώσσιας, or γλώσση λαλεῖν is mentioned as something well known to the church, without the ἐπίτασις, by the characteristic addition of which the event recorded in chap. ii. is denoted as something singular, and not identical with the mere γλώσσιας λαλεῖν, as it was there also markedly distinguished by means of the list of peoples. Now if, in the bare γλώσσας λαλεῖν, this γλώσσας were to be understood in the same sense as in chap. ii. according to the representation of the narrator, then—as Bleek's conception, "to speak in glosses," is decidedly to be rejected—no other meaning would result than: "to speak in languages," i.e. to speak in foreign languages, different from their mother tongue, and therefore quite the same as ἐπίτασις γλώσσας λαλεῖν. But against

1 Comp. on xl. 15.
2 "Librum gratia habet ordinem," Bengel. Not the necessity, but the possibility of the bestowal of the Spirit before baptism, was implied by the susceptibility which had already emerged. The δείγμα of this extraordinary effusion of the Spirit is, according to ver. 45, to be found in this, that all scruples concerning the reception of the Gentiles were to be taken away from the Jewish-Christians who were present in addition to Peter, and thereby from the Christians generally. What Peter had just said: τάνα τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς αὐτὸν, was at once divinely affirmed and sealed by this σημεῖον in such a way that now no doubt at all could remain concerning the immediate admisssibility of baptism. Chrysostom strikingly calls this event the ἐπίτασις μεγάλη, which God had arranged beforehand for Peter. That it could not but, at the same time, form for the latter himself the divine confirmation of the revelation already imparted to him, is obvious of itself.

4 Comp. xl. 2; Rom. iv. 12; Gal. ii. 12, Col. iv. 11; Tit. i. 10. On πνεύματι in the concrete sense, comp. Rom. iii. 30, iv. 9, 13, xv. 8; Gal. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 3.
5 See on chap. ii.
this we may decisively urge the very expression ἐρήμιος, with which agrees 
λόγος in the apocryphal passage, only added in chap. ii., and almost ost-
tentiously glorified as the chief matter, but not inserted at all elsewhere,
here or at chap. xix. or 1 Cor. xii.—xiv. So much the more decidedly is 
γλώσσαι here and in xix. 6 not to be completed by mentally supplying 
ἐρήμιος—so Baur still, and others, following the traditional interpretation—but 
to be explained: "with tongues," and that in such a way that Luke 
himself has meant nothing else—not, "in languages"—than the to him well-
known glossolalia of the apostolic church, which was here manifested in 
Cornelius and his company, but from which he has conceived and repre-
sented the feast of Pentecost as something different and entirely extra-
ordinary, although the latter also is, in its historical substance, to be con-
sidered as nothing else than the first speaking with tongues. Cornelius 
and his friends spoke with tongues, i.e. they spoke not in the exercise of reflective thought, not in intelligible, clear, and connected speech, but in enraptured eucharistic ecstasy, as by the involuntary exercise of their tongues, which were just organs of the Spirit.

Nv. 47, 48. Can any one, then, withhold the water, in order that these be not baptized? The water is in this animated language conceived as the element offering itself for the baptism. So urgent now appeared the necessity for completing on the human side the divine work that had miraculously emerged. Bengel, moreover, well remarks: "Non dicti: jam habent Spiritum, ergo aqua carere possunt." The conjunction of water and Spirit could not but obtain its necessary recognition. — τὸ ὕδατος. τὸ σπυρ. genitive according to the construction καθεξῆς τῶν τινά τινος, and μὴ after verbs of hindering, as in xiv. 18. — καθεξῆς καὶ ἡμείς] as also see, the recipients of the Spirit of Pentecost. This refers to the prominent and peculiar character of the enraptured speaking, by which the fact then occurring showed itself as of a similar kind to that which happened on Pentecost, xii. 15. But καθεξῆς καὶ ἡμείς cannot be held as a proof that by γλώσσαις λαλεῖν is to be understood a speaking in foreign languages—in opposition to Baumgarten, who thinks that he sees in our passage "the connecting link between the miracle of Pentecost and the speaking with tongues in the Corinthian church"—for it rather shows the essential identity of the Pentecostal event with the later speaking with tongues, and points back from the mouth of the apostle to the historical form of that event, when it had not yet been transformed by tradition into a speaking of languages. — προσέταξεν] The personal performance of baptism did not necessarily belong to the destined functions of the apostolic office.—ἐν τῷ ἱδρύμ. τοῦ κυρίου] belongs to βαπτισθ. but leaves untouched the words with which the baptism was performed. As, namely, the name of Jesus Christ is the spiritual basis of the being baptized and

1 Mark xvi. 17.
2 Comp. also van Hengel, de gave d. talen, pp. 73 ff., 84 ff., who, however, here also (see on chap. ii.) abides by the view, that they spoke "openly and aloud to the glorifying of God in Christ."
3 See on chap. xi.
4 Of the νόμος, 1 Cor. xiv. 9.
5 See the more particular exposition at 1 Cor. xii. 10.
6 See on 1 Cor. i. 17.
7 See on ii. 38, comp. viii. 35 f.
the end to which it refers, so it is also conceived as the entire holy sphere, in which it is accomplished, and out of which it cannot take place. — εἰσιμένην] to remain. And he remained and had fellowship at table with them, xi. 3. So much the more surprising is his ἐπισκοπαζ at Antioch, Gal. ii. 11 ff.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

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

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

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

1 xix. 6.
NOTES.

(27) A devout man. V. 2.

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

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

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

(vi) Fell into a trance. V. 10.

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

(v) Accepted with him. V. 35.

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

This note is adopted by Taylor, and heartily approved by him.

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

CHAPTER XI.

VER. 8. κοινόν] Elz. has πάντα κοινόν, against A B D E Μ, min. vss. and Fathers. From x. 14. — Ver. 9. μοι] is wanting in A B Μ, min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. Epiph. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. It is an addition, in accordance with ver. 7. — Ver. 10. The order ἄνευτος πάλιν is, according to preponderant evidence, to be adopted. — Ver. 11. ημέρα] Lachm. Born. read ἡμέρα, after A B D Μ, 40. Without attestation, doubtless, from the vss.; but on account of its apparent irrelevancy, and on account of ver. 5, to be considered as the original. — Ver. 12. μηδὲν διακρίνουσα] is, as already Mill saw, very suspicious (as an interpolation from x. 20), for it is wholly wanting in D, Syr. p. Cant.; in A B Μ, lo! it is exchanged for μηδὲν διακρίνουσα or μ. διακρίνουσα (so Lachm.), and in 33, 46, for μ. διακρίνουσας. Tisch. and Born. have rejected it; de Wette declares himself for the reading of Lachm. — Ver. 13. δὲ is to be read instead of τι, with Lachm. and Born., in accordance with preponderant authority. — After ἱστορημένον Elz. has ἄνευτος, an addition from x. 5, which has against it A B D Μ, min. and most vss. — Ver. 17. οἱδεῖτε is wanting in A B D Μ, min. vss. and several Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. It was omitted as disturbing the construction. — Ver. 18. οἰδάν] The considerably attested οὗδάν (Lachm.) has arisen from the preceding soris. — Instead of ἐραγέ, Lachm. has ἐρά, after A B D Μ, min. A neglect of the strengthening γε, which to the transcribers was less familiar with ἐρά in the N. T. (Matt. vii. 20, xvii. 26, Acts vii. 27). — Ver. 19. Στραφέων] Lachm. reads Στραφέων, after A E, min. Theophyl., but this has been evidently introduced into the text as an emendatory gloss from erroneously take ἐπί as denoting time. — Ver. 20. ἐλθόντες] Elz. reads εἰσελθόντες, against decisive testimony. — Εἰλέφαν] So A D Μ** vss. and Fathers. Already preferred by Grotius and Witsius, adopted by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. Scholz. Born. But Elz. Matth. have Εἰλέφαντας, which, in particular, Ammon (de Hellenistis Antioch. Erl. 1810, krit. Journ. I, 3. p. 213 ff.; Magas. f. chrisl. Pred. III. 1, p. 222 f.) has defended, assuming two classes of Antiocchene Jews, namely, Hebrew-speaking, who used the original text of the O. T., and Greek-speaking, who used the LXX. But see Schultheiss, de Charism. Ap. St. p. 73 ff.; Binck, Lucubr. crit. p. 65 f. The reading Εἰλέφαν is necessary, since the announcement of the gospel to Hellenists, particularly at Antioch, could no longer now be anything surprising, and only Εἰλέφαν exhausts the contrast to ἱουδαῖοι, ver. 20 (not Εἰδραιοι as in, vi. 1). Εἰλέφαν. might easily arise from comparison with ix. 29, for which Cod. 40 testifies, when after ἐλάλησαν it inserts καὶ ἐπεξείρησαν. — Ver. 22. διελθεῖν] is wanting in A B Μ, lo! Syr. and other vss., and is deleted by Lachm. Omitted as superfluous. — Ver. 25. ὁ Βαρναβᾶς and the twice-repeated αὐτόν are to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch., after A B Μ, al.; the former as the subject

1 Bornemann has the peculiar expansion of the simple text from D; ἔκοψε δὲ, ἐπὶ σαλάτις ἐστιν εἰς Ταρσόν, ἐξέβλησεν ἀναρίστων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐς συντυχίαν παρακάλεσεν αὐτῶν ἐδόθη εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν.
written on the margin (seeing that another subject immediately precedes) and the latter as a very usual (unnecessary) definition of the object. — Ver. 26. αὐτοῖς] read with Lachm. Tisch. Born. αὐτοῖς, after A B E Ν, min. This accusative with the infinite after ἔγενετο was most familiar to the transcribers (ix. 3, 32, 37). — Lachm. and Tisch. have καί after αὐτ., following A C Λ Cant. Syr. p. Ath. Vig. Rightly; apparently occasioning confusion, it was omitted. — Ver. 28. μέγαν . . . δοτις] μεγάλην . . . τις is supported by the predominant testimony of A B D E Ν (Ε has μέγαν . . . ἡτις), min. Father, so that it is to be adopted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., as in Luke xv. 14 (see on that passage), and the masculine is to be considered as an emendation of ignorant transcribers. — After Κλαυδίου, Elz. has καίκαρος, an inserted gloss to be rejected in conformity with A B D Ν, loth, Copt. Aeth. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. Cant.

Vv. 1-18. The fellowship into which Peter entered with the Gentiles in chap. x., offends the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, but their objection is allayed by the apostle through a simple representation of the facts as a whole, and is converted into the praise of God. — κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν is not = εν τῇ Ἰουδαίαν, but throughout Judaea. — Ver. 2. δικαιώνων they strove against him. — οἱ εἰκ περιμοι.] the circumcised Christians, as in x. 45, opposed to the Gentiles (ἀκροβυτικοί ἐξονται) whose conversion is reported. — δει is most simply taken as recitative, neither quare, Vulg., nor because, Grotius supplying: hoc querimur. — πρὸς ἄνδρας k.τ.λ.] Thus it was not the baptism of these men that they called in question, but the fellowship entered into by Peter with them, especially the fellowship at table. This was the stone of stumbling: for they had not come to Peter to be baptized, as a Gentile might present himself to become a proselyte; but Peter had gone in to them. (w). Without ground, Gfrörer and Zeller employ this passage against the historical character of the whole narrative of the baptism of Cornelius. — ἀκροβύτικος εἰς.] An expression of indignation. Eph. ii. 11. — Ver. 4. ἄρξαμαι ἐξετάζω] he began and expounded, so that ἄρξαμαι is a graphic trait, corresponding to the conception of the importance of the speech in contradistinction to the complaint; comp. ii. 4. — Ver. 6. εἰς ᾧ ἀπένεισα κατενώθη κ. εἰδώλων] on which I, having fixed my glance, observed (vii. 31) and saw, etc. This εἰδώλων τατερόποδα κ.τ.λ. is the result of the κατενώθην. — κ. τὰ θηρία] and the beasts specially to make mention of these from among the quadrupeds. In x. 13, only the wild beasts were not specially mentioned; but there πάντα stood before τὰ τετράποδα. — Ver. 11. ἡμῶν] (see the critical remarks) is to be explained from the fact, that Peter already thinks of the ἄδελφοι, ver. 13, as included. — Ver. 12. οὕτω] the men of Joppa, who had gone with Peter to Cornelius.

1 Kuinoel, de Wette.
2 Ed. 3.
3 s. 15, and see Nægelseb. on the Mad. p. 13.
4 Jude 9; Dem. 165. 15; Polyb. ii. 22. 11; Athen. xil. p. 544 C.
5 Comp. on Mark ix. 11.
6 Comp. Gal. iii. 12.
7 See, in opposition, Oertel, p. 211.
8 The importance of the matter is the reason why Luke makes Peter again recite in de-
x. 28, had thus accompanied him also to Jerusalem. They were now present in this important matter as his witnesses. — Ver. 13. τὸν ἄγγελον [the angel already known from chap. x., — a mode of expression, no doubt, put into the mouth of Peter by Luke from his own standpoint. — Ver. 14. εἰς οἷς] by means of which. — Ver. 15. εἰ δὲ τῷ ἄγγελῳ με λαλεῖν] This proves that Peter, after x. 43, had intended to speak still considerably longer. — καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ver. 17 — it is otherwise with ἡμείς, ver. 16 — are to be taken as in x. 47. — εἰς ἁρχήν] namely, at Pentecost. The period of the apostolic church was then at its beginning. — Ver. 16. Comp. i. 5. — ὃς ἔλεγεν] A frequent circumstantiality.¹ Peter had recollected this saying of Christ, because he had seen realized in the Gentiles filled with the Spirit what Jesus, i. 5, had promised to the apostles for their own persons. Herein, as respects the divine bestowal of the Spirit, he had recognised a placing of the Gentiles concerned on the same level with the apostles. And from this baptisma flaminis he could not but infer it as willed by God, that the baptisma flaminis also was not to be refused. — Ver. 17. πιστεύσαν] refers not to αὐτοῖς, as is assumed by Beza, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel against the order of the words, but to ἡμῖν: “as also to us as having become believers,” etc., that is, as He has given it also to us, because we had become believers, so that thus the same gift of God indicated as its basis the same faith in them as in us. — εἰ δὲ τῷ ἡμῶν ὄνομας κ.τ.λ.] Two interrogative sentences are here blended into one:² Who was I on the other hand? was I able to hinder God, namely, by refusal of baptism? Concerning δὲ, in the apodosis, following after a hypothetical prothesis, see Nägelsb.;³ Baeumlein.⁴ — Ver. 18. ὁ θεύτη] they were silent, Luke xiv. 4, often in classical writers.⁵ The following ἑδόςαζον (imperfect) thereupon denotes the continuous praising. Previously contention against Peter, vv. 2, 3, now silence, followed by praise of God. — ἄπασα] thus, as results from this event. By τὸν μετάνοιαν, however, is meant the Christian change of disposition; comp. v. 31. — εἰς ζωήν] unto eternal Messianic life; this is the aim of τὸν μετάνοιαν ἔδωκεν.⁶

Vv. 19, 20. Οἱ μὲν ὑπὲρ διασπάσαντες] A resumption of viii. 4, in order now to narrate a still further advance, which Christianity had made in consequence of that dispersion,—namely, to Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, for the most part, indeed, among the Jews, yet also (ver. 20) among the Gentiles, the latter at Antioch.⁷ — ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] on account of, on occasion of, the tribulation.⁸ — εἰς Στεφάνῳ] Luther rightly renders: over Stephen, i.e. on account of Stephen.⁹ Others, Alberti, Wolf, Heumann, Palairos, Kypke, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, render: post Stephaniun. Linguistically admis-
sible, but less simple, as *poet Stephanum* would have again to be explained as *e medio sublato Stephano.* — ἤσαν δὲ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν does not apply to *Ἰουδαίοις,* as the δὲ, corresponding to the μὲν, ver. 19, requires for αὐτῶν the reference to the subject of ver. 19, the διασπαρέντες, and as οίνες ἐλθόντες εἰς Ἀντίοχεαν, ver. 20, so corresponds to the διήδον ἐως Ἀντίοχεας of ver. 19, that a diversity of the persons spoken of could not but of necessity be indicated. The correct interpretation is: “The dispersed travelled through the countries, as far as Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch, delivering the gospel — τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἐξοχήν, as in viii. 4. vi. 4, and frequently — to the Jews only, ver. 19, but some of them, of the dispersed, Cyprians and Cyrenians by birth, proceeded otherwise; having come to Antioch, they preached the word to the Gentiles there.” — τοῖς Ἕλληναῖς is the national contrast to *Ἰουδαίοις* ver. 19, and therefore embraces as well the Gentiles proper as the proselytes who had not become incorporated into Judaism by circumcision. To understand only the proselytes would be a limitation not founded here in the text, as in xiv. 1 (x').

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

on ἵνα αὐτοῖς, just because the reported appellation, which was first given to the disciples at Antioch, was causally connected with the lengthened and successful labours of the two men in that city. It was their merit, that here the name of Christians first arose. — On the climactic καὶ, etiam, in the sense of yet, or yet further, comp. Hartung. — συναξόμεναι] to be brought together, i.e. to join themselves for common work. They had been since ix. 26 ff. separated from each other. — χριστιανοί] to bear the name. — χριστιανοί] This name decidedly originated not in, but outside of, the church, seeing that the Christians in the N. T. never use it of themselves, but designate themselves by μαθηταί, ἀδελφοί, believers, etc.; and seeing that, in the two other passages where χριστιανοί occurs, this appellation distinctly appears as extrinsic to the church. But it certainly did not proceed from the Jews, because χριστός was known to them as the interpretation of ἐξότειρος, and they would not therefore have transferred so sacred a name to the hated apostates. Hence the origin of the name must be derived, from the Gentiles in Antioch. By these the name of the Head of the new religious society, "Christ," was not regarded as an official name, which it already was among the Christians themselves ever more and more becoming; and hence they formed according to the wonted mode the party-name: Christiani, sactor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat." At Antioch, the seat of the mother-church of Gentile Christianity, this took place at that time, for this follows from the reading ἵνα. δε αὐτοῖς, because in that year the joint labours of Paul and Barnabas occasioned so considerable an enlargement of the church, and therewith naturally its increase in social and public consideration. And it was at Antioch that this name was born first, earlier than anywhere else, because here the Christians, in consequence of the predominant Gentile-Christian element, asserted themselves for the first time not as a sect of Judaism, but as an independent community. There is nothing to support the view that the name was at first a title of ridicule. The conjecture of Baur, that the origin of the name was referred to Antioch, because that was the first Gentile city in which there were Christians, cannot be justified by the Latin form of the word.

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

1 Pufendorf, I. p. 188 f.
2 See on Rom. vii: 3.
3 Acts xxvi. 22; 1 Pet, iv. 16.
4 Ewald, p. 441 f., conjectures that it proceeded from the Roman authorities.
5 Thuc. Ann. xvi. 44.
6 ἵηλων, or, according to B M, ἴηλων, Loebbeck, ad Phryn. p. 311 f.
7 De Wette, Baumgarten, after Wetstein and older interpreters.
8 Zeller also mistrusts the account before us.
9 See Wetstein, ad. Matth. xxii. 17.
10 Ewald.
counsel for the exercise of a psycological and moral influence on given circumstances, but always in reference to Christ and His work, was the tenor of what these interpreters of God spoke. The prediction of what was future was, as with the old, so also with the new prophets, no permanent characteristic feature; but naturally and necessarily the divinely-illuminated glance ranged very often into the future development of the divine counsel and kingdom, and saw what was to come. In respect to the degree of the inspired seizure, the προφήται are related to the γλώσσας λαλούντας in such a way that the intellectual consciousness was not thrown into the back ground with the former as with the latter, and so the mental excitement was not raised to the extent of its becoming ecstatic, nor did their speaking stand in need of interpretation. — ἀναστάς] he came forward in the church-assembly. — Ἀγαθός] Whether the name is to be derived from Ζημ, a locust, or from Ζυμ, to love, remains undecided. The same prophet as in xxi. 10. — διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος] This characterizes the announcement (καίημαι) of the famine as something imparted to the prophet by the Holy Spirit; hence Eichhorn's opinion, that the famine was already present in its beginnings, does great violence to the representation of the text, which, moreover, by σοτης . . . Κλαυδίου states the fulfilment as having occurred afterwards, and consequently makes the event to appear at that time still as future, which also μελλειν ἐκείνῳ definitely affirms. — ζημων . . . οἰκονομῶν] that a great famine was appointed by God to set in over the whole inhabited earth. Thus generally is τὴν οἰκονομ. to be understood in the original sense of the prophet, who sees no local limits drawn for the famine beheld in prophetic vision, and therefore represents it not as a partial, but as an unrestricted one. Just because the utterance is a prediction, according to its genuine prophetic character, there is no ground for giving to the general and usual meaning of τὴν οἰκονομ. — which is, moreover, designedly brought into relief by ἀγαθός,—any geographical limitation at all to the land of Judaea or the Roman empire. This very unlimited character of the vision, on the one hand, warranted the hyperbolical form of the expression, as given by Agabus, while yet, on the other hand, the famine extending itself far and wide, but yet limited, which afterwards historically occurred, might be regarded as the event corresponding to the entirely general prophetic vision, and be described by Luke as its fulfilment. History pointed out the limits, within which what was seen and predicted without limitation found its fulfilment, inasmuch, namely, as this famine, which set in in the fourth year of the reign of Claudius (A.D. 44), extended only to Judaea and the neighbouring countries, and particularly fell on Jerusalem itself, which was supported by the Syrian queen Helena of Adiabene with corn and figs. The view which includes as part of the fulfilment a yet later famine, which occurred in the eleventh year of Claudius, especially at Rome, offends against

1 See on x. 46.
2 Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 10.
3 Comp. Ex. ii. 46.
4 With Drusus.
5 With Grotius, Zitsius, Drusius, Wolf.
6 Comp. Heinrichs.
8 See Joseph. Antt. xx. 3, 6, xx. 5. 2 ; Euseb.
9 Baumgarten.
10 Suet. Claud. 19 ; Tacit. Ann. xii. 43.
the words (λιμῶν... ἓτεις) as well as against the connection of the history. It is altogether inadmissible to bring in here the different famines, which successively occurred under Claudius in different parts of the empire, since, by the famine here meant, according to vv. 29, 30, Judaea was affected, and the others were not synchronous with this. Lastly, very arbitrary is the assertion of Baumgarten, that the famine was predicted as a sign and herald of the Parousia, and that the fulfilment under Claudius was therefore merely a preliminary one, which pointed to a future and final fulfilment.—On ὁμός as feminines (Doric), as in Luke xv. 14, see on Luke iv. 26, and Bornemann on our passage.

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

1 vv. 29, 30.
2 Ewald.
3 Comp. Wieseler, p. 149.
4 See Kypke, II. p. 56; comp. also I Cor. xvi. 2.
5 We have no account of the institution of this office. It probably shaped itself after the analogy of the government of the synagogue, soon after the first dispersion of the church (viii. 1), the apostles themselves having in the first instance presided alone over the church in Jerusalem; while, on the other hand, in conformity with the pressing necessity which primarily emerged, the office of almoner was there formed, even before there were special presbyters. But certainly the presbyters were, as elsewhere (xiv. 28), so also in Jerusalem (xv. 28, xxi. 18), chosen by the church, and apostolically installed. Comp. Thiersch, p. 78, who, however, arbitrarily conjectures that the coming over of the priests, vi. 7, had given occasion to the origin of the office.—We may add that the presbyters do not here appear as almoners (in opposition to Lange, apost. Zeit. ii. p. 146), but the money is consigned to them as the presiding authority of the church. “Omnia enim rite et ordine administrari potuit,” Beza. Comp. besides, on vi. 8, the subjoined remark.
6 See on Eph. iv. 11; Huther on I Tim. iii. 2.
age—in the first instance, and already very distinctly, in the Ignatian epistles. That identity, although the assumption of it is anathematized by the Council of Trent, is clear from Acts xx. 17. ¹ Shifts are resorted to by the Catholics, such as Döllinger. ²—The moneys were to be given over to the prebentyers, in order to be distributed by them among the different overseers of the poor for due application. —According to Gal. ii. 1, Paul cannot have come with them as far as Jerusalem. ³ In the view of Zeller that circumstance renders it probable that our whole narrative lacks historical character—which is a very hasty conclusion.

**Notes by American Editor.**

(²¹) They of the circumcision contended with him. V. 3.

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


³ Ewald’s hypothesis also—that Paul had, when present in Jerusalem, conducted himself as quietly as possible, and had not transacted anything important for doctrine for the apostles, of whom Peter, according to xii. 17, had been absent—is insufficient to explain the silence in Gal. ii. concerning this journey. The whole argument in Gal. ii. is weak, if Paul, having been at Jerusalem, was silent to the Galatians about this journey. For the very non-mention of it must have exposed the journey, however otherwise little liable to objection, to the suspicions of opponents. This applies also against Hofmann, *N. T.* p. 121, and Trip, *Paulus nach d. Apostelgesch.*, p. 72 ff. The latter, however, ultimately accedes to my view. On the other hand, Paul had no need at all to write of the journey at Acts xvi. 22 to the Galatians (in opposition to Wieseler), because, after he had narrated to them his coming to an understanding with the apostle, there was no object at all in referring to this Epistle to *further and later journeys* to Jerusalem. See on Gal. ii. 1.
sidered as the commencement of the Jewish controversy, which so greatly troubled the early church, and which Paul so triumphantly maintained and settled.

(x') Antioch. V. 20.

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

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

Vv. 1, 2. Καὶ ἐκείνων δὲ τῶν καιρῶν] but at that juncture,¹ points, as in xix. 23,² to what is narrated immediately before; consequently: when Barnabas and Saul were sent to Jerusalem (xi. 30). From ver. 25 it is evident that Luke has conceived this statement of time in such a way, that what is related in vv. 1–24 is contemporaneous with the despatch of Barnabas and Saul to Judaea and with their stay there, and is accordingly to be placed between their departure from Antioch and their return from Jerusalem;³ and not so early as in the time of the one year’s residence at Antioch, xi. 25.⁴ — Ἡρώδης] Agrippa I., grandson of Herod the Great, son of Aristobulus and Berenice, nephew of Herod Antipas, possessed, along with the royal title, the whole of Palestine, as his grandfather had possessed it; Claudius having added Judaea and Samaria⁵ to his dominion already preserved and augmented by Caligula.⁶ A crafty, frivolous, and extravagant prince,
who, although better than his grandfather, is praised far beyond his due by Josephus (v.). — ἐνθάλεια τὰς χειρας is not, with Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, to be interpreted: coepit, conatus est = ἐνθάλειας,1 because for this there is no linguistic precedent at all, even in the LXX. Deut. xii. 7, xv. 10, the real and active application of the hand is meant, and not the general notion suscipere; but according to the constant usage,2 and according to the context, προεθέτο συλλαβεῖν, ver. 3, it is to be interpreted of hostile laying hands on. Herod laid hands on, he caught at, i.e. he caused to be forcibly seized, in order to maltreat some of the members of the church—on αἷα, used to designate membership of a corporation, see Lobbeck.3 Elsewhere the personal dative 4 or ἐπὶ τινα 5 is joined with ἐνθάλεια τὰς χειρας, instead of the definition of the object aimed at by the infinitive.—On the apostolic work and fate of the elder James, who now drank out the cup of Matt. xx. 23, nothing certain is otherwise known. Apocryphal accounts may be seen in Abdaiæ Histor. apost. in Fabric. Cod. Apocp. p. 516 ff., and concerning his death, p. 528 ff. The late tradition of his preaching in Spain, and of his death in Compostella, is given up even on the part of the Catholics.6 — τ. ἀδελφ. Ἰωάννου. John was still alive when Luke wrote, and in high respect. — μαχαίρη] probably, as formerly in the case of John the Baptist, by beheading,7 which even among the Jews was not uncommon and very ignominous; see Lightfoot, p. 91 (z').—The time of the execution was shortly before Easter week (A.D. 44), which follows from ver. 8; and the place was probably Jerusalem.8 It remains, however, matter of surprise that Luke relates the martyrdom of an apostle with so few words, and without any specification of the more immediate occasion or more special circumstances attending it, ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτηκεν Herod had killed him, says Chrysostom. A want of more definite information, which he could at all events have easily obtained, is certainly not to be assumed. Further, we must not in fanciful arbitrariness import the thought, that by "the entirely mute (f) suffering of death," as well as "in this absolute quietness and apparent insignificance," in which the first death of an apostle is here presented, there is indicated "a reserved glory,"9 by which, in fact, moreover, some sort of more precise statement would not be excluded. Nor yet is the summary brevity of itself warranted as a mere introduction, by which Luke desired to pass to the following history derived from a special document concerning Peter;10 the event was too important for that. On the contrary, there must have prevailed some sort of conscious consideration

1 Luke i. 1; Acts ix. 29.
2 Acts v. 18, xxx. 97; Matt. xxvi. 50; Mark xiv. 46; Luke xx. 19, xxx. 12; John vii. 50; Gen. xxii. 12; comp. Lucian, Tim. 4, also in Arius, Polybius, etc.
3 Schaefer, Medel. p. 26 ff.
4 Acts iv. 40; Acts iv. 3; Mark xiv. 46; Tischendorf, Bahr. vi. 2.
5 Gen. xxii. 12; 2 Sam. xviii. 12, and always in the N. T., except Acts iv. 3 and Mark xiv. 46.
6 See Sepp, p. 75. Who, however, comes at least to the rescue of the bones of the apostle for Compostella!
8 For Agrippa was accustomed to reside in Jerusalem (Joseph. Antt. xix. 7, 3); all the more, therefore, he must have been present or have come thither from Caesarea, shortly before the feast (ver. 19).
9 Baumgarten.
10 Bleek.
CHAPTER XII.

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

Vv. 1, 2. Ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν καρδιῶν] but at that juncture,¹ points, as in xix. 23,² to what is narrated immediately before; consequently: when Barnabas and Saul were sent to Jerusalem (xi. 30). From ver. 25 it is evident that Luke has conceived this statement of time in such a way, that what is related in vv. 1–24 is contemporaneous with the despatch of Barnabas and Saul to Judaea and with their stay there, and is accordingly to be placed between their departure from Antioch and their return from Jerusalem, and not so early as in the time of the one year's residence at Antioch, xi. 25.³ — Ἡρώς] Agrippa I., grandson of Herod the Great, son of Aristobulus and Berenice, nephew of Herod Antipas, possessed, along with the royal title,⁴ the whole of Palestine, as his grandfather had possessed it; Claudius having added Judaea and Samaria ⁵ to his dominion already preserved and augmented by Caligula.⁶ A crafty, frivolous, and extravagant prince.

¹ Winer, p. 374 (E. T. 500).
² Comp. 2 Macc. Ill. 5; 1 Macc. xi. 14.
³ Schrader, Hug, Schott.
⁵ Joseph. Antt. xviii. 6. 10.
⁶ Joseph. Antt. xix. 5. 1, xix. 6. 1; Bell. 1. 11. 5.
⁷ Joseph. Antt. xviii. 7. 2; Bell. 11. 9. 6. See Wieseler, p. 192 f.; Gerlach in the Luther. Zeitschr. 1869, p. 55 ff.
who, although better than his grandfather, is praised far beyond his due by Josephus (v). — ἐνεβάλεν τὸς χειρας is not, with Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, to be interpreted: coepit, conatus est = ἐνεχειρας, because for this there is no linguistic precedent at all, even in the LXX. Deut. xii. 7, xv. 10, the real and active application of the hand is meant, and not the general notion συστηρεμε; but according to the constant usage, and according to the context, προσέθηκαν συλλαβεῖν, ver. 3, it is to be interpreted of hostile laying hands on. Herod laid hands on, he caught at, i.e. he caused to be forcibly seized, in order to maltreat some of the members of the church—on οἱ ἀντί, used to designate membership of a corporation, see Lobeck. Elsewhere the personal dative ο or ἐν τινα is joined with ἐπιβαλλειν τὸς χειρας, instead of the definition of the object aimed at by the infinitive.—On the apostolic work and fate of the elder James, who now drank out the cup of Matt. xx. 23, nothing certain is otherwise known. Apocryphal accounts may be seen in Abdias Histor. apost. in Fabric. Cod. Apocer. p. 516 ff., and concerning his death, p. 528 ff. The late tradition of his preaching in Spain, and of his death in Compostella, is given up even on the part of the Catholics.—τ. ἀδελφ. Ἰωάννου] John was still alive when Luke wrote, and in high respect. —μακαίρω] probably, as formerly in the case of John the Baptist, by beheading, which even among the Jews was not uncommon and very ignominious; see Lightfoot, p. 91 (z').—The time of the execution was shortly before Easter week (A.D. 44), which follows from ver. 3; and the place was probably Jerusalem. It remains, however, matter of surprise that Luke relates the martyrdom of an apostle with so few words, and without any specification of the more immediate occasion or more special circumstances attending it, ἀπλῶς καὶ ἡς ἐν χειρίν Herod had killed him, says Chrysostom. A want of more definite information, which he could at all events have easily obtained, is certainly not to be assumed. Further, we must not in fanciful arbitrariness import the thought, that by "the entirely mute (?) suffering of death," as well as "in this absolute quietness and apparent insignificance," in which the first death of an apostle is here presented, there is indicated "a reserved glory," by which, in fact, moreover, some sort of more precise statement would not be excluded. Nor yet is the summary brevity of itself warranted as a mere introduction, by which Luke desired to pass to the following history derived from a special document concerning Peter; the event was too important for that. On the contrary, there must have prevailed some sort of conscious consideration

---

1 Luke i. 1; Acts ix. 29.
2 iv. 3, v. 18, xxv. 27; Matt. xxvi. 50; Mark xiv. 46; Luke xx. 19, xxxi. 12; John vii. 50; Gen. xxii. 12; comp. Lucian, Tim. 4, also in Arrian, Polybius, etc.
3 Ad Phryg. p. 164; Schaefer, Melit. n. 26 ff.
4 Act. Lge. 440; Acts iv. 3; Mark xiv. 46; Tischendorf, Esth. vi. 2.
5 Gen. xxii. 12; 2 Sam. xviii. 12, and always in the N. T., except Acts iv. 3 and Mark xiv. 46.
6 See Sepp, p. 75. Who, however, comes at least to the rescue of the bones of the apostle for Compostella! 7 "Cervicum spiculatori porrexit," Abdias, l.c. p. 581.
8 For Agrippa was accustomed to reside in Jerusalem (Joseph. Antt. xix. 7. 3); all the more, therefore, he must have been present or have come thither from Caesarea, shortly before the feast (ver. 19).
9 Baumgarten.
10 Bleek.
involved in the literary plan of Luke,—probably this, that he had it in view to compose a third historical book (see the Introduction), in which he would give the history of the other apostles besides Peter and Paul, and therefore, for the present, he mentions the death of James only quite briefly, and for the sake of its connection with the following history of Peter. The reason adduced by Lekebusch, p. 219: that Luke wished to remain faithful to his plan of giving a history of the development of the church, does not suffice, for at any rate the first death of an apostle was in itself, and by its impression on believers and unbelievers, too important an element in the history of that development not to merit a more detailed representation in connection with it.—Clem. Al. in Ευσέβ., ii. 9 has a beautiful tradition, how the accuser of James, converted by the testimony and courage of the apostle, was beheaded along with him.

Vv. 3, 4. Herod, himself a Jew, in opposition to Harduin, born in Judaism, although of Gentile leanings, a Roman favourite brought up at the court of Tiberius, cultivated out of policy Jewish popular favour, and sought zealously to defend the Jewish religion for this purpose. —προσιθετο συλλαβ.] a Hebrewism: he further seized. —τέσσαρα τετράδια] four bands of four—τετράδιον, a number of four, Philo, II. p. 583, just as τετράς in Aristotle and others—quattuor quaternionibus, i.e. four detachments of the watch, each of which consisted of four men, so that one such τετράδιον was in turn on guard for each of the four watches of the night. —μετὰ τὸ πάσχα] not to desecrate the feast, in consideration of Jewish orthodox observance of the law. For he might have evaded the Jewish rule, "non judicat die festo," at least for the days following the first day of the feast, by treating the matter as peculiarly pressing and important. Wieseler has incorrectly assumed the 15th Nisan as the day appointed for the execution, and the 14th Nisan as the day of the arrest. Against this it may be decisively urged, that by μετὰ τὸ πάσχα must be meant the entire Paschal feast, not the 14th Nisan, because it corresponds to the preceding and the elevated place where the tribunal stood (John xix. 13), in order there publicly to pronounce upon him the sentence of death.

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

---

1 Deyling, Obs. II. p. 293; Wolf, Cur.
2 Joseph. Antiq. xiii. 7. 8.
3 Comp. on Luke xix. 11, xx. 12.
4 On this Roman regulation, see Veget. R. M. iii. 8; Censorinus, de die nat. 28; Weitzel in loc.
5 Moed Katon, v. 2.
6 See Bleek, Beltr. p. 199 ff.
9 See Lobec, ad Phryn. p. 311.
10 Comp. Joseph. Antiq. xviii. 6. 7; Plin. ep. x. 65; Senec. ep. 5. al.
Imprisonment of Peter.

Chain to one soldier, but by two chains, and so with each hand attached to a soldier, was an aggravation, which may be explained from the fact that the execution was already determined. Two soldiers of the τεράδων on guard were in the prison, fastened to Peter asleep (κομψομ.), and, indeed, sleeping profoundly in the peace of the righteous; and two as guards, σιλακες, were stationed outside at some distance from each other, forming the πρωτον φυλακην και δευτεραν, ver. 10.

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

---

1 See, generally, Weissler, pp. 361, 395.
2 See ver. 7.
3 Ps. 118. 5.
4 1 evers, see on Luke 11. 9.
5 Lange, apostol. Zeitlatt. II. p. 150, supposes that the help had befallen the apostle in the condition of "second consciousness, in an extraordinary healthy disengagement of the higher life." [Genuslieben], and that the angel was a "reflected image of the glorified Christ;" that the latter Himself, in an angelic form, came within the sphere of Peter's vision; that Christ Himself thus undertook the responsibility; and that the action of the apostle transcended the condition of responsible consciousness. There is nothing of all this in the passage. And Christ in an angelic form is without analogy in the N. T.; is, indeed, at variance with the N. T. conception of the διαλογ of the glorified Lord.
6 See Storr, Opusc. III. p. 188 ff.
7 Who (p. 209) regards our narrative as more historical than the similar narratives in chaps. v. and xvi.
8 Matt. xxvii. 5.
9 Valick. ad Ammon. Ill. 4; Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 587.
10 Dem. 799. 2. 990, 13. 1294. 2; Thuc. IV. 47. 2. 48. 1; Kypke, II. p. 57. Comp. Valick. ad Herod. VII. 119.
CHAP. XII., 12-17.

as a real fact, but that he fancied himself to have seen a vision, comp. xvi. 9. — Ver. 10. τὴν φερόνα έλεις τὴν πόλιν] Nothing can be determined from this as to the situation of the prison. Fessel holds that it was situated in the court of Herod's castle; Walch and Kuinoel, that Peter was imprisoned in a tower of the inner wall of the city, and that the πόλις was the door of this tower, if the prison-house was in the city, which is to be assumed from καὶ εξελθόντες κ.τ.λ., its iron gate still in fact led from the house εἰς τὴν πόλιν. — Examples of αὐτόματος, used not only of persons, but of things, may be seen in Wetstein in loc., and on Mark iv. 28. — ἡμείς μιαν] not several. — Ver. 11. γενόμενος εἰς εαυτοῦ] when he had become (present) in himself, i.e. had come to himself, "cum anno ex stupore ob rem inopinatam iterum collecto satis sibi conscient esset." — καὶ πάσης τῆς προσώπεως τοῦ λαοῦ τ. Ισρα. ] For he had now ceased to be the person, in whose execution the people were to see their whole expectation hostile to Christianity gratified.

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

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

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

2 Luke xv. 17; Xen. Anab. i. 5. 17; Soph.
3 Kypke, comp. Wetstein and Dorville, ad Charit. p. 61; Herm. ad Vig. p. 749.
4 Comp. xiv. 6; Plato. Thea. 7: συνήκας τοῦ κινήσεως, Xen. Anab. i. 5. 9; Plato. Dem. p. 381 E, Dem. 17. 7; 1551; 6; Polyb. 1. 4. 6, iii. 6. 9, vi. 4. 12: 1 Macc. iv. 31: 2 Macc. ii. 24, iv. 4, v. 17, viii. 8; and see Wetstein.
5 Beza.
6 Bengel, comp. Erasmus.
7 Kuinoel.
8 Olfhausen; comp. Chrysostom, λογισμένος δὲ τῶν εύσεβών, also Grotsius and others.
10 Comp. John xx. 19.
11 II. p. 60, and Valckenaer, p. 480 f.
12 Comp. Luke xxiv. 41.
14 Comp. xxvi. 34; Hom. Od. xvii. 406.
of something incredible himself exclaims: μαίνομαι — διὰ χειρὶς. ] as in Luke xxii. 59, and often in Greek writers: she maintained firmly and strongly.—ι ἀγγελος αἰτοῦ ἔστω] Even according to the Jewish conception, the explanation suggested itself, that Peter's guardian angel had taken the form and voice of his protector and was before the door. But the idea, originating after the exile, of individual guardian angels, is adopted by Jesus Himself, and is essentially connected with the idea of the Messianic kingdom. Olshausen rationalizes this conception in an unbiblical manner, to this effect: "that in it is meant to be expressed the thought, that there lives in the world of spirit the archetype of every individual to be realized in the course of his development, and that the higher consciousness which dwells in man here below stands in living connection with the kindred phenomena of the spirit-world." Cameron, Hammond, and others explain: "a messenger sent by him from the prison." It is decisive against this interpretation, that those assembled could just as little light on the idea of the imprisoned Peter's having sent a messenger, as the maid could have confounded the voice of the messenger with the well-known voice of Peter, for it must be presumed from διὰ χειρὶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἔχειν that she told the more special reasons for her certainty that Peter was there. — Ver. 16. ἀνοίξας] consequently the persons assembled themselves, who had now come out of their room.

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

1 Jacobs, ad Antioh. IX. p. 440.
2 See Lightfoot ad loc.
3 See on Matt. xviii. 10.
4 Matt. xviii. 10.
5 Heb. I. 14.
6 Comp. xiii. 16, xix. 38, xxii. 40.
7 See Polyb. I. 78. 3; Heliiod. x. 7; Krebs and Wetstein in loc.
8 Comp. Joseph. Ant. xvii. 10. 2.
9 Ewald, p. 607.
10 But see on ver. 23.
11 Even in the present day the reference to Rome is, on the part of the Catholics (see Gams, d. Jahr. d. Martyrabortes der Ap. Petr.
is not even distinctly apparent that the ἄνερ τόπος is to be placed outside of Jerusalem, although this is probable in itself; for the common explanation of ἐξελθὼν, relicta urbe, is entirely at variance with the context, ver. 16, which requires the meaning, relicta domo, into which he was admitted (A).

—The James mentioned in this passage is not the son of Alpheus,—a traditional opinion, which has for its dogmatic presupposition the perpetual virginity of Mary,¹ but the real brother of the Lord,² ἀδελφός κατὰ σάμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.³ It is the same also at xv. 13, xxi. 18. See on 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5; Gal. i. 19. Peter specially names him, because he was head of the church in Jerusalem. The fact that Peter does not name the apostles also, suggests the inference that none of the twelve was present in Jerusalem. The Clementines and Hegesippus make James the chief bishop of the whole church.⁴ This amplification of the tradition as to his high position goes, in opposition to Thiersch, beyond the statements of the N. T.⁵

Vv. 18, 19. What had become of the (vanished) Peter,⁶ whether accordingly, under these circumstances,⁷ the wonderful escape was capable of no explanation,—this inquiry was the object of consternation (τάραχος) among the soldiers who belonged to the four τετραδία, ver. 4, because they feared the vengeance of the king in respect to those who had served on that night-watch. And Herod actually caused those who had been the φιλακτος of the prison at the time of the escape, after previous inquiry,⁸ to be led to execution—ἀπαξήθαι, the formal word for this.⁹ After the completion of the punishment, he went down from Judaea to his residency, where he took up his abode.—εἰς τὴν Καισαρείαν] depends, as well as ἀπὸ τ. Ιουδ., on κατελθὼν. The definition of the place of the διέτριβεν¹⁰ was obvious of itself.

w. Paul., Regensb. 1857), very welcome, because a terminus a quo is thereby thought to be gained for the duration, lasting about twenty-five years, of the episcopal functions of Peter at Rome. Game, indeed, places this Roman journey of Peter as early as 41, and his martyrdom in the year 65. So also Thiersch. X. im. apostel. Zeit. p. 96 ff., comp. Ewald.

¹ See Hengstenberg on John li. 12; Th. Schott, d. weisse Br. Petr. und d. Br. Judd, p. 192 ff. ² Lange (apostel. Zeitatt. L. p. 198 ff., and in Herzog's Encycl. VI. p. 407 ff.) has declared himself very decidedly on the opposite side of the question, and that primarily on the basis of the passages from Hegesippus in Euseb. ii. 23 and iv. 22; but erroneously. Credner, Einf. II. p. 574 ff., has already strikingly exhibited the correct explanation of these passages, according to which Jesus and James appear certainly as brothers in the proper sense. Comp. Huther on James, Introd. p. 5 ff.; Bleek, Einf. p. 548 ff. James the Just is identical with this brother of the Lord; see, especially, Euseb. H. E. ii. 1, where the opinion of Clem. Al., that James the Just was the son of Alpheus, is rejected by Eusebius (against Wieseler on Gal. p. 81 f.), although it was afterwards adopted by Jerome. See, generally, also Ewald, p. 221 ff. Böttiger, d. Zeug. des Joseph. von Joh. d. T., etc., 1883. Pitt in the Zeitchr. f. Luth. Theol. 1894, I. p. 95 ff.; Laurent, neut. Stud. p. 194 ff.—According to Mark vi. 3, James was probably the eldest of the four brethren of Jesus.

² Const., ap. viii. 35. The Const. ap. throughout distinguish very definitely James of Alpheus, as one of the twelve, from the brother of the Lord, whom they characterize as ἀπεσκοπεσ. See II. 52. 2, vi. 12. 1, 5, 6, vi. 14. 1, viii. 4. 1, viii. 23 ff., viii. 10. 2, viii. 35, viii. 46. 7, v. 8, viii. 46. 1.


⁴ Gal. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 7; Acts xxi, xxi. 18; Epistle of James.

⁵ Luke i. 66; John xxi. 21.


⁸ See Wakefield, Stin. crit. II. p. 131; Kypke, ii. p. 61; and from Philo: Loeser, p. 304.

⁹ Vulg.: ibi commoratus est.
EXECUTION OF THE SOLDIERS.

Ver. 20. 1 Θυμομαχείν signifies to fight violently, which may be meant as well of actual war as of other kinds of enmity. 2 Now, as an actual war of Herod against the Roman confederate cities of Tyre and Sidon is very improbable in itself, and is historically quite unknown; as, further, the Tyrians and Sidonians, for the sake of their special advantage (δι' τῶν τρέφοντων . . . βασιλικῶν), might ask for peace, without a war having already broken out,—namely, for the preservation of the peace, a breach of which was to be apprehended from the exasperation of the king; the explanation is to be preferred, in opposition to Raphael and Wolf: he was at vehement enmity with the Tyrians, was vehemently indignant against them. 3 The reason of this θυμομαχία is unknown, but it probably had reference to commercial interests. — ομοθυμαδόν] here also, with one accord, both in one and the same frame of mind and intention. 4 — πρὸς αὐτόν] not precisely: with him, but before him, turned towards him. 5 —Βλάστων] according to the original Greek name, perhaps a Greek or a Roman in the service of Herod, his praefectus cubiculorum, 6 chamberlain, chief valet de chambre to the royal person, 7 ὁ ἐπὶ τούτων τοῦ βασιλέως. 8 How they gained and disposed him in their favour, πείσαντες, 10 possibly by bribery, is not mentioned. — διὰ τῶν τρέφοντων . . . βασιλικῶν] sc. χώρας. 

This refers partly to the important commercial gain which Tyre and Sidon derived from Palestine, where the people from of old purchased in large quantities timber, spices, and articles of luxury from the Phoenicians, to whom, in this respect, the harbour of Caesarea, improved by Herod, was very useful; 11 and partly to the fact, that Phoenicia annually derived a portion of its grain from Palestine. 12

Ver. 21. Τακτῷ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ 13 According to Josephus, namely, he was celebrating just at that time games in honour of Claudius, at which, declared by flatterers to be a god, he became suddenly very ill, etc. — ἐνδυσάμην. ἵσθητα βασιλ.] stodathen ἐνδυαμένος εἰς ἀργυρίου πεποιημένην πάσαν, Joseph. l.c. —Τὸ βήμα, the platform from which Agrippa spoke, would have to be conceived, in harmony with Josephus, as the throne-like box in the theatre, which, according to the custom of the Romans, was used for popular assemblies and public speeches, 14 which was destined for the king, if Luke

1 Chrysostom correctly remarks the internal relation of what follows: εἰς δὲ ἡμέραν κατέλαβεν αὐτὸν, εἰ καὶ μὴ δὲ Πέτρον, ἀλλὰ δὲ τὴν εἰρήνην μεγαλαγιασάντων. Com. Euseb. ii. 10. There is much subjectively supplied by Baumgarten, who considers it as the aim of this section to exhibit the character of the kingdom of the world in this bloody persecution directed against the apostles.


3 Polyb. xxvii. 8. 4.

4 See on l. 14.

5 See on John i. 1.

6 See the inscription in Wetstein.

7 Sueton. Domit. 16.

8 Scarcely overseer of the royal treasure (Gerlach), as κοσμῶν is used in Dio Cass. xxi. 8. For the meaning chamber, i.e. not treasure chamber, but sleeping-room, is the usual one, and lies at the root of the designations of services, κοιμωνίαρχος (chamberlain) and κοιμωνίτης (valet de chambre). Comp. Lobeck, l.c. In the LXX. and Apocr. also κοιμ. is cubiculum. See Schleusen. Theo.

9 Comp. on ii. viii. 27, and on κοσμῶν. Wetstein and Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 263 f.

10 See Nägelsb. on lkek, p. 50 f.


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


14 Comp. xix. 29.
—which, however, cannot be ascertained—has apprehended the whole occurrence as in connection with the festival recorded by Josephus. The festival itself is not defined more exactly by Josephus than as held ἑδρικῶς καὶ συνηρίας of the emperor. Hence different hypotheses concerning it, such as that of Anger: that it celebrated the return of Claudius from Britain and that of Wieseler: that it was the Quinquennalia, which, however, was not celebrated until August; a date which, according to the context, ver. 21 is too late. — ἐθυμάγος πρὸς αὐτοῖς] he made a speech in public assembly to the people (ver. 23) to them, namely, to the Tyrians and Sidonians, to whom, to whose representatives, he thus publicly before the people declared with a speech directed to them his decision on their request, his sentiments etc. Only this simple view of πρὸς αὐτοῖς: to them,1 not: in reference to them,—my first edition, and Baumgarten,—as well as the reference to the Tyrians and Sidonians, not to the people,2 is suggested by the context and is to be retained. That, moreover, the speech was planned to obtain popularity, is very probable in itself from the character of Herod, as well as from ver. 22; and this may have occasioned the choice of the word ἐθυμαγοις, which often denotes such a rhetorical exhibition.3

Ver. 22. Εὐθὺς δὲ οἱ κόλακες τὰς οὐδὲ ἑκείνω πρὸς ἀγαθῶν ἄλλος ἀλλούδθεν φῶν ἀνεβόμεν, θεῶν προσαγορεύοντες, εἰμιθής τε ἐκής, ἐπιλέγοντες, εἰ καὶ μήχυ νῦν ἡ ἀνθρωποι ἐφοβίζουμεν, ἀλλὰ τοιρειθὲν κρειττόνα σε θυσίας φάσεως ὠμολογοῦμεν.4 Joseph. l.c., who, however, represents this shout of flattery, which certainly proceeded from the mouth, not of Jews, but of Gentiles, as occasioned by the silver garment of the king shining in the morning sun and not by a speech on his part. "Vulgus tamen vacuum curis et sinceri falsi verique discriminate solitas adulationes edoctum, clamore et vocabulo adstrepebat." 5 δόξος, the common people, is found in the N. T. only in the Book of Acts.6

Ver. 23. Ἐπάταξαν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος κυρίου] an angel of the Lord emote him. The paroxysm of disease suddenly setting in as a punishment of God, is in accordance with O. T. precedents,7 apprehended as the effect of a stroke invisibly befalling him from an angel. The fate of Nebuchadnezzar: does not accord with this view, in opposition to Baumgarten. Josephus, l.c. relates that soon after that display of flattery, the king saw an owl sitting on a rope above his head, and he regarded this, according to a prophecy formerly received in Rome from a German, as a herald of death, whereupon severe abdominal pains immediately followed, under which he expired after five days, at the age of fifty-four years. That Luke has not adopted this fable,—instead of which Eichhorn puts merely a sudden shivering,—is a consequence of his Christian view, which gives instead from its own sphere and tradition the ἐπάταξαν . . . Θεός as an exhibition of the divine Nemesis.

1 Comp. Plat. Legg. vii. p. 817 C: δύμας. πρὸς καίμας τε καὶ γυναίκας καί τῶν πάντα ἐδρον.
4 Tacit. Hist. ii. 90.
5 See xvii. 5, xix. 30, 32. Comp. on xix. 32.
6 Comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 17; 2 Kings xix. 21.
7 Dan. iv. 28-30.
therefore Eusebius\(^1\) ought not to have harmonized the accounts, and made out of the owl an angel of death. Bengel: "Adeo differt historia divina et humana."\(^2\) — *ἀνω* ἀνέφικτον *τὸν θεον* ὁ οὐκ ἔσωκεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔξωθεν] he refused God the honour due to Him, inasmuch as he received that tribute of honour for himself; instead of declining it and directing the flatterers to the honour which belongs to God, "nulli creaturae communicabilem." Erasmus; \(^4\) *οὐκ ἔπελλιξεν τοῦτος, the flatterers, ὁ βασιλεὺς, οὐδὲ τὴν κολασίαν ἀσβοῦσαν ἀπετρέψατο. How entirely different the conduct of Peter, x, 26, and of Paul and Barnabas, xiv. 14 f. — γενόμενος σκυληκόβρ.] similarly with Antiochus Epiphanes.\(^5\) This is not to be regarded as at variance with Josephus, who speaks generally only of pains in the bowels; but as a more precise statement, which is, indeed, referred by Baur to a Christian legend originating from the fable of Epiphanes, which has taken the abdominal pains that befell Herod as if they were already the gnawing worm which torments the condemned!\(^6\) Kühn,\(^1\) Eilsner, Morus, and others, entirely against the words, have converted the disease of worms destroying the intestines \(^6\) into the disease of lice, φθειρίας, as if φθειρόβρωτος \(^6\) were used! — The word σκυληκόβρ. is found in Theoph. c. pl. iii. 12. 8 (f), v. 9. 1. — *ἐξέφεραν* namely, after five days. Joseph. l.c. But did not Luke consider the γενόμενος σκυληκ. ἐξέφεραν as having taken place on the spot? The whole brief, terse statement, the reference to a stroke of an angel, and the use of *ἐξέφεραν,*\(^10\) render this highly probable (\(^n\)).


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

---

\(^1\) H. E. ii. 10.
\(^2\) See, besides, Heinichen, Exc. II. ad Euseb. III. p. 356 f.
\(^3\) See on Luke i. 20.
\(^4\) Isa. xlvii. 11. Comp. Joseph. l.c.
\(^5\) See on Macc. ix. 5, 9. Observe how much our simple narrative—became eaten with worms—
\(^6\) is distinguished from the overladen and extravagantly embellished description in 2 Macc. ix. 9 (see Grimm in loc.). But there is no reason, with Gerlich, to explain σκυληκόβρ. *ex nihilo* (like the German wurmschnittig): *worm and shattered by pain.*

\(^6\) Mark ix. 44 f.; comp. Isa. xlvii. 44.
\(^7\) Ad Ad. V. H. iv. 38.
\(^8\) Bartholinus, de morbis Bibl. c. 23; Mead. de morb. Bibl. c. 15; and see the analogous cases in Wetstein.
\(^9\) Heasch. Mill. 40.
\(^10\) Comp. Acts v. 5, 10.
\(^11\) "Jam ante Herodis obitum," etc., Heinrichs, Kuinoel.
\(^12\) vv. 2–18.
\(^13\) Ver. 19.
\(^14\) vv. 20–22.
to Antioch. From this it follows that, according to the Acts, they visited first the other churches of Judaea and came to Jerusalem last; so that the episode, vv. 1–23, is to be assigned to that time which Barnabas and Saul, on their journey in Judaea spent with the different churches, before they came to Jerusalem, from which, as from the termination of their journey, they returned to Antioch. Perhaps what Barnabas had heard on his journey among the country-churches of Judaea as to the persecution of the Christians by Agrippa, and as to what befell James and Peter, induced him, in regard to Paul, not to resort to the capital, until he had heard of the departure and perhaps also of the death of the king. — συμπαραλαβ. κ.τ.λ. from Jerusalem; see ver. 12.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(1) Herod. V. 1.

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

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

(2) He killed James. V. 2.

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

1 Ver. 25. 2 See on xi. 30.
only one of the twelve of whose death there is any account in Scripture, and probably the first of the twelve who died. The record of his "taking off" is very brief—only two words, ἀνείλειν μαχαίρα. Conjecture as to the cause of such brevity is vain. There is a tradition which states that his accuser, or the officer who led him to the judgment-seat, was so influenced by the conduct and confession of the apostle, that he avowed himself a Christian, and, having asked and received the kiss of pardon from James, suffered martyrdom with him. "The accuracy of the sacred writer," says Paley, "in the expressions which he uses here is remarkable. There was no portion of time for thirty years before, or ever afterwards, in which there was a king at Jerusalem, a person exercising that authority in Judea, or to whom that title could be applied, except the last three years of Herod's life, within which period the transaction here recorded took place."

(49) Peter in prison. V. 5.

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

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

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

(3rd) Death of Herod. V. 23.

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

Ver. 1. ἃσων δὲ] So Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. and Scholz add τινὲς against A B D Ν, min. vss. Vig. A hasty addition, from the supposition that all the teachers and prophets of the church of Antioch could not be named. — Ver. 4. οὖν] Lachm. Tisch. read οὖν, after A B Ν, min. Vulg. Syr. utr. Ambr. Vig.; Born. has οὖν only, after D, Ath. As the reading of C is not clear, the preponderance of witnesses, which alone can here decide, remains in favour of the reading of Lachm. — Ver. 6. διὰ] is wanting in Elz., but is supported by decisive testimony. How easily would transcribers, to whom the situation of Paphos was not precisely known, find a contradiction in διὰν and διὰ ρήμα πάθους — ἀνδρα τινὰ] So Lachm. Tisch. Born., after A B C D Ν, min. Chrys. Theophy. Lucif. and several vss. After τινὰ, E, 36, Vulg. Sahid. Slav. Lucif. have ἀνδρα. But Elz. and Scholz omit ἀνδρα, which, however, is decisively attested by the witnesses, and was easily passed over as quite superfluous. — Ver. 9. The usual καὶ after ἀνεύοις is deleted, according to decisive evidence, by Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 14. τῶν Παταπείς] Lachm. and Tisch. read τῶν Παταπείς, after A B C D Ν. But it lacks any attestation from the vss. and Fathers. Therefore it is the more to be regarded as an old alteration (it was taken as an adjective like Παταπείς). — Ver. 15. After ἐλ Λachm. Born. Tisch. have τίς, which has predominant attestation, and from its apparent superfluosity, as well as from its position between two words beginning with Ε, might very easily be omitted. — Ver. 17. After τοίσιν Lachm. reads, with Elz., ἑσπαθῇ, which also Born. has defended, following A B C D Ν, vss. Its being self-evident gave occasion to its being passed over, as was in other witnesses τοίσιν, and in others λατρεία τοίσιν. — Ver. 18. ἐπροφοτ.] So (after Mill, Grabe, and others) Griesb. Matthew, Lachm. Scholz. Tisch., following A C E, min. vss. But Elz. Tisch. and Born. have ἐπροφοτ. (mores eorum sustinuit, Vulg.). An old insertion of the word which came more readily to hand in writing, and was also regarded as more appropriate. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 19. κατεκληρονομησαν] Elz. read κατεκληρονομησαν, against decisive witnesses. An interpretation on account of the active sense. — Ver. 20. καὶ μετὰ . . . ἔδωκε] Lachm. reads ἡς ἐκεῖν τινὸς κοσμῶν καὶ τα δυναμικά, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκεν, which Griesb. has recommended and Born. adopted, after A B C Ν, min. Vulg. An alteration, in order to remove somehow the chronological difficulty. — Ver. 23. ἵγαγε] Elz. and Born. read ἵγαγε, in opposition to A B E G H Ν, min. and several vss. and Fathers. An interpretation in accordance with ver. 22. — Ver. 27. ἄπεστάλη] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read εἰς ἀπεστάλη, which is so decidedly attested by A B C D Ν, min. Chrys. that the Recepta can only be regarded as having arisen from neglect of the double compound. — Ver. 31. νῦν] is wanting in Elz., but is, according to important attestation, to be recognized as genuine, and was omitted because those who are mentioned were already long ago witnesses of Jesus. Hence others have διὰ ρήμα νῦν (D. Syr. p. Vulg. Cant.; so Born.) ; and others simply καὶ νῦν (Arm.). — Ver. 32. αὐτῶν ἡμῖν] Sahid. Ar. Ambr. ms. Bed. gr. have on


With chap. xii. commences the second part of the book, which treats chiefly of the missionary labors and fortunes of Paul. First of all, the special choice and consecration of Barnabas and Paul as missionaries, which took place at Antioch, are related, vv. 1–3; and then the narrative of their first missionary journey is annexed, ver. 4–xiv. 28. These two chapters show, by the very fact of their independent commencement entirely detached from the immediately preceding narrative concerning Barnabas and Saul, by the detailed nature of their contents, and by the conclusion rounding them off, which covers a considerable interval without further historical data, that they have been derived from a special documentary source, which has, nevertheless, been subjected to revision as regards diction by Luke. This documentary

---

1 Lachmann, _Pragm. p. ix., conjecture [φ' ἐν ἐν: "noster tempore."]

2 Lekebusch, p. 106, explains this abrupt isolation as designed; the account emerges solemnly. But to this the simplicity of the following narrative does not correspond. Comp. Schleiermacher, _Erkl._ p. 353 f.
source, however, is not to be determined more precisely, although it may be conjectured that it originated in the church of Antioch itself, and that the oral communications mentioned at xiv. 27 as made to that church formed the foundation of it from xiii. 4 onward. The assumption of a written report made by the two missionaries,¹ obtains no support from the living apostolic mode of working, and is, on account of xiv. 27, neither necessary nor warranted. Schwanbeck considers the two chapters as a portion of a biography of Barnabas, to which also iv. 36 f., ix. 1–30, xi. 19–30, xii. 25 belonged; and Baur² refers the entire section to the apologetic purpose and literary freedom of the author (c⁷).

Ver. 1. This mention and naming of the prophets and teachers is intended to indicate how rich Antioch was in prominent resources for the sending forth messengers of the gospel, which was now to take place. Thus the mother-church of Gentile Christianity had become the seminary of the mission to the Gentiles. The order of the persons named is, without doubt, such as it stood in the original document: hence Barnabas and Saul are separated; indeed, Barnabas is placed first—the arrangement appears to have been made according to seniority—and Saul last; it was only by his missionary labours now commencing that the latter acquired in point of fact his superiority. — κατὰ τὴν ὀψαύν ἐκκλησίαν with the existing church. ἐκεῖ is not to be supplied.³ This ὀψαύν is retained from the original document; in connection with what has been already narrated, it is superfluous. — κατὰ, with, according to the conception of, here official, direction.⁴ — προφηταὶ κ. διάσκέλαρθην as prophets and teachers, who did not speak in the state of apocalyptic inspiration, but communicated instruction in a regular and rational unfolding of doctrine.⁵ — The five named are not to be regarded only as a part, but as the whole body of the prophets and teachers at Antioch, in keeping with the idea of the selection which the Spirit designed. To what individuals these predicates “prophet” or “teacher” respectively belong, is not, indeed, expressly said; but if, as is probable in itself and in accordance with iv. 36, the prophets are mentioned first and then the teachers, the three first named are to be considered as prophets, and the other two as teachers. This division is indicated by the position of the particles: (1) τὰ . . καὶ . . καὶ (2) τὰ . . καὶ.⁶ — That the prophets of the passage before us, particularly Symeon and Lucius, were included among those mentioned in xi. 27, is improbable, inasmuch as Agabus is not here named again. Those prophets, doubtless, soon returned to Jerusalem. — Concerning Simeon with the Roman name Niger,⁷ and Lucius of Cyrene,⁸ who is not identical with the evangelist Luke, nothing further is known. The same is also the case with Menahem (Μηναχμ), who had been σταυροφόρος of the tetrarch Herod, i.e. of Antipas.⁹ But whether σταυροφόρος is, with the Vulgate, Cornelius a Lapide,
Walch, Heumann, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others, to be understood as foster-brother, contemptuous, so that Menahem’s mother was Herod’s nurse; or, with Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Raphel, Wolf, Heinrichs, Baumgarten, Ewald, and others, brought up with, contubernalis,—cannot be determined, as either may be expressed by the word. The latter meaning, however, makes the later Christian position of Menahem the more remarkable, in that he appears to have been brought up at the court of Herod the Great. At all events he was already an old man, and had become a Christian earlier than Saul, who is placed after him (p³).

Ver. 2. Λειτουργοῦντων . . . τῷ Κυρίῳ λειτουργεῖν, the usual word for the temple-service of the priests, is here transferred to the church (aîrōn) engaged in Christian worship, in accordance with the holy character of the church, which had the ἀγὼν, the κύριος of the Spirit, and indeed was a ἱεράμα ἀγίων. Hence: while they performed holy service to the Lord Christ, and, at the same time, fasted. Any more specific meaning is too narrow, such as, that it is to be understood of prayer, Grotius, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and many others, on account of ver. 3, but see on that passage, or of preaching, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others in Wolf. Both without doubt are included, not, however, the mass, as Catholics hold; but certainly the spiritual songs. — ἐκεί τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ ἁγίῳ] the Holy Spirit said, namely, by one or some of these λειτουργοῦντες, probably by one of the prophets, who announced to the church the utterance of the Spirit revealed to him. — ὡς] with the imperative makes the summons more decided and more urgent. — μοι] to me, for my service. — δ ἐποικέσιμα αἰροῖς] for which, description of the design, I have called them to me, namely, to be my organs, interpreters, instruments in the propagation of the gospel. The utterance of the Spirit consequently refers to an internal call of the Spirit already made to both, and that indeed before the church, “ut hi quoque scirent vocationem illorum eique subscriberent,” Bengel. The preposition is not repeated before δ, = ei δ, because it stands already before τῷ ἁγίῳ, according to general Greek usage.
Ver. 3. The translation must be: *Afterwards, after having fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them,* as the consecration communicating the gift of the Spirit for the new and special holy office,¹ they sent them away. For there is here meant a solemnity specially appointed by the church on occasion of that address of the Spirit, different from the preceding, ver. 2; and not the termination thereof.² This is evident from the words of Luke himself, who describes this act differently, νηστεία, κ. προσευχή, from the preceding, λειτουργία, κ. νηστεία, and by τότε separates it as something later; and also because νηστείαν ανείπτε, in the sense of "when they had finished fasting," does not even give here any conceivable sense. — ἀπέλασαν] What the Spirit had meant by εἰς ἵργον, δ. προσευχή. αὐτοῖς, might, when they heard that address, come directly home to their consciousness, especially as they might be acquainted in particular with the destination of Saul at ix. 15; or might be explained by the receiver and interpreter of the Spirit’s utterance. — That, moreover, the imposition of hands was not by the whole church, but by its representatives the presbyters,³ was obvious of itself to the reader.

Vv. 4, 5. Αὐτοὶ (see the critical remarks): such was the course taken with them; they themselves, therefore, ἵπτει ἰγίτωρ. — ἐκείμενοθ. ἐν τῷ τοῦ πινεῖτοι. for "vocatio prorsus divina erat; tantum manu Dei oblatus amplissimae erat ecclesia," Calvin. — They turned themselves at first to the quarter where they might hope most easily to form connections—it was, in fact, the first attempt of their new ministry—to Cyprus, the native country of Barnabas, iv. 38, to which the direct route from Antioch by way of the neighbouring Seleucia, in Syria, also called Pieria, and situated at the mouth of the Orontes, led. Having there embarked, they landed at the city of Salamis, on the eastern coast of the island of Cyprus. — γενόμεν οὖν arrived at. Often so in classical authors since Homer.⁴ — ἔκλεισεν] See on xii. 12. — ἐπιτείμην] as servant, who assisted the official work of the apostles by performing external services, errands, missions, etc., probably also acts of baptism.⁵ "Barnabas et Paulus divinitus nominati, atque his liberum fuit alios adsciscere," Bengel. — As to their practice of preaching in the synagogues, see on ver. 14. (κε')

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

iii. 14. — Βαρισσως, i.e. Βαρναζ., filius Iesus (Joseph). The different forms of this name in the Fathers and versions, Barjeu, Barwuna, Barjesbuk, Bariasow-
viv, have their origin in the reverence and awe felt for the name of Jesus. — 
κυπρι], Cyprus, which Augustus had restored to the senate, was, it is true, at that time a propraetorian province;1 but all provincial rulers were, 
by the command of Augustus, called proconsules.2 — περικεφαλα] although the 
contrary might be suspected from his connection with the sorcerer. But 
his intelligence is attested partly by the fact that he was not satisfied with 
heathenism, and therefore had at that time the Jewish sorcerer with him 
in the effort to acquire more satisfactory views; and partly by the fact that 
he does not feel satisfied even with him, but asks for the publishers of the 
new doctrine. In general, sorcerers found at that time welcome recep-
tions with Gentiles otherwise very intelligent.3 — τον λόγον τον θεον] Descrip-
tion of the new doctrine from the standpoint of Luke. See, moreover, 
on viii. 25.

Ver. 8. 'Ελμα] The Arabic name, 
by which Barjesus chose to be designated, and which he probably adopted 
with a view to glorify himself as the channel of Arabian wisdom by the 
corresponding Arabic name. — ὁ μάγος] Interpretation of 'Ελμα, added in 
order to call attention to the significance of the name.4 — διαστρέβειν ἀπὸ] a 
well-known pregnant construction, which Valckenaer destroys arbitrarily, 
and in such a way as to weaken the sense, by the conjecture ἀναπτρέβειν: 
το περέταιν] and turn aside from the faith. Comp. LXX. Ex. v. 4.

Ver. 9. Σαῦλος ἐστιν, ὁ καὶ Παύλου] sc. λεγόμενος.5 — As Saul, Ἰωάννης, the 
longed for, is here for the first time and always henceforth7 mentioned under his 
Roman name Paul, but before this, equally without exception, only under 
his Hebrew name, we must assume a set historical purpose in the remark 
ὁ καὶ Παυλος introduced at this particular point, according to which the 
reader is to be reminded of the relation — otherwise presupposed as well 
known — of this name to the historical connection before us. It is there-
fore the most probable opinion, because the most exempt from arbitrariness, 
that the name Paul was given to the apostle as a memorial of the conversion of 
Sergius Paulus affected by him.6 "A primo ecclesiæ apolo, proconsule 
Sergio Paulo, victoriae suae trophæarum retulit, erexitque vexillum, ut Paulus 
diceretur e Saulo."9 The same view is adopted by Valla, Bengel, Ols-
hausen, Baumgarten, Ewald; also by Baur,10 according to whom, however, 
legend alone has wished to connect the change of name somehow adopted

1 Dio Cass. liv. 4.
2 Dio Cass. iii. 12.
3 Lucian. Alex. 80; Weisstein in loc.
5 Comp. Bornemann, Schol. in Iuc. p. xviii.
6 Schaefer, ad Boeill. p. 313.
7 Comp. the name Abraham from Gen. xvii.
8 onwards.
9 Lance, apost. Zedlitz. p. 369 (comp. Her-
zo's Enycl. XI. p. 945), sees in the name 
Paul (the little) a contrast to the name 
Elymas; for he had in the power of humil-
ity confronted this master of magic, and had in 
a N. T. character repeated the victory of 
David over Goliath. Against this play of the 
fancy it is decisive, that Elymas is not termed 
and declared a master of magic, but simply ὁ 
μάγος. [II. 3.
10 I. p. 106, ed. 2.
by the apostle—which contains a parallel with Peter, Matt. xvi. 16—with an important act of his apostolic life. Either the apostle himself now adopted this name, possibly at the request of the proconsul, or—which at least excludes entirely the objection often made to this view, that it is at variance with the modesty of the apostle—the Christians, perhaps first of all his companions at the time, so named him in honourable remembrance of the memorable conversion effected on his first missionary journey. Kuinoel, indeed, thinks that the servants of the proconsul may have called the apostle whose name Saul was unfamiliar (?) to them, Paul; and that he thenceforth was glad to retain this name as a Roman citizen, and on account of his intercourse with the Gentiles. But such a purely Gentile origin of the name is hardly reconcilable with its universal recognition on the part of the Christian body. Since the time of Calvin, Grotius, and others, the opinion has become prevalent, that it was only for the sake of intercourse with those without, as the ambassador of the faith among the Gentiles, that the apostle bore, according to the custom of the time, the Roman name. Certainly it is to be assumed that he for this reason willingly assented to the new name given to him, and willingly left his old name to be forgotten, but the origin of the new name, occurring just here for the first time, is, by this view, not in the least explained from the connection of the narrative before us. — Heinrichs oddly desires to explain this connection by suggesting that on this occasion, when Luke had just mentioned Sergius Paulus, it had occurred to him that Saul also was called Paul. Such an accident is wholly unnatural, as, when Luke wrote, the name Saul was long out of use, and that of Paul was universal. The opinion also of Witsius and Hackspan, following Augustine, is to be rejected: that the apostle in humility, to indicate his spiritual transformation, assigned to himself the name, Paulus = exigus; as is also that of Schrader, after Drusius and Lightfoot, that he received at his circumcision the double name. — Niceta, p. 435, § 4. "actu praesente adversus magnum acorem," Bengel.

Ver. 10. ́Ροδιωγύιας] knavery, roguery.—viz ἀπαβέλεν] i.e. a man whose condition of mind proceeds from the influence of the devil, the arch-enemy of the kingdom of the Messiah. An indignant contrast to the name Barjesus ἀπαβέλεν is treated as a proper name, therefore without the article.—πᾶσιν ἄθλησιν] of all, that is right, x. 35.—ὁιστρέχων τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ τὰς κειμένας Wilt thou not cease to pervert the straight—leading directly to the goal—ways of the Lord; to give them a perverted direction? i.e. applying this general reproach to the present case: Wilt thou, by thy opposition to us, and by thy endeavour to turn the proconsul from the faith, persist in so working that God’s measures, instead of attaining their aim according to the divine intention, may be frustrated? The straight way of God aimed here at the
winning of Sergius for the salvation in Christ, by means of Barnabas and Paul; but Elymas set himself in opposition to this, and was engaged in diverting from its mark this straight way which God had entered on, so that the divinely-desired conversion of Sergius was to remain unrealized. De Wette takes it incorrectly: to set forth erroneously the ways in which men should walk before God. On διαστρέφων, comp. in fact, Prov. x. 10; Isa. lix. 8; Micah iii. 9; and notice that the διαστρέφων κ.τ.λ. was really that which the sorcerer streno to do, although without attaining the desired success. Observe, also, the thrice repeated emphatic ταυτός...πάσης...κύριος, and that Κυρίον is not to be referred to Christ, but to God, whom the son of the devil resists, as is proved from ver. 11.

Ver. 11. Χείρ Κυρίου] a designation, borrowed according to constant usage from the O. T.,1 of "God's hand,"2 and here, indeed, of the punitive hand of God, Heb. x. 31. — ἐπὶ αὐτῷ εἰς τὸν ἐπιστρέφοντας, as directed against thee. — ἐπὶ] The future is not imperative, but decided prediction.3—μὴ βλέπων τ. ἡλέκουν] self-evident, but "augur manifestam sententiam."4 To the blind the sun is σίας ἀφεγγίτης.5—ἀχρι καυροῦ] for a season.6 His blindness was not to be permanent; the date of its termination is not given, but it must have been in so far known by Paul, seeing that this penal consequence would cease with the cause, namely, with the withstanding.7 With the announcement of the divine punishment is combined, by ἀχρι καυροῦ, the hint of future possible forgiveness. Chrysostom well remarks: τὸ ἀχρι καυροῦ δὲ οὐ κολάζοντος ἡν τὸ ἀνάμικτο τῇ ἔκτητος εἰ γὰρ κολάζοντος ἡν, διαπαντὸς ἀν αὐτὸν ἐπιστρέφει τυφλοῦ.8—σαλαχήμα πόθεν] ἐπέτεισεν κ.τ.λ.] We are as little to inquire what kind of blindness occurred, as to suppose, with Heinrichs, that with the sorcerer there was already a tendency to blindness, and that this blindness actually now set in through fright. The text represents the blindness as a punishment of God without any other cause, announced by Paul as directly cognizant of its occurrence.9—ἀλλὰς καὶ σκότως] dimness and darkness, in the form of a climax. See on ἀλλὰς, only here in the N. T., Duncan.10—The text assigns no reason why the sorcerer was punished with blindness, as, for instance, that he might be humbled under the consciousness of his spiritual blindness.11 We must abstain from any such assertion all the more, that this punishment did not befall the similar sorcerer Simon. Rom. xi. 34.

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

1 LXX. Judg. xi. 15; Job xix. 21; 2 Macc.
2 viii. 22; Eccles. xxxiii. 2.
4 Comp. v. 9.
5 Quineuil. ix. 3. 45.
6 Soph., O. C. 1546.
7 Comp. Luke iv. 18.
8 Ver. 8. Comp. on ver. 12.
9 Comp. Occumenus.
10 Lex. Hom., ed. Rost, p. 188.
11 Comp. Baumgarten.
12 See on vii. 25.
ment was connected. Comp. on the connection of the judgment concerning the doctrine with the miracle beheld, Mark i. 27. The ἐπιτέλεσεν obviously supposes the reception of baptism.1 — Whether the sorcerer afterwards became a believer the text does not, indeed, inform us; but the presumption of a future conversion is contained in ἄρρη καὶ ποιος, ver. 11, and therefore the question is to be answered in the affirmative; for Paul spoke that ἄρρη καὶ ποιος: Ἰησοῦς γὰρ ἔδωκες, Oecumenius. The Tubingen criticism has indeed condemned the miraculous element in this story and the story itself as an invented and exaggerated counterpart of the encounter of Peter with Simon Magus, chap. viii., — a judgment in which the denial of miracles in general, and the assumption of dogmatic motives on the part of the author, are the controlling presuppositions.2

Vv. 13–15. Having put to the open sea again from Paphos, ἀναχθεῖσας, as xvi. 11, and frequently, also with Greek writers,3 they came in a northerly direction to Perga, the capital of Pamphylia with its famous temple of Diana,4 where John Mark parted from them5 and returned to Jerusalem, for what reason is not certain,—apparently from want of courage and boldness, see xv. 38. But they, without their former companion (ἀπὸ τοῦ), journeyed inland to the north until they came to Antioch in Pisidia, built by Seleucus Nicanor, and made by Augustus a Roman colony,6 where they visited the synagogue on the Sabbath, comp. ver. 5. Their apostleship to the Gentiles had not cancelled their obligation, wherever there were Jews, to turn first to these; and to Paul, especially, it could not appear as cancelled in the light of the divine order: Ἰουδαιωὶ τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ Ἐλληνιοὶ, Rom. i. 16, clearly known to him, of his ardent love to his people, Rom. ix. 1 ff., of his assurance that God had not cast them off, Rom. xi., as well as of his insight into the blessing which would arise to the Gentile world even from the rejection of the gospel by the Jews, Rom xi. 11. ff. Hence, although apostle of the Gentiles, he never excludes the Jews from his mission,7 but expressly includes them,8 and is wont to begin his labours with them. This we remark against the opinion, which is maintained especially by Baur and Zeller, that in the Book of Acts the representation of Paul's missionary procedure is unhistorically modified in the interest of Judaism.9 — οἱ ἑστήκαν ἐπὶ Παύλου] denotes the person and his companions,—the company of Paul.10 Now Paul, and no longer Barnabas, appears as the principal person. The conspicuous agency of the Gentile apostle at once in the conversion of Sergius, and in the humiliation of the sorcerer, has decided his superiority. — τῆς Παύλου.] chorographic genitive.11

1 Comp. lv. 4, xi. 21, xix. 18.
2 See Baur and Zeller; comp. also Schneckenburger, p. 58.
3 Comp. Luke viii. 22.
4 On the ruins, see Fellows' Travels in Asia Minor, p. 142 ff.
5 Ewald, p. 456, conjectures that now Titus (Gal. ii. 1) had appeared as an apostolic companion. But how natural it would have been for Luke at least here to mention Titus, who is never named by him!
6 On its ruins, see Hamilton's Travels in Asia Minor, I. p. 431, ff.
7 Comp. on the contrary, ἐφ' ἄνω, Rom. xi. 18.
8 1 Cor. ix. 20.
10 See on John xi. 19, and Valckenaer, p. 499 f.
11 Krüger, § 47. 5. 5.
For other designations of this situation of the city, see Bornemann.—ικάθισαν] on the seats of the Rabbins, as Wolf, Wetstein, Kuinoel, think. Possibly; but it is possible, also, that they had already, before the commencement of the Sabbath, immediately on their arrival, announced themselves as teachers, and that this occasioned the request of the president to the strange Rabbins. —τού νόμου κ. τ. προφ.] namely, in the Parasha and Haphthara for that Sabbath. 1 That, as Bengel thinks and Kuinoel and Baumgarten approve, the Parasha, Deut. i.—because Paul, in ver. 18, hints at Deut. i. 31—and the cor. responding Haphthara, Isa. i., were in the order of the reading, is uncertain, even apart from the fact that the modern Parshioth and Haphtharthoth were fixed only at a later period. 3 —οἱ ἀρχισαφεῖς.] i.e. the college of rulers, consisting of the ἀρχισαφεῖς γαστρεχόν (Πηετρίου Ἐρρίν), and the elders associated with him. —ἐν ὕδατι] in animis vestris.—λόγους παρακλήσιμον] a discourse of exhortation, whose contents are an encouragement to the observance and application of the law and the prophets. For: "opus fuit expiatoribus, qui corda eorum afficerent." 4 —λέγετε] On λόγου λέγετε, see Lobeck, Paral. p. 504.

Ver. 16. Κατακατε. τῷ χειρὶ] See on xii. 17.—οἱ φωβοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ] is here, as the distinction from Ἰσραήλιν requires, the formal designation of the proses of the gate, who, without becoming actual Ἰσραήλιν by circumcision, were yet worshippers of Jehovah, and attenders at the synagogues, where they had their particular seats. 5 Against the unfavourable judgment, which the following speech has met with from Schneckenburger, Baur, and Zeller,—namely, that it is only an echo of the speeches of Peter and Stephen, a free production of the narrator,—we may urge as a circumstance particularly to be observed, that this speech is directed to those who were still non-believers, not, like the Epistles of the apostle, to Christians, and accordingly does not find in the Epistles any exactly corresponding standard with which to compare it; that, further, nothing un-Pauline occurs either in its contents or form, —on the contrary, the Pauline fundamental dogma of justification* forms its important concluding main point, 7 and the Pauline delicacy, prudence, and wisdom of teaching are displayed in its entire plan and execution; that, in particular, the historical introduction, although it may not have originated without some influence from Stephen's speech, and the latter may have, by the editing, been rendered still more similar, yet presents nothing which could not have been spoken by Paul, as the speech of Stephen was known to the apostle and must have made an indelible impression on him; and that the use of Ps. xvi. 6 as a witness for the resurrection of Jesus, was as natural to Paul as it was to Peter, as, indeed, to Paul also Christ rose κατὰ τός τροφής. 8 The reasons, therefore, adduced against its originality in the

---

1 See on Luke iv. 17.
2 Comp. also Trup. Paulus, p. 194.
5 Comp. vv. 43, 59, xvii. 4, 17, xvi. 14, xviii. 7.
6 v. 28 ff. do not contain a mere "thimuld allusion" to it, as Zeller thinks, p. 327.
7 In opposition to Baur's opinion (i. p. 117, ed. 2), that the author, after he had long enough made the Apostle Paul speak in a Petrine manner, felt that he must now add something specifically Pauline.
8 Comp. Acts xi. 25 ff.
9 1 Cor. xv. 4.
main, are not sufficient, although, especially amidst our ignorance of the
document from which the speech thus edited is taken, a more complete as-
sertion of an originality, which is at all events only indirect, cannot be
made good. 1

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

Ver. 17. Τὸν λαοῦ τοῦτον Ἰσρ. (see the critical remarks) refers with τοὐτον to the address ἄνδρες Ἱσρ., and with the venerated name Ἰσραὴλ the thought of a
narrative national feeling is appealed to. 2—ἐξελέξατο Ἰσραήλ. He chose for Himself, namely, from the mass of mankind, to be His peculiar property. On πατρίς ἡμ., the patriarchs, comp. Rom. ix. 5, xi. 1, 16. In them the people saw the channels and sureties of the divine grace. —ἐξελέξατο] During the sojourn in Egypt, God exalted the people, making them great in number and strength, and especially distinguishing and glorifying them in that period directly before the Exodus by miraculous arrangements of Moses. The history, which Paul supposes as known, requires this interpretation, comp. already Chrysostom, who in ἐξελέξατο finds the two points: εἰς πλήθος ἐνίσχων and τὰ θαυμάρια ὅτι αὐτῶν γέγονε. Others, among whom are Kuinoel, Olshausen, and de Wette, arbitrarily limit ἔξελον merely to the increase in number, appealing even to Gen. xlviii. 19, Ecclus. xliv. 21, 1. 22, where however, ἐξελέξατο, as always, signifies nothing else than to exalt. The specific
nature of the exaltation is derived purely from the context. Calvin, Elsner, and Heinrichs suppose that the deliverance from Egypt is meant. But the exaltation, according to the text, occurred ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν Ἰούδεντω, during their sojourn as strangers in Egypt. Beza and Grotius think that it is the ἐξελός of the people by and under Joseph that was meant. Erroneously, as ἐξελέξατο stands in historical connection with the following ἐγέρας. —μὲτὰ βραχίονος ψηλοῦ] i.e. without figure: ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῶν τῇ μεγαλῇ. 3 Jehovah is conceived as a leader who advances with the lifted arm, at the head of His people, for their defence against all their enemies. 4

Vv. 18, 19. ὃς] might be the as of the protasis, so that καί, ver. 18, would then be the also of the apodosis. 5 But the common render-ing cireiter is simpler and more suitable to the non-periodic style of the ent-
text, as well as corresponding to the ὃς of ver. 20. —On the accentua-
tion of τεταρακονταῖτη, so Lachmann and Tischendorf, see Ellenb.
4 ἐκτροφόφρ.] He bore them as their nourisher, as it were in his arms, i.e. nourished and cherished them. There is here a reminiscence of the LX.

---

1 Comp. the thoughtful judgment of Weiss, bibli. Theol. p. 290.
2 Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 23.
3 Comp. particularly Isa. 1. 2.
4 vil. 6, 29; Wisd. ix. 10.
5 LXX. Deut. iv. 37.
6 Comp. Ex. vi. 1, 6; Bar. ii. 11.
8 Lex. Soph. I. p. 405 f.
Deut. i. 31, according to which passage God bore (φορεῖ) the Israelites in the wilderness as a man (ὤν) beareth his son. The LXX has rendered this φορεῖ by ἐφροφορεῖ, whence it is evident, as the image is borrowed from a man, that it is based on the derivation from δ ἐφροφος and not from ἥ ἐφροφος.\(^1\) In the few other passages where the word is still preserved, women are spoken of—namely, 2 Macc. vii. 27, and Macar. Hom. 46. 3, where of a mother it is said: ἀναλαμβάνει καὶ περιβάλλει καὶ ἐφροφοφορεῖ ἐν πολλῇ στοργῇ. But as in this place and in Deut. i. 31 the motion of a ἐφροφοφορεῖ is quite as definitely presented;\(^2\) usually ἐφροφοφεῖ,\(^3\) it follows that the two references, the male and the female, are linguistically justified in an equal degree; therefore Hesychius explains ἐφροφοφορεῖν, entirely apart from sex, by ἐθρεψέν. From misapprehension of this, the word ἐφροφοφορεῖ was at an early period among the Fathers, Origen already has it—introduced in Deut. i.c.; he bore their manners,\(^4\) because the comparison of God to a nourishing mother or nurse, ἡ ἐφροφος, was regarded as unsuitable,\(^5\) and following this reading in Deut. i.c., ἐφροφοφορεῖ was also adopted in our passage for the same reason.—διὰ ὑπότατον see Deut. vii. 1. He destroyed them, i.e. καθιλὼν.\(^6\) —κατεκλυσμὸν.] He distributed it to them for an inheritance.\(^7\) This compound is foreign to other Greek writers, but common in the LXX. in an active and neuter signification. The later Greeks have κατακλυσμοῦχειν.

Ver. 20. And afterwards—after this division of the land among the Israelites—He gave them, during about 450 years, judges—ΔΙΟΥΛΟΥ, theocratic dictators, national heroes administering law and justice—until Samuel. The dative τῶν τερακ. is dative of the time, during which something happens, comp. viii. 11.\(^8\) As Paul here makes the judges to follow after the division of the land, it is evident that he overleaps the time which Joshua yet lived after the division of the land, or rather includes it in the μετὰ τερακ, which in so summary a statement is the less strange, as Joshua was actually occupied until his death with the consolidation of the new arrangement of the land, Josh. xxiv. 1–28. But the 450 years are in contradiction with 1 Kings vi. 1, where the fourth year of Solomon’s reign, the year of the building of the temple, is placed 480\(^10\) years after the Exodus from Egypt, which leaves only about 800 years for the period of the judges. But, on the other hand, the chronology of Josephus, who\(^11\) reckons 592 years from the Exodus out of Egypt to the building of the temple, agrees with Paul in our passage.\(^12\) If, namely, we reckon: (1) 40 years as the period of sojourn in the desert; (2) 23 years as the period of Joshua’s rule;\(^13\) (3) 450 years as the duration

---

1 So also Cyril, in Ossam. p. 182. in Deut. p 415.  
3 See Lobeck, ad Phrym. p. 316.  
5 With the Greeks their fatherland is often represented under this image. See Stallb. ad Plat. Rep. p. 470 D.  
6 See Thuc. i. 4, and Krüger in loc.  
7 LXX. Juv. x. 24; 1 Kings ii. 8; Isa. xiv. 2; 3 Edr. viii. 35.  
8 See Nägelsbach in Herzog’s Encycl. XIII. p. 33 ff.; Bertheau, Komment.  
10 LXX.: 440.  
11 In Antl. viii. 8. 1, comp. x. 8. 5.  
12 In Antl. xx. 10, c. Ap. ii. 2, he reckons 613 years for the same period, thus 20 years more, which comes still nearer to the statement of time in our passage; see below.  
13 Joseph. Antl. v. 1. 29.
of the judges, to Samuel inclusive, according to our passage; (4) 40 years as the reign of Saul;¹ (5) 40 years as the reign of David, 1 Kings ii. ² (6) the first four years of Solomon's reign,—there results from the Exodus of Egypt to the building of the temple 599 years, with which there remains difference between Paul and Josephus, which is fully covered by the text. Accordingly, it appears as the correct view that Paul here follows chronology entirely different from 1 Kings vi. 1, which is also followed by Josephus. ³ This chronology arises from summing up all the numbers mentioned in the Book of Judges, ⁴ 410 years, and adding 40 years for Eli; which, however, a total much too high results, as synchronous statements are included in the reckoning. All attempts at reconciling our passage with 1 Kings vi. 1 bear the impress of arbitrariness and violence—named (1) that of Perizonius, ⁵ and others, that in 1 Kings vi. 1 the years are reckoned, in which the Israelites in the time of the judges were oppressed by heathen nations, with which view Wolf agrees; ⁶ (2) Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Mill, and others supply γενόμενα after πεντήκοντα, post hæce, quae spatio 450 annorum gesta sunt, so that the terminus ab ius is the birth of Isaac in whom God chose the fathers; from thence to the birth of Jacob are 180 years, from the birth of Jacob to the entrance into Egypt are 180 years, after which the residence in Egypt lasted 210 years, and then from the Exodus to the division of Canaan 47 years elapsed, making in all 447 years—accordingly, about 450 years. With the reading of Lachmann, also must count in accordance with this computation. Comp. Beza. (3) Others have recourse to critical violence. They suppose either ⁷ that in the passage τριάκοντας is to be read (τ' for ἰ'), or ⁸ that what ἐκεῖ τετράν. κ. πεντήκοντα is an addition of a marginal annotator, who reckoned thus from the birth of Isaac; or, at least, ⁹ that 1 Kings vi. 1 is corrupt; in which case, however, Kuinoel grants that Paul follows a Jewish chronology of his time.—Σαμονῆλ] ἤ. until the end of the series of judges, which had commenced with Othniel and closed with Samuel, after which Saul's reign begins. ¹⁰ See ver. 21.

Ver. 21. Κακιδέν] and from thence. ἔκει has only here in the N. T. also in later Greek, a temporal reference, yet so that the time is concealed as something in space stretching itself out. So, too, in the passage: Bornemann.¹¹—ἐνεσπαράκα.] Εὐαγγέλισε Σαυλῷ, Σαμονῆλον ἰώντος, ἔνεσπαράκα τοῖς δέκα τελευτησαντος δὲ δύο καὶ εἰκοσι, Joseph. Antt. vi. 14. 9, according to the usual text, in which, however, καὶ εἰκοσι is spurious.¹² In the O. T. there is no express definition of the duration of Saul's reign.

¹ See on ver. 21.
² That, nevertheless, the reckoning of 480 years in 1 Kings vi. 1 is not on account of our passage to be wholly rejected; and how far, on the contrary, it is to be considered as correct, may be seen in Bertheau on Judges, Introd. p. xvi. ².
³ Or. Leg. p. 331.
⁴ Comp. also Kell in the Dörpf. Beitr. p. 311.
⁵ Luther and Beza.
⁶ Vitringa and Heinrichs.
⁷ Heinrichs.
⁸ Voss, Michaelis, Kuinoel.
⁹ Schol. in Lc. p. 90 f., but not in xii.
¹⁰ See Bertheau on Judges, p. xx.
the explanation 1 that ἐγὼ γεωσάρακ., which, in fact, contains the duration of Ἰδωρύν . . . Σαμὼ, embraces the time of Samuel and Saul together, is to be rejected as contrary to the text; and instead of it, there is to be assumed a tradition—although improbable in its contents, yet determined by the customary number 40—which Paul followed.

Ver. 23. Ἐσαράστ. αὐτόν] cannot be explained of the death of Saul, 2 because there is no εἰκ τοῦ ἔρχου 3 or the like added, or at least directly suggested, from the context. The word is rather to be considered as selected and exactly corresponding to the known history of Saul, expressing the divine rejection recorded in 1 Sam. xv. 16 ff., and deposition of this king from his office, according to the current usus loquendi. 4 — ὦ καὶ εἰκε μαρτύρον] for whom He also bearing witness has said. ὦ is governed by μαρτύρον.; and on εἰκε μαρτύρον., comp. i. 24 : προσευκάμενοι εἰκον. — εἰκον Δαυίδ κ.τ.λ. ] Ps. lxxix. 21 is here quite freely blended with 1 Sam. xiii. 14 in the inexact recollection of the moment, and formed into one saying of God, as indeed in Ps. lxxxix. 21 God is the speaker, but not in Sam. xiii. 14. — εἰκον] God had sought for the kingdom of His people, a so rare man like David. — κατά τίνι καρδίαν μοι] i.e. as my heart desires him. This and the following δὲ . . . μοι is to be left without any more precise limitation—Eckermann, after the older commentators, supposes that it applies to the government of the people; Heinrichs: to the establishment of the theocracy—as the text does not furnish such a limitation, and πάντες ἡ τέλ. forbids it. On these last words Bengel correctly remarks: "voluntates, multas, pro negotiorum varietate." 5

Vv. 23–25. Paul now proceeds to his main point, the announcement of the Messiah, the Son of David, as having appeared in Jesus, 6 whom John already preached before His coming. — τοῦτον] with great emphasis, placed first and standing apart. — κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν] according to promise, an essential element for the awakening of faith. Comp. ver. 32. — ἦγαγε τῷ Ἰσραήλ . . . Ἰσραήλ] He brought 7 to the Israelites Jesus as deliverer, Messiah, John having previously preached before His coming a baptism of repentance, baptism obliging to change of mind, to all the people of Israel. — πρὸ προσώπου ] Ἰσραήλ, i.e. ante, and that in a temporal sense. 8 With τῆς εἰσόδου, according to the context, is meant the official, Messianic, emergence among the people. The Fathers strangely and erroneously refer it to the incarnation. 9 — ὦ δὲ εἰλήφον ὧν Ἰσραήλ. τ. ῥήματον] but when John fulfilled, was in the act of fulfilling, 10 the course—without figure: the official work incumbent on him. 11 Paul considers John’s definite pointing to the ἐρχόμενος as that with which the course of the Baptist approached its termination; the ῥήματος of the forerunner was actually concluded as regards its idea and purpose, when Jesus Himself publicly appeared. — τίνα με ἕπνον εἶναι.] is, with Erasmus, Castallo,
Calvin, Beza, and many others, to be taken as a question; not, with Luther, Grotius, Kuinoel, Lachmann, Buttmann, as a relative clause: "quem rese putatis, non sum," which, indeed, is linguistically justifiable, but detracts from the liveliness of the speech.—οίκει εἰς εὗρον [namely, the Messiah, John i. 20, as self-evidently the expected Person, who was vividly present before the mind of John and of his hearers.]

Ver. 26. In affectionate address (άνδρες αὐτονίων) earnestly appealing to their theocratic consciousness (νοιων ἀληθῶν), Paul now brings home to them the announcement of this salvation, procured through Jesus, ὁ λόγος τῆς σα- τανῆς, to the especial interest of the hearers.—ἐξαποστάλη, namely, from God, ver. 23, x. 36, not from Jerusalem (Bengel). But this ἐμιν. ἐξαποστάλη actually took place by the very arrival of Paul and his companions.

Ver. 27. Γάρ] Chrysostom leads to the correct interpretation: διδόσαν αὐτοίς ἐξωσπολίαν ἀπόκεισθηναι τῶν τῶν φόνων τετολμηκότων. In accordance with the contrast: ἐμιν. and οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, the logical sequence is: "To you was the doctrine of salvation sent; for in Jerusalem the Savior has been rejected;" therefore the preaching must be brought to those outside in the diaspora, such as you are. It does not conflict with this view that at all events the preaching would come to them as Jews; since the fundamental idea rather is, that, because Jerusalem has despised Christ, now in place of the inhabitants of Jerusalem the outside Jews primarily are destined for the reception of salvation. They are to step into the places of those as regards this reception of salvation; and the announcement of salvation, which was sent to them, was withdrawn from those and their rule, the members of the Sanhedrin, on account of the rejection of the Savior. Thus there is in γάρ the idea of divine retribution, exercised against the sin of the theocracy, and resulting in good to those outside at a distance; the idea of a Nemesis, by which those afar off are preferred to the nearest children of the kingdom. Most of the older commentators are silent on γάρ here. According to Erasmus, it is admonitory, according to Calvin, exhortatory to yet greater compliance; but in this case the special point must first be read between the lines. Contrary to the contrast of ἐμιν. and οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἰερουσαλήμ, γάρ, according to de Wette, is designed to introduce the exposition of the idea of σωτηρία; according to Baumgarten, to convey the hint that the informal (?) way, outwardly considered, in which the λόγος has reached Antioch, had its reason in the fact that the centre of the theocracy had resisted Jesus.—ποινῶν ἀγνοοῦντας κ.τ.λ.] not having known Him, in Jesus, as the self-evident subject, they have also—καί, the also of the corresponding relation—fulfilled by their sentence, by the condemnation of Jesus, the voices of the prophets, which are read every Sabbath day. This fulfilment they effected involuntarily in their folly. But the prophecies had to be fo...
falled, Luke xxiv. 35 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 8. — ἀγνοοσαντες] a mild judgment, entirely in the spirit of Jesus. 1 Therefore not too lenient for Paul (Schneck- enburger). Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Hackett, and others refer ἀγνοοσα to not only to τοῦτον, but also to καλ τὰ φ. τ. προφ.: "qui hunc non norant, nec prophetarum oracula . . . intelligeant, eo condemnando effecerunt, ut haec eventum comprobrarent." Unnecessarily harsh, as κρίνοντες and ἐπιλήφρ. require different supplements. — τὰς κ. π. σάββατ. ἀναγωγας.] a novum ψυχικ addition; what infatuation! — κρίνοντες] judging, namely, Jesus. Following Homberg, others have referred it to the φιλνάς τ. πρ.: "and although judging, correctly valuing the voices of the prophets, they nevertheless fulfilled them." Incorrect, because at variance with history, and because the resolution of the participle by although is not suggested by the context, but rather (τοῦτον ἀγνοοσαντες) forbidden.

Vv. 28, 29, Και] and, without having found, they desired. 2 — καθελοντες . . θεμαν εις μνημ.] The subject is the inhabitants of Jerusalem and their rulers, as in the preceding. Joseph and Nicodemus 3 were, in fact, both; therefore Paul, although those were favourably inclined to Jesus, could in this summary narrative continue with the same subject, because an exact historical discrimination was not here of moment, and the taking down from the cross and the placing in the grave were simply the adjuncts of the crucifixion and the promises of the corporeal resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 4.

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

Vv. 31-33. 'Ερι ήμερ. πλειονσ] for several days, as in Luke iv. 25. 5 Instead of the argumentative δι, δοξε would be still more significant. — τοις συναπα- βασιν κ.τ.λ.] Thus Paul according to this narrative, like Luke in the Gospel, follows the tradition which knows only Jewish appearances of the Risen One. — οίτινες] quippe qui. — καὶ ήμεις κ.τ.λ.] νους also, on our part, engaged in the same work of preaching as those eye-witnesses, announce unto you the promise made to the fathers, that, namely, God has completely fulfilled this, etc. — δια ταυτην κ.τ.λ.] contains the particular part of the ἐπαγγελία, the promise of the Messiah generally, which is announced. Entirely arbitrarily, Haunmann, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others hold that it should be connected: εἰς γεγελαζόμεθα, δι' την πρός τοὺς πατέρας γενομ. ἐπαγγελ. δ' θεος ἐκπελ. ἀλ. and that ταυτην is without significance. This very repetition of ταυτην has rhetorical emphasis. — ἐκπαληρωσε] stronger than the simple verb, ver. 27. 6 — τοις

1 Luke xxvii. 34. Comp. on iii. 17; see also 1 Cor. ii. 8.
2 On ἀκαταληφθηναι, comp. ii. 23, x. 30.
3 John xix. 36 f. [viii. 29; Mark xv. 46.]
5 Comp. Rom. 1. 4.
6 ντ 51, 32-37.
7 Nigelsbach on the καδα, p. 284, ed. 3.
8 See on Matt. xxviii. 10. Comp. l. 4.
9 Comp. ix. 20; see Dissen, ad. Dem. de cor. p. 286; Bernhardy, p. 283.
τίκνοις αἰτ. ζημίαν] for the benefit of their children, descendants, us. The prefixing of τίκνοις αἰτ. has a peculiar emphasis. — ἀναστήσας 'Ἰσού] by this that He raised up Jesus, from the dead. This interpretation is necessarily required by the connection, which is as follows: (1) The Jews have put to death Jesus, though innocent, and buried Him, vv. 28, 29. (2) But God has raised Him from the dead, as is certain from His appearance among His followers and their testimony, vv. 30, 31. (3) By this resurrection of Jesus, God has completely fulfilled to us the promise, etc., vv. 33, 38. (4) By the Raised One will, according to God’s assurance, never again die, vv. 33, 38. This, the only explanation accordant with the context, is confirmed by the purposely chosen ἐκπεπλήρωσε, as, indeed, the fulfilment of the promise begun from the very appearance of Jesus has, although secured already essentially, as Hofmann interprets the compound verb, only become complete by His resurrection. It has been objected that ἐκ νεκρῶν would have to be added to ἀναστήσας, as in ver. 34; but incorrectly, as the context makes this addition very superfluous, which yet is purposely added in ver. 34, in order that the contrast of μητρὶ μιλλοντα ἐναστήσεις εἰς διαθήκην might more strongly appear. The textual necessity of our interpretation excludes, accordingly, of itself the other explanation, according to which ἀναστήσας is rendered like ὁ πρῶτος, prodire juvans, exhibens, iii. 22, vii. 37. The rendering would hardly have been adopted and defended, had it not been thought necessary to understand Ps. ii. 7 of the appearance of Jesus upon earth. — ὁ . . . γέραντας] denotes the ἀναστήσας 'Ἰσού as the event which took place according to, besides other scriptural passages, the saying in Ps. ii. 7. — τὸ πρῶτον] Formerly—though not universally, yet frequently—the first Psalm was wont not to be separately numbered, but, as an introduction to the Psalter and certainly composed for this object, to be written along with the second Psalm, as it is even now found in MSS. As, however, such local citation of a passage is found neither in Paul’s writings nor elsewhere in the N. T., it must be assumed that Paul did not himself utter the πρῶτον and that it was not even added by Luke; but that he took it over from his documentary source—into which it had doubtless come, because it was esteemed particularly noteworthy that this prophecy should be found written on the very front of the Psalter (v.2). — vid. μου εἰ σὺ κ.τ.λ. in the historical sense of the Psalm composed by Solomon on his anointing: My son, the theocratic king, thou art; I, no other, have this day begotten thee, make thee by thine anointing and installation to be this my son. But, according to the Messianic fulfilment of this divine saying, so far as it has been historically fulfilled—it is otherwise in Heb. i. 5—especially by the resurrection of the Messiah: My Son, as the Messiah, thou art; I am He who has to-day, on the day of the resurrection, begotten Thee, installed Thee into this divine Sonship by the resurrection, Rom. i. 4,—inasmuch, namely, as the

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

Ver. 34. But that God raised Him from the dead as one who is no more to return to corruption, He has thus said. The μακάρι μέλλοντα . . . διαφθορά is the main element whereby the speech advances. Comp. Rom. vi. 9. — εἰς διαφθοράν] into corruption, is not, with Kuinoel, after Beza and Piscator, to be explained: in locum corruptionis, i.e. in sepulcerum, for which there is no reason at all, as μακάρι by no means requires the inference that Christ must already have been once in the condition of corruption; for μακάρι refers logically to the general idea of dying present in the mind of Paul, which he, already thinking on Ps. xvi. 10, expresses by ὑποστρ. εἰς διαφθ.² Bengel aptly says: "non amplius ibit in mortem, quam alias solat subsequi διαφθορά." The appeal to the LXX., which renders ἄνωθεν by διαφθορά, is equally inadmissible, for the translators actually so understood ἄνωθεν, and thus connected with their διαφθορά no other idea than corruption.³ — ὀφείλει ἕμιν τ. η. Δ. τ. πιστά] a free quotation of the LXX. Isa. lv. 3, in which Paul, instead of διαθήκην μὴν διαθήκην αἰώνων, gives ὀφείλει ἕμιν, certainly not designedly, because the text of the LXX. represents the appearance of the Messiah as something future, as Olshausen thinks; for the words of the LXX., particularly the αἰώνων, would have been very suitable as probative of our passage; nor yet by a mistake of memory, as the passage about the eternal covenant certainly was very accurately known to the apostle; but because he saw the probative force in τὰ βασιλικὰ τὰ πιστά, and therefore, in introducing those words on which his argument hinged, with his freedom otherwise in that he regarded it as sufficient only to prefix to them that verb, the idea of which is really contained in διαθήκην μὴν διαθήκην αἰών. I shall give unto you the holy things of David, the sure; i.e. the holy blessings conferred by me on David, the possession of which will be, federally, sure and certain. By this is meant the whole Messianic salvation as eternally enduring, which, in an ideal sense, for future realization by the Son of David, the Messiah, belonged as a holy property to David, the Messianic ancestor, and was to come to believers through Christ as a sacred inheritance. The LXX. translates "ἐντὸς τὰ βασιλικὰ τὰ πιστά, not exactly by τὰ βασιλικὰ τὰ βασιλικὰ τὰ πιστὰ, but on this very account the literal meaning beneficia is not, against Kuinoel and others,

¹ Against Baumgarten. ² Comp. Winer, p. 874 (E. T. 773). ³ Comp. on ii. 27.
to be assumed for ἰδίᾳ. It denotes veneam, pio observanda. — The historical meaning of the passage in Isaiah contains a promise of the Messianic times alluring the exiles to the appropriation of the theocratic salvation; but in this very Messianic nature of the promise Paul had reason and right to recognise the condition of its fulfilment in the eternal remaining-alive of the risen Christ, and accordingly to understand the passage as a prophetic promise of this eternal remaining-alive; because through a Messiah liable to death, and accordingly to corruption, those holy possessions of David, seeing they are to be πιστά, could not be conferred; for that purpose His life and His government, as the fuller of the promises, must be eternal. As surely as God, according to this prophetic assurance, must bestow the ἰδίᾳ Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστα, so surely Christ, through whom they are bestowed, cannot again die. Less accurately Hengstenberg, Chr. II. p. 384.

Ver. 35. ἰδίῳ] therefore, namely, because the Messiah, according to ver. 34, after His resurrection will not again die, but live for ever. — ἐν ἑτέρῳ] sc. ἑλκυρῷ, which is still present to the mind of the speaker from the quotation in ver. 33. — λέγει] the subject is necessarily that of εἰρηνεύ, ver. 34, and so neither David, nor the Scripture, but God, although Ps. xvi. 10 contains David’s words addressed to God. But David is considered as interpreter of God, who has put the prayer into his mouth. As to the passage quoted, see on ii. 25–27. Calvin correctly says: “Quod ejus corpus in sepulcro fuit conditum, nihil propter eum juris habuit in ipsum corruptum, quam illic integrum non secus atque in lecto jacuerit usque ad diem resurrectionis.”

Vv. 36, 37 give the explanation and demonstration (γὰρ), that in Christ raised by God from the dead this language of the Psalm has received its fulfilment. Comp. ii. 29–31. — ἰδίᾳ γενεὰ] Dativus commodi: for his own contemporaries. Others understand it as the dative of time: suæ actate, or tempore vitae suae. Very tame and superfluous, and the latter contrary to the usus loquendi. ἰδίᾳ γενεὰ is added in foresight of the future Messianic γενεὰ, viii. 38, for which the Son of David serves the counsel of God. “Davidis partes non extendunt se ultra modulum aetatis vulgaris,” Bengel. — τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ βούλῃ] may either be connected with ἐκομίσθη or with ἰντρεπτόνας: after he for his generation had served the counsel of God. The latter meaning is more in keeping with the theocratic standpoint of David and ver. 22.— πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αινοῦ] was added to his fathers, namely, as regards his soul in Sheol, whither his fathers had preceded him. A well-known Hebrew expression, Judg. ii. 10; Gen. xv. 15, xxv. 8, and Knobel thereon.

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

1 Comp. Bremi, ad Lys. p. 269, Goth.
2 Cor. i. 10.
3 Comp. Calvin and Hofmann, Welsag. w.
4 Exe. II. p. 173 f.
5 Bengel, Heinrichs, and others.
6 Henmann.
7 Calvini and the older interpreters.
8 Olshausen.
9 Erasmus, Castello, Calvin, Vatablus, and others.
10 Vulgate, Beza, Luther, Wolf, Bengel, Calvini. Olshausen, Baumgarten, and others.
11 Baur.
FORGIVENESS THROUGH CHRIST.

that precisely through *Him*, who was thus so uniquely attested by God to be the promised Messiah, the Messianic forgiveness and justification are offered, vv. 38, 39; and from this again follows (ἔν, ver. 40) with equal naturalness, as the earnest conclusion of the speech, the warning against despising this benefit. — Observe that Paul does not enter on the point, that the *causa meritoria* of forgiveness and justification lay in the death on the cross, or how it was so; this belonged to a further instruction afterwards; at this time, on the first intimation which he made to those who were still unbelievers, it might have been offensive and prejudicial. But with his wisdom and prudence, according to the connection in which the resurrection of the Lord stands with His atoning death,¹ he has neither prejudiced the truth, nor, against Schneckenburger and Baur, exhibited an un-Pauline, an alleged Petrine reference of justification to the resurrection of Jesus.

Vv. 38, 39. Διὰ τούτου] through this one, i.e. through *His* being announced to you. — καὶ ἄνω πάντων . . . δικαιώματα] and that from all things, from which² ye were unable to be justified in the law of Moses, every one who believes in this One is justified. — ἄνω πάντων] is pregnant: justified and accordingly freed, in respect of the bond of guilt, from all things.³ — εἰ τῷ νόμῳ and the emphatic εἰ τοῦτο represent the δικαιώματα as causally grounded, not in the law, but in Christ. But the proposition that one becomes justified in Christ by means of faith from all things, i.e. from all sins,⁴ from which one cannot obtain justification in the law, is not meant to affirm that already in the law there is given a partial attainment of justification and the remainder is attained in Christ,⁵ which would be un-Pauline and contrary to the whole of the N. T. On the contrary, Paul, when laying down that proposition, in itself entirely correct, leaves the circumstance, that man finds in the law justification from no kind of sins, still entirely out of account, with great prudence not adopting at once an antinomistic attitude, but reserving the particulars of the doctrine of justification in its relation to the law for eventually further Christian instruction. The proposition is of a general, theoretic nature; it is only the major proposition of the doctrine of justification, from all things from which a man is not justified in the law, he is justified in Christ by faith; the minor proposition, but in the law a man can be justified from nothing, and the conclusion, therefore only in Christ can all justification be obtained, are still kept back and reserved for further development. Therefore the shift of Neander, I. p. 145, is entirely unnecessary, who⁶ very arbitrarily assumes that πάντων is designed to denote only the completeness of the removal of guilt, and that, properly speaking, Paul has had it in view to refer the relative to the whole idea of δικαιώματα, but by a kind of logical attraction has referred it to πάντων. — We may add that the view,⁷ according to which καὶ . . . δικαιώματα is taken as an independent proposition, as it is also by Lachmann, who has erased καὶ, after A C*, is also admissible, although

¹ Schwiegler, nachapost. Zeitalt. II. p. 96 f.; admitted also by Zeiller, p. 599.
² Comp. also Schneckenburger, p. 131, and Lekebusch, p. 334.
³ Wolf and others, following the Vulgate.
less in keeping with the flow of the discourse, which connects the negative element (ἀφες ἂματρ.) and the positive correlative to it (δικαιοῦσα) with one another; therefore καί is the simple and, not: and indeed. But it is contrary to the construction to attach καί ἀπὸ . . δικαιοῦσαι to the preceding; so Luther, also Bornemann, who, however, with D, inserts μετάνωσα ώς καί. Lastly, that neither, with Luther, is ἐν τοῖς προφήταις to be connected with προφήταις, nor, with Morus, is ἐν τοῖς προφήταις δικαιοῦσαι to be taken as a proposition, by itself, is evident from the close reciprocal relation of ἐν τῷ νόμῳ and ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. — On the idea of δικαιοῦσα, the essence of which here already, by προφήταις, most definitely emerges as the Pauline justitia fidei, see on Rom. i. 17.

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

Vv. 42, 43. After this speech Paul and Barnabas depart, and on their going out of the synagogue are requested by those present, the subject of παρεκάλες, to set forth these doctrines again next Sabbath. But after the assembly was dismissed (λήθεισι), many even follow them to their lodging, etc.—ἐξεύρων δὲ αὐτῶν] They consequently departed, as is indisputably evident from ver. 43, before the formal dismissal of the synagogue. Olshausen, indeed, thinks that the εἰς ὃν. aiv. did not historically precede the λήθεισι τῆς συναγωγῆς, but is only anticipated as the chief point of the narrative, giving rise to the request to appear again. But this is nothing but an arbitrary device, which would impute to Luke the greatest clumsiness in his representation.—ἐπὶ τῷ μεταφάσει αὐτῶν] on the next following Sabbath. Instead of μεταβας, D has what is correct as a gloss: ἐξεύρων. In the N. T. this meaning is without further example, for Rom. ii. 15 is not a case in point. From the apostolic Fathers: Barnabas 13; Clemens, ad Cor. i. 44. For the few, but

1 Wetstein and others.
4 Comp. xv. 3; Job xliii. 3; Ecclus. xxxix. 12, xliii. 31, xlvii. 8; Joseph. Ant. v. 8; Bell. v. 13. 7.
quite certain examples from the other later Greek, see Krebs. Others — Camerarius, Calvin, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, Rosenmüller, Sepp, and others — render: "diebus sabbathae intercedentibus," by which, following the Recepta (see the critical remarks), those making the request are regarded as Gentiles, who would have desired a week-day. Comp. Luther: "between Sabbathes." We should then have to explain σαββάτων as week, that is: on the intervening week, so that it would require no conjectural emendation. But the evident connection in which ver. 42 stands with ver. 44 gives the necessary and authentic explanation: τῷ ἐχομένῳ σαββάτῳ. — τὸ σεβομ. προσηλ. the (God) worshipping proselytes. This designation of the proselytes occurs only here; elsewhere, merely προσηλυταί, or merely σεβόμενοι with and without Θεόν. Yet there is here no pleonasm; but σεβόμ. is added, because they were just coming from the worship, as constant partakers in which they were worshipping proselytes. — ὁτίνες] applies to Paul and Barnabas, who (quippe qui) made moving representations (ἵππεθον) to those following them to continue in the grace of God, which by this first preaching of the gospel had been imparted to them, because the apostles by the very following of the people, and certainly also by their expressions, might be convinced that the χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ had found an entrance into their souls. — προσλαλοῦντες speaking to them; xxviii. 20.

Vv. 44, 45. Τῷ δὲ ἐχομένῳ σαββάτῳ but on the following Sabbath. It is in itself, moreover, highly probable that the two apostles were not idle during the week, but continued their labours in private circles. — συνάκαθι As it was Sabbath, this assembly, at which also the Gentiles of the city were present, σχέδον πάσα πόλις, and see ver. 48, took place certainly in and near the synagogue, not, as Heinrichs supposes, "ante diversorium apostolorum." The whole city = πάντες οἱ πολίται; see Valckenar, ad Phoen. 982. — τῶν δόλων] which consisted in great part of Gentiles, whose admission to the preaching of the Messiah now stirred up the angry zeal (ζηλοῦ) of Israelitish pride; observe that here the 'Ιουδαίοι alone without the proselytes are named. — ἀντιληπτοί is neither superfluous nor a Hebraism, but joined with καὶ βλασφήμη, it specifies emphatically the mode of ἀντιληπτον, namely, its hostile and spiteful form: they contradicted, contradicting and at the same time blaspheming the apostle and his doctrine.

Vv. 46, 47. Ἡμέρα ἀναγκαίας namely, according to the counsel of God and our apostolic duty. — οὐκ ἀξίως κρίνετε κ.τ.λ.] This judgment of their unworthiness they, in point of fact, pronounced upon themselves by their zealous contradicting and blaspheming. — idem "ingenium articulus temporis magna revolutio," Bengel. As to the singular, comp. on Matt. x. 16 —
oúτω γὰρ εντέκαται Κ.Τ.Λ.] a proof that the στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ θνη occurred not arbitrarily, but in the service of the divine counsel. Isa. xlix. 6, according to the LXX., with slight deviation, referring to the servant of God, is by Paul and Barnabas, according to the Messianic fulfilment which this divine word was to receive, recognised and asserted as ἐνύλη for the apostolic office; for by means of this office it was to be brought about that the Messiah (σε) would actually become the light of the Gentiles,¹ for which according to this oracle, God has destined Him. — τοῦ εἰλεῖ τε κ. Τ.Λ. the final purpose: in order that thou mayest be, etc.

Vv. 48, 49. Τὸν λόγον τ. Κυρίου] see on viii. 25. — δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχον τεταγμένον κ. [κυρίου] αἰῶνα] as many of them as were ordained to eternal, Messianic, life. Luke regards, in accordance with the Pauline conception,⁴ the believing Gentiles as ensuing in conformity to their destination, ordered by God already, namely, from of old, to partake of eternal life. Not all general became believers, but all those who were divinely destined to the ζωή; and not the rest. Chrysostom correctly remarks: ἀφροθρισμένοι τῷ Θεῷ.⁴ The τάξις of God in regard to those who became believers was in accordance with His πρόγνωσις, by means of which He foreknew them as crediturit, but the divine τάξις was realized by the divine θλίψις effectual for faith. Rom. viii. 28–30—of which Paul, with his preaching, was here the instrument. It was dogmatic arbitrariness which converted our passage into proof of the decreatum absolutum.⁴ For Luke leaves entirely out of account the relation of "being ordained" to free self-determination; the object of his remark is not to teach a doctrine, but to indicate a historical sequence. Indeed, the evident relation, in which this notice stands to the apostle's own words, ἐπειδὴ . . . ζωῆς, ver. 46, rather testifies against the conception of the absolute decree, and for the idea, according to which the destinatia of God does not exclude, comp. ii. 41, individual freedom, ὡς οὐ καὶ ἀνάγκη, Chrysostom; although, if the matter is contemplated only from one of those two sides which it necessarily has, the other point of view, owing to the imperfection of man's mode of looking at it, cannot receive proportionately its due, but appears to be logically nullified. See, more particularly, the remark subjoined to Rom. ix. 38. Accordingly, it is not to be explained of the actus paedagogicos,⁴ of the præsentem gratiam operam tionem per evangelium,⁴ of the drawing of the Father, John vi. 44, 87, etc., with the Lutheran dogmatic writers; but the literal meaning is to be adhered to, namely, the divine destination to eternal salvation: ἵνα εὐαγγελισθῇ Θεὸς εἰς περιποίησιν σωματίως, 1 Thess. v. 9. Morus, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, and others, with rationalizing arbitrariness, import the sense: "quibus dum fidem doctrinae habeant, certa erat vita beata et æsterna," by which,

¹ Luke ii. 33, etc.
² Rom. ix.; Eph. i. 4, 6, 11, iii. 11; 2 Thess.
³ In which case Beza, for example, proceeds with logical self-deception: "Ergo vel non omnes erant vitas æternas destinait, vel omnes crediturit." Rather it is to be said: "Omnes erant vitas æternas destinait, sed crediturit." This excludes from the divine τάξις of salvation those who reject the faith through their own fault. See Beza and Calvin in loc., and Canon. Dordr. p. 905, ed. Augusti.
⁴ Calovius.
⁵ Bengal.
the meaning of the word ἔπαγμενος is entirely explained away. Others take ἔπαγμεν in the middle sense, quotquot se ordinaverant ad vitam aeternam, as Grotius, Krebs, Loesner, and others,1 in which case ἔπαγμεν is often understood in its military sense (quia ordines servat):2 "qui de agrmine et classe erat sperantium vel contendierunt ad vitam aeternam." But it is against the middle rendering of ἔπαγμεν,3 that it is just seized on in order to evade an unpleasant meaning; and for the sensus militaris of ἔπαγμεν no ground at all is afforded by the context, which, on the contrary, suggests nothing else than the simple signification "ordained" for ἔπαγμεν, and the sense of the aim for εἰς ἔπαγμεν αἰώνιον. Others join εἰς ἔπαγμεν αἰώνιον to ἐπιστεύειν, so that they understand ἔπαγμεν either in the usual and correct sense destinati,4 or quotquot tempus constituërent,5 or congregati,6 in spite of the simple order of the words and of the expression πιστεύειν εἰς ἔπαγμεν αἰώνιον being without example; for in 1 Tim. i. 16 εἰς defines the aim. Among the Rabbins, also, the idea and expression "ordinati (ὕπερ ἱτάμ) ad vitam futuram aeculli," as well as the opposite: "ordinati ad Gehennam," are very common. See the many passages in Wetstein. But Wetstein himself interprets in an entirely erroneous manner: that they were on account of their faith ordained to eternal life. The faith, foreseen by God, is subsequent, not previous to the ordination; by the faith of those concerned their divine ränge becomes manifest and recognised. See Rom. viii. 30, x. 14; Eph. i. 11, 13, al.

Ver. 50. Παρόρμοναν ἡ. σεβ. γυν. τ. εἰσχ.] they stirred up the female proselytes, of gentle rank.7 Heinrichs interprets σεβ. otherwise: "religiosas zeloque servandorum rituum ethnicoorum ferventes." Against this may be urged the stated use of σεβ. in this narrative, vv. 16, 43, as well as the greater suitableness of the thing itself, that the crafty Jews should choose as the instruments of their hatred the female proselytes, who were sufficiently zealous for the honour of their adopted religion to bring about, by influencing their Gentile husbands, the intended expulsion of the apostles.

Ver. 51. Ἐκτιφασ. τ. κοινῷρ.] as a sign of the greatest contempt.8—ιτά αὑτών] against them, is to be understood either as denoting the direction of the movement of the feet in shaking off the dust, or, more significantly, in the sense of the direction, frame of mind, in which the action took place.

Comp. Luke ix. 5. —'Ισραη] belonging at an earlier period to Phrygia,9 but at this time the capital of Lycaonia,10 and even yet,11 an important city.

1 Hofmann’s view, Schriftent. I. p. 286, amounts to the same thing: “who, directed unto eternal life, were in a disposition of mind corresponding to the offer of it.” The comparison of 1 Cor. xvi. 15 does not suit. Lange, ii. p. 173, in a similar manner evades the meaning of the words: “those who under God’s ordination were at that time ripes for faith.” Comp. already Breetschneider, “disposed,—that is to say, ἀπὸ ἡμῶν orationes Pauli.”

2 See Maji Ódor. III. p. 81 ff.

3 Mede in Wolf.

4 Comp. on xx. 13.

5 So Heinrichs.

6 Markland.

7 Knatchbull.

8 Pind. O. iii. 38; Lucian, Tob. 35. See xvii. 12, and on Mark xv. 43.

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

10 Xen. Anab. i. 2. 19.

11 Strabo, xil. p. 568; Clc. ad Dév. xv. 4; Plin. N. H. v. 25.

12 Koniah or Koniah, see Ainsworth’s Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand Greeks.
Ammian. Marc. xiv. 2, reckons it to belong to the neighbouring Pisidia, in opposition to the above witnesses,—an error easily committed. Iconium the legend makes Thecla be converted by Paul.—From the Pisidian Antioch they did not move farther forward, but turned south-eastward, in order (xiv. 28) at a later period to return by ship to the Syrian Antioch.

Ver. 52. What a simple and significant contrast of the effect produced by the gospel, in spite of the expulsion of its preachers, in the minds of those newly converted! *They were filled with joy, in the consciousness of their Christian happiness, and with the Holy Spirit!* Ἡδονὴ γὰρ ἔβαλεν πάρθενιν, ἐκ τῶν νεωτέρων, ὡς Χρυσόστομος hic says (ο').

**Notes by American Editor.**

(ο') Special documentary source. V. 1.

While there is nothing in the supposition of our author that the 13th and 14th chapters are a separate document, revised by Luke, inconsistent with the authenticity and authority of the record, yet there does not seem to be any necessity, from the style or the contents of the chapters, for any such supposition. Gogus in reference to this says: "The narrative is pervaded throughout with Luke's peculiar style, and is not so unconnected with the preceding history as is asserted." Paul and Barnabas had returned to Antioch, and other distinguished teachers were assembled there, so that, as Meyer happily remarks, the mother church of the Gentiles became a seminary of missionaries.

Hitherto Luke has given an account of the progress of the gospel generally. Henceforth he treats almost exclusively of Saul—now and henceforth called Paul—his missionary labors and journeys, and the leading events of his life. The missionary character of the church is now brought prominently into view. The first two acts of the church at Antioch are characteristic of the gospel, and exemplify the unity of the Christian church. They first sent alms to the poor Jews in Jerusalem, and next sent the gospel far and wide to the ignorant Gentiles. This conduct furnishes a pattern for all churches to-day.

(ο") Prophets and teachers. Vs. 1, 2.

These office-bearers of the early church are frequently referred to in the Acts and in the Epistles of Paul. (1 Cor. xii. 28, and Eph. iv. 11.) The prophets were an order of men endowed with the Spirit, and recognized by the church as next to the apostles in dignity and authority, and superior to the teachers. They, when inspired by the Spirit, addressed the people in an exalted and impassioned state of mind—their conscious intelligence being informed by the Holy Spirit. They were only occasionally under this influence, and sometimes, as in the present instance, they foretold future events. The teachers were publicly appointed by the church to the work of instruction, and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, using their own judgment, after due meditation, furnished instruction for the edification of others. A prophet might also be a teacher, as the higher gift usually included the lower; but the teach
would not assume the function of the prophet. The mention of prophets and
teachers implies that the first Gentile church was large and flourishing. Some
of the prophets came from Jerusalem to minister to the Gentiles. "The
prophets in the New Testament stood to the early churches nearly in the same
relation as do our printed Bibles to our modern churches. They spoke by au-
thority and without error, and gave to their audience such details as occur in
the Gospels, and such illustrations and precepts as are found in the Epistles.
They were the 'men of their counsel'—present oracles, whose lips keep
knowledge." (Badi.)

(29) John as an attendant. V. 5.

The two friends took with them John, surnamed Mark, the nephew of Bar-
nabas, and the author of the second gospel. He is styled in the narrative
"their minister;" but it is impossible to determine with precision the kind of
service he was expected to render them. Some suppose that he was simply a
personal attendant, as Elisha was upon Elijah, or Gehazi upon Elisha; others
believe that he was an assistant in their public duties—such as preaching and
the administration of the ordinance of baptism." (Taylor.) While it may be
readily imagined that Mark, as the younger man, would perform any kind of
service which would contribute to the personal comfort of his relative and his
distinguished companion, doubtless his functions were mainly of a spiritual
character. Soon, however, he left such noble companionship, and seriously
offended Paul by abandoning the arduous and perilous mission. His motives
for doing this were probably various, though cowardice did not necessarily con-
stitute one of them. Having passed through his mother's native isle, he prob-
able felt a strong desire to visit her—or still more probably, being strongly
attached to Peter, through whose instrumentality he was converted, as Peter
affectionately calls him Marcus my son, and sympathizing more strongly with
his work than that of Paul, he may have returned to join him. Be this as it
may, Barnabas never lost confidence in him, and he was also at last reconciled
to Paul, and was with him when a prisoner in Rome (Col. iv. 10; Philemon,
24).

(39) Second psalm. V. 33.

"The majority of MSS. are in favor of δευτέρων; but critics have in general
preferred the reading δευτέρων as being more difficult and adverted to by the
Fathers. It is accounted for, on the supposition that our first psalm was not
numbered, but was composed as an introduction to the psalter; and that the
second psalm was properly the first. In some Hebrew MSS. this order occurs."
(Goog.) Some refer the words quoted to the incarnation of Christ, but the
reference clearly is, as our author shows, to his resurrection. Declared, by his
resurrection, to be the Son of God with power, it was the public inauguration
of his Sonship, a manifestation of his divinity (Rom. i. 4).

(80) Paul's sermon. V. 41.

Of this first recorded discourse of Paul very different judgments have been
formed. Some suppose it to be unhistorical—a mere imitation and repetition
of the speech of Peter. Another says it is but the echo of the speeches of
Peter and Stephen. The similarity between the discourses is just what might be expected, from the two apostles speaking on the same subject to the same audiences. Farther, says Glose, there is nothing un-Pauline either in the form or the contents of the discourse. Neander says: "It is a specimen of Saul's wisdom and skill of the great apostle in the management of men and opinions, and of his peculiar antithetical mode of developing Christian truth. The discourse is regularly constructed, and may be divided into four parts: the historical, the apologetic, the doctrinal, and the practical. In the course the preacher wins the attention of his audience by giving a short sketch of the history of their forefathers. Then he proves the Messiahship of Jesus, based upon the testimony of John, from the fulfilment of prophecy in him, and from his resurrection from the dead. Next he proclaims the forgiveness of sins in his crucified and risen Messiah, announcing distinctly the doctrine which he discusses at so great length in his Epistles—justification by faith in Christ. Justification, as taught by Paul, means deliverance from condemnation, the claim of the law for punishment. Dr. Taylor gives in a striking and curious illustration of the use of the word justified in this taken from Scott's "Waverley,"—when Evan Macombich, pleading his master, says to the judge "that ony six o' the very best o' his clan was willing to be justified in his stead." Here the word means hanged; a charge of being held to be set right with the law when he had suffered its penalty. The conclusion of the discourse is an earnest warning against rejecting Christ and something worse than the evils predicted by Habakkuk should come upon them. Startled and surprised by this solemn conclusion, they besought the apostles, as they left the synagogue, to come and preach again on the Sabbath. Even after they had withdrawn, many followed and had an interview with the apostles.

During the week the excitement was great; nor were the apostles idle or silent. And so next Sabbath almost the whole city came together to hear the word. But when the Jews saw the multitudes of the Gentiles coming to the truth and receiving it, they became enraged, and contradicted and insulted the apostles. On the other hand, the Gentiles, hearing that Jesus crucified was set for a light and salvation to them, were glad and glorified, and even though the apostles were driven off by the instigation of the Jews the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost.
CHAPTER XIV.

VER. 2. ἀπειθοῦντες] A B C W, min. have ἀπειθοῦντες, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have adopted; and rightly, partly on account of the preponderating authority (D, however, does not here concur, as it has an entirely different reading), and partly because ἀπειθοῦντες most directly presented itself to the mechanical scribes as a contrast to those who had become believers. If they had conformed themselves to παρείνει, ver. 1, they would have written ἰκαστήσαντες. — Ver. 3. Before ἄδικα Elz. has καλ, against decisive evidence.

— Ver. 8. After αἰτῶν Elz. has ἀπέρχων, against greatly preponderating evidence. Added from iii. 2 as an unnecessary completion. — περιεπαινητεῖς] So (not τιμηθεῖς, as Elz.) D E G H, min. Chrys. Lachm. and Tisch. have περιεπαινητεῖς, after A B C W, min. But the regular preference, which in relative sentences the Greeks give to the aorist over the pluperfect, here easily supplanted the latter. — Ver. 9. ἡκούνει] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἡκούνει, after A D E G H K, min. Chrys. Theoph. An alteration, as the narrative continues in the aorist, and the intentional selection of the imperfect here was not understood. — Ver. 10. Lachm. Tisch. Scholz (Born. ἀνήλατο, after D) have ἡλατο. But Elz. has ἡλέτο, against decisive evidence. The aorist yielded to the imperfect on account of περιπαινητεῖ. — Ver. 12. μέν] is, after A B C D K, rightly erased by Lachm. Tisch. Born. as a customary insertion. — Ver. 13. After πολεμεῖ Elz. has εἰτέν. A current addition, condemned by the witnesses. — Ver. 14. ἱερήδοσαν] Elz. has εἰερήδοτο, against decisive evidence. The less the reference of ἱ — was understood, the more easily would the better known εἰς be inserted, corresponding to εἰς τὸν ἄγιον. — Ver. 17. καίτου] Others: καίς (so D E, Born.). Others: καίτοι (so A B C D W, Lachm.). With this diversity καίτοι, and also γέ, are to be considered as certainly and predominantly attested; and therefore καίτοι, with C D E H W, min. Chrys. Theoph. Occ., is to be retained. Besides sometimes the one particle and sometimes the other was omitted, as is also the case in xvii. 27. — ἀγαθοπρόνων] so to be read, with A B C W, min. Ath. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. But Elz. Scholz, Born. have ἀγαθοπρονῶν, which, as the more usual word, was inserted. — ἡμῶν . . . . ἡμῶν] Elz. has ἡμῖν . . . . ἡμῶν, against very important witnesses. The alteration arose, because the sentence had become a commonplace. — After ver. 18, C D E, min. vss. read διατριβώντων αἰτῶν κ. διδασκόντων. So Born. with de after διατρ., and attaching it to what follows. An interpolation, by way of smoothing the transition from ver. 18 to its contrast in ver. 19, variously enriched by different insertions. — Ver. 19. νομίσαντες] Lachm. Tisch. and Born. have νομιζοντες, after A B D K, min. The Recepta arose mechanically from the context. — τεθναίναι] Lachm. Tisch. read τεθνηκαίναι, after A B C W, min. Correctly, as the contracted form was the more usual. — Ver. 28. After διετριβοῦν δέ Elz. has ἣπει, which has been, after A B C D W, min. and several vss., erased or suspected since the time of Griesb. Insertion for the sake of more precise definition.
Vv. 1, 2. *Kατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν* at the same time, simul (Vulg.), ὁμοίως, Hes. — Ἐλληνῶν see on xi. 20. Comp. xviii. 4, 6. Yet here those Gentiles are meant who were in connection with Judaism as proselytes of the gate, comp. xiii. 43, and thus had not by circumcision laid aside their Greek nationality. This limitation is required by the context; for they are present in the Synagogue, and in ver. 2 the ἐννυ are distinguished from them, so that they occupy a middle place between the ἐννυ and the Ἰουδαῖον. — *οὕτως* in a similar manner, so effectually. — *ὁτε* refers to the preceding *οὕτως*, as in John 16. — ἀπεθάνατος (see the critical remarks), having refused obedience unbelief. — *ἐκακ. they made evil-afflicted, put into a bad frame of mind ad iracundiam conciliaverunt (Vulg.), like the German phrase, “sie machten böse.” This meaning, not in use with Greek writers, nor elsewhere in the LXX. or in the LXX. (Ps. cvi. 82) and Apocr., occurs in Joseph. Antt. 1. 2, 7, 3, 8, 6. — *κατὰ τὸν ἄνεμ. to* refers to ἐπιγ. κ. ἐκακ. conjointly. They were hostilely directed against the Christians.

Vv. 3, 4. ὃν represents vv. 3 and 4 as a consequence of vv. 1 and 2. "In consequence of that approval (ver. 1) and this hostility (ver. 2), spent indeed (μὲν) a considerable time in free-spoken preaching (even but (δὲ) there arose a division among the multitude" (ver. 4). — ἦ αὐτῶν] states on what their bold teaching rested—had its stay and support. Hence as regards sense: *freti Domino*. Elsewhere in the N. T. with ἦν Κύριος may as well be Jesus as God; the mode of conception of the apocalyptic church admits both the former, Mark xvi. 20, and the latter. The latter, however, is preponderantly supported partly by Acts xx. 32, where χάριτος αὐτῶν is to be referred to God, and partly by iv. 29, 30, where ἐν θυσία k. t. l. likewise points to God. — ἔνα tri] added without copula, denotes form, in which the μαρτυρία was presented. — ἐκακισθη] comp. John vi. 14: *Scinditur incertum studia in contraria vulgus.* Examples in Wetstein — καὶ and indeed.

Vv. 5—7. *Ὦρμῃ* impetus (Vulg.), but not exactly in the sense of assault, nor exactly a plot. — The former meaning, according to the context, expresses too much; the latter is not sanctioned by linguistic usage, in Jas. iii. 4. It denotes a strong pressure, a pushing and thronging. — τοῖς ἄρχονσι αὐτῶν] joins on closely to Ἰουδαίων, whose rulers of the Synagogue and elders are meant. Comp. Phil. i. 1. On ὠδρία, comp. xviii. 32; 1 Thess. ii. 2; Lucian, Soloe. 10. — αὐτῶν Comp. on xi. 9.
EVENTS AT ICONIUM.

It had become known to them, what was at work against them. — Λύστρα, sometimes used as feminine singular, and sometimes as neuter plural, as in ver. 8, see Grotius, and δερβη, two cities of Lycaonia (²), to the north of Taurus, and lying in a southeastern direction from Iconium. Ptol. v. 4 reckons the former to belong to the neighbouring Isauria; but Plin. v. 32 confirms the statement of our passage. On their ruins, see Hamilton’s Travels in Asia Minor, II. pp. 801 f., 807 f.; Hackett, p. 228.

Vv. 8—10. — ἐκάθαρτοι he saei, because he was lame. Perhaps he begged, comp. John ix. 8, like the lame man in chap. iii. — πειράματα.] Pluperfect without augment. — Observe, moreover, the earnest circumstantiality of the narrative. — ἔγνω] The imperfect denotes his persevering listening.— ἰδὼν] Paul saw in the whole bearing of the man closely scanned by him, in his look, gestures, play of features, his confidence of being saved, i.e. healed. This confidence was excited by listening to the discourse of the apostle; by which Paul appeared to him as a holy man of superior powers. Bengel aptly says: “Dum claudius verbum audit, vim sentit in anima, unde intus movetur, ut ad corpus concludat.” — τοῦ σωθήναι] This genitive of the object depends directly on πιστω. — μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ] thus, with the μεγ. predicatively prefixed only here and in xxvi. 24. — ὁρθά] ita ut erectus stes. — ἔλαυναι κ. πειραματαί] Observe the exchange of the aorist and imperfect: he sprang up, made a leap, and walked. Otherwise in iii. 8.

Ver. 11. Ἀνακαυσάμενοι] Chrysostom has finely grasped the object of this remark: οὐκ ἂν τοῦτο οὐδέν δήλου, τῇ γὰρ αἰκείᾳ φωνῇ ἑσθέγγουτο λέγοντες, διʼ οἱ θεοί κ.τ.λ. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς ἔλεγον. The more surprised and astonished the people were, the more natural was it for them to express themselves in their native dialect, although Zeller reckons this very improbable and calculated with a view to make the homoge go as far as possible. Nothing definite can be made out concerning the Lycaonian language; perhaps a dialect of the Lycian, which Jablonsky considered as derived from the Assyrian; Grotius, as identical with the Cappadocian; and Gühling, as a corrupt Greek. — ἄνωθεν ἄνθρώπων] having become similar to men. Theophanies

The distinction there stated of ἐβριζειν with οὐκ is groundless. See, on the contrary, e.g. Dem. 252. ult. 589. 14.

1 Although two cures of the same kind of infirmity and in a similar miraculous manner naturally enough produce two similar narratives, yet it cannot surprise us that, according to the criticism of Schneckenburger, Baur, and Zeller, the whole of this narrative is assumed to originate from an imitation of the narrative of the earlier Petrine miracle in chap. iii. “But with the miracle is withdrawn also the foundation of the attempted worship of the two apostles; this, therefore, cannot be regarded as historical, and so much the less, as it also is exposed to the suspicion of having arisen from an exaggerated repetition of a trait from the history of Peter,” Zeller, p. 214. Comp. Baur, I. p. 112 ff. ed. 2.

In a corresponding manner have the miracles of Paul generally been placed in parallelism with those of Peter, to the prejudice of their historical truth. Comp., in opposition to this view, Trip. Paulus nach d. Apostelgesch. p. 161 ff.


5 See on Matt. xii. 13, and Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 59 f.


7 In Iken’s nov. Theol. II. p. 688 ff.

8 De lingua Lycaonis., Viteb. 1796.
in human form\textsuperscript{1} belonged, at the instance of the myths of antiquity, to the heathen popular belief, in which such conceptions survived as an imitation, in which the author of the Acts shows himself as "acquainted with mythology." Comp., moreover, the analogous conception which attached itself to the appearance of Pythagoras, of Apollonius of Tyana, and others.\textsuperscript{4} Such a belief was naturally rejected by philosophers;\textsuperscript{5} but as naturally it lingered among the people (καὶ γενναίοι).

Ver. 12. The fact that Barnabas and Paul were declared to be Ζεύς Πολυδορός and Ἡρμής, is explained partly and primarily from the well-known provenance of the myths, according to which these gods were once hospitably entertained in the same regions by Philomen and Baucis;\textsuperscript{6} but partly also from Paul having a temple in front of the city, ver. 13, and from its being the only temple of Hermes, as the eloquent interpreter\textsuperscript{7} and messenger of the gods,\textsuperscript{8} to accompany his father when he came down to the earth.\textsuperscript{9} Paul was called a "child of the word" (νήπιος ὑιὸς τοῦ λόγου), as Hermes was considered Θεός ὁ λόγου γεμάτος.\textsuperscript{10} Probably also his more juvenile appearance and greater activity, compared with the calmer and older Barnabas, contributed to this, but certainly not, as Neander conjectures, his insignificant bodily appearance; for apart from the fact that this rests only on very uncertain traditions, as in the Acta Pauli et Theod. in Tischendorf, Act. apocr. p. 41, he is described as μικρός τῷ μεγάτει, ψιλὸς τῷ κεφαλῶν ἀγκύλος ταῖς κνήμισι.\textsuperscript{11} — Hermes is always represented as a handsome, graceful, very well-formed young man. But certainly Barnabas must have had a more imposing appearance, καὶ τῆς ὑφεις, ἀξιοπρεπῆς, Chrysostom.

Ver. 13. But the priest, then officiating, of the Zeus, who is before the i.e. of the Zeus (πολεύς), who had his seat in a temple in front of the city,\textsuperscript{12} ιερὸς is not to be supplied, with Kuinoel and others,\textsuperscript{13} as τοῦ Δίός is the genitive directly belonging to ιερεῖα; but the expression τοῦ θυτος πρὸ τοῦ is explained from the heathen conception that the god himself is present in his temple, consequently is a (θυτος) at the place where his temple stands; hence the classical expressions παρὰ Δίτ (adfanum Jovis), παρὰ Ζεὺς.\textsuperscript{14} We think that it is spoken "de Jove, cujus, simulacrum, and so not temp. ante urbem erectum erat." But mere statues had no special priests.\textsuperscript{15} This does not, however, follow from this passage, that there was also a temple of Jupiter in the city (Olshausen). — ταύρος καὶ στέμματα] bulls and garlands.

\textsuperscript{1} Hom. Od. xvii. 485 ff.
\textsuperscript{2} See also Nägelsbach, Homer. Theol. p. 138.
\textsuperscript{3} Comp. Themist. vii. p. 90, quoted by Wetstein on ver. 12.
\textsuperscript{4} Valckenaer, p. 506.
\textsuperscript{5} Plat. Rep. ii. p. 381 C-E; Cic. de Harusp. 28.
\textsuperscript{6} Ovid Med. vii. 611 ff.
\textsuperscript{7} Voss et sermonis polones, Macrob. Sat. 1. 8.
\textsuperscript{8} Λόγον προφήτης, Orph. H. 97. 4.
\textsuperscript{9} Apollod. iii. 10. 2.
\textsuperscript{10} Hygin. Poet. Astron. 34; Ovid. Fast. 496. Comp. Walch, Dia. in Act. III. p. 11.
\textsuperscript{11} Jamblich. de myster. Aeg. 1.
\textsuperscript{12} Comp. Malalas, Chronogr. x. p. 201; Nicephor. H. E. iii. 37.
\textsuperscript{13} Comp. Müller, Archæol. § 879, 880.
\textsuperscript{14} See Bernhardy, p. 184 f.
\textsuperscript{15} Jacobs, ad Del. epigr. p. 229.
\textsuperscript{16} See Valckenaer, Opusc. ii. p. 255; Schol. l. p. 509.
"Taurus tibi, summe Deorum," Ovid. *Metam.* iv. 755. Beza, Calovius, Raphel, Erasmus Schmid, Palairet, Morus, Heinrichs, and others, have quite erroneously assumed a hendiadys for ταιρωσις ἑστεμένους. This would come back to the absurd idea: *bulls and, indeed, garlands.*¹ The destination of the garlands is, moreover, not to be referred to the deified apostles, in opposition to Grotius and Valckenaer, who, like statues,² were to have been adorned; but to the animals that were to be adorned therewith at the commencement of the sacrifice,³ because the design of the garlands is included in the ἡδέλε δίεπη. — ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶνας] to the gates, doors of the gate, namely, of the city. This reference is required by the correlation in which ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶνας stands to τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως. The alleged incarnate gods were in the city, and therefore the sacrifice was to be brought at the gates of the city. The reference to the doors of the temple,⁴ or of the house where the apostles lodged, is not in keeping with the context.

Vv. 14, 16. ἀκούσαντες] Perhaps an inhabitant already gained by them for Christ brought intelligence of the design. — διάφρὲς τ. ἱμάτ. αἵρ.] from pain and sorrow. See on Matt. xxvi. 65. Not: as doing penance for the blinded people, as Lange imagines. — ἐκεχήρασαν] they sprang out from the gate, to which they had hastened from their lodging, among the multitude. The simple representation depicts their haste and eagerness. — τί ράπτει ποιεῖτε;] see on Luke xvi. 2. — καὶ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.] εἰσεῖς ἐκ προοίμιων ἀνιπτρεπαν τὸ κακόν, Chrysostom. — ὁμοοπάθειαι] of like nature and constitution.⁵ — εἰςγεγειληθέναι ἐς ὁμοιότητι] contains what is characteristic of the otherwise ὁμοοπάθεις ἵμιν: see who bring to you the message of salvation, to turn you from these vain, i.e. devoid of divine reality, gods, to the living, true God. εἰςγεγεῖληθε. does not thus mean cohortantes,⁶ but retains its proper import; and the epexegetical infinitive ἐκπτρεῖεται states the contents of the joyful news. It may be cleared up by supplying δεῖν, but this conception is implied in the relation of the infinitive to the governing verb.⁷ — τοῖς τῶν ματαιῶν] masculine, not neuter, referring to the gods, present in the conception of the hearers, such as Zeus and Hermes, who yet are no real gods, 1 Cor. viii. 4 ff. — ὃς ἐπιφάνεια] significant exegesis of the ἔστιν, whereby the ματαιῶν of the polytheistic deification of the individual powers of nature is made very palpable. Comp. with the whole discourse the speech to the Athenians ("sublimiora audire postulantes," Bengel), chap. xvii.

Vv. 16–18. Who in the past ages left the Gentiles to themselves, did not guide them by special revelation, although He withal made Himself known, doing good to them, by the blessings of nature—an indulgent description⁸ of the ungodly character of the heathen, with a gently reproving reference to the revelation of God in nature. ὁρὰ πῶς λανθανόντως τὴν κατηγορίαν τίθησιν, Chrysostom. Grotius aptly remarks: "Egregiam hic habemus formam

² Comp. op. Jerem. 9.
⁶ Heinrichs and Kuinoel.
⁸ Comp. xvi. 30.
orationis, quam imitari debeat, qui apud populos in idololatria eductor, evangeli praeclaram, 1
1 rallio i[b] den local: in their ways. What is
meant is the development of the inward and outward life in a way shaped by themselves, without divine regulation and influence, and also without the intervention of the divine anger. Comp. Rom. iii. 10 ff., i. 23 ff.,
where the whole moral abomination and curse of this relation is unveiled whereas here only alluring gentleness speaks. 4 — καίτοις εἰν ἀμάρτ. κ.τ.λ.
An indication that they, nevertheless, might and should have known Him. Observe the relation of the three participles, of which the second is logically subordinate to the first, and the third to the second; as doer of good, in
that He gives you rain, thereby filling, etc. — διηράθετω not uselessly added.
“Coelum sedes Dei,” Bengel. Observe also the individualizing ἵνα (see
critical remarks). — εὐφροσύνης joy generally. Arbitrarily, Grotius and Wolf suggest that εἴσερχε is meant. — τοὶ καρδίας ἵνα 
νῦν] neither stands for the simple ἵνα, nor is it to be taken, with Wolf, of the stomach; 7 but the heart is
filled with food, inasmuch as the sensation of being filled, the pleasant feeling of satisfaction, is in the heart. Comp. Ps. civ. 15; Jas. v. 5. — τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς ἐφφερε
c. abroquo; comp. x. 47. The genitive depends on κατέπαυεν, according to the
construction κατα πάντα ἑαυτοῦ to divert a person from a thing, to hinder him
in it, 8 and μὴ is the usual particle with verbs of preventing and hindering.

Vv. 19-22. This unmeasured veneration was by hostile Jews who arrived
(ἐπηλθοῦν) from Antioch 14 and Iconium, 15 transformed into the fickle multitude into a participation in a tumultuous attempt to kill Paul. Between this scene very summarily related and the preceding no interval is, according to the correct text (see critical remarks), to be placed, in opposition to Ewald.
The mobile vulgus, that ἀπαραπαρήκατον πράγμα τῶν ἀπανθρώπων, 16 is at once carried away from one extreme to another. — καὶ πείσαντες κ.τ.λ.] and after they, the
Jews who had arrived, had persuaded the multitude to be of their party, and
stoned 1 Paul, the chief speaker! they dragged him, etc. — ευκλοποιοῦν] not
sopeliendi causa, Bengel, Kuinoel. and others,—a thought quite arbitrarily supplied; but in natural painful sympathy the Lystrians who had been converted to Christ surrounded him who was apparently dead. — ἀναστάσεως
εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τ. π. ] is certainly conceived as a miraculous result. — Ver 22:
cαὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] comp. ver. 27; but here so, that from παρακαλοῦντες a kindness

2 See, generally, on the dativus localis, Becker, Homer. Blätter, 303 f.
3 Comp. on 2 Cor. xii. 18; Jude 11; Judith xiii. 19; Eccles. xxv. 20.
4 The announcement of the gospel forms the great epos in the history of salvation, with the emergence of which the times of men’s being left to themselves are fulfilled. See xvii. 30; Rom. iii. 25 f. Comp. also Be- barn, natūr. Theol. d. Ap. Paul. p. 13. For judgment Jesus has come into the world.
5 Comp. Rom. i. 30, καίτοις, as in John iv. 2, quamquam quidem, and yet. See also
6 Eccles. xxxi. 38.
7 Thuc. II. 49. 2.
8 Rom. Od. xxi. 457; Plat. Polit. p. 294 E frequently in the LXX.
10 xiii. 14, 50.
11 vv. 1, 5, 6.
l. 19, 37.
13 Dem. 283, 5.
14 Consequently in the city. It was to eat ἠπόθεν διήλευτος εἰς πόλιν (Soph. Ant. 38).
verb (λήγωντες) must be borrowed. — δει] namely, ex decreto divino. Comp. ix. 16. — ἡμᾶς] we Christians must, through many afflictions, enter into the Messianic kingdom, βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, to be established at the Parousia. Comp. Matt. x. 38; Rom. viii. 17 f.; also the saying of Christ in Barnab. op. 7: οὐ διδάσκει με ἄγιον κ. ἧπαρθαν μον τῆς βασιλείας ὑπολογοι θαλαντες κ. παθόντες λαβεῖν με. "Si ad vitam ingredi cupias, afflictiones quoque tibi necessario suferendae sunt." That, moreover, the stoning here narrated is the same as that mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 25, is necessarily to be assumed, so long as we cannot wantonly admit the possibility that the author has here inserted the incident known to him from 2 Cor. only for the sake of the contrast, or because he knew not a more suitable place to insert it; so Zeller. It is, however, an entirely groundless fancy of Lange, that the apparent death in vv. 19, 20 is what is meant by the trance in 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.

Ver. 28. Χειροπονηστῆεν] Erasmus, correctly: suffragis delectos. The ecclesiastical offices were ἀρχαὶ Χειροπονηστῶν or αἰρητῶν. The analogy of vi. 2-6 requires this strict regard to the purposely chosen word, which, resting on the old method of choice by lifting up the hands, occurs in the N. T. only here and in 2 Cor. viii. 19, and forbids the general rendering constituant, or elegiand, so that the appointment would have taken place simply by apostolic plenary power, although the word in itself might denote elegere generally without that special mode. Paul and Barnabas chose by vote presbyters for them, i.e. they conducted their selection by vote in the churches. Entirely arbitrary and erroneous is the Catholic interpretation, that it refers to the Χειροπονία at the ordination of presbyters (L). — κατ' εἰκος εἰκείσιν] distributively. Each church obtained several presbyters, xx. 17; Phil. i. 1. — προσεχεῖς, μετὰ νηστών.] belongs to παρθένοιο, not, as Kuinoel supposes, to χειριστ. See on xiii. 9. The committing of the Christians of those places to the Lord, commending them to His protection and guidance, which took place at the farewell, was done by means of an act of prayer combined with fasting. The Κύριος is Christ, as the specific object of faith, εἰς ἐν πενεκτόρ., not God (de Wette).

Vv. 25, 26. Πάργα] see on xiii. 13. — Attalia, now Adalia, was a seaport of Pamphylia, at the mouth of the Catarrhactes, built by Attalus Philadelphus, king of Pergamus. — Αντίοχ.] They returned to Syria, to the

---

2 Vogt, Reil, f. 173. 4.
3 Comp. Clem. Or. I 9: λαθανθὲς.
4 Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 146. 1.
5 See on that passage.
6 Vulgate, Hammond, Kuinoel, and many.
7 De Wette.
8 Löhe.
9 Comp. x. 41, Lucian. Philope. 12. al.
10 Comp. Calvin in loc.; Rothe, Anf. d. Christ. Kirche, p. 150; Neander, I. p. 208. Against Scharer, V. p. 543, who finds in the appointment of presbyters a θέτον κατώτερον; see Lechler, Apost. u. Nachapost. Zeitl. 355 f. On the essence of the matter, Ritschl, allkath. K. p. 363, correctly remarks that the choice was only the form of the recognition of the charisma and of subjectio to it; not the basis of the office, but only the medium, through which the divine gift becomes the ecclesiastical office. Comp. on Eph. iv. 11.
11 See Cornelius a Lapide, and Beelen still, not Sepp.
12 See Bernhardi, p. 340.
13 See Rothe, p. 181 ff.
14 Comp. xx. 22.
15 See on παρθένοιο, Kypke, II. p. 70.
16 Comp. xx. 22.
17 See Fellows, Travels in Asia Minor, p. 183 ff.
18 Strabo, xiv. 4. p. 667.
mother church which had sent them forth. — διὸν ήσαυ παραδεδ. κ.τ.λ.] from which they were commended to the grace of God for (the object) the work which they had accomplished. διὸν denotes the direction outwards, in which the recommendation of the apostles to the grace of God had taken place at Antioch.¹

Vv. 27. 28. Ἠσαυγ. expressly for this object. Comp. xv. 30. Calvin observes well: "quamadmodum solent, qui ex legatione reversi sunt, res- tionem actorum reddere." — μερ' αυτοῦ] standing in active connection with them.² As the text requires no deviation from this first and most natural rendering, both the explanation per ipsos³ and the assumption of a Hebraism ἰνᾳ with οὗ (Luke i. 72): quae ipsis Deus fecisset,⁴ are to be rejected. — καί δὲ] and, in particular, that, etc. — ἐνοικε θερα παρτωκ] a figurative designation of admission to the faith in Christ. Corresponding is the figurative use of θερα in 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 13, Col. iv. 3, of the fulfilling of apostolic work; comp. also εἰσεύθερα, 1 Thess. i. 9. — χρόνον ωκ αἰγιων is the object of διέρμισθον, as in ver. 8; they spent not a little time in intercourse with the Christians.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(Ε?) Iconium. V. 1.

This city was situated about sixty miles eastward of Antioch, on the road between Ephesus and Syrian Antioch. In the middle ages it was celebrated as the capital of the Seljukian Sultans. It is at present a town of considerable importance; retains its ancient name Konieh; contains a population of 30,000; and is the capital of the Turkish province of Carcharania. It is described by travellers as a scene of destruction and decay, with heaps of ruins. Scarcely anything remains of ancient Iconium save a few inscriptions and fragments of columns and sculpture built into the walls. How it appeared in the time of Paul we know not; but it was large and populous. "The elements of its population would be as follows: a large number of trifling and frivolous Greeks, whose principal places of resort would be the theatre and the market place; some remains of a still older population, coming in from the country, or residing in a separate part of the town; some few Roman officials, civil or military, holding themselves proudly aloof from the inhabitants of a subjacent province; and an old settlement of Jews, who exercised their trade during the week, and met on the Sabbath to read the law in the synagogue." Thither the two strangers, driven from Antioch by wicked, crafty, and violent opposition of the Jews, came in accordance with the injunction of the Master, that when they were rejected in one house or city, they should go into another.

¹ See xiii. 3 f. Comp. xv. 40.
² Comp. x. 38; Matt. xxviii. 30; also 1 Cor. xv. 10; and Mark xvi. 30: ὑπὲρ Κύριον συνέργοντος.
³ Besa, Placator, Heimrichs.
⁴ Calvin, de Dieu, Grosins, Kuinoel, and many others; comp. also de Wette.
NOTES.

(2) An assault made. V. 5.

The word ἄρρητος, as explained by Meyer, does not mean just this; but an impulse or strong pressure, impulse or purpose. It implies here a state of mind of which some intimation was given: "There was a strong feeling among them" against the apostles—a movement of some kind. The success of the apostles in Iconium was very great; a multitude both of Jews and Greeks believed. They remained there several months. We have no account of what they preached; but doubtless in the synagogues, and from house to house, they preached that Jesus was the Christ, and that through him, and him alone, could be obtained the forgiveness of sins. They also wrought many miracles, as attestations of their divine commission and of the truth of their doctrine. Their success, however, aroused the hostility of the Jews, who were ever jealous of the old faith, and opposed to the admission of the Gentiles to like privileges with themselves. They looked upon Christianity, not as the outgrowth and perfection of Judaism, but as its antagonistic rival; hence their indignation at its success, and their embittered and continued hostility to its preachers. We are informed that the Jews sent out their emissaries everywhere to circulate falsehoods concerning the Christians, and to stir up the Gentiles against them. Of the many persecutions mentioned in the Acts, all were caused by the Jews except two. Tradition says that Paul frequently preached long and late—that his enemies brought him before the civil authorities, charging him with disturbing their households by his sorcery, and greatly troubling the city. It is probable that here, as suggested by Hackett, that they insinuated that the preachers were dangerous men, and disloyal to the empire.

In the apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla there is a legend given concerning Paul's visit to Iconium, the substance of which is this: that Thecla, who was espoused to Thamyris, was deeply affected by the preaching of the apostle; and when Paul was put in prison, accused of being a magician, she bribed the jailer, and was allowed to visit the prisoner, by whom she was more fully instructed in the Christian faith, which she heartily adopted. She was condemned to die because she refused to marry Thamyris, but was miraculously delivered; joined Paul in his missionary journeys; finally she made her home at Seleucia, where she lived the life of a nun, and died at the age of ninety years.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla gives a portrait-description of the apostle's person and physiognomy, which is by no means flattering. He is represented as "a man small in size, bald-headed, bandy-legged, stout, with eyebrows meeting, rather long-nosed, full of grace—for sometimes he seemed like a man, and sometimes he had the countenance of an angel." Other accounts add that he had small, piercing gray eyes. His manner was singularly winning. "The poverty of the casket served to assist the lustre of the jewel it contained; the plainness of the setting called attention to the worth of the gem."

(4) Cities of Lycaonia. V. 6.

Escaping threatened violence at Iconium, the apostles went into a wilder and less civilized region. The name, Lycaonia or Wolfland, indicates only too faithfully the character of the inhabitants. Few, if any, Jews were settled
there, and we read of no synagogue in either of the towns named. The region is described as wild, rugged, mountainous; an almost Alpine country, with numerous lakes and rivers, which, with the melting of the spring snows, become suddenly rapid and dangerous torrents; the roads were bad, and infested with brigands. Lycaonia is an elevated table-land, a great part of which is unwatered and sterile, and described as a dreary plain, destitute alike of trees and fresh water. Ovid, writing of the place, says:

"Where men once dwell, a marshy lake is seen, And coots and bitterns haunt the waters green."

Neither Lystra nor Derbe were large cities or places of any great importance; hence the apostles embraced the surrounding country and villages in their field of evangelistic labor. The difficulties and obstacles in the way of the apostles were very great. Yet with unwearied zeal they evangelized the whole region. To no part of Paul’s life would the account he vividly gives to the Corinthians of his personal experience more fitly apply than to his labors here: “In perils,” etc. (2 Cor. ii. 26). The sites of both Lystra and Derbe are uncertain. Lystra, however, has a post-apostolic history—the names of its bishops appearing in the records of early councils. It was the home of Timothy, who in all probability was converted under the preaching of Paul at this time. Here Paul performed a miracle in perfectly restoring, by a word, a man who had been a cripple from his birth. The people marvelled; and believing the power to be divine, they thought that two of their pagan gods had appeared in the persons of the apostles.

(*2) Gods in the likeness of men. V. 11.

It was a general belief, long after the Homeric age, that gods visited the earth in the form of men. Such a belief with regard to Jupiter would be natural in such an inland rural district as Lystra, which seems to have been under his special protection, as his image or temple stood in front of the city gates. And as Mercury was the messenger and herald of the gods, especially of Jupiter, it was natural that he should be associated with him. He was also the god of eloquence; and as Paul was the chief speaker, they took him for Mercury; and the more quiet, and perhaps the more aged, venerable, and majestic looking Barnabas, they regarded as Jupiter.

"Jove with Hermes came, but in disguise
Of mortal men concealed their deities."

The pagan priests, true to the functions of their office, hasten to bring oxen and garlands of flowers to crown the victims and wreath the altars, to the temple at the gates, within which Jupiter was supposed specially to dwell, and there to offer sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas. The apostles, when they ascended what the people and priests were about to do, were horror-stricken. Rending their clothes, they rushed out among the people and expressed their abhorrence of the proposed service. We can well imagine with what impassioned earnestness and vehemence Paul uttered the address of which we have only an outline. He exclaims: "We are not gods, but men of like nature and feelings as yourselves; that these supposed gods whom ye worship are mere vanities, and their worship debasing. We have come to declare to you the
NOTES.

one living and true God; that this living God made all things, in heaven above, and in the earth beneath; that this God has never left himself without a witness in the munificent gifts of nature and the benevolent dealings of his gracious providence." This clear and cogent address scarcely restrained the ignorant and superstitious people from their impious act. What a contrast between the inhabitants of Jerusalem and those of Lystra! When a miracle similar to this was performed by Peter, he was not deified but imprisoned. The reality of the miracle was admitted, but the apostles were straitly threatened. The minds of the instructed rulers of the Jews were hardened and blinded by prejudice, and they reasoned against the truth; the ignorant people at Lystra did not reason, but came at once to a conclusion, natural in their circumstances, which, though mistaken, rebukes the vaunted wisdom of the Jewish Sanhedrim. The people were disappointed in being hindered in their idolatrous design, and were all the more ready to listen to the vile insinuations and cruel instigations of those Jews who had, with evil purpose against the apostles, come from Antioch and Iconium. "The fickle and faithless Lycaonians," excited and ignorant, and easily duped, listened to the Jews, and were induced to stone Paul on the very place where but just now they were ready to worship him. A similar sudden change, but in a different direction, subsequently occurred at Malta, among the barbarous people, who first thought Paul a murderer, and then immediately afterward a god. What had only been purposed by the people at Iconium was perpetrated by the inhabitants of Lystra. It is observable that we read of no injury done to Barnabas. Paul's intenser zeal and fiery eloquence doubtless provoked their special ire. He who had approved and assisted at the stoning of Stephen is now himself stoned for the same cause. Some suppose Paul to have been really dead; others that he was only stunned. It is clearly implied, however, that his restoration was supernatural. As soon as Paul recovered his strength the apostles proceeded to Derbe, distant about twenty miles. Paul, in writing to Timothy many years afterward, reminds him of his knowledge of his own persecutions "at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra;" and in his catalogue of sufferings given to the Corinthians is this instance: "Once was I stoned" (2 Cor. xi. 25, and 2 Tim. iii. 11). Paley, from the various references to this event, draws a forcible argument for the authenticity of the narrative by Luke: "Had the assault [at Iconium] been completed; had the history related that a stone was thrown, as it relates that preparations were made both by Jews and Gentiles to stone Paul and his companions; or even had the account of this transaction stopped, without going on to inform us that Paul and his companions were aware of their danger and fled, a contradiction between the history and the Epistles would have ensued. Truth is necessarily consistent; but it is scarcely possible that independent accounts, not having truth to guide them, should thus advance to the very brink of contradiction without falling into it." (Horae Paulinae, chap. IV. No. 9.)

(25) Chosen them elders. V. 23.

The meaning of the word rendered chosen has been disputed. χρυσοτοκεως, compounded of χρυς, hand, and τοκεω, to stretch or extend, means to stretch out the hand. Robinson gives: to stretch out or hold up the hand, hence to vote; to appoint; as also Liddell and Scott, to vote for, to elect. Bloomfield says:
“There is, indeed, no point on which the most learned have been so much
agreed as this, that ἐκπροσώπωσαν here simply denotes having selected, consti-
tuted, appointed. Alford says: “The word will not bear the sense of laying on of
hands,,” and adds: “The apostles ordained the presbyters whom the church
selected.” Gloag says the word admits of two meanings, to choose by election,
or simply to choose. Meyer adopts the first of these meanings. Gloag decided
prefers the second, as does also Hackett, who says: “That formality (election
by extending the hand) could not have been observed in this instance, as by
two individuals performed the act in question.” Abbott says the word
used “as equivalent to select or appoint, and understands the declaration to be
that the apostles appointed elders, without any indication whether the selection
was made by themselves or first by the lay members of the church, and ratified
by the apostles, or by the concurrent action of the two.” While, as we learn
from chap. vii., the seven were chosen by the whole church, it would appear
in this instance, that these elders were chosen by Paul and Barnabas alone.
Clemens gives the following rule as handed down by tradition from the apo-
stles: “That persons should be appointed to ecclesiastical offices by appro-
val of the whole church.” This is the second mention of elders in
the Acts (xi. 30). “The ministers of the church were called ἐπίσκοποι
(elders), with reference to the Jewish element in the church: and ἐπίσκοποι
(overseers), with reference to the Greek element.” (Gloag.)
CHAPTER XV.

Ver. 1. περιτεμπεθε] A B C D Ν, min. Constitut. Ath. Epiph. have περιτμεθερ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born.; and rightly, as the witnesses are so preponderating, and the reference of the aorist easily escaped the notice of the transcribers. — Ver. 2. οὖ] Tisch. Born. read ὅ. The witnesses for ὅ preponderate. — ζηγήσεως Elz. has σοζηγήσεως, in opposition to decisive testimony. From ver. 7. It is also in favour of ζηγ. that it is inserted in ver. 7, instead of σοζηγ. in Α, Ν, min. vsa., which evidently points to the originality of ζηγ. in our passage. — Ver. 4. ἀπεδέχθε] Lachm. Tisch. and Born. read παρεδέχθε, according to A B D* (D* has παρεδέχθαν) Ν lok. These witnesses preponderate, and there are no internal reasons against the reading. — ἡμὶ Tisch. reads ἡμᾶς, following only B C, min. — Ver. 7. ἐν ἡμῖν] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐν ἡμῖν, according to A B C Ν, min. and several vsa. and Fathers. But ημῖν is necessary; and on this account, and because it might easily be mechanically changed into ἡμῖν after the preceding ἡμῖς, it is to be defended on the considerable attestation remaining to it. — Ver. 11. τοῦ Κυρίου ἦσθε] Elz. has Κυρίου ἦσθε Χριστοῦ, against preponderating evidence. Whilst the article was omitted from negligence, Χριστοῦ (which also Born. has) was added in order to complete the dogmatically important saying. — Ver. 14. τῷ ὄντος] so Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. Scholz have ἐπὶ τῷ ὄντῳ,— an exegetical expansion, against preponderating evidence. — Ver. 17. After ταῦτα Elz. has πάντα, which is wanting in A B C D Ν, min. and many vsa. and Fathers. From LXX. Amos ix. 12, and hence it also stands before ταῦτα in E G, min.—Ver. 18, Griesb. Scholz, and Tisch. have only γνωστὰ ἀν’ αἰῶνος, so that this must be attached to ταῦτα in ver. 17. This reading appears as decidedly original, and so ἵστε... αὐτῷ as decidedly interpolated; partly because B C Ν, min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. vouch for the simple γνωστὰ ἀν’ αἰῶνος, and those authorities which have ἵστε... αὐτῷ present a great number of variations; partly because it was thought very natural to complete γνωστὰ ἀν’ αἰῶνος into a sentence, and to detach it from ver. 17, inasmuch as no trace of γνωστὰ ἀν’ αἰῶνος was found in Amos ix. 12; partly, in fine, because, if ἵστε... αὐτῷ is genuine, ver. 18 contains a thought so completely clear, pious, and unexceptionable, so inoffensive, too, as regards the connection, and in fact noble, that no reason can be conceived for the omission of ἵστε... αὐτῷ, and for the numerous variations in the words. Lachm. has γνωστὸν ἀν’ αἰῶνος τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ ἔργῳ αὐτῷ, after A D, Arm. Valg. Cant. Ir., which betrays a still later origin than the Recepta, as the genuine γνωστὰ ἀν’ αἰῶνος first gave occasion to the casting of the sentence in the plural form, but afterwards, in order to bring forward the special reference to the ἔργον in question of the conversion of the Gentiles, the change into the singular form was adopted. Matth. has entirely erased ver. 18, without evidence. — Ver. 20. καὶ τοῦ πνεύματο] is, following Mill, erased by Born. as a later addition; Ambrosiaster already explains the words as such, and, indeed, as proceeding from the stricter observance of the Greeks. But they are only
wanting in D, Cant. Ir. Tert. Cypr. Pacian. Fulgent. Hier. Gaudent. Euch. Ambrosiast., of whom several omit them only in ver. 29. The omission is explained from Lev. xvii. 13, where the eating of things strangled generally is not forbidden, but only the pouring out of the blood is made a condition; and from the laxer view of the Latins. After ver. 20 (so, too, in ver. 29 after πορευεσ), D, min. vss. and Fathers have the entirely irrelevant addition from Matt. vii. 12: καὶ δει τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ τῇ γενεσθαι, ἐτέραις μη τοῦ συνεργεῖς (πορευεσ). — Ver. 22. ἐπικαλ.] Lachm. has καλούμενον, also commended by Griesb. according to decisive evidence, and adopted by Tisch. and Born. Rightly: the former is an interpretation. — Ver. 23. καὶ οἱ ἀδέλφοι] A B C D Μ ὁ λοι. 13. As Vulg. Cant. and some Fathers have merely ἀδέλφοι, which Lachm. and Born. have adopted.1 But the omission of καὶ οἱ is on hierarchical grounds, for which reason also 34 Sahid. have καὶ οἱ ἀδέλφοι entirely. — Ver. 24. λέγων περί τοῦ νόμου is wanting in A B D Μ, lo. 13, Copt. Aeth. Sah. Vulg. Cant. Constitt. Ath. Epiph. Vigil. Beda. Besides variations in details Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. Probably a gloss; yet it remains surprising that it was drawn not from ver. 1, but from ver. 5, and so freely. Besides λέγων περί τοῦ νόμου might be easily passed over after ὁμιλῶν. — Ver. 25. ἐκ τῆς γενεσθείης A B G min. read ἐκ τῆς γενεσθείης. So Lachm. A stylistic correction. — Ver. 28. Instead of τῶν ἐπαναγ. τούτων is to be written, with Lachm., according to preponderating evidence, τούτων τῶν ἐπαναγ. τούτων; Tisch. has erased τούτων, yet only after Α and some min. and Fathers. — Ver. 30. ἡλθον] Lachm. and Born. read ἐκ τῆς γενεσθαι, which is so decidedly attested (A B C D Μ) that it may not be derived from ver. 1. The compounds of ἐκ τῆς γενεσθαι were often neglected. — Ver. 33. ἐκ τῆς γενεσθας] Elz. reads ἐκ της γενεσθας, contrary to A B C D Μ, min. and several vss. and Fathers. A more precisely defining addition, which, taken into the text, supplanted the original. — After ver. 33, Elz. Scholz. Born. have κατὰ τοῦ ἐπιφανους: μόνος σὺ τῷ Σιλα ἐπιμείναι αὐτοῦ, to which D and some vss. and Cassicius add: κατὰ τῷ ἐπιφανους εἰσερχόμεθα (so Bornemann). Condemned by Mill. Griesb. Matthaei, also deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., according to A B E G H Μ, min. Chrys. Theophyl. and several vss. A hasty addition on account of ver. 40. Ver. 37. ἔσωθεν] Lachm. reads ἐσώθησα, which also Griesb. recommends after A B C E Μ, min. Born., following D, reads ἔσωθεν. While the two verbs are frequently (comp. on v. 33) interchanged, ἔσωθεν is here to be preferred on account of its far preponderant attestation. — Ver. 40. Ὕσεω] A B D Μ min. vss. have ὡσειον. So Lachm. Tisch., also Born., who only omits τοῦ, following D*. Ὕσειον is from xiv. 26.

Vv. 1, 2. The Jewish-Christian opinion, that the Gentiles could only enter the way of circumcision and observance of the law—that is, in the way of Jewish Christianity—obtain the salvation of the Messianic kingdom, was by no means set aside by the diffusion of Christianity among the Gentiles, which had so successfully taken place since the conversion of Cornelius. On the contrary, it was too closely bound up with the whole training and habit of mind of the Jews, especially of those who were adherents of the Pharisees,2 not to have presented, as the conversions of the Gentile

1 Approved by Buttman in the Stud. u. 2 Comp. Ewald, p. 484 f. 
KRIT. 1890, p. 358.
DELEGATES SENT TO JERUSALEM.

increased, an open resistance to the freedom of the Gentile brethren from the law,—a freedom which exhibited itself in their whole demeanour to the scandal of the strict legalists,—and to have made the question on which hinged the most burning question of the time. This opposition—the most fundamental and most dangerous in the apostolic church, for the overcoming of which the whole further labour of a Paul was requisite—merged in the very central seat of Gentile Christianity itself at Antioch; neither some\(^1\) from Judaea, τῶν πεποιθημάτων ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων,\(^2\) come down with this doctrine: If ye shall not have been circumcised (περιτομήν, in the critical remarks) according to the custom ordered by Moses, and so have taken upon you the obligation of obedience to the whole law, Gal. v. 3, ye shall not obtain the salvation in Christ! (Μὴ ἑν αὐτῷ τὴν σώσεως ὑμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ. — στασεῖς ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐκκλησία πέρα ὁμοιασθείς ἐπὶ τὴν κοίμησιν τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν.)

\(^{1}\) ταῦτα αὐτοῖς μὲν ἤξιον, τοῖς δὲ ἰδιοῖς ἐπεφέρετο μεγάλη θυσία. Antioch, comp. ver. 8. — Jerusalem was the mother-church of all Christianity; here the apostles had their abode, who, along with the presbyters of the church, occupied for the Christian theocracy a position similar to that of the Sanhedrin. Comp. Grotius. The recognition of this on the part of Paul is implied in Gal. ii. 1, 2. — καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰς αὐτῶν] among them, according to Gal. ii. 1, was Titus, not named at all in the Acts, unless Paul voluntarily took him as companion, which is more suitable to the pression in Gal. ii. 1. — We may add that the commission of the church, under which Paul made the journey, is by no means excluded by the statement: εἰς τὸ ἐαυτὸν ἀποκαλυφθείς, Gal. ii. 2; see on Gal. i.c. Subtleties directed against our narrative may be seen in Zeller, p. 324 f. — ζητήματα, quaestia, i.e. the ζητήματα, quaestia, in the N. T. only in the Book of Acts; often in Greek writers.

Ver. 8. Προερχόμενοι \[ after they were sent forth, deducit, i.e. escorted for a part of the way.\(^1\) Morus and Heinrichs: "rebus ad iter suscipientem cessariis instruct." That, however, must have been suggested by the text, as in Titus iii. 18. The provision with necessaries for the journey understood of itself,\(^2\) but is not contained in the words. — τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, they caused joy by their visit and by their narratives, not only to the Church, but to all.

Vr. 4, 5. Παραδίδοντες (see the critical remarks) denotes, in keeping with the delegation in ver. 3 f., the reception, i.e. the formal receiving of the delegates as such.\(^3\) Observe the prefixing of ἐκκλησία; comp. Phil. i. 1. — τέλης] see on xiv. 27; comp. ὀτέ τεν οἰκίαν, ver. 12. — Ver. 5 belongs to the narratives of Luke, who here records as worthy of remark, that at the very first meeting of the delegates with the church receiving them, the very same thing was maintained by some who rose up in the assembly (ἐξαναστάς).

\(^1\) According to Epiphanius, Haer. 36. Certains is supposed to have been among them.

\(^2\) As Syr. p. has on the margin, and codd. 8. The reading in the text, as a certainly correct gloss, cer. 3. 5. xxiii. 7, 10; Soph. O. R. 634. iv. 30; John iii. 26.

\(^3\) Comp. 3 John 6; Herod. i. 111, vili. 194, 128; Plat. Menex. p. 295 D; Soph. O. C. 1668.

\(^{1}\) Although the travellers, on account of the hospitality of the churches, which they visited by the way, certainly needed but little.

\(^{2}\) Heinrichs.

\(^{3}\) Comp. 3 Macc. iv. 22.
and was opposed (ὅτι) to the narration of Paul and Barnabas διὰ ὁ θεὸς ἐν εἰσορθήσει μετ' αὐτῶν, as had been brought forward by Jews at Antioch and had occasioned this mission. Those mentioned in ver. 1, and those who here came forward, belonged to one and the same party, the Pharisee-Christians, and therefore ver. 5 is unjustly objected to by Schwanbeck. Beza, Piscator, Wakefield, and Heinrichs put ver. 5 into the mouth of the delegates; holding that there is a rapid transition from the oblique to the direct form and that ἔλθον is to be supplied after ἔστασις. δι'. A harsh and arbitrary view, as the change in form of the discourse must naturally and necessarily have been suggested by the words, as in i. 4 and xvii. 3. That the deputation had already stated the object of their mission, was indeed self-evident from ἀπέδρασαν, and hence it was not requisite that Luke should particularly mention it. — αὐτοῖς] namely, the Gentile-Christians, as those to whom the narrative διὰ ὁ θεὸς ἐν εἰσ. μ. αἰρ. had chiefly reference; not that ὅμια διὰ ἢλκων, ver. 2,1 which is erroneously inferred from Gal. ii. — They must be circumcised, etc., has a dictatorial and hierarchical tone.

Ver. 6. The consultation of the apostles and presbyters concerning this assertion (περὶ τοῦ ἔλθον τοῦτον, see ver. 5) thus put forward here afresh, was not confined to themselves — Schwanbeck, who here assumes a confusion of sources — but took place in presence, and with the assistance, of the whole church assembled together, as is evident from ver. 12, comp. with ver. 22, and most clearly from ver. 25, where the ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί, ver. 28, write of themselves: ἠδοξεν ἡμιν γενομένους ὁμοθυμάδον. Against this it has been objected that place would have sufficed to hold them, and therefore it is maintained that only deputies of the church took part; 2 but this is entirely arbitrary, as the text indicates nothing of such a limitation, and the locality is entirely unknown to us. — This assembly and its transactions are not at variance with Gal. ii. 1 ff., in opposition to Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, where, indeed, they are presupposed as known to the readers by αὐτοῖς in ver. 2, as well as by ver. 3 and ver. 5. Hofmann, N. T. I. p. 128, judges otherwise, but by a misinterpretation of Gal. ii. 4 ff. The words κατ' ἱδίαν δὲ τοῖς δικοῖς, Gal. ii. 2, betoken a separate discussion, different from these public discussions 3 (N').

Ver. 7. Πολλὰς δὲ συζήτησις γεγομένης] These were the preliminary debates in the assembly, before Peter, to whom the first word belonged, partly by reason of his apostolic precedence, partly and especially because he was the first to convert the Gentiles, rose up and delivered a connected address. In this previous πολλὰ συζήτησις may have occurred the demand for the circumcision of Titus, indirectly mentioned in Gal. ii. 3. See on Gal. i. c. — αὕτη ἡμερῶν ἀρχαιον does not point to the conversion of Cornelius as to something long since antiquated and forgotten. 4 But certainly that selection of

1 Lekebusch.
4 There is no further mention of Peter in the Book of Acts. — The reference to the conversion of Cornelius is introduced, according to Baur, simply in pursuance of the consistent plan of the author, who makes Peter thus speak after the manner of Paul.
5 Baur, I. p. 91, ed. 2.
Peter as the first converter of the Gentiles, viewed in relation to the entire period, during which Christianity had now existed, dated from ancient days, Acts x. 11. — in ἡμῖν ἐξελέγατο κ.τ.λ. He made choice for Himself among us, that by my mouth, etc. Hence εὑτε is not to be supplied, as Olshausen, following older commentators, holds. Others—Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Heinrichs, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, and many others—unnecessarily take εἰν ἡμῖν for ἡμῖν as a Hebraism in accordance with ἥν ἤγαγεν. ¹ Beza aptly says: “habito inter nos delectu voluisset.” — Luke has the word εἰναγγέλων only here and in xx. 24, not at all in the Gospel. John also has it not.

Vv. 8-10. God who knows the heart, who thus could not be deceived in the matter,³ has, in reference to this their admission effected by my instrumentality into the fellowship of the gospel and of faith (ver. 7), done two things. He has (a) positively borne matter-of-fact witness for them, to their qualification for admission, by His giving to them the Holy Spirit, as to us;³ and (b) negatively, He made in no way distinction between us and them, after He by faith, of which He made them partakers through the gospel, had purified their hearts. God would have made such a distinction, if, after this ethical¹ purification of the heart effected by faith, He had now required of them, for their Christian standing, something else, namely, circumcision and other works of the law; but faith, by which He had morally purified their inner life, was to Him the sole requisite for their Christian standing without distinction, as also with us. Observe on (a), that δός αὐτος κ.τ.λ. is contemporaneus with ἐξαγγέλων, expressing, namely, the mode of it; and on (b), that τ. π. καθαρίσας is previous to the οὕδεν διέκρινε. This is evident from the course of the speech, as the faith must have been already present before the communication of the Spirit.⁴—Ver. 10. Accordingly as the matter now stands (νῦν οὖν). — τι πειράζετε τῶν Θεοῦ;] i.e. why do ye put it to the test, whether God will abandon His attestation of non-observance already given to the Gentiles, or assert His punitive power against human resistance? “Apostrophe ad Pharissios et severus elenchus,” Bengel. — ἐπιθεῖναι with the design to impose, etc. — ζυγὸν comp. Gal. v. 1, and Chrysostom in loc. : τῷ τοῦ ζυγού δύναται τὸ βασιλεία του πράγματος, of the complete observance of the law, αὐτοὶ ἑκάστου. Contrast to this yoke: Matt. xi. 29, 30. — οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν] since the time of Moses.

Ver. 11. Ἀλλὰ A triumphant contrast to the immediately preceding ὁν ὅσιος οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὕτε ἡμῖν ἢσχύνω. βαστ. — διὰ τῆς χάρ. τ. κυρ. 'I.]⁴ Not elsewhere used by Peter. In triumphant contrast to the yoke of the law, it is here placed first.—κατ' ὅν τρόπον κάκεινοι] sc. πιστεύων σωθήναι διὰ τῆς χάρας τοῦ κυρ. 'Ισαοῦ. The εἰκονία are the Gentile-Christians, to whom the whole debate relates. Others, Calvin, Calovius, Wolf, and many older

¹ Sam. xvi. 9, 10; 1 Kings viii. 16; 1 Chron. xxviii. 4, 5; Neh. ix. 7, and the LXX. at those places. So also Ewald.
² Comp. t. 24.
³ Comp. x. 44, xi. 15 ff.
⁴ Weiss, Petr. Lehregr. p. 281, thinks that it is in the ceremonial sense, so that the idea only allusively passes over into that of ethical cleansing. But vās καπίσκει points only to the moral sphere. Comp. Weiss himself, p. 274 f. This moral cleansing presupposes, moreover, the reconciliation appropriated by faith; see 1 Pet. i. 18.
⁵ Comp. xi. 17.
⁶ Comp. Rom. v. 15, i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 2, xiii. 13; Eph. i. 3; Phil. i. 2; 2 Thees. i. 2.
commentators, following Augustine Against Pelagius, make it apply to
παρθενος ήμων. Incorrectly, as the salvation of the Jewish fathers, σωτηρία
is supplied, is quite alien from the question concerning the σωτηρία
of the Gentile-Christians here. But the complete equalization of both
parties is most fitly brought out at the close; after its having been pre-
viously said, they as well as we, it is now said, we as well as they. Thus the
equalizing is formally complete.—That Peter in the doctrine of the right-
eousness of faith was actually as accordant with Paul as he here expresses
himself, is, in opposition to Baur, Schwengler, Hilgenfeld, and Zeller, to be
inferred even from Gal. ii. 15 ff., where Paul acknowledges his and Peter's
common conviction, after he had upbraided the latter, ver. 14 for the
inconsistency of his conduct at Antioch.¹

Ver. 12. The result of this speech was that the whole assembled multi-
tude (πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος) was silent, so that thus a new συζήτησις did not begin
and the agitation of the opponents was set at rest. A happy begin-
ning for the happy issue. Now Barnabas and Paul could without contradiction
confirm the view of Peter by the communication of their own apostolic
experiences among the Gentiles.—Barnabas first, on account of his older
and closer relation to the church. Comp. on ver. 25.—συμεία κ. τιρατον
Comp. generally also Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12, hence so much the less
improbable (Zeller).

Ver. 18. When these had finished speaking (αγγελον), James, not the so-
of Alphaeus, but the brother of the Lord (xii. 17), a strict legalist, and highly
esteemed in Jerusalem as chief leader of the church, delivered his address
having reference to these matters (ἀπεκρίθη). He first confirmed, by his
prophetic testimony, the divine call of the Gentiles brought into promi-
nence by Peter, vv. 18-17, and then made his conciliatory proposal for
the satisfaction of both parties—in concise, but all the more weighty
language (οὐ).

Vv. 14-17. Συμεών] formed after the Hebrew יְשֵׁרָשׁ, while the more
usual Σίμων corresponds to the Rabbinical שׁיָּד. In the Talmud also
both forms of the name are used side by side. Moreover, the original
name of Peter was still the current one in the church of Jerusalem.
We are not to think of any intentional use of it in this passage, that
Peter was not here to be regarded according to his apostolic dignity,
Baumgarten.—ἐπεκρίθη. λαβ. εἰς ἑν. λαόν τοῦ ὅν. αὐτοῦ] he looked to, took
care for, the receiving of the Gentiles a people for His name, i.e. apeople
of God, a people that bore the name of God as their ruler and proprietor.
“Egregium paradoxon,” Bengel.⁴—Ver. 15. τοῦ ὄντος] neuter: and with this,
namely, with this fact expressed by λαβεῖν εἰς ἑνὸν κ. τ. λ., agree, etc.—
kαθὼς γέγραπται] He singles out from the λογί τῶν προφ. a passage, comp.
xx. 85, in conformity with which that agreement takes place, namely,
Amos ix. 11, 12, quoted freely by Luke after the LXX. Amos predi-

¹ Comp. on Gal. i.c.; also Baumgarten, p.
430 f.; Lekebusch, p. 300 ff.
⁴ 2 Pet. i. 1; LXX. Gen. xxix. 38; Luke ii.
25, iii. 50; Acts xiii. 1; Rev. vii. 7.
⁴ 1 Chron. iv. 20.
⁴ Comp. on Luke xxiv. 34.
⁵ Comp. xviii. 10; Rom. ix. 24-25.
the blessed Messianic era, in which not only the Davidic theocracy, fallen into decay by the division of the Kingdom, will be again raised up, ver. 16, but also foreign nations will join themselves to it and be converted to the worship of Jehovah. According to the theocratic character of this prophecy, it has found its Messianic historical fulfilment in the reception of the Gentiles into Christianity, after that thereby the Davidic dominion, in the higher and antitypical sense of the Son of David (Luke i. 32), was re-established. — μετὰ ταῦτα] Hebrew and LXX. : in τῷ ημῖν ἐκείνῳ. The meaning is the same: after the pre-Messianic penal judgments, in the day of the Messianic restoration. — ἀναστάσεως καὶ ἀνοικοδομής] Jehovah had withdrawn from His people; but now He promises by the prophet: I will return and build again the fallen, by desolation, tabernacle of David. Many assume the well-known Hebraism: iterum (בָּאָשָׁה) adiççco. This would only be correct were בָּאָשָׁה in the original; but there stands only דִּיוֹן, and in the LXX. only ἀναστάσιος; and the idea of iterum is very earnestly and emphatically presented by the repetition of ἀνοικοδ. and by ἀναρθ. — τὸν σκηνὴν Δαυὶς] The residence of David, the image of the theocracy, is represented as a torn down and decayed tabernacle, "quia ad magnam tenuitatem res ejus redactae erant," Bengel. — δὲ] not the result, but the design, with which what is promised in ver. 16 is to take place.— οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἄνθρ. i.e. the Gentiles. The LXX., who certainly had before them another reading (יוֹרֵס, נָפָל יָנֵהַ יָדִירָה יָשָׁרָה ...), deviate considerably from the original text, which runs: דִּיוֹן יָהֵיהוֹ רַבָּה יָשָׁרָה ... that they may possess the remainder of Edom; the remainder, for Amaziah had again subdued only a part of it, 2 Kings xiv. 7. As καὶ πάντα ἡ ἐθν. κ.λ. follows, James might have used even these words, as they are in the original, for his object,¹ and therefore no set purpose is to be assumed for his having given them according to the reading of the LXX. Perhaps they were only known to him and remembered in that reading; but possibly also they are only rendered in this form by Luke, or the Greek document used by him, without being so uttered by James, who spoke in Hebrew.— καὶ πάντα ἡ ἐθν. κ.λ. καὶ after οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἄνθρ. is necessarily explicative, and indeed, and the emphasis of this more precise definition lies on πάντα; but the following ἐστις ὁ ὁ οὗτος has an argumentative purpose: they upon whom, i.e. seeing that, indeed, upon all the Gentiles, etc. — ἐστις ὁ οὗτος ἐπικτηλ. τ. ἐν. μου] quite a Hebrew expression: * upon whom (דִּיוֹן יָהֵיהוֹ ... יָשָׁרָה) is named, is uttered as naming them, my name, namely, as the name of their Lord, after whom they are designated, so that they are called "God's people."² They have the name already, inasmuch as the predicted future is conceived as having taken place, and as existing, in the counsel of God; a præteritum propheticum, as in Jas. v. 2, 3. The view, in itself inadmissible, of Hitzig and

² Gesenius, Thes. III. p. 1952.
³ The Greek would say: οἱ κατάλοιποι (or ἐκκλήσιαι) τῷ ἐνομo μων, or оι eκκλήσιαι τῷ ἐνομo μων, or even ἐστις ὁ οὗτος κατάλοιποι τ. ἐν. μων. On ἐστις, to be distinguished from the simple καλεῖν as denoting an accessory naming, comp. especially Herod. viii. 44 (συναγουσίας ... ἐκκλήσιας). Comp. Jas. ii. 7; Deut. xxvii. 10; Isa. lxiii. 19; Jer. xiv. 9; Dan. ix. 19; Bar. ii. 15; 2 Mac. viii. 15.
⁴ Comp. Rom. ix. 25 f.
others: "over whom my name, as that of their conqueror, has been formed," was certainly not that of James. — ἕν' αἰῶνος, is here to be explained not from the Greek use of the repetition of the pronoun, but as imitation of the Hebrew. — ὁ ποιῶν ταύτα γνωστά ἐν' αἰῶνοι Such is to be considered as the original text; the other words, ver. 18, are to be deleted. See the critical remarks. The Lord who does these things, the rebuilding of the theocracy and the conversion of all Gentiles designed by it—known from the beginning. The γνωστά ἐν' αἰῶνος added to the prophetical words are not to be considered as the speaker's own significant gloss accompanying the prophetic saying, for such a gloss would not have been so directly or so curiously added; but as part of the scriptural passage itself. The words must at the time either have belonged to the original text, as it presented itself to James, or to the text of the LXX., as Luke gives it, or to both, as a reading which is now no longer extant; whereas there is now at the conclusion of ver. 11, ἐνας ὀριζόν (LXX.: καθὼς οἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος). — γνωστά, equivalent to γνωστά ὅτα, and therefore without an article. By whom they were known from the beginning, is evident from the context, namely, by God who accomplishes them (ποιῶν) in the fulness of time. He accordingly carries in effect nothing, which has not been from the beginning evident to Him, His consciousness and counsel; how important and sacred must they consequently appear! As Bengel well remarks: "ab aeterno scivit; quare nos debeat us nosum et mirum fugere." Erroneously de Wette renders: what was known of old, through the prophets. Opposed to this is σαρκί, which also means from the very beginning in iii. 21 and Luke i. 75, and how unimportant and superfluous would the thought itself be!

Vv. 19, 20 (29), Ἐγώ. For my part I vote. — παρενοχλεῖν] to trouble them; at their conversion. — ἐπιστεύειν] to address writing to them, that they should abstain—aim of the ἐπιστευεῖν. — ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλατομάτων] may be referred either to τῶν εἰδώλων only, or to all the following particulars. The latter, as ἀπὸ is not repeated with τῆς πορείας, is the more natural: therefore from the pollutions, which are contracted through idols and through fornication, etc. ἀλατομα, from the Alexandrian ἄλατομα, polluer, is a word entirely foreign to the other Greek; therefore Haensch explains it merely in reference to its present connection with τῶν εἰδώλων ἀλατομάτων, τῆς μεταλατομίας τῶν μαραθῶν θυσίων. — τῶν εἰδώλων] What James meant by the general expression, "pollutions of the idols," was known to his hearers, and is evident from ver. 29, where the formally expressed decree required as unambiguous a designation as possible, and therefore εἰδώλων θυσίων is chosen; hence: pollutions occasioned by partaking of the flesh of heathen sacrifices (Ex. xxxiv. 15). The Gentiles were acc...
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tomed to consume so much of the sacrificed animals as was not used for the sacrifice itself and did not belong to the priests, in feasts, in the temple or in their houses, or even to sell it in the shambles. Both modes of partaking of flesh offered in sacrifice, for which the Gentile-Christians had opportunity enough either by invitations on the part of their heathen friends or by the usual practice of purchase, were to be avoided by them as fellowship with idolatry, and thus as polluting Christian sanctity.

- καὶ τὰς πορείας] As in the decree, ver. 29, the same expression is repeated without any more precise definition, and a regulative ordinance, particularly in such an important matter, proceeding from general collegiate deliberation, presupposes nothing but unambiguous and well-known designations of the chief points in question; no other explanation is admissible than that of fornication generally, and accordingly all explanations are to be discarded, which assume either a metaphorical meaning or merely a single form of πορεία; namely: (1) that it denotes figuratively idolatry, and that merely the indirect idolatry, which consists in the partaking of ἱδωλοβιτίων, so that τὰν ἱδωλα and τὰς πορ. form only one point—so, entirely opposed to the order in ver. 29, Beza, Selden, Schleusner; (2) that it is the fornication practised at the heathen festivals, so Morus, Dindorf, Stolz, Heinrichs; (3) that the πορεύμα τοῦ ἑσυχίου is meant, the gains of prostitution offered in sacrifice, Heinsius and Ittig; or (4) the "actus professionis meretriciae, in fornice sanctis viri vel mulieris mercede pacta prostitutae et omnium libidini patentia," Salmasius; or (5) the concubinage common among the Gentiles, Calvin; or (6) the nuptiae intra gradus prohibitos, inceet; or (7) marriage with a heathen husband; or (8) deuterogamy. Bentley has even recourse to conjectural emendation, namely, χορείας or πορείας (swine's flesh). Such expedients are only resorted to, because all the other particulars are not immoral in themselves, but ἀδόξωρα, which only become immoral through the existing circumstances. But the association of πορεία with three adiaphora is to be explained from the then moral corruption of heathenism, by which fornication, regarded from of old with indulgence and even with favour, may, practised without shame even by philosophers, and surrounded by poets with all the tinsel of lasciviousness, had become in public opinion a thing really indifferent. Compare the system of Hetaerae in Corinth,

1 See on 1 Cor. viii. 1; also Hermann, gotteckt. Acter. § xxviii. 29-34.
2 But that the apostles had here in view a saccharization of marriage by the cognizance of approval of the rulers of the church, so that the term of the ecclesiastical nuptial ceremony is to be found here, is very arbitrarily assumed by Lange, apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 185.
3 Lightfoot, comp. Hammond.
4 Gieseier in Staedel in and Tschirner's "Ahr. IV. p. 313; Rainer, I. p. 162, ed. 2; Eichh. alcohol. Kirche, p. 199; Zeller, p. 346; Sepp, and others; also Wieseler, who, however, on Gal. p. 149, takes it generally, and only treats incest as included.
7 That even among the heathen the sinfulness of sexual abuse was recognized (as Hofmann, heil. Schr. N. T. I. p. 131, objects), makes no difference as regards the whole of their moral attitude and tendency. Voices of earnest and thoughtful men in Greece and Rome were raised against all vices. Hofmann attaches to the notion of πορεία a width which the word, as actually used, has not: "Unbridledness of natural sexual conduct, which neither knows nor desires to know
Rome, etc., and the many forms of the worship of Aphrodite in the Greek world.\(^1\) Baumgarten, Ewald, Bleek, Weiss have with reason retained the proper and in the N. T. prevailing literal sense of πορφεῖα. — καὶ τοῦ πυκτοῦ, i.e. the flesh of such beasts as are killed by strangling, strangulation by snare; and the like, and from which the blood is not let out.\(^2\) This is based on Lev. xvii. 13, 14, Deut. xii. 16, 23, according to which the blood was to be let out from every hunted animal strangled, and without this letting out of the blood the flesh was not to be eaten.\(^3\) That the prohibition here refers to Roman epicurism (e.g. to the eating of fowls suffocated in Falernian wine) is very inappropriately assumed by Schneckenburger, especially considering the humble position of most of the Gentile-Christians. — καὶ τοῦ αἵματος denotes generally any partaking of blood, in whatever form it might be found.\(^4\) The prohibition of eating blood, even yet strictly observed by the Jews,\(^5\) is not to be derived from the design of the lawgiver to keep the people at a distance from all idolatry—as is well known, the sacrificing Gentiles ate blood and drank it mingled with wine— or from sanitary considerations, but from the conception expressly set forth in Gen. ix. 6, Lev. xvii. 11, xiii. 14, Deut. xii. 23, 24, that the blood is that which contains "the soul of all flesh." On this also depended the prohibition of things strangled, because the blood was still in them, which, as the vehicle of life, was not to be touched as food, but was to be poured out,\(^7\) and not to be profaned by eating.\(^8\) The very juxtaposition of the two points proves that Cyprian, Tertullian, and others,\(^9\) erroneously explain αίμα of homicidium. With the deep reverence of the Hebrews for the sanctity of blood was essentially connected the idea of blood-sacrifice; and therefore the prohibition of partaking of blood, in respect of its origin and importance—it was accompanied with severe penalties—was very different from the prohibition of unclean animals.\(^10\)

The following general observations are to be made on ver. 20 compared with ver. 29: — 1. The opinion of James and the resolution of the assembly is purely negative; the Gentile brethren were not to be subjected to παρενωπλεία, but they were expected merely ἀπεκθεσθαι, and this from four matters, which according to the common Gentile opinion were regarded as indifferent, but were deeply offensive to the rigidly legal Jewish-Christians. The moral element of these points is here according to the strictness of the Jewish-Christians, between whom and the witnesses in favour of these words.

\(^1\) Comp. Schoettgen in loc.
\(^2\) Lev. iii. 17, vili. 26, xvii. 10. xix. 26; Deut. xii. 16, 23 ff., xv. 33.
\(^3\) Sassenfetz, Mos. R. p. 265 f.
\(^4\) Michaelis, Mos. R. IV. § 305.
\(^5\) Lev. xvi. 13; Deut. xii. 15 ff.
\(^7\) See Wolf in loc.
\(^8\) Comp. also Bähr, Symbol. II. p. 340.
Gentile-Christsans the existing dispute was to be settled, and the fellowship of brotherly intercourse was to be provisionally restored. The Gentile-Christian, for the avoidance of offence towards his Jewish brother, was to abstain as well from that which exhibited the fundamental character of heathenism — pollutions of idols and fornication 1 — as from those things by which, in the intercourse of Christian fellowship, the most important points of the restrictions on food appointed by God for Israel might be prematurely overthrown, to the offence of the Jewish-Christsans. — 2. That precisely these four points are adduced, and neither more nor other, is simply to be explained from the fact, that historically, and according to the experience of that time, next to circumcision these were the stumbling-blocks in ordinary intercourse between the two sections of Christians; and not, as Olshausen and Ebrard, following many older commentators, suppose, 2 from the fact that they were accustomed to be imposed on the proselytes of the gate in the so-called seven precepts of Noah, 3 and that the meaning of the injunction is, that the Gentile-Christsans had no need to become proselytes of righteousness by circumcision, but were only obliged to live as proselytes of the gate, or at least were to regard themselves as placed in a closer relation and fellowship to the Jewish people (Baumgarten). Were this the case, we cannot see why the decree should not have attached itself more precisely and fully to the Noahic precepts, 4 to which not a single one of the four points expressed belonged; and therefore the matter has nothing at all in common with the proselytism of the gate. 5 — 3. That the proposal of James, and the decree drawn up in accordance with it, were to have no permanent force as a rule of conduct, is clear from the entire connection in which it arose. It was called forth by the circumstances of the times; it was to be a compromise as long as these circumstances lasted; but its value as such was extinguished of itself by the cessation of the circumstances—namely, as soon as the strengthening of the Christian spirit, and of the Christian moral freedom of both parties, rendered the provisional regulation superfluous. 6 Therefore Augustine strikingly remarks (e. Manich. 32. 18): "Elegiis mihi videntur pro tempore rem facilem et nequaquam observantibus onerosam in qua cum Israelitsiam gentes propter angularem illum lapidem duos in se condentem aliquid communiter observarent. Transacto vero illo tempore, quo illi duo parietes, unus de circumcisione alter de praeputio venientes, quamvis in angulari lapide concordarent, tamen suis quibusdam proprietatibus distinctius eminebant, ac ubi ecclesia gentium talis effecta est, ut in ea nullus Israelitis carnalis appareat: quis jam hoc Christianus observat, ut turbas vel minutores aviculas non attingat, nisi quorum sanguis effusus est, aut leporem non edat,

1 Comp. on the latter, Rom. 1. 21 ff.
3 See the same in Sanh. 56 a b; Malmoakt, 77. Metach. 9. 1.
4 These forbade: (1) Idolatry; (2) blasphemy; (3) murder; (4) Incest; (5) robbery; (6) disobeidence to magistrates; (7) partaking of flesh cut from living animals.
5 Comp. also Oertel, p. 249; Hofmann, A. Schr. d. N. 77. 1. p. 138 ff.
si manu a cervice percussus nullo cruento vulnere occisus est? Et qui forte pauci tangere icit formidant, a caeteris irritantur, its omnium animos in hac re tenuit sententia veritatis." In contrast to this correct view stand the Canon. apos. 63 (ei τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ἢ διάκονος τοῦ καθαλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ φόνον κρίνει ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, ἢ θηριάλων ὡς θυραμαίον, καθαρεύοντος τοῦ γάρ ὁ νόμος ἀπείρετε. Εἰ δὲ λαῖκος εἰς ἀφορίζειν ὧν, and not less the Clementine Homilies, vii. 4, and many Fathers in Suicer, Thes. 1. p. 113, as also the Concil. Trull. II. Can. 67, and exegetical writers cited in Wolf. It is self-evident withal, that not only the prohibition of πορεία, but also the general moral tenor and fundamental thought of the whole decree, the idea of Christian freedom, to the use of which merely relative limits given in the circumstances, and not an absolute ethical limitation, must be assigned, have permanent validity, such as Paul exhibited in his conduct and teaching. — 4. The Tübingen criticism, finding in Gal. ii. the Archimedean point for its lever, has sought to relegate the whole narrative of the apostolic council and its decree to the unhistorical sphere; because the comparison with Gal. ii. exhibits contradictions, which cause the narrative of the Acts to be recognized as an ironic fiction. It is alleged, namely, that by its incorrect representation the deeply seated difference between the Jewish-Christianity of the original apostles and Paulinism free from the law was to be as much as possible concealed, with a view to promote union. Holtzmann more cautiously weighs the matter, but still expresses doubt. The contradictions, which serve as premisses for the attack upon our narrative, are not really present in Gal. ii. 1 ff. For—and these are the most essential points in the question—in Gal. ii. Paul narrates the matter not in a purely historical interest, but in personal defence of his apostolic authority, and therefore adduces incidents and aspects of what happened at Jerusalem, which do not make it at all necessary historically to exclude our narrative. Moreover, even in Gal. ii. the original apostles are not in principle at variance, but at one, with Paul; as follows from ver. 6, from the reproach of hypocrisy made against Peter, vv. 12, 13, which supposes an agreement in conviction between him and Paul, from the

1 Comp. also the Eriangen Zeitschr. f. Protest. v. K., July 1851, p. 83, where the abstinence from things strangled and from blood is reckoned as a "precipitate on the part of the external Levitical ordinances" to be preserved in the church.


3 Judend. und Christenth. p. 568 ff.


5 Comp. Bleek, Beitr. p. 258 f.
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ἐνυποκρίς ζῆς, ver. 14, and from the speech in common, ver. 16 ff. Further, in Gal. ii. Paul is not contrasted with the original apostles in respect of doctrine, for the circumcision of Titus was not demanded by them, but as regards the field of their operations in reference to the same gospel, ver. 9. By καὶ idem, again, Gal. ii. 2, is meant a private conference,\* which had nothing to do with the transactions of our narrative; nor is the care for the poor determined on, Gal. ii. 10, a matter excluding the definitions of our decree, particularly as Paul only describes an agreement which had been made, not in any sort of public assembly, but merely between him and the three original apostles; the observance of the decree was an independent matter, and was understood of itself. In fine, the absence of any mention of the council and decree in the Pauline Epistles, particularly in the Epistle to the Galatians, and even in the discussion on meats offered in sacrifice, 1 Cor. viii. 10, 23 ff., is completely intelligible from the merely interim nature and purpose of the statute; as well as, on the other hand, from the independence of his apostleship and the freedom of believers from the law, which Paul had to assert more and more after the time of the council in his special apostolic labours, and always to lay greater stress on, in opposition to the Judaism which ever raised itself anew.\* Indeed, the very circumstance that the proposals for the decree proceed from James, is in keeping with his position as the highly respected head of the Jewish-Christians, and is a testimony of his wise moderation, without making him answerable\* for the Judaistic narrowness and strictness of his followers. And there could be the less scruple to consent on the part of Paul, as, in fact, by this henoticicon the non-circumcision of the Gentiles had completely conquered, and he thereby saw the freedom and the truth of the gospel securely established,\* while at the same time the chief vice of heathenism, ἐνομία, was rejected, and the right application of the other three prohibitions, in accordance with the γενεσία and ἀγάπη which his Gospel promoted, was more and more to be expected in confidence on the Lord and His Spirit.\* Ver. 21.\* Ἡδρο] gives the reason why it was indispensable to enjoin this fourfold ἀπαθεματιά—namely, because the preaching of the Mosaic law, taking place from ancient generations in every city every Sabbath day by its being read in the synagogues, would only tend to keep alive the offence which the Jewish-Christians, who still adhered to the synagogue,\* took to their uncircumcised brethren, in view of the complete freedom of the latter from the law, including even these four points.\* These words thus assign

\* See evasions, on account of ἓνυποκρίς, in Schwengler and Baur.
\* Comp. on ver. 6.
\* See on Gal., Introd. § 3.
\* Comp. Jas. i. 25, ii. 12.
\* Gal. ii. 12.
\* Gal. ii. 3 ff.
\* 2 Cor. iii. 17; Rom. viii. 15. See, in addition, on Gal. ii.
\* See Dästerdieck in the Göttingen Monatschr.

1840, p. 268 ff.
10 Lekebusch and Oertel adopt in the main this interpretation, to which Calvin already came very near. Nor is the explanation of Dästerdieck essentially different. Yet he understands ἄγαπη in the sense: he has in his power, holds in subjection, which, however, appears not to be admissible, as not the Jews generally, but the ἐν μισθωτοῖς, are the object.
a ground for the proposal on the score of necessity, corresponding to the ἐπάναγγελες in the decree, ver. 28, and, indeed, of the necessity that there must be, at least so far, accommodation to the Mosaic law. Others: περιττόν τοῖς Ἰουδαϊοῖς ταύτα ἐπιστέλλειν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ταύτα μανθάνονσιν κ.τ.λ., scholiion in Matthæi, Chrysostom, Lyra, and many others, and recently Neander. Out of place, as there was no question at all about an instruction for the Jewish-Christians. Erasmus, Wetstein, Thiersch, and others still more arbitrarily import the idea: "Neque est metuendum, ut Moses proprerae antiquetur," or: it is not to be feared that the Mosaic law generally will be neglected and despised. Still more freely Gieseler reads between the lines what is supposed to be meant: "The Mosaic law already has been so long preached, and yet there are few who submit to embrace it. Now, when the service of the true God is preached without the yoke of the law, many are turning to Him, and it is indisputable that the ceremonial law is the only obstacle to the universal diffusion of true religion." Lange, II. p. 188, likewise imports: "We have nothing further to do. To assert the statutes of Moses is not our office; there are already preachers for that." Similarly Hofmann, who, however, discovers under the words of James the presupposition as self-evident, that Gentiles, if they pleased, might along with the faith embrace also the law of Moses; to those, who wished to become Mosaic, nothing need be said about the law, because they would always have an opportunity to become acquainted with it. As if one could read in such a very important presupposition as self-evident! And as if Paul and Barnabas could have been silent at a proposition so entirely anti-Pauline! Further, we cannot see how what Brenske finds as the meaning, considering the proselytes of the gate as those to whom the κρήσεων took place, is contained in the words: the κρήσεως has the notion of publicity and solemnity, but not of novelty (Brenske), which even passages such as Gal. v. 11, Rom. ii. 21, should have prevented him from assuming. Lastly, Wieseler finds in the words the designed inference: consequently these statutes have for long been not a thing unheard of and burdensome for these Gentiles, because there are among them many proselytes. But even thus the chief points are mentally supplied (F).

Ver. 29. Ἐκλεξαμένως] is not to be taken, with Beza, Er. Schmid, Kuinoel, and others, for ἐκλεξθήτως, as the middle sorist never has a passive signification; on the contrary, the correct explanation is, accusative with the infinitive: after they should have, not had, chosen men from among them, of ἐκεῖ. It is the simple: he has them, they do not fail him.

1 So Grotius and Ewald, p. 472.

2 Thus in substance also Schneckenburger, Zeller, Baumgarten, Hilgenfeld. Particularly ingenious, but importing what is not in the text, is the view of Bengel: "Prophetas citavt, non Moen, cujus consensus est aperiotor," holding that James had Deut. xxxii. 21 in view.

3 In Studia u. Teubner's Archiv. f. Kirchengesch. IV. p. 312. Bear, ed. 1, also adopted the explanation of Gieseler. But in the second edition, I. p. 187, he interprets it as if James wished to say: "a worship so ancient as the Mosaic is perfectly entitled to such a demand." This, however, is in no way contained in the words, in which, on the contrary, the point is the ancient preaching and the constant reading.

4 Schrfliewe. II. 2. p. 41.


6 On Gal. ii. 11 ff., p. 148.

7 Comp. ver. 40.
to send them, i.e. to choose and to send men.—Nothing further is known of Judas Barsabas, whom Grotius and Wolf consider as a brother of Joseph Barsabas, i. 23. Ewald considers him as identical with the person named in x. 23. Concerning Silas, i.e. Silvanus, the apostolic companion of Paul on his journeys in Asia Minor and Greece, see Cellar. de Sila viro apost., Jena, 1773; Leyer in Herzog's Enceycl. XIV. p. 869. These two men, who were of the first rank and influence among the Christians, were sent to Antioch to give further oral explanation, ver. 27.

Vv. 23, 24. Γράφωντες while they wrote, should properly agree in case with εἰλεξαμένοις. Anaclitithia in carrying out the construction by participles is frequent; here it conforms to the logical subject of ἐδοξεῖ τοῖς κ.τ.λ. διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν so that they were to be the bearers of the letter. As the letter was directed not only to Antioch and to Syria, whose capital and chief church was Antioch, but also to Cilicia, we are to infer that in this province also similar dissensions between Jewish and Gentile Christians had taken place, and had come to the knowledge of the apostolic assembly.—The genuineness of the letter is supported as well by its whole form—which, with all distinctness as to the things forbidden, the designation of which is repeated exactly in xxi. 25, yet has otherwise so little official circumstantiality, that it evidently appears intended to be orally supplemented as regards the particulars—as also by the natural supposition that this important piece of writing would soon be circulated in many copies (xxi. 25), and therefore might easily, in an authentic form, pass into the collection of Luke's sources.—καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι i.e. the whole church, ver. 22 (q).—Χαίρειν] the well-known epistolary salutation of the Greeks. The letter addressed to Greek Christians was certainly written in Greek. But that it was actually composed by James does not follow at least from Jas. i. 1, although it is in itself possible, and indeed from his position in Jerusalem even probable. The similarity in the expression of the decree with Luke i. 1, does not justify us in doubting the originality of that expression, as the subdivision in the protasis and apodosis was very natural, and the use of ἐδοξεῖ almost necessary.—ἀνασκευάζοντες destroying, subverting, elsewhere neither in the N. T. nor in the LXX. and Apocrypha. Without δεῖν because in λέγω the sense of commanding is implied. The τρίης τ. νόμου is the ζυγός, ver. 10, which was imposed with circumcision, Gal. v. 3. And the νόμος is the whole law, not merely the ceremonial part.—οἷς oii diastel. So arbitrarily had they acted.

1 Comp. Vulg., and see Kypke, II. p. 73; Winer, p. 290 (E. T. 319 f.).
2 See on 2 Cor. i. 19.
3 xcvii. 4, x. 14 f., xxviii. 5, also 1 Pet. v. 12.
5 See Bernhardy, p. 463; Winer, p. 297 (E. T. 709); also Pangerk, ad Eur. Hec. 970.
6 According to Schwanbeck, the letter is derived from the "Memoria of Silas," In this view, of course, it must be assumed that ἐποιεῖ γένομαι, ver. 29, did not stand in the text at all, or not here.
9 Schwegler, Zeller.
10 But see Xen. Cyr. vi. 2. 25; Polyb. lx. 31. 6, lx. 32. 8; Dem. 895. 5. "Non parcum ilia, qui dubitationes invexerant," Bengel.
11 Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. v. 7. 34. Comp. on xiv. 14.
Vv. 25-28. Γενομένως ὁμοθυμανός] after we had become unanimous. Thus it was not a mere majority of voices: "non parum ponderis additis decreta concors sententia," Grotius. On γενομένως with an adverb in the sense of a predicate, see Bernhardy, p. 887. Comp. on John i. 15. — Βαρνάβας κ. Παύλου. This order, after chap. xiii. almost always regarded by Bleek as a proof of fidelity to the documentary source. The placing of Barnabas first was very natural to the apostles and to the church in Jerusalem, on the ground of the older apostolic position of the man who in fact first introduced Paul himself to the apostles. Also at xiv. 14, xv. 12, this precedence has its ground in the nature of the circumstances. — αὐτάρκος κ. τ. λ. men who have given up, exposed to the danger of death, their soul for the name, for its glorification, v. 41, of our Lord Jesus Christ. παραδίδοντες τοὺς ψυχὰς, the opposite of δεξιόν σώοιτε τ. ψυχὰς, Luke ix. 24, is not to be identified with τιθέναι τ. ψ., and the two are not to be explained from the Hebrew παρεῖναι, in opposition to Grotius, Kuinoel, Olshausen. The purpose of these words of commendation is the attestation of the complete confidence of the assembly in the Christian fidelity, proved by such love to Christ, of the two men who had been sent from Antioch, and who perhaps had been slandered by the Judaistic party as egotistic falsifiers of the gospel. Comp. Grotius. — καὶ αὐτοῖς κ. τ. λ.] who also themselves, i.e. in person, along with this our written communication, make known the same thing orally. — αὐτὰρ κ. τ. λ.] stands not for the future, against Grotius, Hammond, Heinrichi, Kuinoel, but realizes as present the time when Judas and Silas deliver the letter and add their oral report. — τὰ αὐτὰ] namely, what we here inform you of by letter. Neander takes it otherwise: the same, that Barnabas and Paul have preached to you, namely, that faith in the Redeemer, even "without the observance of the law, suffices," etc. Against this view διὰ λόγου is decisive, by which τὰ αὐτὰ necessarily retains its reference to what was communicated by letter. — τοῖς ἄγιοι πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν] The agreement of the personal activity of the advisers themselves with the illuminating and confirming influence of the Holy Spirit experienced by them when advising. Comp. v. 32. Well does Calovius remark: "Conjugatur causa principalis et ministerialis decreti." Olshausen supposes that it is equivalent to τοῖς ἄγιοι πν. ἐν ἡμῖν. Just as arbitrarily and erroneously, Grotius, Piscator, and many others hold that there is here a ἐν διὰ ὀνομ. nobis per Sp. St. Neander, through the Holy Spirit we also, like Paul and Barnabas, have arrived at the perception. To this is opposed ἐδοξεῖ, which, in accordance with ver. 22, must necessarily denote the determination of the council, and therefore forbid the reference of the καὶ ἡμῖν to Paul and Barnabas, which reference, at an earlier rate, see before on τὰ αὐτὰ, is remote from the context. — ἡμῖν] includes, according to vv. 22, 28, also the church, to which, of course, Bellarmin and

1 Comp. Plat. Prod. p. 513 C.
2 See on John x. 11.
3 According to Zeller, p. 246, these commendatory words are calculated by the author for his readers, as indeed the whole book is held to be only a letter of commendation for Paul.
4 διὰ λόγου, see Raphel, Polyb.
5 Ewald, p. 475, appropriately remarks: "The mention of the Holy Spirit, ver. 28, the most primitive Christian thing imaginable."
other Catholics concede only the consensus tacitus.\(^1\) — τά ἐπάνωγις the things necessary.\(^3\) The conjectural emendations, ἐν ἄγανγος\(^8\) and ἐν ἄγάνως,\(^9\) are wholly unnecessary. That ἐπάνωγις\(^6\) is an adverb, see in Schaefer.\(^8\)

The necessity here meant is not a necessity for salvation (Zeller), but a necessity conditioned by the circumstances of the time. See on ver. 20 f.

Ver. 29. The points mentioned in ver. 20 are here arranged more accurately, so that the three which refer to food are placed together. — ἀπε-χερεῖα is in ver. 20, as in 1 Thess. iv. 8, v. 29, Ecclus. xxviii. 8, and frequently in the LXX., joined with ἀπε-; but here, as usually among Greek writers, only with the genitive. The two differ "non quod rem ipsam, sed modo cogitandi, ita ut in priori formula sejunctionis cogitatio ad rem, in posteriori autem ad nos ipsos referatur."\(^7\) — ἐξ ὧν διατριστοῦ ἐκατονάς] from which, i.e., at a distance from, without fellowship with them, ye carefully keeping yourselves.\(^8\) — καὶ πράξετε not: ye shall do well — so usually, also de Wette, comp. x. 33 — but, as also Hofmann interprets it according to the usus loquentis,\(^7\) ye shall fare well, namely, by peace and unity in Christian fellowship. Quite incorrectly, Elsner, Wolf, Krebes, Kuinoel have understood the meaning as equivalent to σωθεσθε, which egregiously and injudiciously mistakes the apostolic spirit, that had nothing in common with the εἰ διανοεῖται σωθήναι of the strict legalists. — ἐρμόσει] the epistolary salutation.

Vv. 31, 32. 'Επεὶ τῇ παρακλήσει] for the consolation, which the contents of the letter granted to them. They now saw Christian liberty protected and secured, where the abrupt demand of the Jewish-Christians had formerly excited so much anxiety. The meaning cohortatio, arousing address,\(^1\) is less suitable to the contents of the letter and to the threatening situation in which they had been placed. — καὶ αὐτοί is to be explained in keeping with ver. 27; and so to be connected, not, as is usually done, with προφ. ἰς, as they also, as well as Paul and Barnabas, were prophets, but with διὰ λόγον π. παρεκάλω. κ.τ.λ. Judas and Silas also personally, as the letter by writing, comforted and strengthened the brethren by much discourse, which they could the more do, since they were prophets.\(^9\) The παρεκάλεσαν must be interpreted like παρακλησε, and so not cohortabuntur, as usually.\(^9\)

Vv. 33–35. Ποιοῦν χρόνον] to spend a time.\(^1\) — μετ' εἰρήνης] i.e. so that welfare (ὑπὲρ) was bidden to accompany them, amidst good wishes. A refer-
ence to the formula of parting: πορείαν ου ὑπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην, or εν εἰρήνῃ — The καί between διόδακ κ. and εναγγ. 6 is expository. — τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου.] see on viii. 25. — At this period, ver. 35, occurs the encounter of Paul with Peter (Gal. ii. 11 ff.) The quite summary statement, ver. 35, makes the non-mention of this particular incident intelligible enough, and therefore there is no reason for the fiction that Luke desired, by the narrative of the strife between Paul and Barnabas, 6 merely to mask the far more important difference between him and Peter. 4 This passing and temporary offence had its importance in the special interest of the Epistle to the Galatians, but not in the general historical interest of Luke, which was concerned, on the other hand, with the separation of Paul and Barnabas and of their working. The objections of Wieseler to the assumed coincidence of time 7 have little weight. In particular, the indefinite statements of time, vv. 33, 35, 36, allow space enough. — As to the spuriousness of ver. 34, see on ver. 40 (a').

Ver. 36. Δῆ] see on xiii. 2. — ἐν αἷς because πᾶσιν πόλιν contains a distributive plurality. 6 — πάς ἔχοντι] how their state is, their internal and external Christian condition. The reference to ἐμπασκίνη τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς depends on a well-known attraction. Moreover, Bengel well remarks that πάς ἔχοντι is the nervus visitationis ecclesiasticae.

(s'.) Vv. 38, 39. But Paul judged it not right 8 to take with them this one who had fallen away from them from Pamphylia, etc. 6 Observe the μὴ συμπαραλαβεῖν standing in sharp opposition to the συμπαραλαβεῖν of ver. 37, and the τῶν σημαίνει that the decisive rejection which Paul founded on this falling away, even in opposition to the highly esteemed Barnabas, who did not wish to discard his cousin, 6 proves that the matter was not without grave fault on the part of Mark. Pickleness in the service of Christ 9 was to Paul's bold and decided strength of character and firmness in his vocation the foreign element, with which he could not enter into any union either abstractly or for the sake of public example. — This separation was beneficial for the church, because Barnabas now chose a sphere of operation for himself. Ver. 39; 1 Cor. ix. 6. And as to Mark, certainly both the severity of Paul and the kind reception given to him by Barnabas were alike beneficial for his ministerial fidelity, Col. iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 11. Τό μὲν γάρ Παῦλου φαβερὸν ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ τὸ δῆ Βαρνάβα χρηστὸν ἐποίη μηχανέ ἀπολύμφηνα. Ὡσα μάχονται μὲν, ἀρα ἐν δῆ τέλος ἄπαντα τῷ πέροι (Chrysos-
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tom). — παραξιωμός] a vaspiration. The expression is purposely chosen; it was σικ ξυπρα υμετ φιλονεκία (Chrysostom). But the thing itself had its ground in the ἀνθρώπινη ἀδιανία according to its relation to the difference of the character confronting it, οἵ γάρ ἔχειν λίθον ἡ ζηλος, Chrysostom.

Vv. 40, 41. Ἐπιλεξαμενος Σιλαν] after he had chosen Silas as his apostolic companion. It is accordingly to be assumed that Silas, ver. 27, after he had returned to Jerusalem, ver. 38, and had along with Judas given an account of the result of their mission, had in the meantime returned to Antioch. But the interpolation, ver. 34 (see the critical remarks), is incorrect, as the return of Silas to Jerusalem was a necessary exigency of the commission which he had received. ἐπιλέξαμεν, in the sense sibi eligere, only here in the N. T.; often in Greek writers, the LXX., and Apocr. — παραδοθ. τῇ χάρ. τ. Κυρίου] committed to the grace of Christ (see the critical remarks). Comp. ver. 11. Not different in substance from xiv. 36, but here expressed according to a more specifically Christian form. Moreover, the notice, compared with ver. 39, leads us to infer, with great probability, that the church of Antioch in the dispute before us was on the side of Paul. — τῶν Συρ. κ. Κιλικ.] as Barnabas, ver. 39, so Paul also betook himself to his native country; from their native countries the two began their new, and henceforth for ever separated, missionary labours. Barnabas is unjustly reproached, by Baumgarten, with repairing to his own country, instead of to the wide fields of heathenism; in point of fact, we know not the further course which he adopted for his labours.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(α) Except ye be circumcised. V. 1.

These words introduce one of the most exciting and important controversies in the history of the Christian Church—the first famous controversy, which threatened the disruption of the church into two sections—a Jewish and a Gentile Church—or, as Meyer designates them, Pharisaic Christians and Gentile Christians. The only other topics of equal moment which have arisen are the doctrine of the Trinity, which shook the church to its foundation in the fourth century—a question concerning the person of Christ; and the doctrine of justification by faith, which was the grand central truth of the Protestant Reformation—a question concerning the work of Christ. The question which so early and so long agitated the primitive church was whether the law of circumcision was still obligatory or abrogated? whether it was necessary to require all to enter the church through the gate of Judaism? or, regarding these rites as superseded by a new dispensation, to open the door for all who simply believed on the Lord Jesus. The conservative party held that circumcision was a divine ordinance, and asked by what authority these new teachers set aside or changed what God had established? Not only did they make circumcision a condition of church communion, but excluded the uncircumcised from the hope of salvation. So that the real question at issue between the disputants

1 Dem. 1105. 34.; Deut. xxix. 28; Jer. xxxii. 87.
was whether Christianity should be confined to the narrowness of a Jewish sect, or be propagated as the religion of the world?—the distinction, in that respect, between Jew and Gentile being forever done away.

The Judaizing teachers declared that it was necessary for the Gentiles "to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses." Paul and Barnabas asserted this was directly opposed to the principles of the Gospel—that the true Christian doctrine is, "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, and that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The controversy waxed warm at Antioch, and, as the church at Jerusalem was the mother church, and many of the apostles were there, the congregations desired to know what was the view of the question entertained there; so a deputation of inquiry was sent. Paul and Barnabas, and Titus also (Gal. ii. 1), were of embassy.

(On) Apostles and elders. V. 6.

We know not how many of the apostles were present. Peter, John, James the Lord's brother, and probably others were there; as were also Barnabas, Silas, Titus, and Jude. With the apostles and elders gathered the brethren for counsel, and the decision arrived at was announced in the name of all. After some preliminary and exciting discussions, Peter arose and addressed the assembly. Partly on account of his age and eminent position, and partly because he first admitted the Gentiles to the church without circumcision, he speaks first. His position was one of authority, but not of primacy. And his authority was that of personal character and practical experience, nothing more. In his cogent and conclusive address Peter shows that the question had already been decided by God himself, since by the effusion of his Spirit he had manifested his acceptance of the Gentiles. Now therefore why tempt ye God? Seeing that we all believe that Jew and Gentile alike are saved by the grace of God through faith in Christ Jesus, it is neither reasonable, nor in harmony with the will of God, to fetter that grace with superfluous and vexatious conditions. "The Spirit of God, through the apostle, now put an end to 'much disputing,' and the decisive reply derived from God's testimony has been made perceptible to all." (Stier.) All the assembly kept silent and listened to the account given them by Barnabas and Paul of the wonders of divine grace among the Gentiles.

(On) James answered. V. 13.

"We, as many others, consider that this James was not the apostle James the son of Alpheus, but James the brother of the Lord, who was not one of the twelve, but was regarded the head of the church at Jerusalem, mentioned in xii. 17, and Gal. ii. 9." (Stier.) See also note on i. 14. It is generally supposed that he was president of the council. He was, at least, the one to speak, and delivered the judgment of the assembly. He is spoken of in ecclesiastical history as bishop of Jerusalem, and also as a legalist or strict adherent of the Mosaic law. In his address he confirms all that Peter had said and shows from prophecy that God had a purpose of mercy toward the Gentiles; and to insist on making a partial and temporary ritual a condition
church membership was an attempt to frustrate the purposes of God. For his part, he was prepared to admit the Gentiles, even in uncircumcision. His opinion would carry great weight, both from his reputed sanctity and sagacity, but also from his well-known Hebrew sympathies. He proposed that the Gentiles should not be troubled on the question of circumcision, but simply enjoined to abstain from certain things, which were either indifferent in themselves, or immoral, and therefore to be avoided. The great end sought in this deliverance which was adopted by the assembly was the reconciliation of the Gentile parties and the peace of the church. "The true meaning appears to be that the Gentiles should abstain from these things in order to avoid giving offence to the Jews; for in every city the law is preached every Sabbath, and these matters are brought prominently forward; and thus, unless there be an abstinence from these particulars, the preaching of the law would perpetuate the offence of the Jewish to the Gentile Christians. In order, then, to maintain peace, let the Gentile Christians abstain from those actions which are regarded by the Jews as causing pollution." (Gloag.) These are substantially the views of Meyer presented in the text. And Alford says: "Living, as the Gentile converts would be, in the presence of Jewish Christians who heard those Mosaic prohibitions read, as they had been from generations past, in their synagogues, it would be well for them to avoid all such conduct and habits as would give unnecessary offense."

(xv) Paul's visits to Jerusalem. V. 21.

In the Acts five visits of Paul to Jerusalem are mentioned—ix. 26, xi. 30, vi. 4, xviii. 22, and xxi. 15. In the Epistle to the Galatians two visits are mentioned—Gal. i. 18 and ii. 1. The first in each case is clearly identical. There are, however, different opinions as to the second referred to in the Epistle. All admit it cannot be either the first or the fifth mentioned in the Acts. Some suppose Paul to have made a visit which is not recorded in Luke's narrative—possibly, but not probable. Others think that in the Epistle reference is made to the second visit. But the date—fourteen years after his conversion—precludes the possibility of that conjecture being correct. The fourth visit has also its advocates, but their arguments are not at all clear or satisfactory.

It is almost certain that in the Epistle the apostle refers to this visit to the council, as Meyer indicates. The result of the whole discussion is thus stated by Conybeare: "If the Galatian visit be mentioned at all in the Acts, it must be identical with the visit at which the (so-called) council took place." "The Galatian visit could not have happened before the third visit; because, if so, the apostles at Jerusalem had already granted to Paul and Barnabas the liberty which was sought for the εὐαγγελιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας; therefore there would have been no need for the church to send them again to Jerusalem upon the same cause. And, again, the Galatian visit could not have happened after the third; because almost immediately after that period Paul and Barnabas ceased to work together as missionaries to the Gentiles; whereas, up to the time of the Galatian visit they had been working together." This conclusion is clear and satisfactory, and is adopted not only by Meyer, but by many able commentators.
The word used means to rejoice or be glad. It is only found elsewhere in N. T., James i. 1. As this letter was, in all probability, either written or dictated by James, this coincidence certainly suggests that he also wrote the Epistle that bears his name. The letter written and sent to the churches was of the nature of a compromise, framed with great sagacity and foresight as a concordat between the contending parties. The advocates of freedom would be satisfied, because circumcision and the rites of the Mosaic law were not to be insisted on; the other party, influenced by the discussion, and specially by the speeches of James and of Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, would accept the allowance made to their scruples in other matters. But their acquiescence in the decision was only temporary. They did not relinquish their opinions, and were soon more active than ever in disseminating them. They followed Paul everywhere; and to the end of his life he maintained a fearless and forceful protest against their persistent attempts to infringe the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free. "The decision of the council at Jerusalem was a great step in advance. Had it been otherwise, had they decided that circumcision and the observance of the law of Moses were necessary, the progress of Christianity would have been impeded. But now Gentile Christianity could be freely propagated without let or hindrance: all the obstacles which stood in the way of its diffusion were removed, and the apostolic church was delivered from legal bondage. We see the immediate effects of this decision in the joy and confidence which the reading of the decree imparted to the Christians at Antioch, and in the great success of Paul in his second missionary journey. The triumph of the free Christian over the Judaizing party was one great element in the success of the Gospel." (Gloag.)

This verse is wanting in the best mss. See critical notes by Meyer, who characterizes the verse as spurious. Alford says: "On every account it is probable that the words forming this verse in the received version are an interpolation. Bloomfield writes: "This verse is omitted in several mss. and versions, and rejected" by many. Hackett says: "Griesbach, Lachman, Tischendorf, and others strike out this verse. Most of the mss. omit it or read it variously. It is a gloss probably, supposed to be required by verse 40." Gloag says: "Verse 34 is considered by the best critics as an interpolation, designed to account for the presence of Silas in Antioch." There is no difficulty, but even the highest propriety, in supposing that Silas first went to Jerusalem to make his report, and then returned to Antioch, of his own accord or at Paul's desire. This verse is omitted in the revised version.

They could not agree about the character of Mark and his fitness to accompany them on their missionary tour. Barnabas, influenced by the kindness and generosity of his disposition, and by his natural affection for Mark, as his sister's son, was disposed to take Mark; but Paul, viewing the matter, not on
my personal grounds, and constitutionally intolerant of vacillation or weakness, thought it was not right or fitting to take with them one who had previously been guilty of a serious dereliction of duty in leaving them and the work several years before. Barnabas insisted; Paul would not yield; and so they agreed to part. In this dispute both doubtless were at fault; both were angry and under undue excitement; nor is it ours to determine how far each was to be blamed, or which should be most censured. Nor need we inquire "whether Paul was chargeable with undue severity or Barnabas with nepotism, or both, or neither, all which alternatives have been maintained." The contention or paroxysm was of short duration, and produced no lasting effects on the mutual relations of the three men concerned. The warmth of their previous friendship, commenced probably in boyhood, fostered by mutual acts of kindness, and confirmed by common labors and dangers, made the breach between them all the more painful. This variance, however, did not in any degree diminish their zeal in their work, or permanently affect their regard for each other; and it was overruled for the wider diffusion of the Gospel. Paul took Silas and went his way; Barnabas took Mark and went his. But, as Alford observes: "It seems as if there were a considerable difference in the character of their setting out. Barnabas appears to have gone with his nephew without any special sympathy or approval; whereas Paul was commended to the grace of God by the assembled church." Too much, however, may be inferred from the seeming difference, as Luke had no occasion to speak particularly of the departure of Barnabas and Mark. Barnabas henceforth disappears from the narrative of Luke altogether. But Paul in his Epistles speaks of him with the highest respect and affection; he also afterwards commends Mark, mentions him among the number of his fellow-laborers, and in his last letter to Timothy, the last he wrote, he expresses a wish to have Mark with him, as one who was profitable to him for the ministry (1 Cor. ix. 6, Gal. ii. 9, Col. iv. 10, Philemon 24, and 2 Tim. iv. 11). Taylor says: "These allusions, after all that had occurred, are equally creditable to both parties. They show that Mark had grown steady and brave, and was not above ministering to Paul; and they prove that Paul was not so soon as to keep up an old grudge, when all that caused it had been perfectly removed." The fact that the dispute with Peter had occurred just before this, and that even Barnabas had been carried away with the temporizing spirit, may have had some influence on the mind of Paul. Stier favors Paul in this sad matter, as does also Calvin; Renan takes the part of Barnabas very strongly, and accuses Paul of pride, love of pre-eminence, and ingratitude. "Barnabas," says he, "had not Paul's genius, but who can say whether in the true hierarchy of souls, which is regulated by the degree of goodness, he would not occupy a more elevated rank?"
CHAPTER XVI.

Ver. 1. After γνωσάσθας Elz. has τινος, which is decidedly spurious according to the evidence. — Ver. 3. τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, δι’ Ἑλλ. ὑπὲρχειν] Lachm. reads δι’ Ἑλλην ὥς πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρχειν, according to A B C Μ, min. Rightly; the Recepta is a mechanical or designed transposition into the usual mode of expression by attraction. If the reading of Lachm. were a resolution of the attraction, Ἑλλην would not have been placed first. — Ver. 6. διελθόντες] A C D E Μ, min. and several vss. and Fathers have διήλθουν, and in ver. 7 for the most part δὲ after ἐλθόντες. Both are adopted by Lachm. and Born. This attestation of this reading is preponderating, that it cannot be held as an emendation to avoid the recurrence of participial clauses. The Recepta, on the contrary, appears to have risen because of a wish to indicate that the hinderance of the Spirit took place only after passing through Phrygia and Galatia, which appeared necessary if Ασίας was understood in too wide a sense. The reading of the Vulg. presents another corresponding attempt, "transseuntes autem ... velati sunt." — Ver. 7. εἰς τ. Β.] Elz. has κατὰ τ. Β. against decisive evidence. Either a mere error of a抄ist after the preceding κατὰ, or an intentional interpretation). — Ισχοῦ] is wanting in Elz., but supported by decisive evidence. If only πνεῦμα were original, the gloss added would not have been Ισχοῦ (for τω. Ισχοῦ is not elsewhere found in the N. T.) but, from the preceding, τὸ ἄγνωστον. — Ver. 9. The order best attested and therefore to be adopted is: ἀνὴρ Μακεδών τοῖς ἑν. So Lachm., also Tisch. and Born. The latter, however, has deleted ἑν according to too weak evidence (it was superfluous), and, moreover, has in accordance with D adopted εἰς ὁράματι. ... ὁ θεός ἀπεκτενίζεσθαι κ. ν. λ., an explanatory gloss, as also are the words κατὰ πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ added after ἑστῶς (Born.). — Ver. 10. ὁ Κύριος] A B C E Μ, min. Const. and Vulg. Jer. have ὁ Θεὸς. Recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. and Born. The Recepta is a gloss in accordance with ver. 7 (πνεῦμα Ισχοῦ), comp. xiii. 31 or written on the margin in accordance with ii. 39. — Ver. 13. πύλης] Approved already by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. instead of the usual πόλεως, against which A B C D Μ, min. Const. Sahid. Vulg. Cant. witness. τὸ πύλης was written by the side of τῆς πύλης as a gloss (as some vss. have still τ. πύλης τ. πόλεως), and then supplanted the original. — ινομίζεται προσεύχεται] A B C Μ, loth. 13, 40. Const. Aeth. have ινομίζομεν προσεύχεται. So Lachm. An alteration, because the reading of the text was not understood. From the same misunderstanding the reading in D, Epiph. ἤδεικνυ τρεῖς προσεύχεται (so Born.) arose, and the translation of the Vulg., "ubi videbatur oratio esse." — Ver. 16. τῆς προσευχῆς] In Elz. the article is wanting, but is supported by preponderating evidence and by its necessity (ver. 13). — Πολύων] A B C* D (?) Μ, loth. 32. Vulg. Cant. and some Fathers have πολύων. Adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. Correctly; the accusative, not understood, was changed for the genitive as the more intelligible case, which was well known to the transcribers with πνεῦμα (comp. especially, Luke iv, 33). — Ver. 17. Instead of the second ἡμίν, Tisch
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Born, have ὑμῖν, contrary to A C G H, min. vss. and Fathers. But ἡμῖν appeared less suitable, especially as a demoniacal spirit spoke from the πατίνη.

—Ver. 24. Instead of εἰληφῶς read, with Lachm. and Born., λαβῶν on decisive evidence. —Ver. 31. Χαίραυν] is with Lachm. and Tisch. to be deleted as a usual addition (comp. on xv. 11), on the authority of A B C, min. Copt. Vulg. Lucif. —Ver. 32. καὶ πᾶσιν A B C D E, min. Vulg. Cant. Lucif. have σὺν πᾶσιν. Approved by Grieseb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The καὶ easily crept in, because it has the dative πᾶσι τοῖς remained, and because καὶ ὁ οἰκός σου (ver. 31) proceed. —Ver. 34. ἡγαλλιώσατο C* (?) D, min. Chrys. Oec. Theo- phyl. have ἡγαλλιάτω. Approved by Grieseb. and adopted by Born. and Tisch. With this weak attestation it is to be regarded as an easily committed error of a transcriber. —Ver. 39. ἐξελθεῖν τῆς πόλ.] Lachm. and Tisch. read ἐπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλ., according to A B C, min. A more definite and precise statement. —Ver. 40. ἐπός] Elz. has εἰς against decisive evidence.

Vv. 1, 2. Δέρβης κ. Λύστρ.] See on xiv. 6. — ἐκεῖ] does not refer to both cities, as Otto, Pastorallor. p. 58, strangely assumes, but to the last named, Lysitra. Here Timothy, whose conversion by Paul is to be referred to xiv. 6 f., was at that time residing (ὅν ἐκεῖ); probably it was also his native place, as may be inferred from ver. 2 (ἐμαρτυρεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Δίστροις) compared with ver. 3 (γίνεσα γὰρ ἀπαντεῖς κ.τ.λ.). Usually, even by Olshausen and Neander, but not by de Wette and Baumgarten, Timothy is supposed to be a native of Dorbe, on account of Acts xx. 4; εἰς is referred to Δέρβην, very arbitrarily, and ver. 2 is explained to mean that, besides the presupposed good report of his native city, Timothy had also the good report of the neighbouring cities of Lysitra and Iconium; a very forced explanation, which Theophilus and the other first readers certainly did not hit upon! — γνωσ. Ἰουδ. ἱστ. The name of this Jewish-Christian was Eunice. Ἰουνιάς is the adjective, John iii. 22, as also Ἐλληνος and Μακεδόν, ver. 9. Whether the father was a pure Gentile or a proselyte of the gate, the language employed and the lack of other information leave entirely undecided. — ἐμαρτυρ.] as in vi. 8. — Ἰκωνίω: see on xiii. 51. What were the peculiar circumstances, which had made Timothy honourably known in Iconium as well as in the place of his birth, we do not know.

Ver. 3. Apart from his superior personal qualifications, fostered by a pious education, Timothy was also well adapted to be the coadjutor of the apostle from the peculiar external relation in which he stood as belonging by parentage both to the Jewish and to the Gentile Christians. — λαβῶν πρώτοτοι he took and circumcised. There is no reason whatever to suppose that Paul should not have himself performed this act, which might in fact be done by any Israelite. — διὰ τοῦτο Ἰουνιῶν, namely, to avoid the offence which the Jews in the region of Lysitra and Iconium would have taken, had Paul associated with himself one who was uncircumcised to go forth

1 With this Köhler also agrees in Herzog's Enzykl. XVI. p. 168; Huther and Wiesinger leave it undecided; but Wieseler, p. 25 f., endeavours to uphold the usual view. But see on xx. 4.

2 But see remarks on that passage.

3 See 2 Tim. i. 5.

4 See on xi. 90.

5 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15.

6 Comp. on Luke i. 59.
(ἐξελθὼν) as his colleague in proclaiming the Messianic salvation. Paul acted thus according to the principle of wise and conciliatory accommodation,¹ and not out of concession to the Judaistic dogma of the necessity of circumcision for obtaining the Messianic salvation.² He acted thus in order to leave no cause of offence at his work among the yet unconverted Jews of that region, and not to please Christian Judaists, to whom, if they had demanded the circumcision of Timothy, as they did that of Titus at Jerusalem,³ he would as little have yielded as he did in the case of Titus. This entirely non-dogmatic motive for the measure, which was neither demanded by others nor yet took place with a view to Timothy's own salvation or to the necessity of circumcision for salvation generally, removes it from all contradiction either with the apostolic decree, xv. 29, or with Gal. ii. 8; for in the case of Titus circumcision was demanded by others against his will, and that on the ground of dogmatic assertion, and so Paul could not allow that to be done on Titus,⁴ which he himself performed on Timothy. This we remark in opposition to Baur and Zeller, who attack our narrative as unhistorical, because it stands radically at variance with the apostle's principles and character, so that it belongs "to the absolutely incredible element in the Book of Acts." ⁵ Chrysostom has hit in the main on the correct interpretation: οὐδὲν Παύλου συνετέχερον ὅσον πάντα πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἔως... περιτέμεν ἵνα περιτυμήν καθιλῇ. But the canon insisted on in the Talmud: partus sequitur ventrem,⁶ can hardly have been taken into consideration by the apostle,⁷ because Timothy was already a Christian, and thus beyond the stage of Judaism; and therefore it is not to be assumed, with Ewald, p. 482, that Paul had wished merely to remove the reproach of illegitimacy from Timothy—even laying aside the fact that Jewsesses were not prohibited from marrying Gentiles, with the exception only of the seven Canaanitish nations.⁸ The circumstance: νῦν γνωσάκεις κ.τ.λ., ver. 1, serves only to explain whence it happens that Timothy, whose Christian mother was known to be a Jewess, was yet uncircumcised; the father was a Gentile, and had in his paternal authority left him uncircumcised. — Observe, according to the correct reading ὅτι Ελλην ἐπὶ ἑαυτῷ ἴππωρχεν (see the critical remarks), the suitable emphasis with which the predicate is placed first: that a Greek his father was. ἴππωρχεν in the sense of εἶναι is used most frequently in the N. T. by Luke. An antithesis to φαίνοσθαί is arbitrarily and unsuitably imported by Otto.

Vv. 4, 5. Παρείδον] orally, perhaps also partly in writing, by delivering to them a copy of the decree, xv. 23 ff. — αὐτοί] namely, to the Gentile-Christians in the towns, which the connection requires by φυλάσσων. — τὰ

¹ 2 Cor. ix. 19.
² Erasmus in his Paraphrase (dedicated to Pope Clement v.) observes: Non quod crediderit circumcisionem conferre salutem, quam sola fides adferrebat sed ne quid tumultus oritusur a Judaeis." Observe this distinctively Lutheran sola fides.
³ Gal. ii. 3 f.
⁴ Comp. Gal. v. 2.
⁶ See Wetstein. [p. 483 ff.
⁷ In opposition to Thiersch and Lange, apost. Zeitalt. I. p. 102 ff.
⁸ Ex. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 1 ff.
The mention of the leaders was sufficient; the co-operation of the church is, according to v. 29 f., obvious of itself. — τῶν ἐκ Ἱερουσ. belongs only to τ. πρεσβυτ. — Ver. 5. They developed themselves internally in steadfastness of faith, and externally in the daily increasing number of their members. On the former, comp. Col. ii. 5; καὶ ἥμερ. belongs to ἔπεμπα τ. ἄριστος, comp. ii. 46.

V. 6, 7. According to the reading ἀνάληπτον and, ver. 7, ἔλθων ὑπὲρ (see the critical remarks): Now they went through Phrygia and Galatia, after they had been withheld by the Holy Spirit from preaching in Asia; but having come toward Mysia, they attempted, etc. Observe (1) that this hindrance of the Spirit to their preaching in Asia induced them, instead of going to Asia, to take their route through Phrygia and Galatia, and therefore the founding of the Galatian churches is correctly referred to this period; indeed, the founding of these may have been the immediate object aimed at in that hindrance. The fact that Luke so silently passes over the working in Phrygia and Galatia, is in keeping with the unequal character of the information given by him generally—an inequality easily explained from the diversity of his documents and intelligence otherwise acquired — so that it appears arbitrary to impute to him a special set purpose—Olshausen: he was hastening with his narrative to the European scene of action; Baumgarten: because the main stream of development proceeded from Jerusalem to Rome, and the working in question lay out of the line of this direction;* and quite erroneously Schneckenburger: because there were no Jews to be found in those regions, and therefore Luke could not have illustrated in that case how Paul turned first to the Jews. Further, (2) Asia cannot be the quarter of the world in contrast to Europe, but only the western coast of Asia Minor, as ii. 9, vi. 9. To that region his journey from Lycaonia—Derbe and Lystra, ver. 1—was directed; but by the hindrance of the Spirit it was turned elsewhere, namely, to Phrygia and Galatia, the latter taken in the usual narrower sense, not according to the extent of the Roman province at that time, as Stügler, Thiersch, and others suppose.*—The hindering of the Spirit, taken by Zeller in the sense of the apostle's own inward act, is in vv. 6, 7 to be regarded as an influence of the Holy Spirit — that is, of the objective Divine spirit, not of 'the holy spirit of prudence, which judged the circumstances correctly,' de Wette—on their souls, which internal indication, they were conscious, was that of the Spirit. — καὶ ῥ. Ἐσθιαν] not: at (see ver. 8), but toward Mysia, Mysia-wards, in the direction of the border of that land. They wished from this to go northeastward to Bithynia; for in Mysia, which, along with Lydia and Caria, belonged to Asia, they were forbidden to preach.

-tον πνεύμα Ἐσθιαν] i.e. the ἄγιον πνεύμα, ver. 6; see on Rom. viii. 9.

Remark.—According to the Received text (διελθοῦντες . . ἔλθων), the rendering must be: having journeyed through Phrygia and Galatia, they endeavoured, after they had been withheld by the Holy Spirit from preaching in Asia, on coming

---

* Whether he also planted churches in Phrygia, is unknown to us. The founding of the church in Colossae and Laodicea took place by means of others, Col. ii. 1.

* Comp. also Zeller, p. 888.

* Comp. on Gal. Introd. § 1.
toward Mysia, to journey to Bithynia, etc. Comp. Wieseler, p. 31; Baumgarten, p. 489; and see regarding the asyndetic participles, which "mutua temporis vel causae ratione inter se referuntur," Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 1. 7; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 249; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 255 (E. T. 297).

Vv. 8-10. They were now between Mysia and Bithynia. To Bithynia the Spirit suffered them not to go; in Mysia they were not to preach, because it belonged to Asia. In this position of things they saw themselves directed to the West, away from all their former sphere of action, and across to Greece. This the Spirit now willed. Accordingly they had first to make for the Asiatic sea-coast, and therefore they went directly westward along the southern border of Mysia, of course without preaching, for this they were not permitted to do, and thus, having passed by Mysia (παρελθόντες τὴν Μυσίαν), they came down to Troas on the Hellespont, in order there to determine more precisely their further journey to the West, or to receive for this purpose a higher determination, which they might expect in accordance with the previous operations of the Spirit. And they received this higher determination by a visionary appearance ¹ which was made to the apostle during the night (διὰ τ. νυκτός, as in v. 19). This vision ¹ is not to be considered as a dream, ² as is evident from the expression itself, and from the fact that there is no mention of a κατ’ ὄναρ or the like, or afterwards of an ἀναστάς or other similar expression, but after the seeing of the vision the ἐγκαθισθαμένοι κ.τ.λ. comes in without further remark. Olschhausen, however, very hastily lays it down as a settled point, that revelation by dreams, as the lowest form of revelation, ³ was no longer vouchsafed to the apostles who were endowed with the Holy Spirit, but that they must have had their visions in ecstasy, always in a waking condition. We have far too little information as to the life of the apostles to maintain this. — Macedon.] is used adjectively. ⁴ As Macedonian the appearance announced itself, namely, by διαβάζεις εἰς Μακεδ. βοηθοῦ ἡμῖν. It is arbitrary in Grotius to say that an angel had appeared, and indeed "angelus curator Macedonum." Something objectively real is not indicated by δραμα λαφθη. ⁵ — ἐγκαθισθαμένοι] we sought, directed our view to the necessity of procuring, first of all, the opportunity of a ship, etc. Here Luke, for the first time, includes himself in the narrative, and therefore it is rightly assumed that he joined Paul at Troas. He does not enter further on his personal relations, because Theophilus was acquainted with them. Olschhausen arbitrarily thinks: from modesty. On and against the assumptions that Timothy ⁶ or Silas ⁷ wrote the portions in which "we" occurs, see Introd. § 1. —

¹ ἐγκαθισθαμένοι, ix. 10, x. 3, xviii. 9.
² Taken by Baur, I. p. 165, ed. 8, only as an embellishment of the history, namely, as symbolising the desire of salvation, with which not only the Macedonian population, but the men of Europe in general, called upon the apostle to come over to them. This view Zeller also, p. 291, considers as possible. It is in the connection of the entire narrative impossible, and simply tends to obscure the further occurrences as regards their historical character.
³ Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Zeller.
⁴ † See Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 294.
⁵ Comp. also li. 17.
⁶ Comp. on v. 1 f. as in Thuc. i. 63. 2, l. 68. 3.
⁷ Comp. x. 17.
⁸ Schleiermacher, Mayerhoff, Ulrich, Bloch.
⁹ Schwanbeck.
CALL TO MACEDONIA.

συμβιβάζοντες κ. τ. λ.] because we gathered (colligebamus) as the meaning of that appearance, drew from it the conclusion,¹ that in it there was issued to us the call of God (see the critical remarks), and the in itself indefinite βοήθουν ἡμῖν was the call for help to be afforded by communication of the gospel (τῇ).

Ver. 11. Εἰσῆλθομ.] having sailed from Troas, we ran by a straight course, xxi. 1. The word is not preserved in Greek writers, who have, εἰσῆλθομος and as a verb, εἰσῆλθομεν. — Samothrace, a well-known island off the coast of Thrace, in the Aegean Sea. — τῇ ἑπίστευσιν die póstera, used by Greek writers both with (vii. 26) and without ἡμῖν.² In the N. T. it occurs only in Acts. — Neapolis, at an earlier period Datos,² a seaport on the Strymonian Gulf, opposite the island of Thasos, at that time belonging to Thrace, but after Vespasian to Macedonia.³ — On Philippi, formerly Krenides, named from the Macedonian Philip, who enlarged and fortified it, see the Introd. to Philipp. § 1. — πρώη ἡ μερίδος Μακεδ. κοινωνία πόλις. As in that district of Macedonia, divided by Aemilius Paulus into four parts, Amphipolis was the capital, and πρώη πόλις cannot therefore in a strict sense mean capital;⁴ all difficulty is removed simply by connecting, and not, as is usually done,⁵ separating, πόλις κοινωνία: which is the first, in rank, colony-town of the part concerned of Macedonia.⁶ Thus it is unnecessary, with Kuinoel, Hug, and others,⁷ who separate πόλις from κοινωνία, to take πρώη πόλις in the sense of a city endowed with privileges—Bertholdt compares the French use of bonne ville—inscriptions on coins being appealed to, in which the formal epithet πρώη is given to Greek cities which were not capitals.⁸ In the case of Philippi itself no special privileges are known, except the general colonial rights of the jus Italicum; nor is the title πρώη found on the coins of Philippi, it is met with only in the case of cities in Asia Minor.⁹ Others take πρώη of local situation, so that they too separate πόλις from κοινωνία: “Philippi was the first city of Macedonia at which Paul touched in his line of travel.” So Olshausen and Wieseler, following Erasmus, who, however, appears to join πόλις κοιν., Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Raphael, Wolf, Bengel, Eckermann, Heinrichs. In this case we have not to consider Neapolis as the mere port of Philippi (Olshausen), but with Rettig, van Hengel, ad Phil. p. 4 ff., and De Wette, to lay stress on the fact that Neapolis at that time belonged to Thrace, and to take ἐπὶ

² See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 464.
⁴ Sueton. Vespa. 8; Dio Cass. xlvii. 35; Ptol. iii. 12. 9.
⁵ Liv. xiv. 29.
⁶ Liv. xiv. 29.
⁷ Without any reason, Wetstein imagined that after the battle at Philippi this city was raised to be the capital. From the erroneous interpretation capital across the reading ἡ τρία καταλεῖ τῷ Μακ., πόλις κοινωνία, which Bornemann regards as original.
⁸ Thus also Rwald, p. 469, according to whom Philippi, on account of its flourishing condition at that time, is assumed to be named “the first city of the province of Macedonia.” But μερίς does not mean province (ἐπαρχία, xxiii. 54, xxv. 1).
⁹ Comp. also Baumgarten, who elaborately explains μερίς, as if τῷ εἰσόρθος stood alongside of it, so that τῇ Μακεδ. would be in apposition to τῷ μερίς. See also Credner, BZ. II. p. 416 f.; Mynster, kl. theolog. Schr. p. 170.
¹¹ See Rettig, Quœst. Philipp. p. 5 ff.
(Luke did not write ἡπ) as an expression of the admitted state of things, that Philippi from that side is the first city, consequently the most easterly.¹ But what reason could Luke have to make such an exact geographical specification, especially with regard to such a well-known city as Philippi? It is quite at variance with his manner elsewhere. And that too with the argumentatively (quippe quae) emphatic ἦτε. This applies also in opposition to Grotius, who takes πόλις κολώνια together, the first colonial city, but understands πρώτη also of the geographical situation. According to our view, there is conveyed in ἦτε an explanation of the motive for their going to Philippi in particular, seeing that it is, namely, the most noteworthy colonial-city of the district, so that the gospel might at once acquire a very considerable and extensive sphere of action in Macedonia. If in itself ἄξιομα ἦτε πόλεως ἡ κολώνια (Chrysostom), this is yet more heightened by πρώτη. — On the combination of two substantives like πόλις κολώνια, comp. Lobeck, Paralip. p. 344. Instead of κολώνια, the Greek uses ἀνακκια or ἐποικία; instead of πόλις κολώνια, πόλις ἀποκικα. — Philippi was colonized by Octavianus through the removal thither of the partisans of Antonius, and had also the jus Italicum conferred on it.² (w³).

Ver. 13. Ποταμοῦ] i.e. not, as Bornemann and Bleek suppose, the Strymen, which is distant more than a day's journey, but possibly the rivulet Ganges,³ or some other stream in the neighbourhood which abounded with springs. — οὗ ἀνακάτερο προσευχή εἶναι] where a place of prayer was accustomed to be, i.e. where, according to custom, a place of prayer was. Οὐ χωρίσασθαι, in more esse, to be wont.⁴ Not: where, as was supposed, there was a place of prayer (Ewald), in which case we should have to supply the thought that the place did not look like a synagogue, which, however, is as arbitrary as it is historically unimportant. The προσευχαί were places of prayer, sometimes buildings, and at other times open spaces — so most probably here, as may be inferred from οὗ ἀνακάτερο εἶναι — near to streams, on account of the custom of washing the hands before prayer, to be met with in cities where synagogues did not exist or were not permitted, serving the purposes of a synagogue.⁵ — ταῖς συνελθεῖσιν γυναικέ̂ι] the women who came together, to prayer. Probably the number of Jewish men in the city was extremely small, and the whole unimportant Jewish population consisted chiefly of women, some of them doubtless married to Gentiles, ver. 1; hence there is no mention of men being present. More arbitrary is the explanation of Calvin: "Vel ad coetus tantum muliebres destinatus erat locus ille, vel apud viros frigebat religio, ut saltem tardius adessent;" and of Schrader: the Jews had been expelled from the city.

Ver. 14. Καὶ τις κ.τ.λ.] Also a woman was listening, etc. Λυσία was a common female name,⁶ and therefore it remains doubtful whether she re-

¹ See Wieseler, p. 37 f.
² See Dio Cass. l. 4; Plin. H. N. lv. 11; Digest. Leg. xx. 6.
³ So Zeller, Hackett.
⁶ Hor. Od. I. 6, iii. 9, vi. 20.
LYDIA BAPTIZED AT PHILIPPI

ceived her name "a solo natali." — πορφυρόπωλίς] ἢ τὰ πορφυρά, fabrics and
clothes dyed purple, πωλούσα." The dyeing of purple was actively carried on,
especially in Lydia, to which Thyatira belonged, and an inscription
found at Thyatira particularly mentions the guild of dyers of that place.
— σεβομ. τ. θεόν] A female proselyte. See on xiii. 16, 43. — ἡς ὦ Κύρ. δύναμέν
t. καρδ..] Luke recognizes the attentive interest, which Lydia with her heart
unclosed directed to the word, as produced by the influence of the exalted
Christ (ὁ Κύριος) working for the promotion of His kingdom, who opened
(δύναμεν) the heart of Lydia, i.e. wrought in her self-consciousness, as the centre
and sphere of action of her inner vital energy, the corresponding readiness,
in order that she might attend to what was preached (προσκένησε τοῖς λαλομεν). The
fidem habere followed, but still was not the προσκένησε itself. Comp. on viii.
6. Moreover, Chrysostom correctly remarks: τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀνοίξαι τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ δὲ
προσκένησε ἀντὶς ὡστε καὶ θείον καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἡμ. She experienced the motus
inereditabiles of grace, to which she offered no resistance, but with willing
submission rendered the moral self-conscious compliance by which she
arrived at faith.

Ver. 15. Καὶ ὁ ὕπνος αὐτῆς] Of what members her family consisted, cannot
be determined. This passage and ver. 33, with xviii. 8 and 1 Cor. i. 16,
are appealed to in order to prove infant baptism in the apostolic age, or at
least to make it probable. "Quis credat, in tot familiis nullum fuisset in-
fantem, et Judaeos circumcidendis, gentiles lustrandis illis assuetos non
etiam obtulisse eos baptismo?" Bengel. See also Lange, apost. Zeitalt. II.
p. 504 ff. But on this question the following remarks are to be made: (1)
If, in the Jewish and Gentile families which were converted to Christ, there
were children, their baptism is to be assumed in those cases, when they
were so far advanced that they could and did confess their faith on Jesus
as the Messiah; for this was the universal, absolutely necessary qualifica-
tion for the reception of baptism. (2) If, on the other hand, there were
children still incapable of confessing, baptism could not be administered to
those to whom that, which was the necessary presupposition of baptism for
Christian sanctification, was still wanting. (3) Such young children, whose
parents were Christians, rather fell under the point of view of 1 Cor. vii.
14, according to which, in conformity with the view of the apostolic church,
the children of Christians were no longer regarded as ἀκαθαρτοί, but as ἁγιοί,
and that not on the footing of having received the character of holiness by
baptism, but as having part in the Christian ἁγιότητι by their fellowship
with their Christian parents. See on 1 Cor. l.c. Besides, the circumcision
of children must have been retained for a considerable time among the
Jewish-Christians, according to xxi. 21. Therefore (4) the baptism of the
children of Christians, of which no trace is found in the N. T., is not to be

1 Grotius, de Wette, and others.
2 Hesychius, Phot. Ἠθ., 301. 41.
3 Val. Fl. iv. 398; Claud. Basp. P. 1. 274;
Plin. H. N. vii. 57; Ael. H. A. 4. 45; Max.
Tyr. x. 2.
4 Pet. v. 2; Plin. v. 31.
6 Grotius, Kuinoel, Heimrich.
7 Comp. 2 Macc. i. 4; Luke xxiv. 45; Eph.
1. 18. [487 f.
8 Comp. Luthardt, vom freien Willen, p.
9 Comp. also vv. 31, 32, 33, xviii. 8.
10 Not even in Eph. vi. 1, in opposition to
Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 192.
held as an apostolic ordinance, as indeed, it encountered early and long resistance; but it is an institution of the church, which gradually arose in post-apostolic times in connection with the development of ecclesiastical life and of doctrinal teaching, not certainly attested before Tertullian, and by him still decidedly opposed, and, although already defended by Cyprian, only becoming general after the time of Augustine in virtue of that connection. Yet, even apart from the ecclesiastical premiss of a stern doctrine of original sin and of the devil going beyond Scripture, from which even exorcism arose, the continued maintenance of infant baptism, as the objective attribution of spiritually creative grace in virtue of the plan of salvation established for every individual in the fellowship of the church, is so much the more justified, as this objective attribution takes place with a view to the future subjective appropriation. And this subjective appropriation has so necessarily to emerge with the development of self-consciousness and of knowledge through faith, that in default thereof the church would have to recognise in the baptized no true members, but only membra mortua. This relation of connection with creative grace, in so far as the church is its sphere of operation, is a theme which, in presence of the attacks of Baptists and Rationalists, must overstep the domain of exegesis and be worked out in that of dogmatics, yet without the addition of confirmation as any sort of supplement to baptism. — οἵτινες οἱ ἐνθισματεύονται — εἰς κεννακα ύπ' ἑαυτῷ. This judgment was formed either tacitly or openly on the ground of the whole conduct of Lydia even before her baptism,—the latter itself was a witness of it; hence the perfect is here entirely in order, in opposition to Kuinoel, Heinrichs, and others, and is not to be taken for the present. —εἰ, in the sense of ἐπει, is here chosen with delicate modesty. — με κινητ. τ. Κυπ. εἴπατι that I am a believer in the Lord (Christ), i.e. giving faith to His word and His promise, which ye have proclaimed, vv. 13, 14. Comp. ver. 34, xviii. 8, where Bengel well remarks: "Ipse dominus Jesus testabatur per Paulum." — παρεξιέναρα. The use of this purposely-chosen strong word, constraining, is not to be explained from the refusal at first of those requested, but from the vehement urgency of the feeling of gratitude (v5).

Ver. 16. That Paul and his companions accepted this pressing invitation of Lydia, and chose her house for their abode, Luke leaves the reader to infer from καὶ παρεξιέναρα ἡμᾶς, ver. 15, and he now passes over to another circumstance which occurred on another walk to the same πρὸς τ' ἔξω mentioned before. What now follows thus belongs to quite another day. Heinrichs and Kuinoel assume that it attached itself directly to the pre-

1 Origen, in sp. ad Rom. lib. v.: "Ab apostolis traditione accept ecclesia."
2 It is the most striking example of the recognition of historical tradition in the evangelical church. Comp. Holtzmann, Kanon u. Tradit. p. 390 ff.
4 Comp. Martensen, d. christl. Theo u. d. 

5 Matt. xlviii. 14; Mark x. 13 f.; Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii. 6; Rom. vi. 3 f.; Col. ii. 13; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 21. See also Richter in the Stud. w. Xvii. 1811, p. 236 ff.
6 Comp. Diessen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 195.
7 Comp. Luke xxiv. 22; 1 Sam. xxviii. 33.
8 Chrysostom, Bengel, comp. Ewald.
A DEMONIAO WOMAN.

ceeding that the conversion and baptism of Lydia had occurred while the women, ver. 18, were waiting at the προσευχή for the commencement of divine worship; and that, when they were about to enter into the προσευχή, this affair with the soothsaying damsel occurred. In opposition to this it may be urged, first, that ver. 15 would only interrupt and disturb the narrative, especially by καὶ παρεβάσας ἡμᾶς; secondly, that the beginning of ver. 16 itself (ἐγένετο δὲ) indicates the narration of a new event; and thirdly, that the instruction and baptism of Lydia, and still more of her whole house, cannot naturally be limited to so short a period.—According to the reading ἕξωσαν πνεύμα πῦθων (see the critical remarks), the passage is to be interpreted: who was possessed by a spirit Python, i.e. by a demon, which prophesied from her belly. The damsel was a ventriloquist, and as such practised soothsaying. The name of the well-known Delphic dragon, Πῦθων, became subsequently the name of a δαιμόνιον μαντικών, but was also, according to Plut. de def. orac. 9, p. 414 E, used appellatively, and that of soothsayers, who spoke from the belly. So also Suidas: ἐγγαστρίματος, ἐγγαστριμάτις, ὃν τινος νῦν πῦθων, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ στετόματιν. This use of πῦθων, corresponding to the Hebrew נֵס, which the LXX. render by ἐγγαστρίματος, Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6, 27, and also passing over to the Rabbins, is to be assumed in our own period, as otherwise we could not see why Luke should have used this peculiar word, whose specific meaning (ventriloquist-soothsayer) was certainly the less strange to him, as the thing itself had so important allusions in the O. T. and LXX. suggesting it to those possessed of Jewish culture, just as among the Greeks the jugglery which the ventriloquists practised was well enough known. Without doubt, the damsel was considered by those who had their fortunes told by her as possessed by a divinity; and that she so regarded herself, is to be inferred from the effect of the apostolic word, ver. 18. Hers was a state of enthusiastic possession by this fixed idea, in which she actually might be capable of a certain clairvoyance, as in the transaction in our passage. Paul, in his Christian view, regards this condition of hers as that of a demoniac; Luke also so designates it, and treats her accordingly.—τοῖς κυρίοις. There were thus several, who in succession or conjointly had her in service for the sake of gain.

Vv. 17, 18. The soothsaying damsel, similar to a somnambulist, reads in the souls of the apostle and his companions, and announces their characteristic dignity. But Paul, after he had first patiently let her alone for many days, sees in her exclamation a recognition on the part of the demon dwelling within her, as Jesus Himself met with recognition and homage from demons; and in order not to accept for himself and his work demoniacal

1 Apollod. i. 4. 1.
2 Suidas, who has the quotation: τὰς τῇ πυθώματι Πυθώματι Πυθώματος ἐνθυμομένως... ἥλεν τῷ ἔρωτος παρεγερθέντι.
3 See Schleusner, Thes. II. p. 229.
4 R. Salmo on Deut. xviii. 11.
5 1 Sam. xxviii. 7.
6 The Ἐπιμελείας or Ἐπιμελείδαι.
7 See Hermann, Gott. Alterth. § xiii. 16.
8 Comp. 1 Cor. x. 20. [1781.
9 Comp. Walch, de servit. et. fidel. Jev. 18.]
10 But she was not a somnambulist. See Dalitzsch, Psychol. p. 320.
11 Mark iii. 11.
testimony, which would not of itself be hushed, at length being painfully grieved, and turning to her as she followed him, he, in the name of Jesus Christ,\(^1\) commands the demon to come out of her. Now, as the slave considered Paul to be the servant of the most high God, who thus must have power over the god by whom she believed herself possessed, her fixed idea was at once destroyed by that command of power, and she was consequently restored from her overstrained state of mind to her former natural condition. Of a special set purpose, for which the slave made her exclamation, οἵοιν οἱ ἀνδραικοι κ.τ.λ.—Chrysostom: the god by whom she was possessed, Apollo, hoped, on account of this exclamation, to be left in possession of her; Walch: the damsel so cried out, in order to get money from Paul; Ewald: in order to offer her services to them; Camerarius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Kuinoel: in order to exalt her own reputation—there is no hint in the text; it was the involuntary and irresistible outburst of her morbidly exalted soothsaying nature.

Vv. 19–21. The first persecution which is reported to us as stirred up on the part of the Gentiles.\(^2\) — ἵνα τοὺς ἀρχοντας . . . τοῖς στρατηγοῖς When they saw that with the departure of the god from the slave their hope of further gain had departed (ἐξῆλθαν), they dragged Paul and Silas, not Timothy and Luke along with them, but only the two principal persons, to the market, where, according to the custom of the Greeks, the courts of justice were erected, to the archons.\(^3\) But these, the city-judges,\(^*\) must have referred the matter to the στρατηγοί; and therefore the narrative proceeds: κ. προσαγάγωντες αὐτοίς κ.τ.λ. The accusation amounted to revolt against the Roman political authority.—The στρατηγοί are the praetores, as the two chief Roman magistrates\(^6\) in towns which were colonies called themselves.\(^7\) The name has its origin from the position of the old Greek strategoi.\(^8\) — ἐκτραπάσας.] to bring into utter disorder.\(^9\) — ἡμῶν τ. π.λ. ἡμῶν prefixed with haughty emphasis, and answering to the following “though they are Jews.” — Ἀρωμάιοι οὖν] proud contrast to the odious Ιουδαίοι ἰπέρχοντες. Calvin aptly says: “Verset composite fuit haec criminatio ad gravandos Christi servos; nam ab una parte obtundent Romanum nomen, quo nihil erat magis favorabile: rursum ex nomine Judaico, quod tunc infame erat, confluent illis invidiam; nam quantum ad religionem, plus habebant Romanii affinitatis cum aliis quibuslibet, quam cum gente Judaica.” —The introduction of strange religious customs and usages (ἰθνι), in opposition to the native religion, was strictly interdicted by the Romans.\(^10\) Possibly here also the yet fresh impression of the edict of Claudius\(^11\) co-operated.

---

1. διασομηθεὶς, see on iv. 2.
2. Comp. iii. 6, iv. 7.
3. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 2.
4. Not different from πολιτάρχεις, xvii. 6.
10. See Wetstein in loc.
11. See on xviii. 2.
IMPRISONMENT OF PAUL AND SILAS.

Vv. 23, 23. And at the same time ("cum ancillae dominis," Bengel) the multitude rose up, in a tumultuary manner, against them; therefore the praetors, intimidated thereby, in order temporarily to still the urgency of the mob, commanded the accused to be scourged without examination, and then, until further orders, to be thrown into strict confinement. — περιφέρησις, αίτων τὰ ἰμάτια] after having torn off their clothes. The form of expression of ver. 23 shows that the praetors did not themselves, in opposition to Bengel, do this piece of work, which was necessary and customary for laying bare the upper part of the body,¹ but caused it to be done by their subordinate lictors. Erasmus erroneously desired to read αίτων, so that the praetors would have rent their own clothes from indignation. Apart from the non-Roman character of such a custom, there may be urged against this view the compound περιφέρ., which denotes that the rending took place all round about the whole body.² — ἱκέλευοι] The reference of the relative tense is to the personal presence of the narrator.³ — Paul and Silas submitted to this maltreatment, one of the three mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 25, with silent self-denial, and without appealing to their Roman citizenship, committing everything to God; see on ver. 37. Men of strong character may, amidst unjust suffering, exhibit in presence of their oppressors their moral defiance, even in resignation. We make this remark in opposition to Zeller,¹ who finds the brutal conduct of the praetors, and the non-employment by the apostles of their legal privilege in self-defence—which Paul, moreover, renounced not merely on this occasion, 2 Cor. xi. 25—inexplicable. Bengel well remarks: "Non semper omnibus praevidiis omni modo utendum; divino regimini auscultandum." In a similar plight, xxii. 25, Paul found it befitting to interpose an assertion of his privilege, which he here only used for the completion of his victory over the persecution, ver. 37,—a result which, in xxi. 25, according to the divine destination which he was aware of, he recognised as unattainable.

Ver. 24. The zealous jailor fulfilled the command ἄσφαλῶς τριήρειν by a twofold measure; he not only put the accused into the prison-ward situated, more than the other wards, in the interior of the house (εἰς τὸν ἱσοτέραν φυλακήν), but also secured their feet in the stocks. — εἰς τὸ ξίλον, ἐν πεντεμῷ, i.e. in the wooden block in which the feet, stretched apart from each other, were enclosed, called also ποδοκάκη and ποδοστράβη in Heb. 7ος (w).³

Vv. 25, 26. In joyful consciousness of suffering for the glorification of Christ, v. 41, they sing in the solemn stillness of the night prayers of praise to God,¹ and thereby keep their fellow-prisoners awake, so that they listened to them (ὑπηροῦντο). Whether these are to be conceived as confined in the same ἱσοτέραν φυλακήν, or possibly near to it but more to the front, or whether they were in both localities, cannot be determined.

¹ Grotius and Wolf in loc.
² Plut. Orat. p. 113 D: περιφέρησις κύλης,
⁴ See Wisner, p. 263 (B. T. 337).
⁵ Comp. Baur.
⁶ Plaut. Captiv. iii. 5. 71; Liv. viii. 28.
⁷ Job xiii. 27, xxxiii. 11. See Herod. vi. 75, ix. 37, and later writers, Grotius and Wetsstein in loc.
"Nihil cruus sentit in nervo, quam animus in coelo est," Tertull.
Then suddenly there arises an earthquake, etc. God at once rewards—this is the significant relation of vv. 25 and 26—the joy of faith and of suffering on the part of Paul and Silas by miraculous interposition. The objection, which Baur and Zeller\(^1\) take to the truth of this narrative, turns on the presupposed inconceivableness of miracles in general. In connection with the fiction assumed by them, even the ἐπηρεάσωτο...δὲσμοι is supposed only to have for its object “to make good the casual connection between the earthquake and the prayer” (Zeller). —πᾶντων] thus also of those possibly to be found in other parts of the prison.\(^8\) The reading ἄνελπῇ (Bornemann) is a correct gloss.

Vv. 27, 28. The jailer, aroused by the shock and the noise, hastens to the prison, and when he sees the doors which, one behind another, led to it open, and so takes it for granted that the prisoners have escaped, he wishes, from fear of the vengeance of the praetors, to kill himself—which, in opposition to Zeller’s objection, he may have sufficiently indicated by expressions of his despair. Then Paul calls, etc. —μάχαιραν] a sword, which he got just at hand;\(^8\) with the article it would denote the sword which he was then wearing, his sword. —ἀπαντησάς] Thus the rest of the prisoners, involuntarily detained by the whole miraculous event, and certainly also in part by the imposing example of Paul and Silas, had not used their release from chains (ver. 26) and the opening of the prison for their own liberation. The ἰνδάκε does not affirm that they had all come together into the prison of Paul, but only stands opposed to ἐπηρεάσωτον. None is away; we are, all and every one, here! —The loosening of the chains, moreover, and that without any injury to the limbs of the enchained, is, in view of the miraculous character of the event, not to be judged according to the laws of mechanics, in opposition to Gfrörer, Zeller, any more than the omission of flight on the part of the other prisoners is to be judged according to the usual practice of criminals. The prisoners were arrested, and felt themselves sympathetically detained by the miracle which had happened; and therefore the suggestion to which Chrysostom has recourse, that they had not seen the opening of the doors, is inappropriate.

Vv. 29, 30. Φόρα] Lights, i.e. lampa,\(^4\) several, in order to light up and strictly search everything. —ἐντρόμος γενόμενος...προσέπ.] He now saw in Paul and Silas no longer criminals, but the favourites and confidants of the gods; the majesty which had been maltreated inspired him with terror and respectful submission. —ινα σωθῶν] in order that I may obtain salvation. He means the σωτηρία, which Paul and Silas had announced; for what he had heard of them, that they made known ὄλον σωτηρίας, ver. 17, was now established in his conviction as truth. This lively conviction longs to have part in the salvation, and his sincere longing desires to fulfil that by which this participation is conditioned. Morus, Stolz, Rosenmüller render it: “in order that I may escape the punishment of the gods on account of your

---

\(^1\) Comp. Gfrörer, heli. Sage, i. p. 448.
\(^3\) Mark xiv. 47.
\(^5\) Xen. Hell. v. 1. 8; Lactian. Conviv. 15; Plut. Alex. 36.
harsh treatment.” But, if Luke desired to have σωθώ and σωθήσῃ, ver. 31, understood in different senses, he must have appended to σωθώ a more precise definition; for the meaning thus assigned to it suggests itself the less naturally, as the jailer, who had only acted as an instrument under higher direction,¹ could not reasonably apprehend any vengeance of the gods.

Vv. 31, 32. The ἐπανορθωσίς σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκος σου extends to πιστεύων and σωθήσῃ. — They lay down faith on Jesus as the condition of σωτηρία, and nothing else; but saving faith is always in the N. T. that which has holiness as its effect, Rom. vii, not “a human figment and opinion which the depths of the heart never get to know,” but “a divine work in us which transforms and begets us anew from God,”² without, however, making justification, which is the act of the imputation of faith, to include sanctification.³ — For the sake of this requirement of believing, they set forth the gospel to the father of the family and all his household.⁴

Vv. 33, 34. Παραλαβὼν αὐτῶν... ἔλυσεν] he took and washed them (x). Vividness of delineation. Probably he led them to a neighbouring water, perhaps in the court of the house, in which his baptism and that of his household was immediately completed.⁵ — ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν] a pregnant expression: so that they were cleansed from the stripes—from the blood of the inflicted wounds, ver. 22 f.⁶ — παραξενία] the adverb emphatically placed at the end.⁷ — ἀναγεννών] We are to think of the official dwelling of the jailer as being built above the prison cells.⁸ — παρέθηκε τράπεζαν] quite the Latin apponit mensam, i.e., he gave a repast; to be explained from the custom of setting out the table before those who were to be entertained.⁹ — πανοκή] αὐτῷ διὰ τῷ οἶκῳ, Phavorinus. It belongs to πεπιστ. A more classical form,¹⁰ according to the Atticists, would have been πανοκὴ or πανοκής.¹¹ — πεπιστευκός τῷ Θεῷ] because he had become and was a believer on God (perfect). He, the Gentile, now believed the divine promises of salvation announced to him by Paul and Silas.¹² That this his πιστεύειν was definitely Christian faith, and accordingly equivalent to πιστεύειν τῷ Κυρίῳ was self-evident to the reader.¹³ — That, after ver. 34, Paul and Silas had returned to prison, follows from vv. 36–40.

Vv. 35, 36. The news of the miraculous earthquake, perhaps also the particulars which they might in the meantime have learned concerning the two prisoners, may have made the praetors have scruples concerning the hasty maltreatment. They consider it advisable to have nothing further

¹ Comp. Chrysost.
² Luther’s Preface to the Epistle to the Romans.
³ See on Rom. i. 17.
⁴ See on vll. 25.
⁵ This is confirmed by the fact that baptism took place by complete immersion,—in opposition to Baumgarten, p. 515, who, transferring the performance of baptism to the house, finds here “an approximation to the later custom of simplifying the ceremony,” according to which complete immersion did not take place. Immersion was, in fact, quite an essential part of the symbolism of baptism (Rom. vi.).
⁷ Comp. on Matt. ii. 10, and Kühner, § 863. 1.
⁸ Comp. ix. 39; Luke iv. 5, xii. 67.
⁹ Hom. Od. v. 93, xii. 29; Polyb. xxxix. 2. 11.
¹⁰ Yet see Plat. Epiz. p. 262 C.
¹¹ Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 514 ff. See examples from Philo in Loesner, p. 503.
¹² Ver. 33; comp. ver. 15, xviii. 8.
¹³ See also ver. 33.
to do with them, and to get rid of them forthwith by releasing them. Curtly and contumously (τοῖς ἀνδρ. ἐκλνοὺς), in order to maintain at least thereby their stern official attitude, they notified the order by their lictors (μαζδόχους, bearers of the fasces) to the jailer, who, with congratulatory sympathy, announces it to the prisoners. According to Baumgarten, the motives for the severity of the previous day had lost their force with the praetors during the night—a point in which there is expressed a distinction from the persistent enmity of the Sanhedrists in Jerusalem. But this would furnish an adequate ground for a proceeding running so entirely counter to the course of criminal procedure. The praetors must have become haunted by apprehension and ill at ease, and they must therefore have received some sort of information concerning the miraculous occurrences. —

ἐν εἰρήνῃ] happily. ¹

Ver. 87. Πρὸς αὐτοῖς] to the jailer and the lictors; the latter had thus in the meantime come themselves into the prison.—δειπνοῦς ὡς ὑ. ἤμ.] after they had beaten us publicly without judicial condemnation,—us who are Romans. This sets forth, in terse language precisely embracing the several elements, their treatment as an open violation, partly of the law of nature and nations in general,² partly of the Roman law in particular. For exemption from the disgrace of being scourged by rods and whips was secured to every Roman citizen by the Lex Valeria in the year 254 B.C.,³ and by the Lex Porcia in the year 506 B.C.,⁴ before every Roman tribunal;⁵ therefore Cicero, in Verr. v. 57, says of the exclamation, Civis Romanus sum: “saepè multis in ultimis terris opem inter barbaros et salutem tuit.” — That Silas was also a Roman citizen, is rightly inferred from the plural form of expression, in which there is no reason to find a mere synecdoche. The distinction, which was implied in the bestowal of this privilege, cannot be adduced against the historical character of the narrative (Zeller), as we know not the occasion and circumstances of its acquisition. But how had Paul, by his birth, xxii. 18, Roman citizenship? Certainl not simply as a native of Tarsus. For Tarsus was neither a colonia nor a municipium, but an urbs libera, to which the privilege of having governing authorities of its own, under the recognition, however, of the Roman supremacy, was given by Augustus after the civil war, as well as other privileges,⁶ but not Roman citizenship; for this very fact would, least of all, have remained historically unknown, and acquaintance with the origin of the apostle from Tarsus would have protected him from the decree of scourging.⁷ This much, therefore, only may be surely decided, that his father or a yet earlier ancestor had acquired the privilege of citizenship either as a reward of merit⁸ or by purchase,⁹ and had transmitted it to the apostle. According to Zeller’s arbitrary preconceptions, the mention of the Roman citizenship

¹ See on Mark v. 34; comp. on xv. 38.
² kκαραπετόω, found neither in the LXX. or Apocrypha, nor in Greek writers.
³ Liv. ii. 8; Valer. Max. iv. 1; Dion. Hal. v. p. 289.
⁴ Liv. x. 9; Cic. pro Rabir. 4.
⁵ Comp. Enueb. H. E. v. 1.
⁶ Dio Chrys. II. p. 36, ed. Relke.
⁷ See xxii. 29, comp. with xxii. 24 sq.
⁸ Suet. Aug. 47.
RELEASE FROM PRISON.

here and in chap. xxii. had only the unhistorical purpose in view "of recommending the apostle to the Romans as a native Roman." — καὶ νῦν λάθρα ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλει is indignantly opposed to δειοντες ἡμᾶς θυμοσιά . . . ἐβαλεν εἰς φυλακᾶς: and now do they cast us out secretly? The present denotes the action as already begun, by the order given. Paul, however, for the honour of himself and his work, disdains this secret dismissal, that it might not appear—and this the praetors intended!—that he and Silas had escaped. On the previous day he had, on the contrary, disdained to avert the maltreatment by an appeal to his citizenship, see on ver. 28. The usual opinion is that the tumult in the forum had prevented him from asserting his citizenship. But it is obvious of itself that even the worst tumult, at ver. 22 or ver. 23, would have admitted a "Civis Romanus sum," had Paul wished to make such an appeal. —οὐ γὰρ, ἄλλα] not so, but. It is to be analyzed thus: for they are not to cast us out secretly; on the contrary (ἄλλα) they are, etc. γὰρ specifies the reason why the preceding, indignant question is put, and ἄλλα answers adversatively to the οὐ. — αὐτοῖς ] in their own persons they are to bring us out.

Vv. 38, 39. Ἐρωθήθησαν] The reproach contained in ἀκατακρίτως did not trouble them, but the violation of citizenship was an offence against the majesty of the Roman people, and as such was severely punished. —Ver. 39. What a change in the state of affairs: ἔλθωντες . . . παρεκάλεσαν, namely, to acquiesce, . . . ἐγεραγώντες . . . ἡρῶν! —ἐξερχόμεθα with the simple genitive, as in Matt. x. 14. Very frequent with Greek writers since subsequent to Homer. On παρακαλεῖν, to give fair words, comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 13.

Ver. 40. Before they comply with the ἐξελθεῖν τῆς πόλεως, ver. 39, the apostolic heartfelt longing constrains them first to repair to the house of Lydia, to exhort (παρεκάλεσαν) the new converts assembled there that they should not become wavering in their Christian confession. And from this house grew the church, to which, of all that Paul founded, he has erected the most eulogistic monument in his Epistle—in this sense also the first church which he established in Europe. —ἐξῆλθον] Only Paul and Silas, as they alone were affected by the inquiry, appear now to have departed from Philippi. Luke at least, as the use of the third person teaches us, did not go with them. Paul left him behind to build up the youthful church. Whether, however, Timothy (vv. 1 ff.) also remained behind, cannot be determined. He is not again named until xvi. 14, but he may nevertheless have already departed from Philippi, and need not necessarily have rejoined them till in Berea or Thessalonica.

REMARK.—In the rejection of the entire history as history Baur and Zeller (comp. Hausrath) essentially agree; it is alleged to be formed in accordance with xii. 7 ff., as an apologetic parallelism of Paul with Peter. But as Philippian persecutions are mentioned also in 1 Thess. ii. 2, the opinions formed by them concerning the relation of the two passages are opposite. Baur makes 1

1 So also de Wette.
3 Dion. Hal. xi. p. 786; Grotius in loc.
CHAP. XVI.—NOTES.

Thess. ii. 2 to be derived from the narrative before us; whereas Zeller, considering the Epistles to the Thessalonians as older, supposes the author of the Acts to have "conooced" (p. 258) his narrative from 1 Thess. ii. 2.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(vr) We endeavored to go. V. 10.

"It is observable that the first person is here introduced for the first time, the author thus intimating his presence. From this it appears that Luke joined Paul's company at Troas." Meyer supposes the reason why Luke never mentions his own name throughout the entire history to be that Theophilus was well acquainted with his personal relations to Paul. Olshausen suggests, Meyer says arbitrarily, we think with great probability, a feeling of modesty on the part of Luke. Some, in view of the fact that the apostle had only recently recovered from a severe illness (see v. 6, and Gal. iv. 13), suppose "that Luke, the beloved physician," accompanied him, to watch over his health. From this time till the last imprisonment at Rome, with but two brief intervals, he was the great apostle's constant attendant. In the very last of his Epistles the apostle, writing in full view of a violent death, and forsaken by many, touchingly says: "Only Luke is with me" (2 Tim. iv. 11). Another hypothesis is that Luke makes use of a history written by Silas or Timothy; but this is not probable in itself, and if true would have produced an earlier change in the form of the narrative. These four, then—Paul, Silas, Timothy, and Luke—after a brief voyage from Troas, landed at Neapolis, and so the first Christian apostle landed in Europe. It is probable, however, ere this time that the gospel had been preached in Rome by some of the dispersion, but not by an apostle. Dr. Taylor writes: "That voyage stands out by itself as unique as it is glorious. They went to plant a seed from which have sprung liberty, law, progress, and religion on that continent, and all the blessings which, in this western land, we now enjoy. The gigantic trees in the Mariposa grove sprung each from a seed no bigger than a grain of wheat, though it took them centuries to grow. Here, in the landing of Paul with the gospel at Neapolis, we have the germ out of which European and American Christianity has been developed."

(vr) The chief city. V. 12.

Various opinions are held as to the meaning of this description of Philippi, πρωτην πολισ— the obvious meaning is chief city or capital; but Thessalonica was the capital, or capital of that part of Macedonia where Paul then was; but Amphipolis held that position. Some would change the reading from πρωτην της to πρωτης, a city of the first part of Macedonia; but the authority of the αρχης is against such change. Others understand the phrase to mean a chief town. Others, with Meyer, unite the two words πρωτην πολισ with καλωνια—the first colonial city of the district—the most distinguished in point of importance. Many others render it the first city of Macedonia proper at which Paul arrived; and this appears to be the correct idea. "The purpose of the narrator is to define the geographical position, and not the political importance of Philippi. He means to say that to one entering Macedonia from the Thracian frontier in that district, Philippi is the first city on his route." (Taylor.)
NOTES.

(v) She was baptised and her household. V. 15.

This verse has often been quoted as evidence that infant baptism was the practice of the apostolic age. Commentators are divided in opinion on the force of the evidence afforded. The passage in itself cannot be adduced either for or against infant baptism. It might be a presumption in favor of it. “The practice itself rests on firmer grounds than a precarious induction from a few ambiguous passages.” (Plumptre.) The subject, however, does not properly fall under the domain of exegesis, but must be, as Meyer says, “worked out in that of dogmatics.”

(w) Into the inner prison. V. 24.

In the Roman prisons there were usually three distinct stories, one above another—the communiora, or upper flat, where the prisoners had light and fresh air; the inferiora, or lower flat, shut off with strong iron gates, with bars and locks; the tullianum, or lowest flat or dungeon, the place for one condemned to die. Into this dark, damp, underground, filthy, stifling pit, after having been stripped, beaten with great severity, and bound with an instrument of torture, the unoffending preachers were thrust with unfeeling alacrity. “Yet over all this complication of miseries the souls of Paul and Silas rose in triumph. With heroic cheerfulness they solaced the long black hours of midnight with prayer and hymns. To every Jew, as to every Christian, the psalms of David furnished an inexhaustible storehouse of sacred song.” “Never, probably, had such a scene occurred before in the world’s history, and this perfect triumph of the spirit of peace and joy over shame and agony was an omen of what Christianity would afterwards effect. And while they sang, and while the prisoners listened, perhaps, to verses which ‘out of the deeps’ called on Jehovah, or ‘fled to him before the morning watch,’ or sang—

‘The plowers plowed upon my back and made long furrows,
But the righteous Lord hath hewn the snares of the ungodly in pieces,’

or triumphantly told how God had ‘burst the gates of brass, and smitten the bars asunder.’ Suddenly there was felt the great shock of earthquake, which rocked the very foundation of the prison.” (Farrar.) This is the first instance recorded of a persecution against the Christians by the Roman authorities. Hitherto either the Jews themselves, or the multitude instigated by them, had persecuted the disciples; but there had been no interference on the part of the Roman government. The accusation against them was not on religious grounds, or because they preached Jesus and the resurrection; but it was based on political grounds, charging them with being disturbers of the peace, and teaching practices contrary to Roman customs. On this charge against the apostles Calvin writes: “This accusation is craftily composed to burden the servants of Christ. For on the one side they pretend the name of the Romans, than which nothing was more favorable; on the other, they purchase hatred and bring them in contempt by warning the Jews, which name was at that time infamous; for, as touching religion, the Romans were more like to any than to the Jewish nation. For it was lawful for one which was a Roman to do sacrifice either in Asia or in Grecia, or in any other country where were idols and superstitions. They frame a third accusation out of the crime of sedition, for
they pretend that the public peace is troubled by Paul and his company. In like sort was Christ brought into contempt (odiose traductus fuil)."

(xiv) And washed their stripes. V. 33.

The twofold washings—that which evidenced the true repentance, awakened gratitude, and kindly reverence of the jailer for his prisoners, and that which they administered to him, as the sign of the washing of regeneration—are placed in close and suggestive juxtaposition. As Chrysostom beautifully expresses it: "ἐλούσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἐλούση ἐκλίνεις μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν ἐλούσεν, ἀντὶς δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἐλούση—He washed them, and he was washed; he washed them from their stripes, he himself was washed from his sins."
CHAPTER XVII.

VER. 2. διελέγετο] A B Μ, min. have διελέξατο (so Lachm.). D E, min. have διελέξη, which Griesb. has recommended and Born. adopted. Different alterations of the imperfect into the aor. (in conformity with εἰσήλθε). — Ver. 4. After σεβομ. Lachm. has καί (A D etc. Vulg. Copt.). Offence was taken at the combination σεβομ. ἐλλήν., and therefore sometimes ἐλλήν. was omitted (min. Theophyl. 1), sometimes καί was inserted. — Ver. 5. προσλαβ. δὲ οἱ ἱουδ. So Griesb. But Elz. has ζηλουσάντες δὲ οἱ ἀπειθοῦντες ἱουδαίοι, καὶ προσλαβ. Lachm.: ζηλοῦσαντες δὲ οἱ ἱουδ. καὶ προσλαβ., which also Rinck prefers. Matthaei: προσλαβ. δὲ οἱ ἱουδ. οἱ ἀπειθ. So Scholz and Tisch. Still other variations in codd. vss. and Fathers (D: οἱ δὲ ἀπειθ. άνθρωποι, as Jn. 14, 28, so Born.). The reading of Lachm. has most external evidence in its favour (A B Μ, min. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Syr. utr.), and it is the more to be preferred, since that of Griesb., from which otherwise, on account of its simplicity, the others might have arisen as amplifications in the form of glosses, is only preserved in 142, and consequently is almost entirely destitute of critical warrant; the ἀπειθοῦντες in the Recepta betrays itself as an addition (from xiv. 2), partly from its being exchanged in several witnesses for ἀπειθόσαντες, and partly from the variety of its position (E has it only after τούτων). — ἀγαγεῖν] So H, min. Chrys. Theoph. Occ. But D, 104, Copt. Sahid. have ἔγαγεν (so Born.); A B Μ, min. Vulg.: προσγαγεῖν (so Lachm.); E: προσγαγεῖν; G, 11: ἀναγαγεῖν. All of them more definite interpretations. — Ver. 13. After σελεύσατες, Lachm. and Born. have καί ταράσσοντες. So A B D, M, min. and several vss. But σαλ. was easily explained after ver. 8 by ταράσσει, as a gloss, which was then joined by καί with the text. — Ver. 14. ὦ] A B E Μ, min. have ἔως, which Lachm. has adopted. But ἔως was not understood, and therefore was sometimes changed into ἔως, sometimes omitted (D, min. vss.). — Ver. 15. After ἥγαγον, Elz. Scholz have αὐτοῖς, against preponderating testimony. A familiar supplement. — Ver. 16. θεωροῦντοι] Lachm. and Tisch. read θεωροῦντος, which also Griesb. recommended, after A B E M, min. Fathers. Rightly; the descriptive is adapted to the στιχ. — Ver. 18. Instead of αὐτοῖς (which with Lachm., according to witnesses of some moment, is to be placed after εἴηγερα.) Rinck would prefer αὐτοῖς, according to later codd. and some vss. A result of the erroneous reference of the absolute τὴν ἀνάστασιν to the resurrection of Jesus. The pronoun is entirely wanting in B G M, min. Chrys. So Tisch.; and correctly, both on account of the frequency of the addition, and on account of the variety of the order. In D the whole passage ὦτα . . . εἴηγεραἐξεταστα is wanting, which Born. approves. — Ver. 20. Instead of τὶ δὲ, A B M, min. vss., have τίνα, and instead of θέλω: θέλει. Lachm. has adopted both. But ΤΙΑΝ was the more easily converted after the preceding τινα into ΤΙΝΑ, as τὰῦτα follows afterwards. The removal of the ἄν then occasioned the indicative. — Ver. 21. καὶ ἀκούειν] Lachm. Tisch. Born read δ ἀκούειν, which according to A B D M, Vulg. Sahid. Syr. p. is to be adopted. — Ver. 23. Instead of δὲν and τοῦτων, A B D M*

Ver. 1. Amphipolis, an Athenian colony, at that time the capital of Macedonia prima, comp. on xvi. 12, around which on both sides flowed the Strymon. Apollonia, belonging to the Macedonian province Mygdonia, was situated 36 miles to the south-west. It is not to be confounded with Apollonia in Macedonian Illyria. Thessalonica lay 36 miles to the west of Apollonia—so called either, and this is the most probable opinion, by its rebuild and embellisher, Cassander, in honour of his wife Thessalonica, or earlier by Philip, as a memorial of his subjection of Thessaly, at an earlier period Therme,—on the Thermaic gulf, the capital of the second district of Macedonia, the seat of the Roman governor, flourishing by its commerce, now the large and populous Saloniki, still inhabited by numerous Jews. — τῇ συναγωγῇ] Beza held the article to be without significance. The same error occasioned the omission of ἐκ in A B D Κ, min. Lachm. But the article marks the synagogue in Thessalonica as the only one in all that neighbourhood. Paul and Silas halted at the seat of the synagogue of the district, according to their principle of attempting their work in the first instance among the Jews (καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων). Vv. 2–4. Καὶ ἦν τὸ καθῆκα τῶν εἰωθ. τῷ Π. I.] Comp. Luke iv. 16. The construction is by way of attraction (καὶ ἦν τῷ εἰωθ. αὐτῷ εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Παῦλος), with anticipation of the subject. — δικαίως αἰτοῖ] he carried on colloquies with them.

1 Dionys. Hal., Strabo, Zonaras.  
2 Stephan. Byz., Tzetzes.  
3 See Lassen on 1 Thess. Introd. § 1.  
4 Approved by Buttmann in the Stud. W.  
Krit. 1880, p. 360.  
Thus frequently in and after Plato, with the dative or πρός, in which combinations it is never the simple facere verba ad aliquem, in opposition to de Wette, not even in xviii. 19, xx. 7, nor even in Heb. xii. 5, where the paternal παράκλησις speaks with the children. The form of dialogue, Luke ii. 46 f., was not unsuitable even in the synagogue; Jesus Himself thus taught in the synagogue, John vi. 25–59; Matt. xii. 9 ff.; Luke iv. 16 ff. — ἀπὸ τῶν γραφ. [starting from the Scriptures], deriving his doctrinal propositions from them. Is ἀπὸ τῶν γραφ. to be connected with διελ. αὑτοῖς or with διανοικον κ.τ.λ.? The latter is, on account of the greater emphasis which thus falls on ἀπὸ τ. γρ., to be preferred. — διανοικ. κ. παρατίθ. Upon what Paul laid down as doctrine, theologically, he previously gave information, by analytical development. Bengel well remarks: "Duo gradus, ut si quis nucleum fracto cortice et recludat et exeatum ponat in medio." — ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν ὑιόν (Luke xxiv. 26) κ.τ.λ. is related to καὶ δι ότος κ.τ.λ., as a general proposition of the history of salvation to its concrete realization and manifestation. The latter is to be taken thus: and that this Messiah, no other than He who had to suffer and rise again, Jesus is, whom I preach to you. Accordingly, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἐ. κατ. ἦν is the subject, and ὁ ότος ὁ Χριστός the predicate. By this arrangement the chief stress falls on Ἰησοῦς κ.τ.λ., and in the predicate ὁ ὁτος, which, according to the preceding, represents the only true Scriptural Messiah, has the emphasis, which is further brought out by the interposition of ἵνα between ὁ ὁτος and ὁ Χριστός. — ἐγὼ] emphatic: I for my part. As to the oratio variata, see on i. 4. — προσκελήρ.] is not to be taken as middle, but as passive: they were assigned by God to them, as belonging to them, as μαθηταί. Only here in the N. T. — τίνες ... πολὺ πλήθος] The proselytes were more free from prejudice than the native Jews.

Vv. 5, 6. ζηλώσαντες (see the critical remarks): filled with zeal, and having taken to themselves, namely, as abettors towards producing the intended rising of the people. — ἁγοραίοι are market-loungers, ἑδερα, a rabble which, without regular business-avocations, frequents the public places, subrostrani, subbasilicani. The distinction which old grammarians make between ἁγοραῖος and ἁγόρας appears to be groundless from the conflicting character of their statements themselves. — Whether Jason is an originally Hellenic name, or only a Hellenic transformation of the Jewish Jesus, as according to Joseph. Antt. xii. 5. 1 was certainly the case with the high priest in 2 Macc. i. 7, iv. 7 ff., remains entirely undecided from our want of knowledge as to the man himself. It was his house before which they suddenly

1 Mark ix. 34; Acts xvii. 17.
2 Comp. Delitzsch in loc. p. 612.
3 Comp. xxviii. 29; Winer, p. 349 (B. T. 465).
4 So Vulg., Luther, and many others, Winer and de Wette.
5 Priscian, Grotius, Elsmor, Morus, Rosenmüller, Valckenar, Kuhnol, Ewald.
7 Comp. Eph. i. 11.
8 But see Plut. Mor. p. 738 D; Laclau, Amor.
9 Loesner, p. 309 f.
* See Herod. ii. 141; Plat. Prot. 247 C, and Act in loc.
10 Suidas: the former is ὁ ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ ἀνατρέψομεν ἄνθρωπος, the latter ἡ ἁγορά ἐν ὧν ἡ ἁγορά τελείναι, whereas Ammonius says: the former denotes τὸν ἐν ἁγορᾷ ἁμώμουν, the latter τὸν πονηρὸν τὸν ἐν ἁγορᾷ τεθραμμένον; see Götting, Accult. p. 297. Comp. Stephanus, Thes. I. p. 450, ed. Paris.
appeared,¹ because this was known to them as the place where Paul and Silas were lodged. These two, however, were absent, either accidentally, or designedly after receiving information. — τὸν ’Ιάσωνα κ. τινας ἀδέλφ. as accomplices, and Jason also as such, and at the same time as the responsible host of the insurgents. — πολιτάρχας] like τοὺς ἀρχοντας, xvi. 19. Designation of the judicial personages acting as magistrates of the city. — οἱ τῶν οἰκουμ. ἀναστατ. who have made the world rebellious! The exaggerative character of the passionate accusation, especially after what had already taken place amidst public excitement at Philippi, is a sufficient reason to set aside the opinion that the accusation bears the colouring of a later time, Baur, Zeller; comp. xxiv. 5. — ἀναστατῶν, excito,² belongs to Alexandrian Greek.³

Ver. 7. Ἰπποδίκηται not secretly, which Erasmus finds in ἴπτα, but as in Luke x. 38, xix. 6. — As formerly in the case of Jesus the Messianic name was made to serve as a basis for the charge of high treason, so here with the confessors of Jesus (οἵτινες πάντες) as the Messiah. Comp. xix. 12. Perhaps the doctrine of the Parousia of the risen (ver. 8) Jesus had furnished a special handle for this accusation. — οἵτινες πάντες] "Eos qui fugerant, et qui aderant notant," Bengel. — ἀπελαύντων τῶν δοχείαν. Καίο. in direct opposition to the edicts of the emperor, which interdicted high treason and guarded the majesty of the Caesar.⁴ — βασιλ. λίγ. ἐνεργ. εἰναι] basile. in the wider sense, which includes also the imperial dignity.⁵

Vv. 8, 9. Ἐτέραθεν] This was alarm at revolutionary outrage and Roman vengeance. Comp. Matt. ii. 8. — λαβόντες τὸ ἰακωβ] Comp. Mark xv. 15, where τὸ ἰακωβ ποτειν ἀναίρετο is: to satisfy one, so that he can demand nothing more. Therefore: after they had received satisfaction, so that for the present they might desist from further claims against the persons of the accused, satisfactiones accepta. Comp. Grotius. But whether this satisfaction took place by furnishing sureties or by lodging a deposit of money, remains undecided; certainly its object was a guarantee that no attempt against the Roman majesty should prevail or should occur. This is evident from the relation in which λαβόντες τὸ ἰακωβ necessarily stands with the point of complaint, ver. 7, and with the disquietude (ἐτέραθεν) excited thereby. Therefore the opinions are to be rejected, that λαβ. τ. ἱκ. refers to security that Paul and Silas would appear in case of need before the court,⁶ or that they would be no longer sheltered,⁷ or that they should immediately depart.¹⁰ Moreover, it is erroneous, with Luther and Camerarius, to suppose that by τὸ ἰακωβ is meant a satisfactory vindication. Luke would certainly have brought out this more definitely; and λαβόντες denotes an actual receipt of the satisfaction (τὸ ἰακωβ), as the context suggests nothing else.

— Observe, too, how here—it is otherwise in xvi. 20—the politarchs did not

¹ See 1 and 2 Thess.
² On ἄπειρον, comp. Ecles. xxxvi. 14, xxxvii. 4.
⁴ Grotius, Raphael.
⁵ Michaelis, Heinrichs, comp. Ewald.
⁶ Heumann, Kuhn. 
prosecute the matter further, but cut it short with the furnished guarantee, which was at least politically the most prudent course.

Vv. 10—12. Digital τ. νυκτ. As in xvi. 9. — Beroea, a city in the third district of Macedonia, to the south-west of Thessalonica. ώ τετελειπεν ώ πεμπει, so frequent in Greek writers, only here in the N. T. They separated, after their arrival, from their companions, and went away to the synagogue. — εἰς εὐεστιαροήν] of a nobler character. Theophyl. after Chrys.: εἰς εὐεστιαροήν. An arbitrary limitation; tolerance is comprehended in the general nobleness of disposition. — τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλ. than the Jews in Thessalonica. — τά καθ' ἡμέραν daily. — άνακρίνοντες τάς γρ. searching the Scriptures (John v. 39), namely, to prove: εἰ ἔχει τάα, which Paul and Silas stated, πρότερον, as they taught, "Character versus religion, quod se djudicari patitur," Bengel. — εἰς Χρυσ. see on xiii. 50. — The Hellenic women and men are to be considered partly as proselytes of the gate who had heard the preaching of Christ in the synagogue, and partly as actual Gentiles who were gained in private conversations. Comp. on xi. 20. — Κελλερίνου] construed with γνωσών, but also to be referred to ἀνθρώπων. — That the church of Beroea soon withered again, is quite as arbitrarily assumed by Baumgarten, as that it was the only one founded by Paul to which no letter of the apostle has come down to us. How many churches may Paul have founded of which we know nothing whatever ! (2).

Vv. 13—15. Κακίζω] is to be connected, not with ἔλθω, so that then the usual attraction would take place, but with σαλευτόρητος; for not the coming, but the σαλευεύω, had formerly taken place elsewhere. — Ver. 14. Then immediately the brethren sent Paul away from the city, that he might journey ως εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Neither here nor elsewhere is ως redundant, but it indicates the definitely conceived purpose of the direction, which he had to take toward the sea, the Thermaic gulf. Others render it: as if toward the sea; so that, in order to escape the snares, they took the road toward the sea only apparently, and then turned to the land-route. But in that case Luke, if he wished to be understood, would not have failed to add a remark counter to the mere semblance of the πορ. εἰς τ. θάλ, especially as in what follows nothing necessarily points to a journey by land to Athens. — ὁ Τιμοθεός.] Where Timothy, supposing him to have remained behind at Philippi, again fell in with Paul and Silas, is uncertain. — ἐκεί] in Beroea.

— Ver. 15. καταστάναι] to bring to the spot; then, to transport, to escort one. — ἐνω ως τάξις τ. κ.λ. See xviii. 5, according to which, however, they

1 Liv. xiv. 30. [Ferris.
2 See Forbiger, Geogr. III. p. 1061. Now
3 Comp. 4 Macc. vi. 8; 2 Macc. xxi. 1.
5 Comp. Luke xi. 5, xix. 47; Bernhardy, p.
6 See Matthew, 641.
7 See on Matt. ii. 22.
8 See Winer, p. 573 f. (E. T. 771); Hermann, ad Philoct. 86; Elenchi, Lex Soph. II. p. 1004.
9 Besa, Piscator, Gottius, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Olahausen, Neander, Lange.
10 Erasmus correctly observes: "probabiliss est enim navigavisse . . . quas nulla fit mentione eorum, quae P. in itinere gesset, cul fuerint tot civitates pergrandae."
11 See on xvi. 40.
12 Not: who brought him in safety (Besa and others). — Homer. Od. xiii. 374: τοις n' ἀκατάτονα Πολιοντα (thus also by ship) εὑρισκόμενοι, Theoc. iv. 78, vi. 108. 8; Xen. Anab. iv. 6. 8.
only joined Paul at Corinth. But this, as regards Timothy, is an incorrect statement, as is clearly evident from 1 Thess. iii. 1,—a point which is to be acknowledged, and not to be smoothed over by harmonistic combinations which do not tally with any of the two statements. According to Baumgarten, Luke has only mentioned the presence of the two companions again with Paul, xviii. 5, when their co-operation could again take an effective part in the diffusion of the gospel. But it is not their being together, but their coming together, that is narrated in Acts xviii. 5 (A²).

Ver. 16. Παρωξινωτος was irritated at the high degree of heathen darkness and perversity which prevailed at Athens. — το πνεύμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αἰνώ] comp. John xi. 33, 38. — The genitive θεωρούντως, mentally attached to αὐτοῦ (see the critical remarks): because he saw.—κατείδωλον full of images, of idols, not preserved elsewhere in Greek, but formed according to usual analogies (κατάμπελος, κατάδεναρος, κατάξωνος, κατάλιθος, al.). — Athens, the centre of Hellenic worship and art, united zeal for both in a pre-eminent degree, and was—especially at that period of political decay, when outward ritual and show in the sphere of religion and superstition flourished among the people alongside of the philosophical self-sufficiency of the higher scholastic wisdom among people of culture—full of temples and altars, of priests and other persons connected with worship, who had to minister at an innumerable number of pompous festivals.

Ver. 17. οὐ] impelled by that indignation to counteract this heathen confusion. He had intended only to wait for his companions at Athens, but "insigni et extraordinario zelo stimulatus rem gerit miles Christi," Bengel. And this zeal caused him, in order to pave the way for Christianity in opposition to the heathenism here so particularly powerful, to enter into controversial discussions with Jews and Gentiles at the same time, not first with the Jews, and, on being rejected by them, afterwards with Gentiles. — in τῇ ἁγορᾷ favours the view that, as usual in Greek cities, there was only one market at Athens. If there were two markets, still the celebrated ἁγορα καὶ ἐξοχὴν is to be understood, not far from the Pnyx, the Acropolis, and the Areopagus, bounded by the στοὰ τουκλῆ on the west, by the Stoa Basileios and the Stoa Eleutherios on the south, rich in noble statues, the central seat of commercial, forensic, and philosophic intercourse, as well as of the busy idleness of the loungers (B²).

Ver. 18. That it was Epicureans and Stoics who fell into conflict with him, and not Academics and Peripatetics, is to be explained—apart from the greater popularity of the two former, and from the circumstance that they were in this later period the most numerous at Athens—from the greater contrast of their philosophic tenets with the doctrines of Christianity. The one had their principle of pleasure, and the other their pride of virtue!

---

1 Such as Otto, Pastoralr. p. 61 f., makes.
2 See Lünemann on 1 Thess. iii. 1.
3 1 Cor. xiii. 5; Dem. 514. 10: ὑψιστὴν και
4 Rom. i. 21 ff.
5 See Paus. i. 24. 3; Strabo, x. p. 479: Liv. xlv. 27; Xen. Rep. Ath. iii. 2; and Wetstein in loc.
6 See on ver. 2.
7 Forchhammer, Fehiger, and others.
8 So Otfried Müller and others.
9 Not the Braeis (v vυν ἐνυν ἁγορα, Strabo, x. 10. p. 447).
and both repudiated faith in the Divine Providence. 1 — The opinion of these philosophers was twofold. Some, with vain scholastic conceit, pronounced Paul's discourses, which lacked the matter and form of Hellenic philosophy, to be idle talk, undeserving of attention, and would have nothing further to do with him. Others were at least curious about this new matter, considered the singular stranger as an announcer of strange divinities, and took him with them, in order to hear more from him and to allow their fellow-citizens to hear him, to the Areopagus, etc. — τι ἀν θέλοι . . . λέγειν] if, namely, his speaking is to have a meaning. 2 — οὐ σπερμολόγον] originally the rook. 3 Then in twofold figurative meaning: (1) from the manner in which that bird feeds, a parasite; and (2) from its chattering voice, a babbler. 4 So here, as the speaking of Paul gave occasion to this contemptuous designation. 5 — δαιμονίων] divinities, quite generally. The plural is indefinite, and denotes the category, see on Matt. ii. 20. According to de Wette, it is Jesus the Risen One and the living God that are meant in contrast to the Greek gods, — an element, however, which, according to the subjoined remark of Luke, appears as imported. The judgment of the philosophers, very similar to the charge previously brought against Socrates, 6 but not framed possibly in imitation of it, in opposition to Zeller, was founded on their belief that Jesus, whom Paul preached and even set forth as a raiser of the dead, must be assumed, doubtless, to be a foreign divinity, whose announcer — καταγγέλτης, not elsewhere preserved — Paul desired to be. Hence Luke adds the explanatory statement: δε τὸν Ἰησοῦν κ. τ. ἀνάστ. εἰνηγ. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Alexander Morus, Selden, Hammond, Spencer, Heinrichs, Baur, 7 Lange, and Baumgarten, strangely imagine that the philosophers meant the Ἀνάστασις as a goddess announced by Paul. 8 But if Luke had aimed at this by his explanatory remark, he must have indicated it more precisely, especially as it is in itself improbable that the philosophers could, even in mere irony, derive from the words of the apostle a goddess Ἀνάστασις, for Paul doubtless announced who would raise the dead. Olearius referred τ. ἀνάστ. not to the general resurrection of the dead, but to the resurrection of Jesus; so also Bengel. But Luke, in that case, in order not to be misunderstood, must have added αὐτῷ, which (see the critical remarks) he has not done.

Vv. 19, 20. Ἐπιλαβόμενοι] Grotius aptly says: "manu leniter prehensum." 9 Adroitly confiding politeness. Ver. 21 proves that a violent seizure and carrying away to judicial examination is not indicated, as Adami 10 and others imagined, but that the object in view was simply to satisfy the curiosity of the people flocking to the Areopagus. And this is evinced by the whole proceedings, which show no trace of a judicial process, ending as they did partly with ridicule and partly with polite dismissal, ver. 81.

1 Comp. Hermann, Culturgesch. d. Gr. w. 2 See on ii. 12. [Støm. I. p. 267 f. 3 Aristoph. As. 323, 579. 4 Dem. 326, 19; Athen. viii. p. 344 C. 5 See also Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 297. 6 Xen. Mem. I. i. 1. 7 See his Pauius, I. p. 193, ed. 2; the ironical popular wit had out of Jesus and the ἀνάστασις made a pair of divinities. 8 Comp. also Ewald. p. 494 f. 9 Comp. ix. 27, xxiii. 19. 10 See in Wolf.
after which Paul departed unhindered. Besides the Athenians were very indulgent to the introduction of foreign, particularly Oriental, worship, provided only there was not conjoined with it rejection of the native gods, such as Socrates was formerly accused of. To this the assertion of Josephus, c. Ap. 2, is to be limited: νόμω δ’ ἐν τούτῳ παρ’ αὐτοῖς κεκολομενον καὶ μιμορία κατὰ τῶν ξένων εἰσαγόμενων θεῶν ὥστε θάνατο,—which, perhaps, is merely a generalization from the history of Socrates. And certainly Paul, as the wisdom of his speech attests, prudently withheld a direct condemning judgment of the Athenian gods. Notwithstanding, Baur and Zeller have again insisted on a judicial process in the Areopagus—alleging that the legend of Dionysius the Areopagite, as the first bishop of Athens, had given rise to the whole history; that there was a wish to procure for Paul an opportunity, as solemn as possible, for the exposition of his teaching, an arena analogous to the Sanhedrim (Zeller), etc. Concerning the Ἄρειος πάγος, σύλλογον Ἀριστοτέλους so called ἵνα πρὸς Ἀρης ἐνταῦθα ἐκρίθη, the seat of the supreme judicature of Athens, situated to the west of the Acropolis, and concerning the institution and authority of that tribunal, see Meursius.—an οἰκομένη δικαίου κ.τ.λ.] invitation in the form of a courteous question, by way of securing the contemplated enjoyment.—τις ἡ καὶ τυχή κ.τ.λ.] volat, as respects its more precise contents, this new doctrine, namely, that which is being announced by you. In the repetition of the article there is here implied a pert, ironical emphasis.—εὐσίζωντα] startling. εὐσίζω οὗ ὕμων τὸ ξένων ὑποδεχομαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπικλῆτες.]—εἰσόψεις] namely, whilst you are here, hence the present.—τι ἂν θέλω ταύτα εἰσαι] see on ver. 18, ii. 12, and Tittmann, Synon. N. T. p. 129 f. The plural ταύτα indicates the individual points, after the collective character of which τι inquires.

Ver. 21. A remark of Luke added for the elucidation of vv. 19, 20. But Athenians, Ἀθηναῖοι, without the article: Athenian people, collectively, and the strangers resident there, had leisure for nothing else than, etc. εὐσίζωντα, vacare alicui rei, belongs to the later Greek. The imperfect does not exclude the continuance of the state of things in the present, but interweaves it with the history, so that it is transferred into the same time with the latter. According to Ewald, Luke actually means an earlier period, when it had still been so in Athens, “before it was plundered by Nero.” But then we should at least have expected an indication of this in the text by τότε or πάλαι, even apart from the fact that such a characteristic of a city is not so quickly lost. κατανόημεν] The comparative delineates more strongly

1 Strabo, x. p. 474; Philostr. Flit. Apoll. vi. 7; Hermann, Gottesk. Alterth. § 12.
2 Ver. 22 ff.
3 Eus. iv. 23.
4 Paus. i. 38. 5.
8 Krüger, § ix. S. 2; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Gorg. p. 638 C, Euliphiphr. p. 15 A.
9 πάλαι, see Fritzsch, ad Marc. p. 12; Kühner, § 685, note 2; [Phryn. p. 195.
10 Sturm, de Dial. Al. p. 189; Lobeck, ad
11 See on John xi. 16, and Kühner, ad Xer. Anab. i. 4. 9. Comp. also the pluperfect ἔξωκος, ver. 23.
and vividly. The novelty-loving and talkative Athenians wished always to be saying or hearing something newer than the previous news.

Ver. 22. Σκαθείς εν ὑπώρ] denotes intrepidity. — The wisdom with which Paul here could become a Gentile to the Gentiles, has been at all times justly praised. There is to be noted also, along with this, the elegance and adroitness, combined with all simplicity, in the expression and progress of thought; the speech is, as respects its contents and form, full of sacred Attic art, a vividly original product of the free apostolic spirit. — καὶ πίνακα] in all respects. Comp. Col. iii. 20, 22. δεισιδαιμονεστέροις] A comparison with the other Greeks, in preference over whom Athens had the praise of religiousness. δεισιδαιμόω means divinity-fearing, but may, as the fear of God may be the source of either, denote as well real piety as superstition. Paul therefore, without violating the truth, prudently leaves the religious tendency of his hearers undetermined, and names only its source — the fear of God. Chrysostom well remarks: προσδοκουμεν τῷ λόγῳ διά τοῦτο εἰς δεισιδαιμονεστέροις ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ. Mistaking this fine choice of the expression, the Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calovius, Suicer, Wolf, and others explained it: superstitiones. ὡς: I perceive you as more God-fearing, so that you appear as such. — ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ] "Magna perspicacia et parrhesia; unus Paulus contra Athenas," Bengel.

Ver. 23. Διερχόμεν] belongs jointly to τὰ σεβάσματα. ὑμ. — ἀναθεόρ. τὰ σεβ. ὑμ.] attentively contemplating the objects of your worship, temples, altars, images. — ἀγνώστω θεῷ] That there actually stood at Athens at least one altar with the inscription: "to an unknown god," would appear historically certain from this passage itself, even though other proofs were wanting, since Paul appeals to his own observation, and that, too, in the presence of the Athenians themselves. But there are corroborating external proofs: (1) Pausan. i. 1. 4. (comp. v. 14. 6) says: in Athens there were βωμοὶ θεῶν τι γυμναζομένων ἄγνώστων καὶ ἠρωμένων; and (2) Philostr. Vit. Apollo. vi. 2: σωροντερον περὶ πάντων θεῶν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ ταῦτα Ἀθηναίοι, οὗ καὶ ἄγνωστων θεῶν βωμοὶ ἑρωται. From both passages it is evident that at Athens there were several altars, each of which bore the votive inscription: ἄγνωστω θεῷ. The explanation of the origin of such altars is less certain. Yet Diog. Laert. Epim. 3 gives a trace of it, when it is related that Epimenides put an end to a plague in Athens by causing black and white sheep, which he had let loose on the Areopagus, to be sacrificed on the spots where they lay down τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ, i.e. to the god concerned, yet not known by

1 Thuc. iii. 33. 4.
2 Wetstein and Valckenera in loc.
3 See Winer, p. 296 (E. T. 305). Comp. Plat. Phaed. p. 115 B; Dem. 43. 7; 160. 2.
5 Xen. Cyr. iii. 3, 56, Apo. 11. 8.
6 Theophr. Char. 16; Diod. Sic. i. 62; Lucian. Alex. 9; Plutarch, and others.
7 See on this word, Hermann, gotteid.
8 See Bernhardy, p. 338. [Allert. § 8. 6.
9 Heb. xiii. 7; Diod. Sic. xii. 18; Pint. L. P. 1; Lucian, Vit. acut. 2; comp. ἀναθεόρουσας, Cicero, ad Att. ix. 19, xiv. 15 f.
10 2 Thess. 11. 4; Wisd. xiv. 30, xv. 7; Hist. Drag. 27; Dion. Hal. Ant. i. 30, v. 1; Suicer, Theor. II. p. 942.
11 Lucian, Philopat. 9 and 29, is invalid as a proof, for there the reference of the pseudo-Lucian to the ἄγνωστος εἰς Ἀθηναῖς is based on this very passage.
name, namely, who was the author of the plague; and that therefore one may find at Athens βομιοὶ ἀνώνυμοι, i.e. altars without the designation of a god by name, not as Kuinoel, following Olearius, thinks, without any inscription. From this particular instance the general view may be derived, that on important occasions, when the reference to a god known by name was wanting, as in public calamities of which no definite god could be assigned as the author, in order to honor or propitiate the god concerned (τὸν προοίμου) by sacrifice, without lighting on a wrong one, altars were erected which were destined and designated ἀγνώστω θεώ. Without any historical foundation, Eichhorn¹ supposed that such altars proceeded from the time when the art of writing was not yet known or in use; and that at a later period, when it was not known to what god these altars belonged, they were marked with that inscription in order not to offend any god. Against this may be urged the great probability that the destination of such altars would be preserved in men's knowledge by oral tradition. Entirely peculiar is the remark of Jerome on Tit. 1. 13: "Inscriptio arae non ita erat, ut Paulus assererit: ignoto Deo, sed ita: Diis Asias et Europae et Africae, Diis ignorant et peregrinis." Verum quia Paulus non pluribus Diis ignotis indigebat, sed uno tantum ignoto Deo, singulari verbo usus est," etc. But there is no historical trace of such an altar-inscription; and, had it been in existence, Paul could not have meant it, because we cannot suppose that, at the very commencement of his discourse, he would have made a statement before the Athenians deviating so much from the reality and only containing an abstract inference from it. The ἀγνώστω θεώ could not but have its literal accuracy and form the whole inscription; otherwise Paul would only have promoted the suspicion of στερμολογία. We need not inquire to what definite god the Athenians pointed by their ἀγνώστω θεώ. In truth, they meant no definite god, because, in the case which occasioned the altar, they knew none such. The view (see in Wolf) that the God of the Jews—the obscure knowledge of whom had come from the Jews to Egypt, and thence to the Greeks—is meant, is an empty dogmatic invention. Baur, p. 292, ed. 2, with whom Zeller agrees, maintains that the inscription in the singular is unhistorical; that only the plural, ἄγνωστοι θεοί, could have been written; and that only a writer at a distance, who "had to fear no contradiction on the spot," could have ventured on such an intentional alteration. But the very hint given to us by Diogenes Laertius as to the origin of such altars is decisive against this notion, as well as the correct remark of Grotius: "Cum Pausanias ait aras Athenis fuisse θεών ἀγνώστων, hoc vult, multas fuisse aras tali inscriptions: θεών ἀγνώστων, quamquam potuere et aliae esse


² But, according to Oecumenius: θεοῖς Ἀσίαι καὶ Εὐρώπης καὶ Λατινίοις θεῶν ἀγνωστῶν καὶ ξένων. Comp. Isidor. Polis. in Cramer, Cat. p. 304. According to Ewald, this is the more exact statement of the inscription; from it Paul may have borrowed his quotation. But the exactness is suspicious just on account of the singular in Oecumenius; and moreover, Paul would have gone much too freely to work by the omission of the essential term Λατινίοις ("the unknown and strange god of Libya"); nor would he have had any reason for the omission of the ξένων, while he might, on the contrary, have employed it in some ingenious sort of turn with reference to ver. 18.
plurality inscriptae, aliae singulariter." Besides, it may be noted that Paul, had he read ἄνωστος θεός on the altar might have used this plural expression for his purpose as suitably as the singular, since he, in fact, continues with the generic neuter δ... τοῦτο. — On the Greek altars without temples, see Hermann, gottesd. Altherth. § 17. — δ οὖν ἄνωστος εἰσεβείτε, τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.] (see the critical remarks) what ye therefore, according to this inscription, without knowing it, worship, that, this very object of your worship, do I, εἰς, with a self-conscious emphasis, make known unto you. Paul rightly inferred from the inscription that the Athenians, besides the gods, Zeus, Athene, etc., known to them, recognised something divine as existing and to be worshipped, which was different from these, however, after the manner of heathenism, they might conceive of it in various concrete forms.

And justly also, as the God preached by him was another than those known heathen gods,1 he might now say that this divinity, which served them in an unknown manner as the object of worship, was that which he announced to them, in order that it might now become to them γνωστὸς θεός. Of course, they could not yet take up this expression in the sense of the apostle himself, but could only think of some divine being according to their usual heathen conception,2 but, most suitably to the purpose he had in view, reserving the more exact information for the further course of his address, he now engaged the religious interest of his hearers in his own public announcement of it, and thereby excited that interest the more, as by this ingeniously improvised connection he exhibited himself quite differently from what those might have expected who deemed him a καταγελεῖσε διὰν δαιμονίων, ver. 18. Chrysostom aptly remarks in this respect: ἣν πός ἀληθῶς προειληφθας αὐτὸν οἰδήν διὰν, φησίν, οἰδήν καὶ νῦν εἰσέρχεται. — Observe, also, the conciliatory selection of εἰσεβείτε, which expresses pious worship, εἰσέβεθεν, with the accusative of the object,3 is in classical writers, though rare, yet certainly vouched for, in opposition to Valckenaer, Porson, Seidler, Ellendt4 (c).

Vv. 24–29. Paul now makes that unknown divinity known in concreto, and in such a manner that his description at the same time exposes the nullity of the polytheism deifying the powers of nature, with which he contrasts the divine affinity of man.

Comp. Rom. i. 18 ff.

Vv. 24, 25. Comp. vii. 48; Ps. 1. 10 ff.; also the similar expressions from profane writers.5 — θεραπευταί is served, by offerings, etc., namely, as regards the actual objective state of the case. — προσδέομαι. τινὸς] as one, who needed anything in addition,6 i.e. to what He Himself is and has. Erasmus, Paraph.: “cum... nullius boni desideret accessionem.”7 — αὐτὸς ἰδιός

1 Rom. i. 22, 23; 1 Cor. viii. 4 ff., x. 20.
2 Comp. Laws in the Stud. und Krit. 1850, p. 584 f.
3 1 Tim. v. 4; 4 Macc. v. 23, xl. 5.
4 See Hermann, ad Sopha. Ant. 727. Compare also the Greek δαιμονίων τι of τοῦν.
5 In Grotius and Wetstein, Kypke, II. 98, and the passages cited from Porphyr. by Ullmann in the Stud. und Krit. 1872, p. 388; likewise Philo, leg. alleg. II. p. 1037.
6 Luther takes τινὸς as masculine, which likewise excellently corresponds with what precedes, as with the following εἰς. But the neuter rendering is yet to be preferred, as affecting everything except God (in the vi there is also every τι.) Comp. Clem. ad Cor. I. 53.
7 Comp. 3 Macc. xiv. 53, and Grimm in loc.,
A confirmatory definition to οἶδε...τινός: seeing that He Himself gives, etc.—πάσιν] to all men, which is evident from the relation of αὐτὸς...πᾶνα to the preceding οἶδε...τινός.—[Ωῆν κ. πνοήν] the former denotes life in itself, the latter the continuance of life, which is conditioned by breathing. 'Ἐπνοοῦντι ἔτει εἰμὶ κ. πνοὰς θερμὰς πνεύματα.'1 The dying man φρώσεις πνοῶν; εἰκνεῖν. Erasmus correctly remarks the jucundus concentus of the two words.2 Others assume a hendiadys, which, as regards analysis—life, and indeed breath—and form, namely, that the second substantive is subordinate, and must be converted into the adjective, Calvin has correctly apprehended: vitam animalis. But how tame and enfeebling!—καὶ τὰ πάντα] and, generally, all things, namely, which they use.—Chrysostom has already remarked how far this very first point of the discourse, vv. 24, 25, transcends not only heathenism in general, but also the philosophies of heathenism, which could not rise to the idea of an absolute Creator. Observe the threefold contents of the speech: Theology, ver. 24 f.; Anthropology, vv. 26—29; Christology, ver. 30 f.

Vv. 26, 27. “The single origin of men and their adjusted diffusion upon the earth was also His work, in order that they should seek and find Him who is near to all.”—ἐπίστρεψε...κατοικίας] He has made that from—proceeding from—one blood, every nation of men should dwell upon all the face of the earth, comp. Gen. xi. 8. Castratico, Calvin, Beza, and others: “feci et, a sanguine omne genus hominum, ut inhabitaret” (after ἄνθρωπo a comme). Against this is the circumstance that ὁρίας κ. ἡ. contains the modal definition, not to the making, to the producing, of the nations, but to the making-them-to-dwell, as is evident from τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν; so that this interpretation is not according to the context.—ἐξ ἐνὸς αἰματός See, respecting αἷμα as the seat of life propagating itself by generation, on John i. 18. Paul, by this remark, that all men through one heavenly Father have also one earthly father, does not specially oppose, as Stolz, Kuinoel, and others, following older interpreters, assume, the belief of the Athenians that they were αὐτόχθόνες;3 the whole discourse is elevated above so special a polemic bearing. But he speaks in the way of general and necessary contrast to the polytheistic nature-religions, which derived the different nations from different origins in their myths. Quite irrelevant is what Olahausen suggests as the design of Paul, that he wished to represent the contempt in which the Jews were held among the Greeks as absurd. —ἐπὶ τὰν τὸ πρῶτον. τ. γῆς] refers to the idea of the totality of the nations dwelling on the earth, which is contained in πάν εἴδος, every nation.

—ὁρίας] Aorist participle contemporaneous with ἐπιστρέφει, specifying how God proceeded in that ἐπιστρέψει κ. ἡ.: inasmuch as He has fixed the appointed periods and the definite boundaries of their, the nation's, dwelling. τῆς κατοικίας a. belongs to both—to πρωτετ. καρπ., and to τὰς ὄροθ. God has deter-

p. 199. See on this meaning of the verb especially, Dem. xiv. 22; Plat. Phil. p. 80 E; and on the distinction of πρωτετευματικὸς and τ. Stalib. ad Plat. Rep. p. 343 A.  

1 Pind. Nem. x. 140.  
2 Comp. Lobeck, Paral. p. 50; Winer, p. 561 (E. T. 798).  
3 See Wetstein in loc.
Paul’s Address.

mined the dwelling of the nations, according both to its duration in time and to its extension in space. Both, subject to change, run their course in a development divinely ordered. Others take προοριστ. καυρ. independently of τα καυρα. καυρ., so Baumgarten; but thereby the former expression presents itself in perplexing indefiniteness. The sense of the epochs of the world set forth by Daniel must have been more precisely indicated than by the simple καυρα. Lachmann has separated προορισταγμ. into πρός τα τεταγμένας unnecessarily, contrary to all versions and Fathers, also contrary to the reading προορισταγμ. in D* Iren. interpr. — η ὄρθωσις is not elsewhere preserved, but τὸ ὀρθῳσιον; see Bornemann.

Ver. 27. The divine purpose in this guidance of the nations is attached by means of the telic infinitive: * in order that they should seek the Lord, i.e. direct their endeavours to the knowledge of God, if perhaps they might feel Him, who is so palpably near, and find Him. Olshausen thinks that in σετείν is implied the previous apostasy of mankind from God. But the seeking does not necessarily suppose a having lost; and since the text does not touch on an earlier fellowship of man with God, although that is in itself correct, the hearers, at least, could not infer that conclusion from the simple σετείν. The great thought of the passage is simply: God the Author, and the Governor, and the End of the world’s history: from God, through God, to God.—ψηλαφ . . . εἴροιν] Paul keeps consistently to his figure. The seeker who comes on his object touches and grasps it, and has now in reality found it. Hence the meaning without figure is: if perchance they might become conscious of God and of their relation to Him, and might appropriate this consciousness as a spiritual possession. Thus they would have understood the guidance of the nations as a revelation of God, and have complied with its holy design in their own case. The problematic expression, εἴ ἰδοντες, if they at least accordingly, is in accordance both with the nature of the case—Bengel: “via patet; Deus inveniri potest, sed hominem non cogit”—and with the historical want of success; for the heathen world was blinded, to which also ψηλαφ points—a word which, since the time of Homer, is very frequently used of groping in the dark or in blindness.—καίροις κ.τ.λ.; although certainly He does not at all require to be first sought and found, as He is not far from every one of us. Comp. Jer. xxiii. 28. This addition makes palpably evident the greatness of the blindness, which nevertheless took place.

Ver. 28. Reason assigned (γάρ) for ὁ μακρ. ἀπὸ τῆς κατολ., for in Him we see, we move, and we exist. Paul views God under the point of view of His immanence as the element in which we live, etc.; and man in such intimate connection with God, that he is constantly surrounded by the Godhead and embraced in its essential influence, but, apart from the Godhead, could

1 serosa, Polyb. v. 78. 5; Strabo, v. p. 346.
2 Comp. Job xii. 23.
3 Baumgarten.
6 See Klots, ad Didar. pp. 178, 192.
7 See Rom. i. 18 ff., and comp. Baumg. p. 550 ff.
8 Od. ix. 416; Job v. 14; comp. here especially, Plato, Phaed. p. 90 B.
9 xiv. 17; John iv. 2.
10 For see ver. 28.
neither live, nor move, nor exist.\(^1\) This explanation is required by the relation of the words to the preceding, according to which they are designed to prove the nearness of God; therefore \(\epsilon\nu \alpha\iota\nu\phi\) must necessarily contain the local reference—the idea of the divine \(\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\chi\sigma\rho\sigma\iota\), which Chrysostom illustrates by the example of the air surrounding us on all sides. Therefore the rendering \(p\epsilon\rho\varepsilon\varphi\nu\),\(^2\) or, as de Wette more correctly expresses it, “resting on Him as the foundation,”\(^3\) which would yield no connection in the way of proof with the \(\sigma\nu\kappa\rho\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\) of the Godhead, is to be abandoned. In opposition to the pantheistic view, see already Calvin. It is sufficient to urge against it—although it was also asserted by Spinoza and others—on the one hand, that the transcendence of God is already decidedly attested in vv. 24–26, and on the other, that the \(\epsilon\nu \alpha\iota\nu\phi\ \zeta\omicron\mu\nu\nu\ \kappa\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\) is said solely of \(\mu\nu\iota\), and that indeed in so far as they stand in essential connection with God by \(d\epsilon\iota\nu\eta\iota\ \sigma\rho\sigma\tau\iota\) see, the following, in which case the doctrine of the reality of evil \(^4\) excludes a spiritual pantheism. — \(\zeta\omicron\mu\nu\nu\ \kappa\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\ \iota\omicron\mu\nu\kappa\vartheta\iota\) a climax: out of God we should have no life, not even movement, which yet inanimate creatures, plants, waters, etc., have, nay, not even any existence, we should not have been at all. Heinrich and others take a superficial view when they consider all three to be synonymous. Storr,\(^5\) on the other hand, arbitrarily puts too much into \(\zeta\omicron\mu\nu\nu\); \(\nu\iota\nu\iota\mu\nu\iota\ \beta\alpha\iota\mu\nu\ \alpha\iota\kappa\iota\nu\iota\) and Olshausen, after Kuinoel, too much into \(\iota\omicron\mu\nu\iota\): the true being, the life of the spirit. It is here solely physical life and being that is meant; the moral life-fellowship with God, which is that of the regenerate, is remote from the context.—\(\tau\iota\omicron\zeta\ \tau\omega\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\theta\ \iota\nu\alpha\zeta\nu\zeta\) Namely, Aratus, of Soli in Cilicia, in the third century B.C.,\(^6\) and Cleantus of Assos in Mysia, a disciple of Zeno.\(^7\) For other analogous passages, see Wetstein.—The acquaintance of the apostle with the Greek poets is to be considered as only of a dilettante sort;\(^8\) his school-training was entirely Jewish, but he was here obliged to abstain from O. T. quotations.—\(\tau\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\iota\theta\ \iota\nu\alpha\zeta\nu\zeta\) Of the poets pertaining to you, i.e. your poets.—\(\tau\omicron\nu \gamma\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu \iota\omicron\mu\nu\kappa\vartheta\iota\) The first half of a hexameter, verbatim from Aratus l.c.; therefore \(\gamma\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\) is not to be considered in logical connection with the speech of the apostle, but as, independently of the latter, a component part of the poetical passage, which he could not have omitted without destroying the verse. \(N\alpha\iota\ \nu\iota\iota\zeta\ \pi\omicron\nu\iota\iota\nu\iota\zeta\) sumus: this Paul adduces as a parallel (\(\zeta\omicron\kappa\iota\ \tau\iota\omicron\zeta\ . . . \epsilon\iota\rho\kappa\alpha\iota\)) confirm-

---

\(^1\) Comp. Dio Chrys. vol. I. p. 384, ed. Reiske: \(\epsilon\omicron\nu \mu\kappa\rho\alpha\nu\ \omicron\nu\iota\ \iota\omicron\nu\iota\ \kappa\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\ \delta\omega\kappa\iota\mu\iota\mu\iota\nu\iota\). \(\epsilon\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\nu\phi\ \kappa\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\ \iota\omicron\mu\nu\kappa\vartheta\iota\.
\(^2\) Beza, Grotius, Heinrichs, Kuinoel.
\(^3\) Comp. already Chrysostom: \(\omicron\nu\ \iota\omicron\nu\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\ \iota\omicron\mu\nu\kappa\vartheta\iota\).
\(^4\) Comp. Olshausen.
\(^5\) Opusc. III. p. 95.
\(^6\) Pharnom. 5.
\(^7\) Hymn. in Jov. 5.
\(^8\) That Paul after his conversion, on account of his destination to the Gentiles, may have earnestly occupied himself in Tarsus with Greek literature (Baumgarten), to which also the \(\beta\i\omicron\lambda\iota\), 2 Tim. iv. 13, are supposed to point, is a very precarious assumption, especially as it is Aratus, a fellow-countrypman of the apostle, who is quoted, and other quotations (except Tit. i. 13) are not demonstrable (comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 33). The poetical expression itself in our passage is such a common idea (see Wetstein), that an acquaintance with it from several Greeks poets (\(\tau\iota\omicron\nu\iota\iota\nu\iota\)) by no means presupposes a more special study of Greek literature. See Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans, § 1. See Bernhardy, p. 241.
ing to his hearers his own assertion, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴν . . . ἵματι. As the offspring of God, we men stand in such homogeneity to God, and thus in such necessary and essential connection with God, that we cannot have life, etc., without Him, but only in Him. So absolutely dependent is our life, etc., on Him. — τοῦ] Here, according to poetical usage since the time of Homer, in the sense of τοίτου. Paul has idealised the reference of the τοῦ to Zeus in Aratus.—In the passage of Cleanthes, which was also in the apostle’s mind, it is said. εἰ σῶν γὰρ γένος ἵματι, where γένος is the accusative of more precise definition, and means, not kindred, as with Aratus, but origin.

Ver. 29. Since, then, we, according to this poetical saying, are offspring of God, so must our self-consciousness, kindred to God, tell us that the Godhead has not resemblance to gold, etc. We cannot suppose a resemblance of the Godhead to such materials, graven by human art, without denying ourselves as the progenies of God. Therefore we ought not (οῖκ θελομεν). What a delicate and penetrating attack on heathen worship! That Paul with the reproach, which in οἰκ θελομεν κ.τ.λ. is expressed with wise mildness, does no injustice to heathenism, whose thinkers had certainly in great measure risen above anthropomorphism, but hits the prevailing popular opinion, may be seen in Baumgarten, p. 566 ff. — γένος placed first and separated from τ. θεοῦ, as the chief point of the argument. For, if we are proles Dei, and accordingly homogeneous with God, it is a preposterous error at variance with our duty to think, with respect to things which are entirely heterogeneous to us, as gold, silver, and stone, that the Godhead has resemblance with them. — χαράγματα τέχν. κ. ενθ. ἀνθρώπου] a graven image which is produced by art and deliberation of a man, for the artist made it according to the measure of his artistic meditation and reflection: an apposition to χρυσ. κ.τ.λ., not in the ablative (Bengel). — τὸ θεῖον] the divine nature, divinum numen. The general expression ἄφιξις corresponds to the discourse on heathenism, as the real object of the latter. Observe also the striking juxtaposition of ἀνθρώπου and τὸ θεῖον; for χαράγμ. τέχν. κ. ενθ. ἀνθρ. serves to make the οἰκ θελομεν νομίζειν still more palpably felt; insomuch as metal and stone serve only for the materials of human art and artistic thoughts, but far above human artistic subjectivity, which wishes to represent the divine nature in these materials, must the Godhead be exalted, which is not similar to the human image, but widely different from it.

Vv. 30, 31. It is evident from ver. 29 that heathenism is based on ignorance. Therefore Paul, proceeding to the Christological portion of his discourse, now continues with μὴ οὖν: the times, therefore, of ignorance, for such they are, according to ver. 29, God having overlooked, makes known at present to all men everywhere to repent. — ἑπερατῶν] without noting them with a view to punishment or other interference. The idea of contempt, although

1 See Kühner, § 490, 5; Eilenriedt, Lex. Eph. II. p. 198.
2 Graf views it otherwise, but against the clear words of the passage, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 232.
3 Bengel: "elementa locutio, præseertim in prima persona plurali."
4 ὁρεῖ τοὺς θελομένους δ' λόγον ἐν αὐτῷ, Chrysostom.
5 Herod. ill. 108, l. 23; Plat. Phaedr. p. 243
6 Comp. Wisd. xv. 15 ff.
7 Comp. Dion. Hal. v. 33. Opposite of ἀφορίζειν. See also on Rom. iii. 35; Acts xiv. 16.
8 Vulg.: despiciens.
otherwise linguistically suitable, which Castalio, de Dieu, Gataker, Calovius, Seb. Schmid, and others find in the expression, partly even with the observation: "indignatione et odio temporum . . . corruptus," is at variance with the cautiousness and moderation of the whole speech. — πάσιν παραγγέλλειν a popular hyperbolical expression; yet not incorrect, as the universal announcement was certainly in course of development. — καθιστ. (see the critical remarks): in accordance with the fact that He has appointed a day. It denotes the important consideration, by which God was induced ταῦτα παραγγέλλειν κ.τ.λ. Comp. ii. 24. — ἐν δικαιοσ. | in righteousness, so that this is the determining moral element, in which the κρίνειν is to take place, i.e. δικαίως, 1 Pet. ii. 23. Paul means the Messianic judgment, and that as not remotely impending. — ἐν ἰδικ] i.e. in the person of a man, who will be God’s representative. — ψ ȍν φυσε κ.τ.λ.] a well-known attraction: whom He ordained, namely, for holding the judgment, having afforded faith, in Him as a judge, to all, by the fact that He raised Him from the dead. The πίστιν παρέχειν is the operation of God on men, by which He affords to them faith, — an operation which He brought to bear on them historically, by His having conspicuously placed before them in the resurrection of Jesus His credentials as the appointed judge. The resurrection of Jesus is indeed the divine σημεῖον,* and consequently the foundation of knowledge and conviction, divinely given as a sure handle of faith to all men, as regards what the Lord, in His nature and destination was and is; and therefore the thought is not to be regarded as “not sufficiently ideal!" for Paul. The δρᾶσιν is not, as in x. 42, the appointment which took place in the counsel of God, but that which was accomplished in time and fact as regards the faith of men, as in Rom. i. 4. Moreover, the πίστιν παρέχειν, which on the part of God took place by the resurrection of Jesus, does not exclude the human self-determination to accept and appropriate this divine παρέχειν. Πίστιν παρέχειν may be rendered, with Beza and others, according to likewise correct Greek usage: to give assurance by His resurrection, but this commends itself the less, because in that case the important element of faith remains without express mention, although it corresponds very suitably to the παραγγέλλει μετανοεῖν, ver. 30. The conception and mode of expression, to afford faith, is similar to μετάνοιαν ἰδόνα, v. 81, xi. 18, yet the latter is already more than παρέχειν, potestatem facere, ansam praebere credendi.

Ver. 32. As yet Paul has not once named Jesus, but has only endeavoured to gather up the most earnest interest of his hearers for this the great final aim of his discourse; now his speech is broken off by the mockery of some, and by a courteous relegation to silence on the part of others. — ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν | a resurrection of dead persons, as Paul had just asserted such a case. The plural denotes the category. To take it of the general rising of the

---

1 Wolf.
2 Comp. Col. i. 23. On the juxtaposition of τῶν παραγγ. see Lobbeck, Paralip. p. 56 f.
3 See Wetstein and Kypke in loc.
4 Comp. John ii. 18 f.
5 De Wette. Comp. on ii. 26, iv. 27, x. 38, xiii. 28.
6 Comp. on Rom. ii. 4.
7 See especially Raphel, Polyc. in loc.
8 Comp. on Rom. i. 4.
dead at the day of judgment, is quite at variance with the context. That,
moreover, the oi μὲν were all Epicureans, and the oi δὲ Stoics, as Grotius,
Wolf, and Rosenmüller supposed, cannot be proved. Calvin, Grotius,
Wolf, Rosenmüller, Alford, and others hold ἀκονδιμεθα σου πάλ. περὶ τοῦ τοῦτος
as meant in earnest. But would not Paul, if he had so understood it, have
remained longer in Athens? See xviii. 1. — The repellent result, which
the mention of the resurrection of Jesus brought about, is by Baur sup-
pposed to be only a product of the author, who had wished to exhibit very
distinctly the repulsive nature of the doctrine of the resurrection for edu-
cated Gentiles; he thinks that the whole speech is only an effect fictitiously
introduced by the author, and that the whole narrative of the appearance
at Athens is to be called in question—"a counterpart to the appearance of
Stephen at Jerusalem, contrived with a view to a harmless issue instead of
a tragical termination," Zeller. But with all the delicacy and prudence,
which Paul here, in this Ἐλλάδος Ἐλλάς,² had to exercise and knew how to
do so, he could not and durst not be silent on the resurrection of Jesus, that
foundation of apostolic preaching; he could not but, after he had done all
he could to win the Athenians, now bring the matter to the issue, what effect
the testimony to the Risen One would have. If the speech had not this
testimony, criticism would the more easily and with more plausibility be
able to infer a fictitious product of the narrator; and it would hardly have
neglected to do so.

Vv. 33, 34. οἴς] i.e. with such a result. — κολληθέντες αὐτῷ] having more
closely attached themselves to him. Comp. v. 13, ix. 26. — ὁ Ἀρεωπαγ.] the
assessor of the court of Areopagus. This is to be considered as the well-known
distinctive designation, hence the article, of this Dionysius in the apostolic
church. Nothing further is known with certainty of him. The account of
Dionysius of Corinth in Eus. H. E. iii. 4, iv. 23,³ that he became bishop of
Athens, where he is said to have suffered martyrdom,⁴ is unsupported. The
writings called after him,⁵ belonging to the later Neoplatonism, have been
shown to be spurious. According to Baur, it was only from the ecclesiastic-
tal tradition that the Areopagite came into the Book of Acts, and so
brought with him the fiction of the whole scene on the Areopagus.—
Δαμάρτις] wholly unknown, erroneously held by Chrysostom to be the wife
of Dionysius, which is just what Luke does not express by the mere γυνή.
Grotius conjectures Δάμαλις (juvenca), which name was usual among the
Greeks. But even with the well-known interchange of λ and ρ,⁶ we must
assert to the judgment of Calovius: "Quis nescit nomina varia esse, ac
plurima inter se vicina non tamen eadem." As a man's name we find
Δαμαρίων in Boeckh, Inscr. 3393, and Δαμάρτης, 1241, also Δαμάρτετος in Pausan.
v. 5. 1; and as a woman's name, Δαμαρτη, in Diod. xi. 26.

¹ Comp. Zeller. [103.
² Thucyd. epigr., see Jacob, Anthol. i. p.
³ Comp. Constitt. ep. vii. 46. 3.
⁴ Niceph. iii. 11.
⁵ Pace τῆς οἰκείας ἱστορίας κ.τ.λ.
⁶ Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 179.
(20) Thessalonica. V. 1.

Having been "shamefully entreated" and then honorably dismissed from Philippi, Paul and two of his companions, leaving Luke at Philippi, passing through other cities, came to Thessalonica. This celebrated city, distant about one hundred miles south-west from Philippi, was beautifully situated on the slope of a hill, at the northern end of the Thermaic Gulf. It was a great commercial city, the capital of the province and residence of the proconsul. After the battle of Philippi, on account of its attachment to the cause of Anthony, it was made a free city. Strabo mentions it as the largest city in Macedonia. It has always been a city of importance; at present it is considered the second city of European Turkey, and has a population of 70,000. Here the missionaries rested, as there was a synagogue of the Jews, probably the only one in that district. After finding the means of earning his daily bread by manual toil, and a home in the house of Jason, the apostle, as was his custom, went to the synagogue, and for three consecutive Sabbaths preached to the Jews that Jesus was the promised Messiah. Some of them believed, and formed the nucleus of what became a large and useful church. But the Jews as a class, from first to last, were the plague of his suffering life, and a great hindrance to his ministry. "At Antioch and Jerusalem, Jews, nominally within the fold of Christ, opposed his teaching and embittered his days; in all other cities it was the Jews who contradicted and blasphemed the holy name which he was preaching. In the planting of his churches he had to fear their deadly opposition; in the watering of their yet more deadly fraternity. The Jews who hated Christ sought his life; the Jews who professed to love him undermined his efforts. The one faction endangered his existence, the other ruined his peace. Never, till death released him, was he wholly free from their violent conspiracies or their insidious calumnies. Without, they sprang upon him like a pack of wolves; within, they hid themselves in sheep's clothing to worry and tear his flocks." (Rarrar.) Here in Thessalonica he was assaulted by a mob, instigated and led on by the Jews; and he and his friends deemed it prudent that he should privately and hastily depart, lest the liberty and the lives of the brethren who had given surety for him might be imperilled.

(20) Honorable women. V. 12.

The term employed indicates that the women were of high rank and social position—among the chief people of the city. Arnot, on this passage, writes: "And is there ground for gladness there? Are the upper ten thousand more precious in God's sight than the myriads who occupy a lower place? No; this word comes from heaven, and does not shape itself by the fashion of the world. But though poor and rich are equally precious, there are times and circumstances in which conversion in high places is more noted and noteworthy than conversion in a low place. The common people heard the Master gladly; but the rulers held aloof, and boasted that they were not tinged with any trust.
in Jesus of Nazareth. On this very account there was great joy in their circle when a magnate joined their band. Even the Lord longed to have some of them, and looked fondly on the young rich man who came running and kneeling and calling him Master.” At Antioch in Pisidia the Jews enlisted the services of women of similar rank and position, and characterized by superstitious devotion and ignorant zeal, to counteract the influence and usefulness of the apostles. “This is an agency that has from the beginning been sought and used both for good and evil. Women were employed by our Lord himself for certain appropriate ministries in the establishment of his kingdom. But false teachers have in all times availed themselves of the combined weakness and strength of the female nature for their own ends. The Romish hierarchy have always made much of female agency, and especially the agency of women in high social rank. But as Christ himself employed their tenderness and patience and perseverance in his own cause, he has encouraged his disciples in all ages to go and do likewise. Let woman stand on her true foundation—the family; and forth from that citadel let her go to her daily task, wherever the Lord hath need of her daily service; but back to the family let her ever return, as to her refuge and rest. Colonies of women, cut off from family relations and affections and duties, and bound by vows, are mischiefous to themselves, and, notwithstanding superficial apparent advantages, in the long run, dangerous to the community. God made the family; man made the convent. God’s work! behold it is very good; man’s is in this case a snare.” (Arnol.) Lately, in the Christian church in this land, the place and power of woman, both at home and abroad, has been more generally acknowledged and felt—among the young and the poor and afflicted amidst ourselves; and in the schools and zenanas of foreign lands, her work is greatly blessed. And as a large proportion of the membership of the Protestant churches in this country are women, their work and their worth in every field of religious and charitable enterprise cannot be overestimated.

(1a) Timothy. V. 15.

This is the first time Timothy is mentioned in the narrative since Paul left Philippi. The probability is, however, that he was with the apostle at Thessalonica, as he appears to have been intimately connected with that church.

(1 Thess. i. 1, iii. 2, and 2 Thess. i. 1.)

Comparing xviii. 5 and 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2 our author and others suppose that there is a mistake in Luke’s narrative which cannot be explained or removed. On this Glosg writes: “But certainly the mere omission by Luke of Timothy’s visit to Athens and return to Thessalonica is no discrepancy, as the circumstance had no bearing on his narrative. If Timothy had remained with the apostle, and thus had not rejoined him at Corinth, the case would have been different. But after all, the fact that Timothy came to Athens at all is a mere supposition; it is not asserted in 1 Thess. iii. 1. The probability is that he was sent by Paul to Thessalonica from Berea, and not from Athens; and that after his return he and Silas went directly from Berea to Corinth.” Those who had accompanied Paul to Athens when they returned brought back a request from him that Silas, who had remained at Berea, and Timothy, who had in the meantime gone back to Thessalonica, either from Berea or from Athens, should
go to him with all speed. "But Silas and Timothy do not seem to have re-
joined Paul until he reached Corinth. We have no direct information what
became of Luke in the meantime." (Abbott.) Plumtree says: "As far as we
can gather from 1 Thess, i. 1-3, Timothy came by himself to Athens, probably
after the scene at the Areopagus, and was sent back at once with words of coun-
sel and comfort to those whom he reported as suffering much tribulation."

Alford gives this explanation: "When Paul departed from Berea, he
sent Timothy to exhort and confirm the Thessalonians and determined to be left
at Athens alone, Silas meanwhile remaining to carry on the work at Berea.
Then Paul, on his arrival at Athens, sends a message to both to come to him
as soon as possible. They did so, and find him at Corinth."

(24) The market-place. V. 17.

The Agora, or market-place, in any Greek city, was the centre of its life. The
market-place of Athens was at once its Exchange, its Lyceum, and its lounge.
Men of all ranks and classes, of all callings and professions, met and jostled
each other in the eager, bustling throng which daily crowded it. In this same
market-place, more than four centuries before, Socrates had conducted his
wonderful conversational discussions. Hither Paul, after having addressed the
Jews in their synagogue, went, with stirred heart, to address the idolatrous
multitudes. Among the throng of curious listeners mingled many philosophers
of every shade of opinion. Special mention is made of the Epicureans and
Stoics. Epicurus, the founder of the one school, lived a long and tranquil
life at Athens, and died at the age of 72. The leading tenet of his philosophy
was that the highest good is pleasure. But as experience taught that what are
called pleasures are often more than counterbalanced by the pains which they
incur, he taught that all excess in sensuous delights should be avoided. His
own life seems to have been characterized by generosity, general kindness, and
self-control; many of his followers, however, adopted a life of ease and self-
indulgence; sometimes restrained by the calculations of prudence, and some-
times sinking into mere voluptuousness.

"Quid sit futurum cras fuges querere; et
Quem fors dieum cumque dabit, lucro appone."

"Strive not the morrow's chance to know,
But count whate'er the Fates bestow
As given thee for gain." (Horace.)

The other school took its name, not from its founder, Zeno, but from the
Stoa præculi, the painted porch, where Zeno was accustomed to teach. This
school held as their chief tenet, that the highest source of pleasure is to be
found in virtue. They taught that true wisdom consisted in controlling cir-
cumstances and not being affected by them; that men should be alike indif-
ferent to pleasure and pain. They aimed at obtaining a complete mastery, not
only over their passions, but even over their circumstances. There was much
that was good in each system, and the highest and noblest of the schools ex-
hibited a moral and manly life. But each, in most cases, tended to degrade
and degenerate the race. "In their worst degeneracies Stoicism became the
apotheosis of suicide, and Epicureanism the glorification of lust." (Farrar.)
The one school was designated the school of the garden; the other the school of the porch. The one was atheistic, the other pantheistic. Neither believed in a divine personal Providence. To them, the message of this new teacher, enforced by his fiery eloquence and informal logic, concerning Jesus and the resurrection, seemed but as idle tales and garrulous chattering. But as it was something new, they all wished, from curiosity, to hear something farther from him; at least it might amuse them, if nothing more. So they led him to Mars' Hill, where he might more fully unfold his strange doctrines.

(c^2) *An unknown God.* V. 23.

Paul standing in the midst of a vast, curious, sneering, or indifferent throng, announced as his text an inscription he had seen on one of their numerous altars. As to the pulpit he occupied and its surroundings, Bishop Wordsworth observes: "He stood on that hill in the centre of Athens, with its statues and altars and temples around him. The temple of the Eumenides was immediately below him, behind was the temple of Theseus; and he beheld the Parthenon of the Acropolis fronting him from above. The temple of Victory was on his right and a countless multitude of temples and altars in the Agora and Ceramicus below him. Above him, towering over the city from its pedestal on the rock of the Acropolis, was the bronze colossus of Minerva, the champion of Athens." With deep earnestness, undaunted composure, and sublime faith in the message he had to utter, and in the Master he served, the apostle addressed the mixed and multitudinous assemblage. And a most remarkable address he gave. His manner was courteous and winning; his style natural and adapted to his audience; his arguments clear and conclusive; his illustrations ample and appropriate; his application personal and pointed, solemn and impressive.

"In expressions markedly courteous, and with arguments exquisitely conciliatory, recognizing their piety toward their gods, and enforcing his views by an appeal to their own poets, he yet manages, with the readiest power of adaptation, to indicate the errors of each class of his listeners. While seeming to dwell only on points of agreement, he yet practically rebukes, in every direction, their national and intellectual self-complacency." (Farrar.) From the nature and dignity of man, he infers and declares the spirituality and unity of God, and the obligations under which all men are laid to worship him alone, as the Creator of all things, and in whom "we live and move and have our being." Then he urges all to repentance for the past, in view of a coming general judgment, which will be held by Jesus Christ, whereof indisputable assurance has been given by God, in raising his Son from the dead. The apostle was here interrupted by a burst of derision, and the apostle went sorrowfully away, mourning over their intellectual pride and spiritual incapacity. Some, however, believed, among whom was a member of the court, who must have occupied a high position, and a woman, also probably of some distinction. Tradition tells us that this Dionysius became Bishop of Athens, and died a martyr. The success of the apostle was less in Athens than in any other city he visited, and he makes no allusion to the city or the church in it, in any of his epistles. He left Athens a despised and lonely man, yet his visit was not in vain—in its effects on his own mind, and in the results that followed from the planting of
the grain of mustard-seed. He founded no church there, but one grew up in that city, which furnished its martyr bishop, and able apologists to the church, in the next century. "Of all who visit Athens, many connect it with the name of Paul who never so much as remember that, since the days of its glory, it has been trodden by the feet of poets and conquerors and kings. They think not of Cicero, or Virgil, or Germanicus, but of the wandering tent-maker." (Farrar.)

The report of this able, eloquent, powerful speech, and the results which followed, was probably written by Paul's own hand.
CHAPTER XVIII.

Ver. 1. ὁ Παῦλος is wanting in important witnesses. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. With χωρισθείς a church-lesson begins. — Ver. 2. τας] A B D E G K, min. Vulg. have ἀνέ. So Lachm. Tisch. Born., and rightly, on account of the decisive attestation.—On preponderating evidence, τῷ τέχνης is, in ver 3, to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch., instead of τῷ τέχνην. — Ver. 5. τῷ λόγῳ] Eliz. has τῷ πνεύματι, in opposition to A B D E G K, min. several vss. and Fathers. Defended by Rinck on the ground that τῷ λόγῳ is a scholion on διαμαρτ. But it was not διαμαρτ., but συνελήφθη, that needed a scholion, namely, τῷ πνεύματι, which, being received into the text, displaced the original τῷ λόγῳ. — Ver. 7. Ἰούστου) Syr. Erp. Sahid. Cassiod. have Τίτου; E K, min. Capt. Arm. Syr. p. Vulg. have Τίτου 'Ἰούστου; B D**: Τίτου 'I. A traditional alteration.¹ — Ver. 12. ἀνθυσαρέσων] Lachm. Born. read ἀνθυσαρέων ἑνευς after A B D K, min. An explanatory resolution of a word not elsewhere occurring in the N. T. — Ver. 14. οἷς] Lachm. and Born. have deleted it according to important testimony. But it was very easily passed over amidst the cumulation of particles and between μην and ἡμ, especially as οἷς has not its reference in what immediately precedes. — Ver. 15. ἐξῆμα] A B D K, min. Theophyl. and several vss. have ἐξῆμα. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The singular was, in spite of the several objects afterwards named, very easily introduced mechanically as an echo of ἐκκημα and ἄφωργημα. — γὰρ] is to be deleted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. in accordance with A B D K, Vulg. Capt., as a connective addition. — Ver. 17. After πάντες, Eliz. Born. read οἱ Ἑλλήνες, which is wanting in A B K, Erp. Capt. Vulg. Chrys. Bed. Some more recent cods. have, instead of it, οἱ ἱουδαίοι. Both are supplementary additions, according to different modes of viewing the passage. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 19. κατῆκορας] Lachm. Tisch. read κατῆκοραν, after A B E K, 40, and some vss. The sing. intruded itself from the context. — οὗτος] ἔκει, which Lachm. and Born. have according to important evidence, was imported as by far the more usual word. — Ver. 21. ἀπεκτάζων αὐτ. εἰπὼν] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἀποκατάμενος καὶ εἰπὼν (with the omission of καὶ before ἀνήκην), after A B D E K, min. vss. Rightly; the Recepra is an obviously suggested simplification. — δέι μὲ πάντος . . . εἰς Πειρακ.] is wanting in A B E K, min. Capt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Vulg., as well as δέ after πάλιν. Both are deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., and condemned already by Mill and Bengel. But the omission is far more easily accounted for than the addition of these words,—occasionally possibly by xix. 21, xx. 16, or by the πάλιν διακ. presumed to be too abrupt,—as in what directly follows copyists, overlooking the reference of ἀναβάς in ver. 22, found no journey of the

¹ Occasioned by the circumstance that Justus does not elsewhere occur alone as a name, but only as a surname; and that the person here meant must be a different person from those named in i. 22 and Col. iv. 11. Wieseler judges otherwise, on Galat. p. 573, and in Herzog's Encycl. XXI. 278; he prefers Τίτου 'Ἰούστου.
apostle to Jerusalem, and accordingly did not see the reason why Paul declined a longer residence at Ephesus verified by the course of his journey. — Ver. 25. Ἰρεόν] Elz. has κυρίων, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 26. The order Προκ. κ. Α.κ. (Lachm.) is attested, no doubt, by A B E Ρ, 13, Vulg. Copt. Aeth., but is to be derived from ver. 18. — τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ὀδόν] A B Ρ, min. vss. Lachm. have τὴν ὀδόν τοῦ θεοῦ; E, vss. have τ. ὀδ. τοῦ κυρίων; D has only τὴν ὀδὸν (so Born.). With the witnesses thus divided, the reading of Lachm. is to be preferred as the best attested.

Vv. 1, 2. In Corinth, at which Paul had arrived after his parting from Athens, he met with the Jew Ἀκίλας, Greek form of the Latin Aquila, which is to be considered as a Roman name adopted after the manner of the times instead of the Jewish name, a native of the Asiatic province of Pontus, but who had hitherto resided at Rome, and afterwards dwelt there also, and so probably had his dwelling-place in that city—an inference which is rendered the more probable, as his temporary removal to a distance from Rome had its compulsory occasion in the imperial edict. We make this remark in opposition to the view of Neander, who thinks that Aquila had not his permanent abode at Rome, but settled, on account of his trade, now in one and then in another great city forming a centre of commerce, such as Corinth and Ephesus. The conjecture that he was a freedman of a Pontius Aquila, so that the statement Ποντικὸς τῷ γένει is an error, is entirely arbitrary. Whether Πρίσκιλλα—identical with Priscia, Rom. xvi. 3, for, as is well known, many Roman names were also used in diminutive forms, see Grotius on Rom. i.e.—was a Roman by birth, or a Jewess, remains undecided. But the opinion—which has of late become common and is defended by Kuinoel, Olshausen, Lange, and Ewald—that Aquila and his wife were already Christians, having been so possibly at starting from Rome, when Paul met with them at Corinth, because there is no account of their conversion, is very forced. Luke, in fact, calls Aquila simply Ἰουδαίον, he does not say, τινα μαθητὴν Ἰουδ. whereas elsewhere he always definitely makes known the Jewish Christians; and accordingly, by the subsequent τῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, he places Aquila, without any distinction, among the general body of the expelled Jews. He also very particularly indicates as the reason of the apostle's lodging with him, not their common Christian faith, but their common handicraft, ver. 3. It is therefore to be assumed that Aquila and Priscilla were still Jews when Paul met with them at Corinth, but through their connection with him they became Christians. This Luke, keeping in view the apostolic labours of Paul as a whole, leaves the reader to infer, inasmuch as he soon afterwards speaks of the Christian working of the two, ver. 26. We may add that the reply to the question, whether and how far Christianity existed at all in Rome before the decree of Claudius, can here be of no consequence,
Paul in Corinth.

seeing that, although there was no Christian church at Rome, individual Christians might still at any rate be found, and certainly were found, among the resident Jews there. — πρόσφατως [πρε]σβυ, 1 from πρόσφατος, which properly signifies freshly, = just slaughtered or killed, then generally new, of quite recent occurrence. 2—διὰ τὸ διαρθαχ. Κλ. κ. τ. Λ. 11 Judeos impulsa Christo asidus tumultuantes Roma expulit. 14 As Christus was actually a current Greek and Roman name, it is altogether arbitrary to interpret impulsa Christo otherwise than we should interpret it, if another name stood instead of Christo. Christus was the name of a Jewish agitator at Rome, whose doings produced constant tumults, and led at length to the edict of expulsion. 3 This we remark in opposition to the hypothesis upheld, after older interpreters in Wolf, by most modern expositors, that Suetonius had made a mistake in the name and written Chresto instead of Christo—a view, in connection with which it is either thought that the disturbances arose out of Christianity having made its way among the Jewish population at Rome, and simply affected the Jews themselves, who were thrown into a ferment by it, so that the portion of them which had come to believe was at strife with that which remained unbelieving; 4 or it is assumed 5 that enthusiastic Messianic hopes excited the insurrection among the Jews, and that the Romans had manufactured out of the ideal person of the Messiah a rebel of the same name. While, however, the alleged error of the name has against it generally the fact that the names Christus and Christiani were well known to the Roman writers, 6 it may be specially urged against the former view, that at the time of the edict 7 the existence of an influential number of Christians at Rome, putting the Jewish population into a tumultuous ferment, is quite improbable; and against the latter view, that the Messianic hopes of the Jews were well enough known to the Romans in general, 8 and to Suetonius in particular. 9 Hence the change 10 of Christus into Chrestos (Χρηστός) and of Christianus into Chrestianus, which pronunciation Tertullian rejects by perperam, may not be imputed to the compiler of a history resting on documentary authority, but to the misuse of the Roman colloquial language. Indeed, according to Tacit. Ann. xv.

1 Polyb. iii. 87. 11, Ht. 48. 6; Alciphr. i. 30; Judith iv. 3, 5; 2 Macc. xiv. 80. 
3 Sueton. Claud. 95. 
4 Philostr. v. Soph. ii. 11; Inscr. 194; Cic. ad Fam. xi. 8. 
5 Herzog in der Jahrb. f. D. Theol. 1897, p. 561, rightly defends this explanation (against Pressensé). The objection is entirely unimportant, which Mangold also (Römeshr. 1866) has taken, that short work would have been made with an insurgent Christus at Rome. He might have made a timely escape. Or may he not have been actually seized and short work made of him, without thereby quenching the fire? See also Wieseler, p. 123, and earlier, Ernesti, in Suet., l.c. 
7 Paulus, Reiche, Neander, Lange, and others. 
8 Tacitus, Pliny, and Suetonius himself, Ner. 16. 
9 Probably in the year 63, see Anger, de temp. rat. p. 118; Wieseler, p. 135 ff. 
11 Suet. Vesp. 4. 
44: "Nero . . . poenis affectit, quos . . . vulgus Christianos appellabat; auctor nominis ejus Christus," etc., it must be assumed that that interchange of names only became usual at a later period; in Justin. Apol. I. 4, τὸ Χριστοῦ is only an allusion to Χριστιανοί. The detailed discussion of the point does not belong to us here, except in so far as the narrative of Dio Cass. lx. 6 appears to be at variance with this passage and with Suet. l.c.: τοὺς τε Ιουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αὐτίς, ὅστε χαλεπῶς ἀν ἀνεν ταραχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀξύνον σφόν τῆς πάλεως εἰρήθησα, οὐκ ἐξ ἐξῆλασε μὲν, τῷ δὲ ὅτε πατρίν νόμως διὰ χρωμένου ἐκλέπτεισκε ἴδῃ. This apparent contradiction is solved by our regarding what Dio Cassius relates as something which happened before the edict of banishment, and excited the Jews to the complete outbreak of insurrection. The words οὐκετὸ . . . εἰρήθησαι, which represent the ordinance as a precautionary measure against the outbreak of a revolt, warrant this view. From xxviii. 15 ff., Rom. xvi. 8, it follows that the edict of Claudius, which referred not only to those making the tumult, but, according to the express testimony of this passage, to all the Jews, must soon either tacitly or officially have passed into abeyance, as, indeed, it was incapable of being permanently carried into effect in all its severity. Therefore the opinion of Hug, Eichhorn, Schrader, and Hemsen, that the Jews returned to Rome only at the mild commencement of Nero's reign, is to be rejected. — πάντας τοὺς 'Ἰουδαίους] with the exception of the proselytes, Beyerl. thinks, so that only the national Jews were concerned. But the proselytes of righteousness at least cannot, without arbitrariness, be excluded from the comprehensive designation.

Vv. 3, 4. It was a custom among the Jews, and admits of sufficient explanation from the national esteem for trade generally, and from the design of rendering the Rabbins independent of others as regards their subsistence, that the Rabbins practised a trade. Olshausen strangely holds that the practice was based on the idea of warding off temptations by bodily activity. Comp. on Mark vi. 8, according to which Christ Himself was a τεκνων. — διὰ τὸ ὄμοστεχνον εἰναι] sc. αὐτόν, because he (Paul) was of the same handicraft. Luke might also have written διὰ τὸ ὄμοστεχνον εἰναι. — ἐσε] the two married persons. — σκεποτοι] is not with Michaelis to be interpreted makers of art-instruments, which is merely based on a misunderstanding of

---

1 Ewald, p. 346, wishes to insert οὗ before χρωμένου, so that the words would apply to the Jewish Christians. [It otherwise.
2 Wieseler, p. 128, and Lehmann, p. 5, view
3 To place the prohibition mentioned by Dio Cassius as early as the first year of Clau-
diius, A.D. 41 (Laurent, neuest. Stud. p. 99 f.), does not suit the peculiar mildness and favour which the emperor on his accession showed to the Jews, according to Joseph. Ant. xix. 6. 2 f. The subsequent severity supposes a longer experience of need for it. Laurent, after Oros. vi. 7, places the edict of expulsion as early as the ninth year of Claudius, A.D. 49; but he is in consequence driven to the artificial explanation that Aquila indeed left Rome in A.D. 49, but remained for some time in Italy, from which (ver. 2: ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας) he only departed in A.D. 53. Thus he would not, in fact, have come to Corinth at all as an immediate consequence of that edict, which yet Luke, particularly by the addition of ἑράτων, evidently intends to say.
4 Credner, Einl. p. 380.
5 Juch. xxiii. 1. 2.
6 Kühner, II. p. 353; but comp. on the accusative Luke xli. 8, and see on the omission of the pronoun, where it is of itself evident from the preceding noun, Kühner, § 828 b, and ad Xen. Mem. i. 2, 49.
Pollux, vii. 189, nor yet with Hug and others make s of tent-cloth. It is true that the trade of preparing cloth from the hair of goats, which was also used for tents (αλίκα), had its seat in Cilicia;1 but even apart from the fact that the weaving of cloth was more difficult to be combined with the unsettled mode of life of the apostle, the word imports nothing else than tent-maker,2 tent-tailor, which meaning is simply to be retained. Such a person is also called σμονονομένος,3 and so Chrysostom4 designates the apostle, whilst Origen makes him a worker in leather,5 thinking on leathern tents.6 ἐπιίδε is the result of διέλευξε, xvii. 2, 17. He convinced, persuaded and won, Jews and Greeks, here—as it is those present in the synagogue that are spoken of—proselytes of the gate.

Ver. 5. This activity on his part increased yet further when Silas and Timothy had come from Macedonia,7 in whose fellowship naturally the zeal and courage of Paul could not but grow.8 The element of increased activity, in relation to what is related in ver. 4, is contained in συνέχεετο τῷ λόγῳ: he was wholly seized and arrested by the doctrine, so that he applied himself to it with assiduity and utmost earnestness. Against my earlier rendering: he was pressed in respect of the doctrine,8 he was hard-beset,10 it may be decisively urged, partly on linguistic grounds, that the dative with συνέχεεθαι is always the thing itself which presses,11 partly according to the connection, that there results in that view no significant relation to the arrival of Silas and Timothy. — τὸν Ἐρωτῦν Ἰποῦ, as in ver. 28.

Ver. 6. The refactoriness12 and reviling, which he experienced from them amidst this increased activity, induced him to turn to the Gentiles. — ἵσταται, ταῦτα ἔσται.] he shook out his garments, ridding himself of the dust, indicating contempt, as in xiii. 51. — τῷ αἰμα ὑμῶν . . . ὑμῶν] sc. ἐλθέω, Matt. xxiii. 35, i.e. let the blame of the destruction, which will as a divine punishment reach you, light on no other than yourselves.15 The expression is not to be explained from the custom of laying the hands on the victim,14 as ELSNER and others suppose, or on the accused part of the witnesses;15 but in all languages16 the head is the significant designation of the person himself. The significance here lies particularly in the conception of the divine punishment coming from above, Rom. i. 18. — What Paul intends by the destruction

2 Pollux, l.c.; Stob. ed. phys. i. 52, p. 1094.
3 Ael. V. H. ii. 1.
4 See also Theodoret, on 2 Cor. ii. 6: τοιούτως ἵσταται καὶ γράφεται ὁ θεοῦ τοῖς ἱεράσκει.
5 Hom. 17 in Num.
6 Comp. de Dieu.
7 xvii. 14 f.
8 Comp. Wisd. xvii. 20, and Grimm in loc. So in the main, following the Vulgate ("in statbat verbo"), most modern interpreters, including Olhausen, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lange, Ewald.
9 Comp. on Phil. i.
10 Comp. Chrysostom, reading τῷ συνεχεῖται.
11 Comp. xxviii. 8; Luke viii. 37; Comp. also Thuc. ii. 49. 3, iii. 98. 1; Arrian, vi. 94. 6; Plat. Soph. p. 250 D; Xen. Oec. i. 31, and many other passages; Heind. ad Plat. Soph. 46, particularly Wisd. xvii. 90; Herod. i. 17, 22; Ael. V. H. xiv. 28.
12 Rom. xiii. 2.
13 Comp. 2 Sam. i. 16; 1 Kings ii. 38; Ezek. iii. 16 ff., xxviii. 4, 7 ff. On ἐπιίδε or εἰς τ. κεφαλήν, see Dem. p. 323, ult. 381. 15. On the elliptical mode of expression, see Matt. xxvii. 25; 2 Sam. i. 16; Plat. Bul. p. 293 E; Arist. Plut. 558.
14 Lev. xvi. 31; comp. Herod. ii. 39.
15 So Piscator.
16 Comp. Heinsius, ad Ost. Hor. xx. 197.
which he announces as certainly coming, and the blame of which he adjudges to themselves, is not moral corruption, but eternal ἀνάλεια, which is conceived as θάνατος, and therefore symbolized as αἷμα to be shed, because the blood is the seat of life. The setting in of this ἀνάλεια occurs at the Parousia, 2 Thess. i. 8. Thus Paul, as his conduct was already in point of fact for his adversaries an ἵνα εἰς ἀνάλειας, expressly gives to them such an ἵνα εἰς. — καθαρὸς ἐγὼ] comp. xx. 26. — ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν κ. τ. λ.] as in xiii. 46.

Ver. 7. Paul immediately gave practical proof of this solemn renunciation of the Jews by departing from the synagogue, and went, not into the house of a Jew, but into that of a proselyte, the otherwise unknown Justus, who is not to be identified with Titus. That Paul betook himself to the non-Jewish house nearest to the synagogue, is entirely in keeping with the profoundly excited emotion under which he acted, and with his decision of character. — συννυστεὶν] to border upon, is not found elsewhere; the Greeks use ἀνοικεῖν in that sense. Observe, moreover, that a change of lodging is not mentioned.

Ver. 8. This decided proceeding made a remarkable impression, so that even Crispus, the president of the synagogue, whom the apostle himself baptized, with all his family, believed on the Lord, and that generally many Corinthians, Jews and Gentiles, for the house of the proselyte was accessible to both, heard him and received faith and baptism.

Vv. 9–11. But Jesus Himself, appearing to Paul in a night-vision, infused into him courage for fearless continuance in work. — λάλει κ. μὴ σωπ.] solemnly emphatic. Bengel well says: "fundamentum fiduciae." — ἑστηκεν σοι τοῦ κακ. σε] will set on thee (aggredi) to injure thee. On the classical expression ἐστηκεν σοι τοῦ, to set on one, i.e. impetum facere in aliq., see many examples in Wetstein and Kypke. The attempt, in fact, which was made at a later period under Gallio, signally failed. — δότας λαὸς κ. τ. λ.] gives the reason of the assurance, ἐγὼ εἰμι μετά σου, κ. σωπ. ἑστηκεν σοι τοῦ κακ. σε. Under His people Jesus understands not only those already converted, but likewise proleptically those who are destined to be members of the church purchased by His blood, the whole multitude of the ἑταγμένως εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνων at Corinth. — ἐναυτῶν κ. μήνας ἐξ] The terminus ad quem is the attempt of the Jews, and not the departure of Paul, ver. 18. For after Luke in vv. 9, 10 has narrated

1 De Wette, who sees here an un-Pauline expression.
2 Rom. i. 29, vi. 16, 21, 23, vii. 5, 10, 13, 24, viii. 2, 6 al.
3 I Comp. on xv. 20.
4 Phil. i. 29.
5 1 Thess. 26, 27, which Heinrichs and Alford after Calvin explain, contrary to the context, as domo Aquilaeos.
6 Wieseler.
7 1 Cor. i. 14.
8 xvi. 15, 34.
9 According to Laurent, neut. Stud. p. 143 f., ver. 11 was a marginal note of Luke to ἔμαχον εἰςναῦς, ver. 18. But ver. 11 is by no means superfluous in its present textual position, but attests the fulfilment of the promise, ver 10.
10 Comp. ix. 10.
11 Comp. lxxi. 1, and see on John i. 3, 30.
12 Comp. John x. 16, xi. 52.
13 xx. 38; Eph. i. 14.
14 xiii. 48.
15 Ver. 13.
16 In opposition to Anger, de temp. rat. p. 69 f., and Wieseler, p. 45 f.
the address and promise of Jesus, he immediately, ver. 11, observes how long Paul in consequence of this had his residence, i.e. his quiet abode, at Corinth, attending to his ministry; and he then in vv. 12–18 relates how on the other hand an attack broke out, indeed, against him under Gallio, but passed over so harmlessly that he was able to spend before his departure yet a considerable time at Corinth, ver. 18.—ἐν αὐτοῖς i.e. among the Corinthians, which is undoubtedly evident from the preceding ἐν τῷ πάλιν τ. Vv. 12, 13. Achaia, i.e. according to the Roman division of provinces, the whole of Greece proper, including the Peloponnesus, so that by its side Macedonia, Illyria, Epirus, and Thessaly formed the province Macedonia, and these two provinces comprehended the whole Grecian territory, which originally had been a senatorial province, but by Tiberius was made an imperial one, and was again by Claudius converted into a senatorial province, and had in the years 53 and 54 for its proconsul Jun. Ann. Gallio, who had assumed this name—his proper name was M. Ann. Novatus—from L. Jun. Gallio, the rhetorician, by whom he was adopted. He was a brother of the philosopher L. Ann. Seneca, and was likewise put to death by Nero.—they stood forth against him, is found neither in Greek writers nor in the LXX.—παρὰ τ. νόμῳ i.e. against the Jewish law. To the Jews the exercise of religion according to their laws was conceded by the Roman authority. Hence the accusers expected of the proconsul measures to be taken against Paul, whose religious doctrines they found at variance with the legal standpoint of Mosaism. Luke gives only the chief point of the complaint. For details, see ver. 15.

Vv. 14, 15. The mild and humane Gallio refuses to examine into the complaint, and hands it over, as simply concerning doctrine, to the decision of the accusers themselves—to the Jewish tribunal—without permitting Paul, who was about to begin his defence, to speak. —οὐν namely, in pursuance of your accusation.—ῥήματα[ἡμῶν] I should with reason bear with you, i.e. according to the context: give you a patient hearing. "Judeas Gallion sibi molestos inuit," Bengal.—εἰ δὲ γρηγορ. . . νῦν[ἡμᾶς] but if, as your complaint shows, there are questions in dispute, xv. 2, concerning doctrine and names—plural of category; Paul's assertion that the name of Messiah belonged to Jesus, was the essential matter of fact in the case, see ver. 5—and of your, and so not of Roman, law.—τοῦ καθήκ. νῦν[ἡμᾶς] See on xvii. 28.—κρίνῃς κ.τ.λ.] Observe the order of the words, judge will I for my part, etc. Thus Gallio speaks in the consciousness of his political official po-

---

1 ἵσασθαι, as in Luke xxiv. 49.
2 δὲ, ver. 13, marks a contrast to ver. 11.
3 Observe this ἐν, ver. 18.
5 Tact. Ann. i. 75.
6 Suet. Claud. 45.
7 See Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 190, 1–3.
8 ἐρώτησον, see on xiii. 7.
9 Tact. Ann. xv. 73, xvi. 17.
10 See Lipius, in Senec. prooem. 2, and ep. 104; Winer, Realw.
11 See on ver. 15. They do not mean the law of the state; nor yet do they express themselves in a double sense (Lange, apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 240). Gallio well knew what ὁ νόμος signified in the mouth of a Jew.
12 Stat. Silv. ii. 7, 32; Seneca, Q. Nat. 4 præf.
sition; and his wise judgment—which Calovius too harshly designates as ἀμελέω atheistica—is after a corresponding manner to be borne in mind in determining the limits of the ecclesiastical power of princes as bearing on the separation of the secular and spiritual government, with due attention, however, to the circumstance that Gallio was outside the pale of the Jewish religious community.

Vv. 16, 17. Ἀπήλλασαν] he dismissed them as plaintiffs, whose information it was not competent to him to entertain. 1 —Under the legal pretext of the necessity of supporting this Ἀπήλλασαν of the proconsul, all the bystanders—πάντες, partly perhaps Roman subordinate officials, but certainly all Gentiles, therefore οἱ Ἐλληνες is a correct gloss—used the opportunity of wreaking their anger on the leader and certainly also the spokesman of the hated Jews; they seized Sostrhenes, the ruler of the synagogue, even before the tribunal, and beat him. —Σωτῆνες is by Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin, and others, also Hofmann,² very arbitrarily, especially as this name was so common, considered as identical with the person mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 1; hence also the erroneous gloss οἱ Σωτᾶδαι added to πάντες has arisen from the supposition that he either was at this time actually a Christian, or at least inclined to Christianity, and therefore not sufficiently energetic in his accusation. Against this may be urged the very part which Sosthenes, as ruler of the synagogue, evidently plays against Paul;³ and not less the circumstance, that the person mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 1 was a fellow-labourer of Paul out of Corinth; according to which, for the identification of the two, a more extended hypothesis would be necessary, such as Ewald has. Chrysostom considers him even identical with Ορίσπος.—τῶν ἀρχιστόν.] Whether he was a colleague⁴ of the above-named Κρίστος, ver. 8, or successor to him on his resignation in consequence of embracing Christianity,⁵ or whether he presided over another synagogue in Corinth,⁶ remains undetermined.—καὶ οἱ τοὺς τοῦτον κ.τ.λ. [and Gallio troubled himself about none of these things, which here took place; he quite disregarded the spectacle. The purpose of this statement is to exhibit the utter failure of the attempt. So little was he the charge successful, that even the leader of the accusers himself was beaten by the rabble without any interference of the judge, who by this indifference tacitly connived with the accused.

Ver. 18. Ἀποφάσησαν τινι] to say farewell to one. See on Mark vi. 46. —κεφάλεν τῷ κεφ. is not to be referred to Paul, as Augustine, Beda, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Spencer, Reland, Wolf, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Morus, Olshausen, Zeller, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lange, Hackett, Lechler, Ewald, Sepp, Bleek, and others connect it, but to Αὐγίλα, with character would thus be the result! And what reader could from the simple words put together for himself traits so odious! How entirely different were Joseph and Nicodemus!

² See on xiii. 15. [and others.
³ Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten, Ewald,
⁴ Grothus.
Aquila and Priscilla.

Vulgate, Theophylact, 1 Castalio, Hammond, Grotius, Alberti, Valckenaer, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Wieseler, Schneckenburger, also Oertel. 2 A decisive consideration in favour of this is the order of the names Πρισκίλλα καὶ Ἀκίλας, which 3 appears as designedly chosen. Luke, if he had meant the κυρήμ. of Paul, would, by placing the wife first, have led the reader himself into error, whereas, with the precedence naturally given to the husband, no one would have thought of referring κυρήμ. to any other than Paul as the principal subject of the sentence. If, accordingly, κυρήμ. is to be referred to Aquila, Luke has with design and foresight placed the names so; but if it be referred to Paul, he has written with a strange, uncalled for, and misleading deviation from vv. 2 and 26. 4 On the other hand, appeal is no doubt made to Rom. xvi. 3, 5 where also the wife stands first; 6 but Paul here followed a point of view determining his arrangement, 7 which was not followed by Luke in his history, as is evident from vv. 2 and 26. Accordingly, we do not need to have recourse to the argument, that it could not but at all events be very strange to see the liberal Paul thus, entirely without any higher necessity or determining occasion given from without, voluntarily engaging himself in a Jewish votive ceremony. How many occasions for vows had he in his varied fortunes, but we never find a trace that he thus became a Jew to the Jews! If there had been at that time a special reason for accommodation to such an exceptionally legal ceremony, Luke would hardly have omitted to give some more precise indication of it, 8 and would not have mentioned the matter merely thus in passing, as if it were nothing at all strange and exceptional in Paul's case. Of Aquila, a subordinate, he might throw in thus, without stating the precise circumstances, the cursory notice how it happened that the married couple joined Paul on his departure at the seaport; regarding Paul as the bearer of such a vow, he could not but have entered into particulars. Nothing is gained by importing suggestions of some particular design; e.g. Erasmus here discovers an obsequium charitatis toward the Jews, to whom Paul had appeared as a despiser of their legal customs; 9 Bengel supposes 10 that the purpose of the apostle was: "ut necessitatem sibi imponeret celeriter peragendi iter hoc Hierosolymitanum;" Neander presupposes some occasion for the public expression of gratitude to God in the spirit of Christian wisdom; and Baumgarten thinks that "we should hence infer that Paul, during his working at Corinth, lived in the state of weakness and self-denial ap-

1 Chrysostom and Oecumenius do not clearly express to whom they refer κυρήμ. But in the Vulgate ("Aquila, qui sibi totoderat in Cenchrus caput") the reference is undisputed.
3 Comp. with vv. 2 and 26.
4 Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 19. It is true that A B have also in ver. 35 Πρισκίλλα (so Lachm.), but that transposition has evidently arisen from our passage.
5 Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 19.
6 See especially, Neander, p. 343, and Zeller, p. 304.
7 See on Rom. xvi. 8.
8 The case in xxi. 23 ff. is different.
9 Comp. xvi. 3.
10 And so in substance Lange, post. Zeitalt. II. p. 946 f.
11 With Bengel agrees in substance Ewald, p. 502, who supposes that Paul, in order, perhaps, not to be fettered by Priscilla and Aquila in Ephesus, made the solemn vow of his desire to be at Jerusalem even before Easter, and in sign thereof shaved his head, which had no connection with the Nazarite vow, and is rather to be compared to fasting.
pointed by the law and placed under a special constitution;" 1 whereas Zeller uses the reference to Paul in order to prove a design of the writer to impute to him Jewish piety. — ἐν Κεγχρεαίᾳ Κεγχρεαί (in Thuc. Κεγχρεαί) κώμη καὶ λαμύν ἀπεχῶν τῆς πόλεως δαν ἐβδομάκοντα στάδια. Τότε μὲν οὖν χρώναι πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἄσιας, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας τῷ Δεκελῷ, Strabo, viii. 6, p. 380. — εἰκε γὰρ εἰκὴν] states the reason of κεφαλάμ. τ. κεφ. εἰν Κ. : ὅταν ἦν
a vow on him, which he discharged by having his head shorn at Cenchreae. — The vow itself is not to be considered as a Nazarite vow, 2 called by Philo εἰκὴν μεγάλη, according to which a man bound himself, for the glory of Jehovah, to permit his hair to grow for a certain time and to abstain from all intoxicating drink, "Tres species sunt prohibitae Nasiraeis, immunditates, tonsura et quicquid de vite agreditur," 3 and then after the lapse of the consecrated time to have his hair shorn off before the temple, and to present a sacrifice, into the flames of which the hair was cast. 4 For the redemption of such a vow had to take place, as formerly at the tabernacle, so afterwards at the temple and consequently in Jerusalem; 5 and entirely without proof Grotius holds: "haec praeconta . . . eos non obligabant, qui extra Judaeam agebant." 6 If it is assumed 7 that the Nazarite vow had in this case been interrupted by a Levitical uncleanness, such as by contact with a dead person, according to Lange, by intercourse with Gentiles, and was begun anew by the shearing off of the hair already consecrated but now polluted, 8 this is a mere empty supposition, as the simple εἰκε γὰρ εἰκὴν indicates nothing at all extraordinary. And even the renewal of an interrupted Nazarite vow was bound to the temple. 9 Therefore a proper Nazarite vow is here entirely out of the question; it is to be understood as a private vow (votum civile) which Aquila had resting upon him, and which he discharged at Cenchreae by the shaving of his head. On the occasion of some circumstances unknown to us,—perhaps under some distress, in view of eventual deliverance,—he had vowed to let his hair grow for a certain time; this time had now elapsed, and therefore he had his head shorn at Cenchreae. 10 The permitting the hair to grow is, in the Nazarite state, according to Num. vi. 7, nothing else than the sign of complete consecration to God, 11 not that of a blessed, flourishing life, which meaning Bähr imports; 12 nor yet, from the later view of common life, 1 Cor. xi. 14, a representation of man’s renunciation of his dignity and of his subjection to God, 13 which is entirely foreign to the matter. In a corresponding manner is the usage in the case of the vow to be understood. For the vow was certainly analogous to the Nazarite state, 14 in so far as one idea lay at the root of

1 [This is a literal rendering. The meaning seems to me obscure.—Ed.]
2 Num. vi.
3 Aeliaena Nasirt, vi. 1.
4 See Num. i.c.; Ewald, Alterth. p. 112 f. Comp. on xxii. 38 f.
6 Wolf, Stolz, Rosenmüller.
7 Num. vi. 10.
8 See Num. vi. 10.
10 Whence also Judg. xvi. 17 is to be explained. Comp. Ewald, Alterth. p. 115.
11 Symbol. II. p. 438 f.
12 Comp. in opposition to this, Kell, Archdol. § ixvii. 11.
13 Baumgarten.
14 See Ewald, Alterth. p. 32 f.
both; but it was again specifically different from it, as not requiring the official intervention of the priests, and as not bound to the temple and to prescribed forms. Neander correctly describes the εἰχή in this passage as a modification of the Nazarite vow; but for this very reason it seems erroneous that he takes the shearing of the head as the commencement of the redemption of the vow, and not as its termination. See Num. vi. 5, 18; Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 15, 1: τοῖς γὰρ ἡ νοσῳ καταπονουμένως, ἡ τεσσαράς ἀνάγκαις, ἔθος εὐχεσθαι πρὸ τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν, ἢ ἀποδόσεις μέλλουσιν θεσίας, οἰνοῦ τε ἀφέσασθαι καὶ εὐρήσασθαι τὰς κόμας, where the meaning from ἔθος onwards is thus to be taken: "They are accustomed, thirty days before the intended presentation of the offering, to vow that they will abstain from wine and, at the end of that period, have the head shorn."—A special set purpose, moreover, on the part of Luke, in bringing in this remark concerning Aquila, cannot be proved, whether of a conciliatory nature, with the assumed object of indirectly defending Paul against the charge of antagonism to the law, or by way of explaining the historical nexus of cause and effect, according to which his object would be to give information concerning the delay of the departure of the apostle, and concerning his leaving Ephesus more quickly.

Vv. 19, 20. Κατέλειψεν αὐτοῖς he left them there, separated himself from them, so that he without them—αὐτός, he on his part—went to the synagogue, there discoursed with the Jews, and then, without longer stay, pursued his journey. The shift, to which Schneckenburger has recourse, that αὐτός ἐστι properly belongs to ἀπετάσει, αὐτοῖς, is impossible; and that of de Wette, that Luke has written κακείνους κατέλειπεν, αὐτ. in anticipation, "in order, as it were, to get rid of these secondary figures," is arbitrarily harsh. — We may remark, that within this short abode of the apostle at Ephesus occurred the first foundation of a church there, with which the visit to the synagogue and discussion with the Jews are appropriately in keeping as the commencement of his operations. So much the less, therefore, is an earlier presence there and foundation of the church to be assumed.—ἐπὶ π. ἤρχεται for a longer time. It was to take place only at a later period, chap. xix.

Ver. 21. What feast was meant by τὴν ἔορτην τὴν ἑρχομ. must remain undetermined, as δεῖ με πάντως does not allow us absolutely to exclude the winter season dangerous for navigation, and as the indefinite ἡμέρας ἱκανάς, ver. 18—which period is not included in the one and a half years—prevents an exact reckoning. It is commonly supposed to be either Easter or Pentecost. The latter by Anger. The former is at least not to be inferred from the use of the article "the feast," which in general, and here specially on account of the addition τὴν ἑρχομ., would be an uncertain ground. The

motive, also, of the determination indicated by δεῖ is completely unknown. — ποιεῖν] as in ver. 22; see on xv. 38. — εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα] — πάλιν δὲ κ.τ.λ.] which took place, xix. 1.

Vv. 22, 23. Fourth journey to Jerusalem, according to chap. ix., xi., xv. — From Ephesus Paul sailed to Caesarea—i.e. Caesarea Stratonis, the best and most frequented harbour in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; not, as Jerome, Beda, and Lyra suppose, Caesarea in Cappadocia, against which the very word ἀναβάς serves as a proof—and from thence he went up to Jerusalem, whence he proceeded down to Antioch. — ἀναβάς] namely, to Jerusalem. So Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmuller, Heinrichs, Olshausen, Neander, Anger, de Wette, Weissel, Baumgarten, Lange, Ewald, and others. Others refer it to Caesarea, so Calovius, Wolf, Kuinoel, Schott, and several others, and think that the word is purposely chosen, either because the city was situated high up from the shore, or because the church had its place of meeting in an elevated locality. The reference to Caesarea would be necessary, if δεῖ με πάνως κ.τ.λ., ver. 21, were not genuine; for then the reference to Jerusalem would have no ground assigned for it in the context. But with the genuineness of that asseveration, ver. 21, the historical connection requires that ἀναβας κ. ἀσπάζοντας τ. ἐκκλ. should contain the fulfilment of it. In favour of this we may appeal both to the relation in meaning of the following κατέβας to this ἀναβάς, and to the circumstance that it would be very strangely in contrast to the hurried brevity with which the whole journey is despatched in ver. 22, if Luke should have specially indicated in the case of Caesarea not merely the arrival at it, but also the going up (!) to it. In spite of that hurried brevity, with which the author scarcely touches on this journey to Jerusalem, and mentions in regard to the residence there no intercourse with the Jews, no visit to the temple, and the like, but only a salutation of the church, the fidelity of the apostle to the Jewish festivals has been regarded as the design of the narrative, and the narrative itself as invented. The identification of the journey with that mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 is incompatible with the aim of the apostle in adding his journeys to Jerusalem in that passage. See on Galatians. Nor can the encounter with Peter, Gal. ii. 11, belong to the residence of Paul at that time in Antioch. — ἐγείρεις τ. ἐκκλ. τ. ἁγιασμ. certainly, also, Lycaonia, xiv. 21, although Luke does not expressly name it. On ἐσκάσασας, comp. xiv. 22, xv. 32, 41.

Vv. 24—28. Notice interposed concerning Apollos, who, during Paul’s absence from Ephesus, came thither as a Messianic preacher proceeding from the school of the disciples of John, completed his Christian training there, and then before the return of the apostle, xix. 1, departed to Achaia.

1 See Winer, p. 587 (R. T. 515).
2 De temp. rat. p. 69 f.
3 Kuinoel and others.
4 De Dieu and others.
5 The so short residence of the apostle in Jerusalem is sufficiently intelligible from the certainly even at that time (comp. xxi. 31 ff.) very excited temper of the Judaists, with whom Paul now recognized it as incompatible with his more extended apostolic mission to meddle. See Ewald, p. 503 f.
6 Schneckenburger.
7 Zeiller, Haurath; comp. Holtzmann, p. 695.
8 Weissel.
9 Neander, Weissel, Lange, Baumgarten.
APOLLOS.

Ver. 24. Απολλώνιος; the abbreviated Απολλώνιος, as D actually has it. His working was peculiarly influential in Corinth. In any way, learned or eloquent, Neander, also Vataplus, takes it in the former signification. But the usual rendering, eloquens, corresponds quite as well with his Alexandrian training, after the style of Philo, and is decidedly indicated as preferable by the reference to vv. 25 and 28, as well as by the characteristic mode of Apollos's work at Corinth. Besides, the Scripture-learning is particularly brought forward alongside of λόγος by διασκεδάζω, in v. γράφ.: he had in the Scriptures, in the understanding, exposition, and application of them, a peculiar power, for the conviction and winning of hearts, refutation of opponents, and the like.

Ver. 25. Κατ' Χριστόν τ. ὁδ. τ. Κυρ.] Apollos was instructed concerning the way of the Lord, i.e. concerning Christianity as a mode of life appointed and shaped by Christ through means of faith in Him, doubtless by disciples of John, as follows from ἐν πατρί. μαθαίνει μάθημα. Βαπτίζει. Ἰσαίας. How imperfect this instruction had been in respect of the doctrinal contents of Christianity, appears from the fact that he knew nothing of a distinctively Christian baptism. He stood in this respect on the same stage with the μαθητής in xix. 2; but, not maintaining the same passive attitude as they did, he was already—under the influence of the partial and preliminary light of Christian knowledge—full of a profound, living fervour, as if seething and boiling in his spirit, i.e. in the potency of his higher self-conscious life, so that he ἐλάττευσεν καὶ ἐνδιδαχθεῖν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ιησοῦ. What had reference to Jesus, to whom as the Messiah John had borne witness, was naturally that concerning which he had in his Johannine training received most information and taken the deepest interest. He must have regarded Jesus—His historical person—actually as the Messiah, not merely as a precursor of Him, which Bleek erroneously denies, contrary to the express words of the passage; but he still needed a more accurate Christian instruction, which he received, ver. 26. The incompleteness and even the lack to some extent of correctness in his Christian knowledge, made him, with his might in the Scriptures and fervour in spirit—which latter was under the control of the former—not incapable to teach, according to the measure of his knowledge, with accuracy concerning Jesus, although he himself had to be instructed yet ἀκριβῶς τοποθετοῦν, ver. 26, in opposition to Baur and Zeller, who find here contradictory statements. In a corresponding manner, for example, a missionary may labour with an incomplete and in part even defective knowledge of the way of salvation, if he is mighty in the Scriptures and of fervent spirit. — ἢ ἄγιος αἰτία, are simply to be distinguished as genus and species; and

1 On Apollos, see Heymann in the *Schr. Stud. 1849, p. 222 f.; Bleek on Hebr. Introd. p. 324 f.; Ewald, p. 515 f. We should know him better, if he were the author of an edition to the Hebrews, which, however, remains a matter of great uncertainty.


3 See on lx. 2.

4 Eusebius, *P. V. p. 91, 92; *P. V. p. 92;

5 See νπον τῆς περιπολαίας, see in Rom. xii. 11.

7 Baumgarten.

8 Not to be taken in a subjective sense; carefully (Bessa and others), which the comparative in ver. 26 does not suit.
ἀκριβῶς, exactly, receives its limitation by ἐπιστ. μόν. τ. β. Ἰ. — ἐπιστάμενος μόν. τ. βάπτ. Ἰωάννου] although, etc. The view, that by this an absolute ignorance of Christian baptism is expressed, is incredible in itself, and not to be assumed on account of John iii. 26. Notwithstanding, the simple literal sense is not to be interpreted, with Lange,1 as though Apollo was wanting only in "complete Christian experience of salvation and maturity;" but, inasmuch as he did not recognise the characteristic distinction of the Christian baptism from that of John, he knew not that the former was something superior to the latter; 2 he knew only the baptism of John.3

Ver. 26. Τί] to which δὲ afterwards corresponds.4 ἦρεσις] beginning of the παράστασ. εἰς τὴν συναγ. Immediately afterwards Aquila and Priscilla, who had temporarily settled in Ephesus, 4 and had heard him speak — from which they could not but learn what he lacked — took him to themselves for private instruction. — τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδόν] the same as τὴν ὁδόν τ. Κυρίου, ver. 25, inasmuch as the whole work of Christ is the work of God. That, also Christian baptism was administered to Apollo by Aquila, is neither to be assumed as self-evident, 5 nor is it to be arbitrarily added, with Olshausen, that he first received the Holy Spirit at Corinth by Paul (i). Ewald correctly remarks: "there could be no mention of a new baptism in the case of a man already, in a spiritual sense, moved deeply enough." The Holy Spirit had already taken up His abode in his fervent spirit,—a relation which could only be furthered by the instruction of Aquila and Priscilla.

Ver. 27. Διελθεῖν εἰς τ. Ἀχαΐαν] probably occasioned by what he had heard from Aquila and Priscilla concerning the working of Paul at Corinth. — προτεταυρ. οἱ δὲ ἑγαρ. τοῖς μαθητ. ἀπελευθ. τοῖς μαθητ. ἀποτελεῖσθαι.] The Christians already at Ephesus4 wrote exhorting, issued a letter of exhortation, to the disciples, the Christians of Achaia, to receive him hospitably as a teacher of the gospel. So Luther, Castalio, and others, also de Wette and Ewald. The contents of their letter constituted a λόγος προτεταυρικ. 6 But many others, as Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, following Chrysostom (προτέταμων κ. γράμματα ἐπιδίδοντας), refer προτεταυρ. to Apollo 8 as its object, not to the μαθητ.4, "sua exhortatione ipsum magis incitaverunt frates et contenti addiderunt calcar," Calvin; according to which we should necessarily expect either a defining ἀπό τοῦ with προτεταυρ., or previously βουλόμενον δὲ αὐτόν. — συνεβάλετο] he contributed much,11 helped much.11 This meaning, not disservit,12 is required by the following γὰρ. — τοῖς παιπτεικόσι] Bengel appropriately remarks: "τριγανίς Apollo, non plantavit."14—διὰ τῆς χάριτος] is not to be connected with τοῖς παιπτεικόσι,15 but with συνεβ. πολύ; for the design of the text is to characterize Apollo

---

1 Apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 260.
2 xix. 3, 4. 3 [p. 38 f.
3 Comp. Oertel, Paulus in der Apostelgesch.
4 See Winer, p. 409 (E. T. 466) ; Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. v. 8. 8.
5 Ver. 18 f.
6 Erasmus, Grotius, and others.
7 See on xix. 5.
8 Doubtless but few at first, vv. 19 f.
9 Plat. Chrm. p. 410 D.

---

10 This reference is implied also in the amplification of the whole verse in D, which Bornemann has adopted.
11 Constitt. Vulg.: profecti, Cod. It.
12 Dem. 556. 18; Plat. Legg. x. p. 905 C; Polyb. i. 2. 5; ii. 13. 1; Philo, megr. Abr. p. 492 D.
13 xvi. 18.
14 Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 6.
15 Hammond, de Wette, Hackett, and others.
and his workings, and not the ἐπιστευκ. The χάρις is to be explained of
the divine grace sustaining and blessing his efforts. Not only is the view of
Hammond and Bolten, that it denotes the gospel, to be rejected, but also
that of Raphael, Wetstein, and Heinrichs, that it signifies facundia dicendi
venustas, in which case the Christian point of view of Luke, according to
which he signalizes that συνεβάλ. πολύ, is entirely mistaken. Apollon thus
laboured, not by his art, but by grace. But the reception of baptism is not
presupposed by this χάρις, in opposition to Grotius; see on ver. 26.

Ver. 28. Εὐτώνως] nervously, vigorously, also in Greek writers used of ora-
elsewhere. The dative of reference 1 is to be rendered: for the Jews, i.e.
over against the Jews, to instruct them better, he held public refutations, so
that he showed, etc. — δημοσία] The opposite is ἰδία. 2 It comprehends more
than the activity in the synagogue. — διά τῶν γραφ.] by means of the Script-
ures, whose expressions he made use of for the explanation and proof of his
proposition that Jesus was the Messiah, Ἰησοῦν is the subject, comp. ver. 5.
—The description of the ministry of Apollon, vv. 27, 28, entirely agrees with
1 Cor. iii. 6.

NOTES by AMERICAN EDITOR.

(9) Corinth. V. 1.

Corinth, distant from Athens about 45 miles, was situated on an isthmus,
between two seas, the Εὐχεν and the Ionian, on each of which, respectively,
were the ports of Cenchrea and Lechæum. Hence called “The City of the Two
Seas,” Its favorable position rendered it a vast commercial emporium. It was
also a city of great military importance, as it commanded the entrance into the
peninsula. In ancient and in modern times, armies have contended for the
possession of the lofty citadel of this city, called by Xenophon “The Gate of
the Peloponnesus,” and by Pindar the “Bridge of the Sea.”

This city differed much in almost every respect from Athens. Athens was a
Greek free city, Corinth was a Roman colony. Athens was a seat of learning, 
Corinth a mart of commerce. At Corinth, more than anywhere else, the
Greek race could be seen in all its life and activity.

The ancient city, so renowned in Grecian history, and which rivalled even 
Rome, had been destroyed and for a century lay in ruins; but, nearly a century
before the time of Paul’s visit, the city was rebuilt by Julius Caesar, and it quickly
surpassed its former opulence and splendor. “Splendid buildings, enriched
with ancient pillars of marble and porphyrion and adorned with gold and silver,
soon began to rise side by side with the wretched huts of wood and straw, which
sheltered the mass of the poorer population. The life of the wealthier in-
habitants was marked by self-indulgence and intellectual restlessness, and the
mass of the people, even down to the slaves, were more or less affected by the
prevailing tendency. Corinth was the Vanity Fair of the Roman Empire, at
once the London and the Paris of the first century after Christ.” (Farrar.)

1 Comp. Symm., Job xxxix. 29: διελέγχεται—
2 Xen. Hier. xi. 9.

See xix. 9.
It was no less notorious for vice and licentiousness than it was famous for its magnificence and refinement. For while Cicero calls it "totius Graeciae lumen," the light of all Greece, and Florus designates it "Graecia decus," the glory of Greece," so low had it sunk in morals, that to live like a Corinthian became proverbial for a course of wanton licentiousness and reckless dissipation. It was "a populous city, rich, brilliant, frequented by numerous strangers, centre of an active commerce. The characteristic feature which rendered its name proverbial was the extreme corruption of manners displayed there." (Renan.) To this vast city, with its teeming mixed population of Jews, Greeks, and Romans, where strife and uncleanness prevailed, the apostle came to preach the gospel of peace and purity, and he did so with great power and success.

(Gallio. V. 15.)

Gallio was the brother of Seneca, the celebrated moralist, who dedicated two of his books to him. He possessed those qualities which render a man a general favorite. He was characterized as the "dulcis Gallio."

"He was a man of fine mind and noble soul, the friend of the poets and celebrated writers. Such a man must have been little inclined to receive the demands of fanatics, coming to ask the civil power, against which they protest in secret, to free them of their enemies." (Renan.)

Seneca says: "Nemo mortalium uni tam dulcis est, quam hio omnibus." And the narrative of Luke represents him as acting in harmony with such a disposition. In the matter brought before him, he acted the part of a wise and upright judge. The question was one which did not fall under his jurisdiction. He was unwilling to be made a party to a Jewish prejudice, or the executioner of an alien code. Paul and his accusers as religionists stood on an equality in the eye of the law. His conduct is often reproached severely, as if he had been wholly indifferent on matters of religion. Whether he was so or not is not manifested here. He simply declined to interfere in such matters. In this he was right; though he should surely have kept the peace, and prevented the attack on Sosthenes. The view of Meyer is probably correct, that he favored the accused.

The Romans regarded the Jews with mingled feelings of curiosity, disgust, and contempt. Their orators and satirists heap scorn and reproach upon them for their low cunning, their squalor, mendicancy, turbulence, superstition, cheatery and idleness. And they viewed Christianity in the light of a Jewish faction.

"It took the Romans nearly two centuries to learn that Christianity was something infinitely more important than the Jewish sect, which they mistook it to be. It would have been better for them, and for the world, if they had tried to get rid of this disdain, and to learn wherein lay the secret power of a religion, which they could neither eradicate nor suppress. But while we regret this unphilosophic disregard, let us at least do justice to Roman impartiality. In Gallio, in Lysias, in Felix, in Festus, in the centurion Julius, even in Pilate, different as were their degrees of rectitude, we cannot but admire the trained judicial insight with which they at once saw through the subterranean injustice and virulent animosity of the Jews in bringing false charges against innocent men." (Farrar.)
NOTES.

(3) Having shorn his head. V. 18.

It is a matter of dispute whether this shaving of the head refers to Paul or to Aquila. Meyer is decidedly of the opinion that it was Aquila who had the vow. He argues strenuously in favor of this view, but he very candidly gives a list of authorities on both sides.

On the statement Plumptre writes thus: "The grammatical structure of the Greek sentence makes it possible to refer the words to Aquila as well as St. Paul, but there is hardly the shadow of a doubt that the latter is meant."

Alford says: "There are, from verse 18 to 23—a section forming a distinct narrative, and complete in itself—no less than nine aorist participles, eight of which indisputably apply to Paul as the subject of the section; leaving it hardly open to question that κεφαλήνιος also must apply unto him." Taylor quotes this passage and concurs with it. On the other hand Bloomfield writes: "All who were distinguished for knowledge of Greek and almost every editor of the N.T. have adopted the view that it refers to Aquila, which is supported by the ancient versions, and, as it invokes far more probability, and avoids the difficulties attendant on supposing Paul to be meant, it deserves the preference." Houson also, in "The Life of Paul," says: "Aquila had bound himself by one of those vows which the Jews often voluntarily took—even when in foreign countries," and "had been for some time conspicuous, even among the Jews and Christians at Corinth, for the long hair, which denoted that he was under a peculiar religious restriction; and before accompanying the apostle to Ephesus, laid aside the tokens of his vow." He also in a note quotes Heinrichs: "Præferendum mihi videtur, quia constructio fluit facilior, propiusque fidem est, notitiam hanc, quae lereviter nonnisi et quasi per transseunam additur, de homine ignitione adjunctam esse." Gloag thinks the view which refers the shaving of the head to Paul is the more correct. Since the time of Augustine, opinion on this question has been divided; among the scholars and commentators of the present day diversity of sentiment still exists, nor can we expect unanimity in the future. In view of the whole discussion, we are disposed to agree with Meyer, that it was Aquila and not Paul who shaved his head.


Nothing is known of the previous history of Apollos, only that he was born in Alexandria, of Jewish parents. He was doubtless trained from his childhood in the knowledge of the O. T. Scriptures; and thoroughly disciplined by the culture of the best schools in a city where literature, philosophy, and criticism excited the utmost intellectual activity, and which at that time was second only to Athens in influence over the current thought of the age. The philosophy of Alexandria exercised an important influence, both for good and evil, over primitive Christianity.

Apollos was not only learned and mighty in the Scriptures, but he was endowed with a most fascinating and persuasive eloquence, and, both before and after his acquaintance with Paul, rendered good service to the cause of Christ, in Corinth and in Ephesus. He was with Paul when he wrote the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and Paul mentions him many years afterward, in his
Epistle to Titus. Luther suggested the idea that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and many have agreed with him. The term λόγος, applied to Apollos, may mean skilful in history, learned, or eloquent, the last is best suited to the context; but, in all its senses, the word was applicable to the distinguished Alexandrian.

(Baptism of John. V. 25.)

Besides his early Biblical and literary training, Apollos had probably been instructed by some disciple of John, if not by John himself, and had been imbued with the spirit of the trumpet-toned preacher of the Jordan, and sought to lead men to repentance, and to the reception of the Messiah, who had already come, as he proved from the received Scriptures. He had been instructed in the way of the Lord—that is, the divine purpose to redeem Israel through the Messiah, whom he believed Jesus of Nazareth to be; for with great fervor of spirit and force of speech he taught accurately the things concerning the Lord Jesus, as far as he knew them. It is not to be supposed that Apollos was ignorant of the fact that Jesus was the Christ, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world; for this was the keynote of John's ministry; nor that he did not know anything about Christian baptism, but only that he did not distinguish between it and that of John. The disciples of John, who were numerous and scattered, may be divided into three classes: those, including a large majority, who became disciples of Christ; those, who formed a small sect of their own, holding that John was the Messiah; and those who, being removed from Palestine, held just what John taught. To this last class Apollos and the twelve disciples at Ephesus belonged. They had not yet heard of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, though they were personally led into the truth by Him. The pious couple, who had left Corinth with Paul, took the fervent, eloquent preacher to their home, and gave him more full and accurate instruction in the gospel of Christ, its distinctive doctrines, and, though no mention is made of the fact, Aquila in all probability baptized him. Meyer thinks he was not rebaptized; but both Hackett and Plumptre think it more probable that he was rebaptized, and we agree with them.
CHAPTER XIX.

Vv. 1, 2. εἰρήνω] A B Ν, min. Copt. Vulg. Fulg. have εἰρείνω, and then τε (or δέ) after εἰσε. So Lachm. Tisch. But how easily might εἰρήνω, after εἰσε, be changed by transcribers into εἰρείνω! — εἰσε, ver. 2, and πρόσ αὐτοῦ, ver. 3 (both deleted, after important witnesses, by Lachm. Tisch. Born.), have the character of an addition for the sake of completion. — Ver. 4. μέν] is wanting in A B D Ν, min. Vulg. Delected by Lachm. and Born. The want of a corresponding δέ occasioned the omission. — Before Ἰρσοῦ Elz. Scholz read Χριστόν, which is deleted according to preponderating testimony. A usual addition, which was here particularly suggested by εἰς τ. ἐρχ. — Ver. 7. δεκαδοῦ] Lachm. Born. read ὀδὸν, it is true, according to A B D E Ν, min., but it is a change to the more usual form. — Ver. 8. τὰ περι] B D, min. vsa. have περι. So Lachm. Tisch. Born. See on viii. 12. — Ver. 9. τινός] is wanting in A B Ν, min. vsa. Lachm. Tisch., but was, as apparently unnecessary, more easily omitted than inserted. — Ver. 10. After Κορίνθιον Elz. has, against decisive testimony, Ἰρσοῦ, which Griesb. has deleted. — Ver. 12. ἀποφέρ.] recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch., after A B E Ν, min. But Elz. Scholz. Born. read ἐπιφέρ. Occasioned by εἰς τ. ἄσθ. — εἰκοποιεσθα] Elz. reads ἐξερευνεῖν αὐτῷ αὐτῶν, against preponderating evidence. The usual word for the going out of demons! and αὐτῷ αὐτῷ, was added from the preceding. — Ver. 13. καὶ] after τινός, is approved by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch., according to A B E Ν, min. Syr.; Elz. Scholz. read ἄπο, according to G H, min.; Born. reads ἐκ, after D. Accordingly something, at all events, originally stood after τινός. But had ἄπο or ἐκ stood, no reason can be perceived why they should be meddling with; καὶ, on the other hand, might be found perplexing, and was sometimes omitted and sometimes exchanged for ἄπο or ἐκ. — ὀρκιζω] So A B D E Ν, min. Copt. Arm. Cassiod. But Elz. has ὄρκιζων. Correction to suit the plurality of persons. — Ver. 14. τινός vioi Σκ. '1. ἄρχ. ἐπιτα] Lachm. reads τινοί Σκ. '1. ἄρχ. ἐπτει vioi. Both have important evidence, and the latter is explained as a correction and transposition (Tisch. has τινός indeed, but follows the order of Lachm., also attested by Ν), the transcribers not knowing how to reconcile τινός with τινα. — αύτ] is deleted by Lachm., according to insufficient evidence. Superfluous in itself; and, according to the order of Lachm., it was very easily passed over after vioi. — Ver. 16. ἐφαλλόμ] A B Ν*, 104. Lachm. reads ἐφάλλω. Correctly; the Recepta arises from the inattention of transcribers. — Before κατακλώρ. Elz. Scholz. have καὶ, which is deleted according to predominant testimony. An insertion for the sake of connection. — ἀμφοτέρων] Elz. has αὐτοῦ, against A B D Ν, min. Theophyl. 2, and some vsa.; ἀμφ., which is recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., was objectionable, as before there was no mention of τω. — Ver. 21. διελθόν] Lachm. Born. read διαλοιπό, according to A D E. Resolution of the construction, by which καὶ became necessary before ποιεσθα, which, also, D has (so Born.). — Ver. 24. παρείχεσθε] Lachm. reads παρείξε, according to A D E; yet D places ὅς before, and has previously ἦν.
after τίς (so Born.). The middle was less familiar to transcribers. — Ver. 25. Elz. Scholz have ἴδιων; Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἴδιω, according to A B D E Μ, min. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Theophyl. 2. The latter is to be received on account of the preponderance of testimony, and because ἴδιος would more easily suggest itself to unskilful transcribers. — Ver. 26. ἀλλα] Lachm. Born. read ἀλλὰ καλ, after A B G, min. vss. Chrys. Both suitable in meaning; but καλ would more easily after οὐ μόνον be mechanically inserted (comp. ver. 27) than omitted. — Ver. 27. λογισθήσαται, μέλλειν] Lachm. Born. read λογισθήσεται, μέλλει, according to weighty evidence; but certainly only an emendation of a construction not understood. — τὴν μεγάλ.] Lachm. reads τῆς μεγαλειότητος, Α Β Ε Μ, min. Sahid. Correctly; the genitive not being understood, or not having its meaning attended to, yielded to the more naturally occurring accusative. — Ver. 29. ἀλη] is wanting in A B Μ, min.Vulg. Copt. Arm., and is deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition which easily suggested itself. — Ver. 33. προεθήκασαν] Lachm. reads συνεθήκασαν, according to A B E Μ, min.; Born. reads κατεθήκα, after D*. In this diversity συνεθήκα is indeed best attested by Codds., but yet is to be rejected as completely unsuitable. "As, further, κατεθήκ has only D* for it, the reading of the Recepta, which was glossed in a variety of ways, is to be retained. — Ver. 34. ἐπιγύνεσα] Elz. has ἐπιγύνεσαν, against decisive evidence. A correction in point of style. — Ver. 35. ἀνθρώπων] Lachm. Tisch. read ἀνθρώπων, according to A B E Μ, min. vss. The Recepta came in mechanically. — After μεγάλ. Elz. has θεάσ. Condemned by decisive testimony as an addition. — Ver. 37. θεόν] Elz. reads θέαν, against decisive testimony. — Instead of ἴδιων, Griesb. approved, and Lachm. and Born. read, ἴδιων, according to A D E Μ Χ. But with the important attestation which ἴδιων also has, and as the change into ἴδιων was so naturally suggested by the context, the Recepta is to be defended. — Ver. 39. περὶ τρέπων] B, min. Cant. have περατρέω. Preferred by Rinck, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.; and correctly, as alterations easily presented themselves for a word not occurring elsewhere in the N. T. (E has περὶ τρέπων), and which is hardly to be ascribed to the transcribers. — Ver. 40. After περὶ of Griesb. and Matth. have adopted ὁ, which, however, has more considerable authorities against it than for it (A G H Μ). Writing of the ὁ twice. — περὶ before τῆς σοφίας is found in A B E Μ, min. vss.; it is, with Lachm., to be adopted, because, being superfluous and cumbrous, it ran the risk of being omitted, but was not appropriate for insertion.

Ver. 1. 'Απολλώ] Concerning this form of the accusative, see Winer, p. 61 (E. T. 72). — τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ] the districts lying more inland from Ephesus, as Galatia and Phrygia, xviii. 23.¹ The reading Theophylact, τὰ ἀνωτέρικα, is a correct gloss. A more precise definition of the course of the journey³ through the regions of Hierapolis, Philadelphia, and Sardis, is not to be attempted. — μαθητάς] i.e. as no other definition is added, Christians. It is true that they were disciples of John,² who had been, like Apollos, instructed and baptized by disciples of the Baptist,⁴ but they had joined the fellowship of the Christians, and were by those regarded as fellow-disciples, seeing that they possessed some knowledge of the person and doc-

¹ Comp. Кypke, Π. 96. ² ver. 2, 3. ³ Böttger, Betr. I. p. 30, and de Wette. ⁴ Comp. xvi. 25.
trine of Jesus and a corresponding faith in Him, though of a very imperfect and indefinite character,—as it were, misty and dawning; therefore Paul himself also considered them as Christians, and he only learned from his conversation with them that they were merely disciples of John.¹ Heinrichs² thinks that they had received their instruction³ and baptism of John from Apollos, and that Paul was also aware of this. But the very ignorance of these disciples can as little be reconciled with the energetic ministry of Apollos as with any already lengthened residence at Ephesus at all, where, under the influence of the Christians, and particularly of Aquila and Priscilla, they must have received more information concerning the πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Therefore it is most probable that they were strangers, who had but just come to Ephesus and had attached themselves to the Christians of that place. As disciples of John they are to be regarded as Jews, not as Gentiles, which ver. 2 contains nothing to necessitate.⁴—Observe, also, that the earlier keeping back of the apostle from Asia on the part of the Spirit⁵ had now, after his labours thus far in Greece, obtained its object and was no longer operative. Of this Paul was conscious. Cod. D has a special address of the Spirit to this effect,—an interpolation which Bornemann has adopted.

Ver. 3. The want of the distinctively Christian life of the Spirit in these disciples must have surprised the apostle; he misses in their case those peculiar utterances of the Holy Spirit, commencing with Christian baptism, which were elsewhere observable.⁶ Hence his question. — εἰ] The indirect form of conception lies at the foundation, as in i. 6. — πιστεύοντες] after ye became believers, i.e. Christians, which Paul considered them to be.⁷—ἀλλ' εἰσήκουσαι] as the existence of the Holy Spirit at all cannot have been unknown to the men, because they were disciples of John and John's baptism of water had its essential correlate and intelligible explanation in the very baptism of the Spirit—even apart from the O. T. training of these men, according to which they must at least have been aware that the Holy Spirit was something existing—ἐστιν, to be so accented, must necessarily be taken as adeus, as in John vii. 39: No, we have not even heard whether the Holy Spirit is there, already present on the earth. Accordingly, they still remained ignorant whether that which John had announced, namely, that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit, had already taken place, and thus the πνεῦμα ἅγιον had become present. The supplements, δοθήν, ἐκχυσθῇς, and the like, give the sense, just as in John vii. 39, but are quite unnecessary. The view which it takes of existence generally has misled Olshausen to import the here inappropriate dogmatic assertion: that God still stood before their minds as a rigid, self-contained, immediate unity, without their knowing anything of the distinctive attributes of the Father, Son, and Spirit, necessarily conditioned by the nature of the

¹ verse 3.
² Comp. Wetstein, also Lange, II. p. 264.
³ xvii. 25, 26.
⁴ In opposition to Baumgarten, II. p. 8.
⁵ 1 Cor. xii. 13; Tit. iii. 5.
⁶ See on ver. 1.
Spirit; and, with Baumgarten, has given rise to the supposition that they were Gentiles. — The question occurred to them as surprising.

Ver. 3. Εἰς τῷ ὑποθέτησιν τῆς βάπτισεi. In reference to the baptism: unto what, then, as the object of faith and confession, to which you were referred, were ye baptized? — ὅπως] accordingly, since the matter so stands, since ye have not even heard of the existence of the Holy Spirit. The presupposition in this εἰς τῷ ὅπως is, that they, baptized in the name of Christ, could not but have received the Holy Spirit. — εἰς τῷ Ἰωάννῃ. βάπτισε.] in reference to the baptism administered by John, so that thus the baptism performed in our case was to be the baptism of John, in relation to which we were baptized.

Ver. 4. Μὴ] See on i. 1. Instead of following it up by an apodosis, such as: "but Jesus is the coming One, on whom John by his baptism bound men to believe," Paul already inserts this idea by τοις ἐστιν εἰς τῷ Ἰ. into the sentence begun by μὴν, and, abandoning the μὴν, entirely omits to continue the construction by δέ. — ἡ βάπτισμα. βάπτισα. μεταβα. he baptized, administered, a baptism which obliged to repentance. See Mark i. 4. On the combination of βάπτισαν with a cognate noun. — εἰς τῷ ἐπιχείρησα.] is with great emphasis prefixed to the ἑω. — ἑω πιστὸν.] is to be understood purely in the sense of design; saying to the people: that he administered a baptism of repentance, in order that they should believe on Him who was to come after him, i.e. on Jesus. This terse information concerning the connection of the baptism of John, which they had received, with Jesus, decided these disciples to receive Christian baptism. The determining element lay in τοῖς ἐστιν εἰς τῷ Ἰησοῦν, which Paul must have more precisely explained to them, and by which they were transplanted from their hitherto indistinct and non-living faith into the condition of a full fides explicita—from the morning dawn of faith to the bright daylight of the same.

Ver. 5. Εἰς τῷ δικαιοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ. on the name of the Lord Jesus, which they were to confess, namely, as that of the Messiah. These disciples of John thus received—whether from Paul himself, or from a subordinate assistant, the text leaves undetermined. — Christian baptism, for it had appeared that they had not yet received it. The Anabaptists have from the first wrongly appealed to this passage; for it simply represents the non-sufficiency of John’s baptism, in point of fact, for Christianity, and that purely in respect of the twelve persons, but does not exhibit the insufficiency of the Christian baptism of infants. Many, moreover, of the orthodox, in a controversial interest—both against the Roman Catholic doctrine of the distinction between the Johannean and the Christian baptism, and also against the Anabaptists,—have wrongly attached ver. 5 to the address of the apostle: "but after they had heard it they were baptized (by John), etc."

1. On ἀλλαζ, in the reply, see Klotz, ad locov, p. 11 f.
3. Matt. iii. 11, xxvii. 19; Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. i. 13, x. 2, xii. 18; Gal. iii. 37.
5. Comp. on Gal. ii. 10; Eph. iii. 18.
7. But see for the latter view 1 Cor. i. 17; comp. Acts x. 48.
But against this it may be urged, that John did not baptize in the name of Jesus, and that ὅτε, ver. 5, stands in no logical connection at all with μὲν, ver. 4. On the other hand, Calvin and others have maintained, against the Anabaptists, that ver. 5 is meant not of the baptism of water, but of the baptism of the Spirit, which ver. 6 only more precisely explains; but this shift is just another, quite as utterly unexegetical, error of dogmatic presupposition. We may add, that it may not be inferred from our passage that the disciples of John who passed over to Christianity were uniformly rebaptized; for in the case of the apostles who passed over from John to Jesus, this certainly did not take place;¹ and even as regards Apollos, the common opinion that he was baptized by Aquila is purely arbitrary, as in xviii. 26 his instruction in Christianity, and not his baptism, is narrated. Indeed, in the whole of the N. T., except this passage, there is no example of the rebaptism of a disciple of John. Hence the baptism of the disciples of John who passed over to Christianity was not considered as absolutely necessary; but it did or did not take place according as in the different cases, and in proportion to the differences of individuals, the desire of the persons concerned, and the opinion of the teachers on the matter determined. With those twelve, for example, Paul regarded it as conducive to his object and requisite that they should be baptized, in order to raise them to the elevation of Christian spiritual life; and therefore they were baptized, evidently according to their own wish and inclination, as is implied in ἀναγόμενος ὡς ἐβαπτ., whilst Apollos, on the other hand, could dispense with rebaptism, seeing that he with his fervid spirit, following the references of John to Christ and the instruction of his teachers, penetrated without any new baptismal consecration into the pneumatic element of life. If, however, among the three thousand who were baptized at Pentecost² there were some of John’s disciples,—which is probable,—it was their desire to be baptized, and apostolic wisdom could not leave this unfulfilled. Accordingly, the opinion of Ziegler,³ that those twelve were rebaptized, because they had been baptized by some disciple of John not unto the ἐπέθανεν, but unto John himself, and thus had not received the true Johannean baptism, is to be rejected. They did not, in fact, answer, in ver. 8, εἰς τὸν Ἰωάννην!

Vv. 6, 7. After the baptism the imposition of the hands of the apostle⁴ became the vehicle of the reception of the πνεύμα ἅγιον on the part of the minds opened by the apostolic word. The Spirit descended upon them, and manifested Himself partly by their speaking with tongues,⁵ and partly in prophetic inspiration.⁶ These two must, according to the technical mode of reference to them in the apostolic church attested by 1 Cor. xii.–xiv., be distinguished, and not treated as equivalent, with van Hengel, who⁷ finds here merely in general an expression of the inspired praising aloud of God in Christ.⁸ The analogy of the phenomenon with what occurred in the

¹ John iv. 2.  
² H. 36, 41.  
³ Theol. Abs. II. p. 102.  
⁴ See on viii. 15, remark.  
⁵ See on x. 42.  
⁶ See on xi. 27.  
⁷ Comp. on chap. ii. 10.  
⁸ See his Gave d. iàten, p. 34 ff.; Trip, p. 120, follows him.
history of Cornelius serves Baur for a handle to condemn the whole narrative as unhistorical, and to refer it to the set purpose of placing the Apostle Paul, by a new and telling proof of his apostolic dignity and efficiency, on a parallel with the Apostle Peter. The author had, in Baur’s view, seeing that the first γλώσσας λατρεία, chap. ii., is exhibited in the person of Jesus, and the second, chap. x., in that of Gentiles, now chosen for the third a middle class, half-believers, like the Samaritans. With all this presumed refinement of invention, it is yet singular that the author should not have carried out his parallelism of Paul with Peter even so far as to make the descent of the Holy Spirit and the speaking with tongues take place, as with Cornelius, before baptism, on the mere preaching of the apostle. People themselves weave such fictions, and give forth the author of the book, which is thus criticised, as the ingenious weaver. — Ver. 7. A simple historical statement, not in order to represent the men “as a new Israel.”

Ver. 8. Πειθων] is not equivalent to διδάσκων, but contains the result of διαλέγει. He convinced men’s minds concerning the kingdom of the Messiah.

Ver. 9. But when some were hardened and refused belief, he severed himself from them, from the synagogues, and separated the Christians, henceforth discoursing daily in the school of a certain Tyrannus. Tyrannus is usually considered as a Gentile rhetorician, who had as a public sophist possessed a lecture-room, and is perhaps identical with the one described by Suidas: Τύραννος σοφάτης ποιήσας κ. διαφάνεις λόγου βιβλία δέκα. But as the text does not indicate a transition of the apostle wholly to the Gentiles, but merely a separation from the synagogues, and as in the new place of instruction, Ἰουδαίοι, and these are named first, ver. 10, continued to hear him; as, in fine, Tyrannus, had he been a Gentile, would have to be conceived of as σεβόμενος τὸν θεόν, like Justus, xviii. 7,—an essential point, which Luke would hardly have left unnoticed: the opinion of Hammond is to be preferred, that Tyrannus is to be considered as a Jewish teacher who had a private synagogue, שבי דרומ ב. Paul with his Christians withdrew from the public synagogue to the private synagogue of Tyrannus, where he and his doctrine were more secure from public annoyance. The objection, that it would have been inconsistency to pass from the synagogue to a Rabbinical school, is of no weight, as there were also Rabbins like Gamaliel, and Tyrannus must be considered, at all events, as at least inclined to Christianity. — r. βολον] see on ix. 2, xviii. 25.

1 x. 44 f.
2 I. p. 212 f., ed. 2 (with whom Zeller agrees, and see earlier, Schneckenburger, p. 26 E.
3 See Schwengler.
4 So Baumgarten, II. p. 7, whom the very αὐτοὶ ought to have preserved from this fancy.
5 Comp. on εὐθύς with the mere accusative of the object (Plat. Pol. p. 304 A; Soph. O. C. 1444; Valckenaer, ad Eur. Hipp. 1002).
6 The same name in Apollod. ii. 4. 5; Boeckh, Corp. Inscri. 1792; 2 Macco. iv. 40; Joseph. Antt. xvi. 10. 3, Bell. i. 90. 3; and among the Rabbins דְּלָרֵי, see Drusius in loc.
7 As by Lange and Baumgarten, comp.
8 See, on the other hand, xviii. 6. 7, xiii. 46. [etc.]
9 σχολή, a teaching-room, often in Plutarch.
10 Comp. xviii. 7.
11 “In Beth Midrasch docenunt traditions atque aeren expositiones,” Babyl. Berac. 1. 17. 1; see Lichten. ad Mat. 19. 256 f.; Vitzinga, Synag. p. 137.
12 Baumgarten.
Ver. 10. 'Εν τῇ δύο] for two years. The three months, ver. 8, are to be reckoned in addition to this for the whole residence at Ephesus. This statement of the time is not at variance with xx. 31, if only we take the διατα in our passage, and the ταυτα in xx. 31, not as documentarily strict, but as approximate statements. There is not, therefore, sufficient reason to suppose, nor is there any hint in the narrative, that we are to reckon the ἓν δύο as not extending further than ver. 20. — ὅσε τὰν κ.τ.λ.] a hyperbolic expression. In Ephesus, flourishing by commerce and art, with its famous temple of Diana and festivals, strangers were continually coming and going from all parts of Asia Minor, Jews and Gentiles, the latter particularly for the sake of worship. The sensation which Paul made excited very many to hear him; a great sphere of labour was opened up to him, 1 Cor. xvi. 9. — 'Ελληνας comprehends here both proselytes of the gate and complete Gentiles. The private school, which Tyrannus had granted to Paul, was made accessible by the latter also to the Gentiles, which could not have been the case with a public synagogue.

Vv. 11, 12. Οὗ τὰς τυχόν.] not the usual, i.e. distinguished, not to be compared with those of the Jewish exorcists. The opposite: μικραί καὶ ἄλληνοι πρῶτες. On τυχόν, in the sense of vulgaris, see generally, Vigerus, ed. Hermann, p. 364; and on the very frequent connection by way of litotes with οὐ, see Wetstein in loc. — ὅσε καὶ κ.τ.λ.] so that also, among other things, towels and aprons were brought to the sick from his skin, and thereby the ailments were removed from them, etc. — αὐτικών, not preserved elsewhere, the Latin semicinctum, is explained either as a handkerchief, or usually as an apron, in favour of which is the etymology, and Martial, Epigr. xiv. 151. Very probably it was a linen apron which workmen or waiters wore after laying aside their upper garment, and which, when they had it on, they likewise used for the purpose remarked by Oecumenius. — ἀνά τοῦ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ] so that they had just been used by him and been in contact with his skin. Luke, who also here distinguishes the ordinary sick from the possessed, represents the healing of the former and the deliverance of the latter as an effect, which was brought about by the cloths laid on them; for ὅσε down to ἐπορ. forms together the description of a peculiar kind of those unusual miraculous ὄνωμες. Purely historical criticism, independent of arbitrary premises laid down a priori, has nothing to assail in this view, as the healing power of the apostle, analogous to the miraculous power of Jesus, might through his will be transmitted by means of cloths requested from him to the suffering person, and received by means of the faith of the latter. The truth of the occurrence stands on the same footing with

1 As ver. 8, xxviii. 50, and frequently.
2 Comp. Anger, de temp. rat. p. 59.
3 Schrader, Wessel, and others.
5 Comp. on xi. 90.
6 Ver. 12. Comp. xxviii. 9.
7 Polyb. i. 95. 6.
8 Valckenaer, p. 569 f.; from Philo, Loeper, p. 319. Comp. 2 Macc. iii. 7.
9 Oecumenius; in ταῖς χειρί ἐκχέσων...
10 πρὸς τῷ ἐκπολεμήσαι τὰς ἐγκαταστάσεις τοῦ προ-
11 σώματος, εἰπ' ἑαυτῷ, πτυχάζω, ἐκπολεμῶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ, comp. Theophylact and Suscul, Theo-
12 πολ. p. 950.
13 ἐπιτελεῖται λιτοσκῦλα εἰς, Schol. ap. Matth.
14 Pignor, de serv. p. 1xv.
15 Comp. Luke iv. 40 f. al.
the N. T. miraculous cures in general, which took place through the will of the worker of miracles, partly with and partly without sensible transmission. By relegating the matter from the historical domain of miracles, which is yet undoubtedly to be recognized in the working of Paul, to the sphere of legends as to relics, with comparison of v. 15, or to that "of the servants' rooms and houses behind," the narrative of our passage is easily dismissed, but not got rid of, although a more special embellishment of it by the importance of those seeking help, and by the pouring out of the sweat of the apostle as he worked, of which the text indicates nothing, is to be set aside.

Ver. 18. But some, also, of the itinerant Jewish demon-exorcisers—sorcerers, who, for the healing of demoniacs, used secret arts derived from Solomon, and charms—undertook, in expectation of greater results than their own hitherto had been, and provoked by the effects which Paul produced by the utterance of the name of Jesus, to use this formula with the demoniacs: I conjure you to come out, ye evil spirits, by Jesus, who, besides, will punish you, whom Paul announces. —ἐν τῷ ἤλιῳ ἔποιεν τὸν ναοῦ.] denotes the local direction: towards the possessed, not, as Kuinoel proposes, on account of the possessed, perhaps with a design towards, of the direction of the will, in which case the vivid form of the representation is entirely overlooked.

—τὸν Ἰησοῦν.]—Equivalent to τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἰ., 3 Esdr. i. 48.

Ver. 14. Ἀρχαῖος.] Whether he was a former head of one of the twenty-four priestly classes, or a past de facto high priest, remains undecided, as this Skewas—according to Λ: Skuejas, according to Ewald, perhaps ἴλυ—-is otherwise entirely unknown. —τινῶ...ἐπιτά] is by many, including Kuinoel and Olshausen, taken as some seven, i.e., about seven; but then Luke would have placed the pronoun close to the numeral, either before or after it; and the merely approximate expression would not be in keeping with the significance of the number seven. The correct mode of taking it is: but there were certain sons of Skewas, a Jewish high priest, and indeed seven, who did this. The number, not thought of at the very beginning, instead of τίνως, is introduced afterwards. Baur converts the sons into disciples, without any ground whatever in the text.

Ver. 15. But how entirely did that ἐπεχείρησαν fail of success in the very first instance of its application! Bengel well remarks on ver. 18: "Si semel successisset, saepius ausuri fuerant." —τὸ πνεῦμα] the demon, who had taken possession of the individual consciousness in the man.—By τῶν Ἰησοῦν...ἐπισταμαι he recognises the presence of Jesus and of the apostle over him; by οὕτως ἐπὶ τίνως, what sort of men! ILogger he shows his contempt for the presumption of his powerless—not empowered by Jesus and Paul—opponents. οὕτως is with deprecating emphasis placed first.

1 Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12.
2 Baur. Zeller.
3 Hauerath.
4 Baumgarten.
* See Joseph. Antt. vili. 2. 5, Bell. Jud. i. 1. 2; Matt. xii. 27.
6 ἐπεχείρησα, see on Luke i. 1.
7 Ver. 15.
8 Comp. Mark v. 7; 1 Thess. v. 27.
9 xlii. 23; Thuc. vii. 84. 4, εἰς τινὰ, and see Kühner, § 632. 5; Kräger, § 11. 16. 4.
10 I. p. 215, ed. 2.
Ver. 16. 'Εφεσενος (see the critical remarks) εις αυτον c. τ. λ. having leaped upon them, after overpowering both he so prevailed against them, that, etc. The mode of representation is not exact, as we only see from ἀμφοτέρων that here of those seven but two were active, whom Luke has already conceived to himself in αὐτοῖς. According to Ewald, ἀμφότερος is neuter; on both sides, i.e. from above and from below. This would be ἀρ. ἀμφοτέρων, παρ. ἀμφότερος, ἀμφοτέρως. — γυμνοῖς] whether entirely naked, or merely divested of their upper clothing, remains an undecided point.

Vv. 17, 18. The first impression of this signal miscarriage of that application of the name of Jesus was in the case of the Ephesian multitude naturally fear, dread on account of its extraordinary nature; and then followed universal praise of that name. And many who, through this event now, were believers (τὰς πεπιστ. 1) came, to Paul, and confessed and made known, an exhaustive description, their deeds. This open confession of their previous practices, which had been entirely alien and opposed to the faith in Christ, was the commencement of their new life of faith. In παλαιοί and τὰς πράξις. ait. the converted sorcerers and their evil tricks are meant to be included, but not they only; for it is not till ver. 19 that these exclusively are treated of. As to πράξεις in a bad sense, comp. on Rom. viii. 13.

Ver. 19. On περιεργος, often joined in Greek writers with ἄτομος, μῖκρος, ἀνώτατος, and the like, male sedulus, curiousus, and on τὰ περιεργα, what is useless, especially employed of the practices of sorcerers, see Kypke and Wetstein. — The article here denotes that which is known from the context. — τὰς βιβλιους] in which the magical arts were described, and the formulae were contained. Such formulae of exorcism, carried on slips as amulets, proceeded in large quantities from the sorcerers at Ephesus; hence the expression Ἑφεσία γράμματα. — σωφρόνισαν] The sorcerers themselves reckoned up the prices, which, indeed, others could not do. From this is partly explained the greatness of the sum. — εἰρ. ἀγν. μυρ. πίντε] they found in silver money fifty thousand, namely, drachmæ. As the word is not ἄργυριον, but ἄργυριον (comp. Dem. 949. 1: τριακόλια ἐγκόλιας ἄργυριον δραχμας); as Luke did not write for a Hebrew, and as the scene of the transaction was a Greek city, the opinion of Grotius, Hammond, and Drusius, that shekeles are meant, is to be rejected. The statement of a sum, without naming the sort of money of the drachmæ, was usual with the Greeks.

1 See on John xxi. 7.
2 See on ii. 48.
4 Comp. Luke viii. 16.
5 This rendering of τὰς πεπιστ. is justified by ἀμφοτέρος c. τ. λ., ver. 17. Others, as Baumgarten, understand those who had already previously been believers, but who had not yet arrived at such a confession. This, however, is not reconcilable with μετά γε as the necessary moral condition of faith and baptism, which condition must have at an earlier period been fulfilled by those who had already at an earlier time become believers.

Luther (see his gloss) has misunderstood the verse.

6 ἡγομ. see on Matt. iii. 6.
7 In opposition to Heinrichs and Olahsen.
8 II. p. 95.
9 Comp. περιεργάζοντας, Plut. Apol. S. p. 19
10 See Wetstein and Grotius in loc.; Valckenaer, Schol. p. 564; Hermann, Gott. All. 1827. § xiii. 17.
11 Got out as the sum, see Raphel in loc.
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13 See Bos, Ellipt., ed. Schaeffer, p. 119 f;
drachma, — 6 oboli, is about 24 kreuzers, accordingly the sum is about 20,-
000 Rhenish guldens.1—Baur, according to his presupposition, cannot but
reject the whole history of the demoniac, etc., as unhistorical; he holds
even the judgment in ver. 20 as itself unworthy of the associates of an
apostle; and the following history, vv. 21–40, appears to him only to have
arisen through an a priori abstraction, the author wishing to give as splen-
did a picture as possible of the labours of Paul at Ephesus. Zeller declares
himself more neutrally, yet as suspecting the narrative (p. 265), as does also
Hausrat, p. 86 f.

Ver. 20. So (so much) with power (par force) grew, in external diffusion,
and displayed itself powerful, in the production of great effects, the doctrine
of the Lord. — καὶ κράτος. The reference of κράτος to the power of
Christ has occasioned the order τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ λόγος. 2

Vv. 21, 22. Ταῦτα these things hitherto reported from Ephesus. 4 Schra-
der would strangely refer it to the entire past labours of Paul, even in-
cluding what is not related by Luke. An arbitrary device in favour of his
hypothesis, that after ver. 20 a great journey to Macedonia, Corinth, Crete,
etc., occurred. 6 — ζήτο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, he determined in his spirit, he resolved. 8
— τὴν Μακεδ. κ. 'Αχ. see on xviii. 12. — πορευόμενος εἰς 'Ἰερουσ. The special
object of the journey is known from 1 Cor. xvi. 1 f.; 2 Cor. viii.; Rom.
xv. 25 ff. The non-mention of this matter of the collection is so much the
less to be set down to the account of a conciliatory design of the book 10—as
if it made the apostle turn his eyes toward Jerusalem on account of the
celebration of the festival11—since the very aim of the collection would have
well suited that alleged tendency.12 — δει] in the consciousness of the divine
determination, which is confirmed by xxiii. 11. From this consciousness is
explained his earnest assurance, Rom. i. 10 ff. And towards Rome now
goes the whole further development 13 of his endeavours and of his destiny.
He was actually to see Rome, but only after the lapse of years and as a
prisoner. — Ἱερουσαλήμ] 2 Tim. iv. 20. Otherwise unknown and different
from the person mentioned in Rom. xvi. 23. — ἑπτὰ χρόνον] he kept him-
self, remained, behind for a time.14 — εἰς τ. Ἀσίαν does not stand for εἰς τῇ
'Ασίᾳ, in opposition to Grotius, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and many others, but it
denotes the direction in which this keeping back took place, toward Asia,
where he was.16 Considering the frequency of this construction generally,
and in the N. T.,17 it is not to be rendered, with Winer: for Asia, in
order to labour there.

1 About £1875, or $3000.
2 vi. 7, xil. 94.
3 See Valckenaer, p. 585; Bernhardy, p.
941; Bornemann, ad Xem. Cyr. 1. 4. 23.
4 Eph. 1. 19. [B M.]
5 Lechmann and Tischendorf, following A
6 vv. 1–19.
7 Der Apostel Paulus, II. p. 55 f.
8 See, on the contrary, Anger, de temp. rat.
p. 64 f.
9 Comp. on v. 4.
10 Schneckenburger, p. 87; Zeller, p. 267.
11 xx. 18, xxiv. 11, 17.
12 Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 12 f.; see Lekebusch, p.
950. How undesignedly the work of the collection remained here unmentioned, is evi-
dent from xxiv. 17. [36 ff.
13 Compare Klostermann, Pindaros Loc. p.
14 See examples in Wetstein, and from Philo
in Loesner, p. 219.
15 Comp. the well-known ἵστηκεν μέτρειν,
Soph. Aj. 80.
16 Comp. xvili. 21.
Ver. 24. The silver-beater (ἀργυροκόπος) Demetrius had a manufactory, in which little silver temples (αὐτόφρυμα) representing the splendid temple of Diana with the statue of the goddess, ὡς κιβώρια μικρά, were made. These miniature temples must have found great sale, partly among Ephesians, partly among strangers, as it was a general custom to carry such miniature shrines as amulets with them in journeys, and to place them in their houses; and particularly as the Ἀρτέμις Ἐφεσία was such a universally venerated object of worship. We are not to think of coins with the impression of the temple, in opposition to Beza, Scaliger, Piscator, Valckenaer, as the naming of coins after the figure impressed on them is only known in reference to living creatures; nor can the existence of such coins with the impress of the Ephesian temple be historically proved.

Vv. 25, 26. Demetrius assembled not only the artificers (οίς) who worked for him, but also the other workmen who were occupied in similar industrial occupations (rā τοιοῖ). Bengel correctly remarks: "Alii erant τεχνίται, artifices nobiliores, alii ἵππαι operarii." — οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ] without καί, like the Latin non modo . . . sed, contains a climax. — μεταφ.] namely, from the worship of the gods. — δὴ οίκοι εἰς τοὺς θεοί] The people identified the statues of the gods with the gods themselves, or at least believed that the numen of the divinity filled them. Observe the order of the words, accordant with their emphasis, marked also by a dislocation in ver. 26, and the scornful and bitter ὅ Παῦλος οίς: that Paul there! — θεοί is predicate. How Paul looked on the heathen gods, may be seen at 1 Cor. viii. 4, x. 20. The gods, = images, were to him of course only the work of men, without any reality of that which they were intended to represent. Comp. xvii. 29.

Ver. 27. And not only this matter, this point, namely, our lucrative trade, is in danger for us of coming into contempt, but also the temple of the great goddess Artemis is in danger of being regarded as nothing, and there will also, he added, be brought down the majesty of her, whom, etc. — ἡμι] dative of reference, i.e. here incommodi. — εἰς ἀπελ. ἐδή] i.e. to come into dis credit; ἵππαι not preserved elsewhere; but comp. ἵππαι, frequent in the LXX. and Apoc. — τῆς μεγάλης] a habitually employed epithet, as of other gods, so particularly of the Ephesian Artemis. With μελέτων the oratio recta passes into the oratio obliqua. — τέ is and, simply annexing; καί is also,
climactic: "destrucetumque etiam iri majestatem," etc. 1 — τῆς μεγαλεύσης (see the critical remarks) is to be taken partitively, as if τί stood with it; there will be brought down something of her majesty. 2 Nothing of this magnificence will they sacrifice. On καθαρείαν of the lowering of the honour of one, comp. Herodian. iii. 3. 4. vii. 9. 24. ἢν ... σιδεραῖ] again the direct form of address. See on such mixing of direct and indirect elements, Kühner. 3 The relative applies to αὐτῆς.

Vv. 28, 29. Μεγάλη ἡ 'Αρι. 'Εφ.] An enthusiastic outcry for the preservation of the endangered, and yet so lucrative! majesty of the goddess. — ἱσμηναν] namely, those who ran together along with Demetrius and his companions. — ὑμὸθυμῶν] here also: with one mind, in opposition to Deyling, Krebs, Loesner, and others, who think that, on account of ver. 32, it must be rendered simul; for they were at one on the point, that in the theatre something in general must be determined on against Paul and his companions for the defence of the honour of the goddess, 4 although especially the most might not know τίνος ἐνεκεν συνεληλόθεισαν. 5 — It is well known that the theatre was used for the despatch of public transactions and for popular assemblies, even for such as were tumultuary. 6 Consequently the more easy it is to understand, why the vehement crowd poured itself into the great theatre. 7 — συναρτάς.] First, they drew along with them the two fellow-travellers (συνεμ.) of the apostle, and then rushed into the theatre. But it may also be conceived as simultaneous; while they carried along with them, they rushed, etc. Whether they fetched these two men from their lodgings, or encountered them in the streets, cannot be determined. — Caius is otherwise unknown, and is not identical with the Caius mentioned in xx. 4, 8 or with the one mentioned in Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. i. 15. — 'Ἀπεραγχὲς.] See xx. 4, xxvii. 2; Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24.

Vv. 30, 31. Παῖλος] whom doubtless the rioters had not found present at his usual place of abode. "Nulla militaris audacia par huic fortitudini," Bengel. — εἰς τ. δήμου] among the people that ran together into the theatre. 9 δήμος is also among Greek writers very often the multitude. 10 Contrary to the whole course of proceeding as narrated, Otto 11 understands a formal assembly of the people, of which we are not to think even in the case of ἐκκλησία, ver. 32.—The ten presidents of sacred rites as well as of the public games in proconsular Asia were called 'Ἀπαρχαί, corresponding to whom in other provinces were the Γαλαταρχαί, Βεθναρχαί, Σωραρχαί κ.τ.λ. They had to celebrate, at their own expense, these games in honour of the gods and of the emperor. Each city annually, about the time of the autumnal equinox, delegated one of its citizens, and these collective dele-

1 Comp. xxi. 28; Buttmann, p. 300 (E. T. 260).
2 Comp. Xen. Hellen. iv. 4. 13: τῶν τειχῶν καθελίν, also ii. 2. 11.
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4 Ver. 34.
5 Ver. 32.
6 Ver. 32. [alterth. § 126. 9.
7 See Wetstein in loc.; Hermann, Staas-
8 It was one of the largest, as its ruins show. See Ottfr. Müller, Archdol. d. Kunst, p. 301.
9 See in loc.
10 Ver. 31.
11 Dem. 363. 5; Diod. Sic. xvi. 54, plebe, vulgus. See Sturz, Leu. Xen. i. p. 665; Nägelebach on the Ηλιαδ, p 277, ed. 3.
12 Pastorah. p 103.
gates then elected the ten. It was natural that one of these—perhaps chosen by the proconsul—should preside, and hence may be explained the remark in Eusebius, H. E. iv. 15, that Polycarp was executed under the Asiarch Philip. But the inference from our passage is historically indemonstrable, that only one was really Asiarch, and that the plural is to be explained from the fact that the other nine, but particularly the retired Asiarchs, like the past high priests of the Jews, bore the title, which is in itself improbable on account of the enormous expense which in that case would have been laid on one. —μη δοιναι έταντων] apprehension of danger to life. On the expression with είς of a dangerous locality, comp. Polyb. v. 14. 9.

Vv. 32, 33. Οὐ] joins on, by way of inference, the description of the conourse, ver. 29, interrupted by vv. 30 and 31. —άλλο . . . άλλο.] * The following τι might have been left out, but it is only wanting in D.—ὁ ἱκληρος] It was no ἵννωμος ἱκλη., ver. 39, and accordingly, no legal popular assembly, neither an ordinary one (νόμιμος), nor an extraordinary (συγκλητος), but simply an ἀσσαλάσθε of the people, who had flocked together of their own accord.—a concio plebis extex et abusiva. —συγκεκριμ.] confused, in an uproar. * It lacked all order, guidance, self-restraint, discipline, etc. —προεβ. Λεξικ. προβαλλ. αὐτ. του. Ἴνδικ.] a vivid description of its tumultuary character. The Jews showed (pushed) him forward from behind (προβαλλ.), and others, standing in front, brought or drew him out of the crowd. 7 Grotius, Wetstein, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others take προβάλλειν as to propose, * but this does not at all suffice for the lively picture of the tumult. Alexander, otherwise entirely unknown, was certainly a Christian, since only to such a one is the subsequent ἀπολογεῖως suitable, not a Jew. * He is commonly, but arbitrarily, especially considering the frequency of the name, considered as identical with the Alexander mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 14, in which case it is in its turn presupposed that the name occurring at those two passages denotes one person. Such completely indemonstrable assumptions cannot serve to prove the genuineness and time of the composition of the Epistles to Timothy, in opposition to Otto. The Alexander in our passage had, in the Christian interest, mixed among the crowd, and was pushed forward by the malicious Jews that he might make a public address and, if possible, become a sacrifice to the fury of the multitude. If we hold him to be a non-Christian Jew, which does not result from ver. 34, it is to be supposed that the Jews would be afraid that, on this occasion, they also might be attacked, and therefore pushed forward Alexander, an eloquent man and hostile to Paul, that he might main-

1 Salmastius, Valesius, Tillemont, Harduin, and Deyling.
4 Kühner, § 896, note 5.
5 Bornemann.
6 Comp. ver. 25.
7 ει τω δικαιω προεβ. * See Xen. Anab. vi. 1. 25, vi. 2. 6; Dem. 519. 16; Kypke, II. p. 101 f.
8 Beza, Grotius, Ewald, and others.
tain the innocence of the Jews to the destruction of the Christians. But Luke must have called attention to such a connection,¹ and that the more as the simple ἀπολογεῖσθαι, to make a defence, points quite naturally to the accusation of the Christians referred to. — καταστ. τ. χ.] moving his hand up and down,² for a sign that he wished to speak. — τῷ ὁμιλῶ] before the people.³ — δῆμος is as in ver. 30, and the ἀπολογεῖσθαι cannot therefore be meant to be a defence of the Jews ⁴ and of the ὅχλος.⁵

Vv. 34, 35. ὁτι Ἰουνάκιος ἐτέρι Alexander was a Jewish Christian; but his Christian position was either unknown to the mob, or they would listen to nothing at all from one belonging to the Jewish nation as the hereditary enemy of the worship of the gods. — ἐπιγυνώντες] Nominative participle, having reference to the logical subject.⁶ — καταστεῖλα] after he had quieted.⁷ — The γραμμάτειος, who had come up in the meantime, perhaps being sent for, is the city-secretary,⁸ to whose office belonged the superintendence of the archives, the drawing up of official decrees, and the reading of them in the assemblies of the people.⁹ — τῆς γὰρ π. τ. λ.] who is there then, etc. With γὰρ the speaker glances back on his efforts to calm them as completely justified, since there is certainly no one who does not know, etc. The question introduced with γὰρ therefore states the motive of the καταστεῖλας.¹⁰ Thus vividly does the question fit into the poition of affairs. — τὴν Ἑβεσίουν πόλιν] with patriotic emphasis. — On νεκρός, properly temple-sweeper, temple-keeper,¹¹ as an honourable epithet of cities, particularly in Asia, in which the temple-service of a divinity or of a deified ruler has its principal seat.¹² — τὸ διοπτήτις] that which fell from Zeus. That this was the ἀγαλμα fallen from heaven,¹³ was obvious of itself. The image of Artemis in the temple of Ephesus—according to Vitruvius, ii. 9, of cedar; according to Plin. xvi. 40, of the wood of the vine; according to Xen. Anab. v. 3. 12, of gold, or at least gilt; and according to others of ebony—was given out as such.¹⁴ On the figure of the image,¹⁵ see Creuzer, Symbol. II. p. 178 ff. It represented the goddess with many breasts.¹⁶ According to our passage it must have been rescued at the burning of Herostratus, at least according to general opinion.

¹ Otto, p. 106, makes up—the scene more artificially, and that so as to make Alexander even the soul and the secret spring of the whole uproar. According to Haurrath, the author gives designately only a fragmentary account of the Jewish-Christian Alexander, because the conduct of the Jewish-Christians at that time did not suit the conciliatory object of his book.

² Comp. xiii. 17, xiii. 16, xxi. 40, where, however, the verb is joined with the dative, which, therefore, also D. ah. (Bornemann) have here.

³ Herod. vii. 161; Plut. Prot. p. 399 A ; Lucian. Gall. 3. See Bernhardt, p. 79.

⁴ Bengel, Ewald.

⁵ Otto.


⁷ Plut. Mor. p. 307 B ; Joseph. Antiq. xiv. 9 1, 1. 2.

⁸ Thuc. vii. 19, ὃ γραμματεῖος ὃ τῆς πόλεως.

⁹ See van Dale, i.e., p. 498 f. ; Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 137. 20, 147. 6.

¹⁰ Comp. Nägelsbach on the Iliad, p. 59, ed. 3. [A-C.]

¹¹ Xen. Anab. v. 3. 6 ; Plat. Legg. 6, p. 759

¹² See van Dale, i.e., p. 300 ff. ; Valckenaer, p. 570 f. ; Krause, de civit. necoros, Hal. 1844 ; Hermann, godetd. Alterth. § 12. 7.

¹³ Bur. Ipà. T. 977 ; Herodian, l. 11. 2.

¹⁴ See Spanhelm, ad Callim. in Diam. 288 ; Wetstein in loc.

¹⁵ With enigmatical words on forehead girdle, and feet ; see upon it Ewald, Jahrh., II. p. 175 f.

¹⁶ Multimammillam, Jerome.
TUMULT QUELLED BY THE TOWN CLERK.

Ver. 37. Γάρ] justifies the expression used, προσπέρασι, rashly, without consideration.

Ver. 38. Οὖν] accordingly, since these men are neither robbers of temples, etc. On ἐξείν πρὸς τινα λύσαν, an utterance, i.e. complaint, see examples in Kypke, II. p. 108. — ἀγοραία] by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Bornemann, following Suidas, accented ἀγοραίων, are judicial assemblies; in construing it, σύνεσιν is to be conceived as supplied. — καὶ ἀνθρώπως εἰς ὑπ' and there are proconsules. The plural is here also the plural indefinite of the category. Arbitrarily Calvin and Grotius hold that the proconsul and his legate are meant. Bengel correctly says: "de eo quod nunquam non esse soleat."

Vv. 39, 40. But if you desire anything further thereupon, beyond matters of private law, it will be discussed, cleared up, in the lawful assembly of the people. On περαιτέρω see the critical remarks. — καὶ γὰρ κανόν. for we even run the risk of being charged with tumult—στάσεως: genitive of accusation—on account of this day. γάρ gives the reason why the speaker in the latter case, ver. 39, has relegated the matter to the ἐννομος ἐκκλησ. τῆς σήμερον is not to be connected with στάσεως. — μηδένως αἰτίων . . . ταύτας] there being no reason, on the ground of which we shall be in a position to give account of this concourse. μηδ. αἰτίων, taken as masculine, would less accord with the prudence of the speaker, who with wise forbearance clothes the threatening in a form embracing others, including his own responsibility. — Very wisely, on the whole, has the politically adroit man of business, in the first instance, by way of capitatio benevolentiae praised the Ephesian worship of Diana in its unendangered world-wide fame; then from this inferred the unseemliness of such a hasty proceeding; further, pointed Demetrius and his companions to the legal form of procedure in their case; and finally, put on the people the lasting curb of the fear of Roman punishment. — καὶ ταῦτα εἰτὸν κ.κ.κ.] οίτως ἐπέβαλε τὸν τιμὸν ὅπερ γὰρ ῥᾴδιως ἔξα-πτεται, οὕτω καὶ ῥᾴδιως σβάννυται, Chrysostom. — How lightly Baur deprives this whole history of its historical character, may be seen in his Paulus, I. p. 217, ed. 2.

1 But see on xvii. 5.
2 Comp. Strabo, xii. p. 629; Vulg.: con-\[a missing or incorrect symbol\]
3 Comp. xvii. 18.
4 "Quia a magistratu civitatis convocatus et regius," Grotius; in contrast to this illegal concourse, comp. on vv. 28, 30.
6 Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, and others. So also Beitzmann, neut. Gr. p. 154 (E. T. 177). Certainly the στάσεως ποιεῖ is in keeping with ἡμεῖς ἔχουμεν. But it may be urged, on the other hand, that such a position of the preposition after the noun (Krüger, § lxviii. 4. 2; Kühner, § 626) is not usual in the N. T., and also that the γεγομένως in his speech was too diplomatically prudent to designate, on his part, the affair exactly as a tumult (στάσει). In his mouth it is only a concourse (συναγωγή). — We may add, that in Greek writers προσκελεσθείς, with the simple genitive, is the usual expression.
7 Vulgate.
8 vv. 35-40.
Ephesus was the greatest city of Asia Minor, and the metropolis of a province said to embrace no less than five hundred cities. It was situated on the Cayster, and built partly on the two mountains Prion and Coressus, and partly on the valley between them. It had a commodious harbor, and lay on the main road of traffic between the east and the west, a position favorable alike to inland and maritime commerce. It was a free city of the Roman Empire, and self-governed. It was full of elegant buildings; and its markets were supplied with the choicest products of all lands, and adorned with works of art of every kind. They supplied the writer of the Apocalypse with the vivid and glowing description given in Rev. xviii. 12,13. Its theatre was one of the largest ever erected, said to be capable of holding 30,000 persons. The city was the resort of all nations, and its population was numerous and multifarious.

"It was more Hellenic than Antioch, more Oriental than Corinth, more populous than Athens, more wealthy and refined than Thessalonica, more sceptical than Ancyr or Pessinus. It was, with the single exception of Rome, by far the most important scene of the apostle's toils, and was destined in after years to become not only the first of the seven churches of Asia, but the seat of one of those great Ecumenical Councils which defined the faith of the Christian world." (Furrar.)

The temple of Diana, built of white marble, was magnificent in extent, 425 feet in length and 220 feet in breadth, with 127 columns 60 feet high, each said to be the gift of a king, and many of them adorned with rich ornamentation in bas-relief. It was the glory of the city, and one of the wonders of the world. The sun in his course, it was said, shone on nothing more splendid.

Ephesus was specially famous for two things—the worship of Diana and the practice of magic—and it was the headquarters of many defunct superstitions, which owed their continuance to various orders of priests. The general character of the inhabitants was in very bad repute. Renan, basing his views upon numerous ancient authorities, writes: "It might have been called the rendezvous of courtesans and victors. The city was full to repletion of magicians, diviners, mimics, and flute-players, eunuchs, jewellers, amulet and metal merchants, and romance writers. The expression, Ephesian novels, indicated, like that of Milesian fables, a style of literature, Ephesus being one of the cities in which they preferred to locate the scenes of love stories. The mildness of the climate, in fact, disinclined one to serious things. Dancing and singing remained the sole occupation; public life degenerated into bacchanalian revels. Good studies were thrown aside." Nothing now remains of the magnificent metropolis of Asia but a miserable Turkish village. The once thronged harbor is now a malarious marsh. The ruins alone are grand. The vast theatre may still be traced, but of the proud temple not one stone remains above another. It is said that some of the pillars may still be seen in the Mosque of St. Sophia at Constantinople.
NOTES.

(2) Whether there be any Holy Ghost. V. 2.

The persons referred to were believers in Jesus as the Messiah, but they were imperfectly instructed, and had as yet a very imperfect Christian experience. From the fact that they seem to hold the same relation to John and Jesus as Apollos did, they were probably converts under his first ministry. It is not conceivable that they could have received even the baptism of John without knowing something of the Holy Spirit, his existence and personality; as Bengel justly remarks, "They could not have followed either Moses or John the Baptist without hearing of the Holy Ghost." The words then must mean that they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Messiah, and were baptized into that faith, but they had not heard anything about the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and the marvels that followed. That the question and answer both had reference to the special rather than ordinary gifts of the Spirit is obvious when we refer to verse 6, where we are told that "the Holy Ghost came upon them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." The baptism of John was simply provisional and preparatory. He taught his disciples to believe in Jesus as the Messiah already come; and belief implied obedience; and obedience baptism in his name. Archbishop Sumner gives the following paraphrase of the passage: "You are the disciples of Christ. Have the gifts of the Spirit been bestowed upon you as on other congregations of disciples? Have any prophesied? Any spoken with tongues? Any done wonderful works? Their answer signifies that they had not heard whether such a power of the Holy Ghost was granted at all. The Holy Ghost they knew. But they had not heard of such an effusion of the Spirit as Paul alluded to, or known that they were to expect it."

(2) Exorcists. V. 13.

"Such professed exorcists were numerous in the days of the apostles. Our Lord himself alludes to them, when he says, 'If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?' The Ephesians were specially addicted to astrology, sorcery, incantations, amulets, exorcisms, and every kind of magical imposture, and persons of this class flocked to the city. They professed that their magical arts were derived from Solomon. Josephus refers to this, and also mentions a certain root which, being brought to those who were possessed, quickly expelled the demons from their bodies. Seven sons of Sceva, who was probably a chief ruler of the synagogue, practised this art, and impiously pronounced as a cabalistic sign the sacred name of Jesus. About this time, also, the celebrated thaumaturgist, Appolonius of Tyana, is supposed to have visited Ephesus. The worship of Diana and the practice of magic were almost indissolubly connected, and a species of writings were manufactured and sold to the credulous purchaser, which when pronounced were used as a charm, and when written carried as an amulet. "Among them were the words ascion, katasikon, itis, tetrames, damnameneus, and aleko, which for sense and efficiency were about on a par with the daries, derdaries, astataries or ista pista sista, which Cato, the elder, held to be a sovereign remedy for a sprain, or the shavriti, uriri, uriri, iriri, iri, ri, which the rabbies taught as efficacious for the expulsion of the demon of blindness." (Farrar.) Among such a people Paul preached the gospel of Jesus, and wrought many real miracles in his name.
There is a striking resemblance between the tumult at Ephesus and that at Philippi. They were both distinguished from all other persecutions mentioned in the Acts, in that they were not caused by the Jews, but by Gentiles; both also originated in interested motives, the loss of gain; both were characterized by senseless rioting and cruel violence, and in both the actors were restrained from proceeding to extreme measures. At Ephesus, when the mob was at the height of excitement, wild uproar, and blind fury, the town clerk by a well-timed and admirable address appeased their wrath and dismissed the crowd. He showed them that such senseless and noisy conduct was undignified, as the universality and magnificence of their worship was unimpeachable; that their course with regard to these men was unjustifiable, as they could prove nothing illegal or criminal against them; that it was entirely unnecessary, as other means of redress were open to them; and that it was hazardous, as it might involve them in difficulty with the Roman government. Dick suggests the following reflections on this passage: That opposition to the gospel arises from the depraved passions of men—avarice, ambition, and love of pleasure; that the sacred name of religion has often been prostituted to serve the most infamous purposes; that the concurrence of a multitude in support of a cause is no proof of its justice; and that God reigns and carries on the designs of his government amid all the commotions of the world, and constrains the very wrath of man to praise him. Taylor gives these: That self-interest perverts the judgment, and that it speaks ill for a trade when its prosperity is destroyed by the success of the gospel. Schaff adds another lesson: That which profits the purse may injure the soul.
CHAPTER XX.

VER. 1. καὶ ἀσπασ. A B D E Μ, min. vs. have καὶ παρακαλέσας, ἀσπασ. So Leachm. Yet D has πολλά before παρακαλ. (so Born.), and E καὶ before ἀσπασ. Other witnesses have καὶ παρακ. ἀσπασ. τε. So Rinck. παρακαλ. has certainly preponderant attestation in its favour, but against the internal decisive consideration, that no reason is apparent for its subsequent omission, whereas it might very easily suggest itself from ver. 2 and xvi. 40 as a pious marginal remark to ἀσπασ. — Ver. 4. Πάφου] is wanting in Elz., and is condemned by Mill as an addition from tradition. But it has greatly preponderant attestation, and might be passed over quite as well on the ground of a varying tradition, as by mistake of the transcribers on account of the similar sound of the initial syllable in the following name. — Ver. 5. οὐτοὶ] Lachm. reads οὐτοὶ δὲ, after A B E Μ, min. A connective addition. — Ver. 7. ἡμῶν] Elz. has τῶν μαθη-τῶν, in opposition to A B D E, min. Chrys. Aug. and most vs. An interpolation on account of the following αὐτοῖς. Still stronger witnesses support ἡμῶν in ver. 8, for which Elz. has ἦσαν. — Ver. 9. καθήμενοι] Instead of this, καθεκ-θέντα (Lechm. Tisch. Born.) is preponderantly attested. Comp. on ii. 3. — Ver. 11. ἄργον] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read τὸν ἄργον, according to A B C D Μ*. Rightly; the article was neglected after ver. 7, because its force was overlooked. — Ver. 15. καὶ μείν. ἐν Τρογυ., τῇ] A B C E Μ*, min. have merely τῇ δὲ. So Lachm. Several vs. and some more recent oodd. have καὶ τῇ. But there was no occasion for the insertion of μείν. ἐν Τρ., whereas its omission is very capable of explanation, because Trogium was not situated in Samos, as the context seemed to say. — Ver. 16. κακρίκει] Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to greatly preponderating evidence. But Elz. Scholz have ἱππανη. A church-lesson begins at ver. 16, and therefore the tense, which has its reference in what precedes, was altered. — ἡ] Lachm. reads εἰν, following considerable witnesses. A grammatical improvement. — Ver. 18. After πρὸς αὐτῶν A has ὁμοίως ὄντων αὐτῶν, which Lachm. adopted; others have ὁμοθυμαδίῳ; and others ὁμοίως ὄντων αὐτῶν (so Born., according to D). Different additions for the sake of completion. — Ver. 19. Before θακρ. Elz. has πολλῶν, which already Griesb. rejected, according to decisive testimony. A strengthening addition from 2 Cor. ii. 4. — Ver. 22. According to decisive testimony read ἐγώ, with Lachm. Tisch., after δεδε. — Ver. 23. μοι] is wanting in Elz., but is decidedly attested, and was easily passed over as quite unnecessary. — με] is, according to decisive evidence, to be placed after θλίψεις (Lechm. Tisch.). Born. has μοι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, according to D, vs. Lucif., and that only after μένουσιν. But μοι is a mechanical repetition from the preceding, and ἐν Ἱεροσολ. is an addition by way of a gloss; the two, moreover, are not equally attested. — Ver. 24. ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν . . . ἐμαντών] very many variations. Lachm. has ἀλλ’ οὐδένος λόγου ἔχω, οὐδὲ ποιοῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν τιμῶν ἐμαντών. Tisch. reads ἀλλ’ οὐδένος λόγου ποιοῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν τιμῶν ἐμαντών, according to B C D** Μ*, vs. Lucif. Born. reads essentially as Lachm., yet adding μοι after ἔχω, and μοι after ψυχήν. The
Recepta is founded on E G H, Chrys. Theophyl. Oec.; but G, Chrys., have not μου. The reading of Lachm. (A D* Μ, min. Vulg.), as well as the Recepta, are to be considered as alterations and expansions of the reading of Tisch., which was not understood. — After φυμον μου Elz. Scholz have μετὰ χαράσ, which is wanting in A B D Μ, min. Lacif. Ambr. and several vss. A scholion. — Ver. 25. τοῦ Θεοῦ is wanting in A B C Μ, 13, 15*, 36, Copt. Syr. p. Arm. Chrys. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A supplementary D has τοῦ Θεοῦ. So Born. — Ver. 26. τεταρτάτο, Considerable witnesses have εἰ, which Griesb. has recommended and Lachm. adopted. Rightly; των came from xviii. 6. — Ver. 28. τοῦ Κυρίου Elz. has τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is adhered to among recent critics (following Mill, Whitby, Wolf, Bengel, and others), by Scholz, Alford, Rinck, Lucubr. crit. p. 82 f. The weight of evidence is externally decisive for τοῦ Κυρίου; A C* D E, 13, 15, 18, 36, 40, 69, 73, 81, 95*, 130, 156, 163, 180, Copt. Sahid. Syr. p. (on the margin) Arm. Aeth. Constitutt. (ii. 61), Ir. (iii. 14), Eus. (on Isa. xxxv.), Ath. (ad Serap. 1 in ms.), Didym. (de ἐρ. 211), Chrys. Lucif. Aug. Jer. al. τοῦ Θεοῦ is found among uncial ms. only in B Μ, and, besides, only in about twenty more recent and inferior codd., and among vss. in the Vulg. Syr. p. (in the text); but among the Fathers in none before Epiph. and Ambros. See the more detailed statement of the evidence in Tisch. The internal decisive argument for τοῦ Κυρίου lies in the fact that in the Pauline Epistles τοῦ Κυρίου never occurs, but τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, and τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ (this latter Griesb. recommends, without, however, approving it, but Matth. received it), are combinations of the original reading with the Pauline parallel written on the margin. Teller’s and van Hengel’s proposal to read only τοῦ εἰκός is destitute of all critical support. — τοῦ αἰματος τοῦ ἱδίου Elz. has τοῦ ἱδίου αἰματος, in opposition to A B C D E Μ, min. vss. Ir. Lucif. An alteration, which arose from the adoption of τοῦ Θεοῦ, in order to establish the interpretation of the blood of God. — Ver. 29. After τεταρτάτο Elz. Scholz. Tisch. have γὰρ, against A C* D Μ, min. Vulg. Fathers. The more to be rejected, as others read δι' ἵ' τεταρτάτο (B), others ἵ' τεταρτάτο (Μ*), others still καὶ τεταρτάτο. A connective addition. τοῦτο also, which Elz. Scholz. Tisch. have after οἶδα, has such preponderating evidence against it, and in such essential agreement with those witnesses which condemn γὰρ, that it cannot be considered as original, although, taken by itself, it might be more easily omitted than added. — Ver. 32. After ὡς Elz. Scholz. have ἀδερφον, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have deleted, according to A B D Μ, 33, 34, 68, Syr. Erp. Copt. Sahid. Vulg. Jer. If it had been original, there is no apparent reason for its omission; on the other hand, its insertion at this solemn passage was very natural. — οἶκος.] Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Born. But Elz. Scholz. Tisch. have τοῦτοι, against decisive testimony. A more precise definition corresponding to the persons in question; and therefore, also, D E, vss. add ὡς. — Ver. 35. τῶν λόγων] G and more than thirty min. Vulg. Sahid. Arm,
Aeth. Chrys. Theophyl. have τὸν λόγον. So Rinck. Others have τοῦ λόγου after min.; so Bengel. Both are alterations, because only one saying of Christ afterwards follows.—The order μᾶλλον διδόναι (Elz. inverts it) is decidedly attested.

Vv. 1–3. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παῦσα. τ. θέρυβ...] is simply a statement of time, not, as Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Hug hold, the motioe of departure, for which there is no hint in the text,¹ and against which the resultless character of the tumult testifies. — ἀσπασάμενος] here of the farewell salutation, combined with kissing and embracing, vale dicere.² — αὐτῶν] the Macedonian Christians. — 'Ελλάδα] i.e. 'Αχαιαν, xix. 21. Luke alternates in his use of the appellations well known as synonyms, which, after xix. 21, could occasion no misunderstanding. This against Schrader, who understands 'Ελλ. here of the districts lying between the Peloponnesus and Thessaly and Epirus, especially of Attica, and would have the journey to Corinth only inferred from xix. 31. — ποιήσας τε μήνας τρεῖς] certainly for the most part in Corinth.³ That Luke, moreover, gives us no information of the foundation of the church at Corinth, and of the apostle's labours there, is just one of the many points of incompleteness in his book. — τὸν ἵππον] namely, to Asia (ver. 4), from which he had come. The genitive depends directly on γνώμη.⁴

Ver. 4. Ἀχιρί τῆς 'Ασιας⁵] excepting only the short separation from Philippi to Troas, ver. 5, where those companions (συνεπεστρεψον), having journeyed before the apostle, waited for him. The statement is summary, not excluding the sailing before from Philippi to Troas, the Asiatic emporium; but Tittmann⁶ erroneously judges: "eos usque in Asiam cum Paulo una fuisse, deinde praevisse eumque expectasse." Vv. 5, 6 are at variance with this. Nor is there, with Wieseler, p. 293, and Baumgarten, to be artificially deduced from ἄχρι τῆς 'Ασίας the meaning: "up to that point from which people crossed to Asia;" so that Luke would oddly enough have indicated nothing else than as far as Philippi. On συνεπεσεθαυ, only here in the N. T., comp. 2 Macc. xv. 2; 3 Macc. v. 48, vi. 21; very frequent in the classics. — Of Sopater, the son of Pyrrhus, of Beroea, and whether he is identical with Sosipater, Rom. xvi. 21, nothing is known. The other companions were two Thessalonians, Aristarchus⁷ and Secundus, entirely unknown; further, an inhabitant of Derbe, Caius, thus different from the Macedonian, xix. 29; for Derbe belonged to Lycaonia;⁸ Timotheus, whose dwelling is supposed as known and therefore is not specified;⁹ and lastly, the two Asiatics, Tychicus¹⁰ and Trophimus.¹¹ It was nothing but arbitrary violence, when Ernesti, Valckenaer, and Kuinoel, in order to identify

¹ See on the contrary, xix. 21.
² As Xen. Anab. vili. 1. 8, 40; Heli. iv. 1. 3; Cyrop. ii. 1. 1.
³ The anakoluthic nominative, as in xix. 34.
⁴ As in xiv. 9, xxvii. 20. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 6.
⁵ The omission of ἀχρι τῆς 'Ασίας is not strongly enough attested by B M, 13, Vulg. Aeth. Exp. Bæda, particularly as it might easily have taken place for the sake of ver. 5. It is, however, approved by Lekebusch.
⁷ xiv. 29.
⁸ See on xiv. 6.
⁹ See on xvi. 1.
¹⁰ Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. [xlii. 12.
¹¹ xxi. 29; 2 Tim. iv. 20.
Caius—how extremely frequent was the name!—with the Caius of xix. 12 and to make Timothy a native of Derbe, wished to put a comma after Γαίος and then to read Δερβ. ἐς Τυμ. Following the same presupposition, Olshausen contents himself with merely putting a point after Γαίος and then taking καί in the signification of also! And for this even Wieseler has declared himself, appealing to the parallelism of the language, according to which, from Θεσσαλονικη. onwards, the nomen gentilium is always placed first. But the parallelism is rather of this nature, that the nomen gentilium first follows after, Ἑλεος, then precedes, Θεσσαλονικη, then again follows after, Δερβ., and lastly, again precedes, Ἀσιαν., thus in regular alternation. We may add, that no special reason for such a numerous escort is indicated in the text, and hypotheses referring to the point amount to mere subjective fancies.

Vv. 5, 6. Ἡμᾶς] Luke had remained behind at Philippi, xvi. 40. Now, when Paul, on his present journey back through Macedonia, came to Philippi, Luke again joined him. But the above-mentioned seven companions (οὐρας) journeyed before—wherefore? is unknown; possibly to make preparations for the further sea voyage—to Tros, and there waited the arrival of Paul and Luke. For οὐρας cannot, without arbitrariness, be otherwise referred than to all the seven above mentioned, which is not precluded by xxii. 29, xxvii. 2, and thereby, no doubt, our passage is decisive against the hypothesis that Timothy speaks in the ἡμείς. Hence the supporters of that hypothesis are necessarily reduced to refer, as already Beza and Wolf have done, οὐρας merely to Tychicus and Trophimus.—μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἁ. Paul remained over the Paschal days in quietness, keeping holy the festival of his people in Christian freedom.—ἀκριτικ. ἡμέρας πέντε] specifies ἀκριτικ. τίνι, i.e. how long the ἐκκλησίαι lasted from the sailing from Philippi, namely, up to five days. The reading πεμπταῖοι 10 is a correct gloss.—ἡμέρας ἐπτά] a full week.11 More is not to be sought behind this simple statement of time, in opposition to Baumgarten, II. p. 48 f.

Ver. 7. But on the first day of the week. That the Sunday was already at this time regularly observed by holding religious assemblies and Agape, cannot, indeed, be made good with historical certainty, since possibly the observance of the Agape in our passage might only accidentally occur on the first day of the week, because Paul intended to depart on the following
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1 Heinrichs: καὶ Τυμ. Δερβ. Lachmann, Proefl, p. ix., conjectured καὶ Δερβ. Τυμ. He places a point after Τυμ., and makes the χi, read by him after οὐρας, ver. 5, to be reminiscent (repeating the χι after Ἀσιανος), which, as the discourse is not interrupted by parentheticals, would be without motive and forced.
2 p. 26, and in Herzog’s Encycl. XXI. p. 276.
3 According to Schneckenburg, they are the collection-commissioners of the chief churches; according to Baumgarten, they appear, in their number corresponding to the deacons in Jerusalem, as representatives of the whole Gentile church; comp. also Lange, II. p. 291. Such inventions are purely fanciful.
4 See Introduction, § 1.
6 A.D. 59.
7 Comp. Chrys.
8 Heddle. iv. 19. 65.
9 Comp. on Luke ii. 37; Plat. Mor. p. 791 R.
10 D. Born.
11 Comp. xxv. 4.
12 See on Matt. xxvii. 1; Cor. xvi. 2.
13 ἡδονὴ ἀποτελεῖ; see on ii. 48.
day, and since even 1 Cor. xvi. 2, Rev. i. 10, do not necessarily distinguish this day as set apart for religious services. But most probably the observance of Sunday is based on an apostolic arrangement — yet one certainly brought about only gradually and in the spirit of Christian freedom — the need of which manifested itself naturally, importance of the resurrection of Jesus and of the effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost, and indeed necessarily, in the first instance, when the gospel came to be diffused among the Gentiles who had no Sabbath festival; and the assumption of which is indispensible for the explanation of the early universal observance of that day, τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἄγροις μενότων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνήλευσις γίνεται, although for a long time the observance of the Sabbath along with it was not given up by the Jewish Christians and even by others — a circumstance which was doubtless connected with the antinomistic interest. Rightly, therefore, is the μια τῶν σαββάτων, in our passage regarded as a day of special observance. The observance of Sunday was not universally introduced by law until A.D. 321 by Constantine. — aıvοικ] to the assembled. Luke changes his standpoint, previously ἡμῶν, as the discourse was held with the Christians of that place. — μέχρι μεσον.] On Sunday, not Saturday, evening they had assembled for the love-feast. On τείνειν and its compounds, used of long speaking, see Heind.

Vv. 8–10. Ἡσαυ δὲ λαμαρ. Ικ.] therefore the fall of the young man could at once be perceived. The lamps served for the lighting up of the room, for it was night; but perhaps at the same time for heightening the solemnity of the occasion. According to Ewald, Luke wished to obviate the evil reports concerning the nocturnal meetings of the Christians, but they remained withal nocturnal and thereby exposed to suspicion. — Whether ἔντυσες was a young man serving, which at least is not to be inferred from the occurrence of the name among slaves and freedmen, the text does not say. — ἐνὶ τις ὑπόδ.] on the open window, i.e. on the window-seat. The openings of the windows in the East, having no glass, were sometimes with and sometimes without lattice-work. So they are still at the present day. — καταφέρεσθαι κ.τ.λ.] falling into a deep sleep. καταφέρεσθαι is the proper word for this among Greek writers, usually with εἰς ὑπόν. Observe the logical relation of the participle: But as there sat (καθεζόμε., see the critical remarks) a young man, falling, in his sitting there, into deep sleep during the prolonged discourse of Paul, he fell, overpowered by the sleep, from the third story, etc. — The discourse continued for a longer time than the young man

1 See Neander in the Deutsch. Zeitschr. 1850, p. 302 ff.
2 Justin, Apol. I. 67; comp. ο. Tryph. p. 34; Ignat. ad Magnes. 9; Barnab. 15.
3 Constitt. ap. li. 59. 2, vil. 33. 3, can. 66; Orig. Hom. 33; Eus. III. 37.
5 See Gieseler, K. G. I. 1, p. 374, ed. 4.
7 Comp. Calvin and Bengal.
8 Rosenberg, Heinrichs.
9 Artem. III. 38; Phaedr. 3, prol.
10 See Winer, Realw.
11 Comp. also Aquila, Ps. Ixxx. 6.
12 Lucian, Dial. mer. li. 4; Herod. I. 3, li. 9, 6; Comp. Hom. Od. vi. 2; ὡς καταφέρεσθαι εἴρησθαι
13 As to ἐνὶ μεσον comp. on lv. 17.
14 xviii. 20.
had expected. — ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιστήμονος ἀπὸ denotes the proceeding from, the power producing the effect,1 and the article denotes the sleep already mentioned.2 — ἐπίθεσεν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ. he was taken up dead. The words affirm nothing else than that the young man actually fell down dead and was taken up dead, Chrys.: διὰ τοῦτο ἀποθανὼν, ina Παῦλου ἀκούσας, Calvin, Beza, and others; recently Schneckenburger, Schwegler, Zeller, and Baumgarten; and only so understood has the fall, as well as the conduct of the apostle in ver. 10 and the result, the significance which can have induced its being narrated, namely, as a raising from the dead.3 This we remark in opposition to the view which has become common, as if τὸ νεκρός were used, “apparently dead.”4 — ἐπίθεσεν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.] not in order to examine him, but in order to revive him by his contact, in a way similar to the procedure of Elisha and Elijah.5 — μὴ δορυφορεῖς: ἦ γὰρ ψυχὴ κ.τ.λ.] Thus he speaks, obviating the consternation of those present,6 when he had convinced himself of the successful intervention of his miraculous influence. His soul is in him, i.e. he is living! ἡ ψυχή αὐτοῦ, not in αὐτῷ, has the emphasis, not spoken without a lively feeling of victory. The young man had, in fact, been but now ἀψυχος. Accordingly there is no ambiguity of the words, in which Lekebusch asserts that we desiderate an added “again,” and would explain this ambiguity on the ground that the author himself was not quite convinced of the miraculous nature of the incident.7

Vv. 11, 12. On account of the discoursings the intended partaking of the Agapae8 had not yet taken place. But by the fall of the young man these discoursings were broken off; and now, after Paul had returned to the room, he commences, as the father of a family among those assembled, the so long deferred meal — he breaks the bread, and eats, and discourses at table9 until break of day, whereupon he thus, οὕτως, after all that is mentioned in ἀναβάς ... αὐγής,10 leaves the place of meeting. After his departure, they, “qui remanserant apud adolescetem,”11 brought the dead alive into the room, and they, those assembled, were by this greatly12 comforted over their separation from the apostle, who had left behind such a σημεια of his miraculous power. — κλάσας τὸν (see the critical remarks) ἄρτον stands in definite reference to κλάσας ἄρτ., ver. 7, and therefore the article is put. Piscator, Grotius, Kunioel, and others erroneously hold that a breakfast is meant, which Paul partook of to strengthen him for his journey, and that therefore γενάμα is subjoined. But the Agape was, in fact, a real meal, and that therefore γενάμα denotes nothing else than that Paul had begun to partake of it. It is only added to bring more prominently
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2 Matt. 1. 34.
3 Baur’s criticism in the case, however, converts an event which was in itself natural into a parallel in a miraculous form with the raising of the dead narrated of Peter in chap. ix.
4 De Wette; comp. Ewald.
5 2 Kings iv. 34; 1 Kings xvii. 17 f. 10
6 Comp. on μὴ δορυφ. Dem. de cor. 35.
7 See, on the other hand, Oertel, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. p. 147.
8 Ver. 7.
9 Comp. Chrysostom.
11 Erasmus.
12 οὐ μετρίῳ, often so with Plutarch, also in Isocrates and others.
forward this partaking as having at length taken place. — ὑμὴν ὑμᾶς, as in Luke xxiv. 14; more familiar than διάλεγ., ver. 9. — ἄγαγον] they brought him, so that he came into the midst of them; but only now, so that thus subsequently to his revival, he must have gradually recovered, in order to be able to return into the room. — τὸν παῖδα] he must consequently have been still very young. — ζωντα] Opposed to νεκρὸς, ver. 9, and for the joyful confirmation of the words of the apostle, ver. 10.

Ver. 18. Ἡμείς] without Paul. — Ἀσσων, a seaport in Mysia, south of Troas, opposite Lesbos, ἦπι ὑψηλοῦ κ. ὄξιος κ. ὅσανδον τόπον, Steph. Byz. — ἦν διατεταγμ. middle, for he had so arranged, namely, that they should from thence (ἰκεῖθεν) receive him on board (ἀναλαμβάν.). — αῦτον] He for his part chose the route by land, probably because he had a particular official object in view. More arbitrary are the suggestions of Calvin, that it took place "cul嗷rafticca causas," of Michaelis and Stolz, that he wished to escape the snares of the Jews; of Lange, that he acted thus in order to withdraw himself from the circle of his too careful protectors; and of Ewald, that he did so in order to be solitary.

Vv. 14, 15. Εἰς τὸν Ἀσσων] The element of the previous movement — the notion of coming-together — still prevails. So also the landing εἰς Σάμων, ver. 15. — Ἡμβρῖον, the beautiful capital of Lesbos, on the east coast. — ἀντικρι] συν. against. — καὶ μείν. in Trog. Thus on the same day they had sailed over from Samos, where they had touched (παρεβάλ.), to Trogyllum, a town and promontory on the Ionia coast, distant only forty stadia, and there passed the night. On the different modes of writing the name Trog., see Bornemann.

Vv. 16, 17. The ship was thus entirely at his disposal, probably one hired specially for this voyage. — παραπλ. ἡ Ἐφεσον] he sailed past Eph.; for in the chief church of Asia, to which Paul stood in such intimate relation, and where he also would encounter his opponents, he would have been under the necessity of tarrying too long. In order to avoid such prolonged contact with friend and foe, because on account of the aim of his journey he might not now spend the time in Asia, he arranged the interview with the presbyters, which was to subserve the longing of his parting love as well as the exigency of the threatening future, not at the very near Trogyllum, but at Miletus, distant about nine geographical miles from Ephesus. — εἰ δυνατ. ἦν αὐτῷ] if it should be possible for him. Direct form of expression. Of another nature is the conception in xxvii. 39: εἰ δυνατον. — γένος] in the sense of coming, as in John vi. 25. — πιστοῖς] as in Matt. xiv. 10, and in the classical writers. He caused them to be summoned to him by an embassy to Ephesus.

Vv. 18, 19. "In hac concione praecipue huc insistit Paulus, ut, quos

1 Comp. x. 94.
2 Ver. 10.
3 Winer, p. 464 (E. T. 886).
4 Köhner, Π. p. 317.
5 Hor. Od. i. 7, 1. Ep. i. 11, 17.
6 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 444.
8 1 Cor. xvi. 9.
9 ἔρωτας, comp. Aristot. Ἐθ. iii. 8; Plut. Mor. p. 225 B.
10 Köhner, § 466.
Ephesi creaverat pastores, suo exemplo hortetur ad munus suum fideltater peragendum," Calvin. It is a clear and true pastoral mirror.—Only the Ephesian presbyters were assembled; not, as Iren. iii. 14. 3 relates, those also of the neighbouring churches,—an error which arose, perhaps, on account of ver. 28, from the later episcopal dignity.—άρτο πρώτης . . . ἁγιόνωμα, to which it is emphatically prefixed, not to εἰστιασθε; for the point was not the continuity of the knowledge of those addressed, but that of the apostolic conduct. Tholuck, with justice, here calls attention to the frequency and force of the self-witness, which we meet with in Paul. The reason thereof lies in his own special consciousness; and it is wrong to find in the self-witness of this speech the apologetic fabrication of a later adorer.—The first day; see xviii. 19. On μεθ' ὑπ. ἐγκύων., comp. vii. 38. —τῇ Κυρίῳ] to Christ, as His apostles.—μετὰ πάσης ταπεινωσίας] with all possible humility, πολλὰ γὰρ εἶδε τῆς ταπεινωσίας.]—παράγεων.] See on ver. 31.

Vy. 20, 21. ‘Ως οἰδέν κ.τ.λ.] sets forth more precisely the παραγέω;—τοῖς μὴ ἀναγγ. contains the design which would have been present in the ἐπετρ.: how I have held back (dissimulans) nothing of what was profitable, in order not to preach and to teach it to you, etc. So also ver. 27: for I have not been holding back, in order not, etc. The μὴ extends to both infinitives. That dissimulans might have taken place from the fear of men, or in order to please men.—On οἰδέν ὑποστελλόμενα, comp. Dem. 64, ult., πάντως ἀπλός, οἰδέν ὑποστελλόμενος παράρρησιασμοῦ, and 980. 23: μηδὲν ὑποστελλόμενον μηδὲν ἀἰσχυνό-μενον, also 415. 2: μετὰ παράρρησιας διαλεχθήναι μηδὲν ὑποστελλόμενον, according to Becker. —τῶν συμφερόντων] "Haec docenda sunt; reliqua praeecessenda," Bengel. —τὴν εἰς τ. θεόν μετάν.] the repentance, by which we turn to God. It is not, with Beza, Bengel, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, to be referred only to the Gentiles, and πιστιν κ.τ.λ. to the Jews; for the call to this μετάνοια was addressed also to the Jews, inasmuch as they were unfaithful to God, not indeed by idolatry, but by immorality and hypocrisy. Bengel, moreover, aptly remarks: Repentance and faith are the "summa eorum quae utilia sunt."

Ver. 23. 'Ἰδοὺ] Singular, although addressed to several.—τῷ] apostolic sense of personal significance in the consciousness of his important and momentous destiny;—δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι] cannot denote the shutting off of any
inward glimpse into the future, which is first expressed afterwards and in plain terms. Since, moreover, the Holy Spirit first comes in at ver. 23, and since the being fettered was first to befall the apostle in Jerusalem, ver. 28, those views are to be rejected, which explain το θνείμα of the Holy Spirit and δεσμεύμα of the being fettered. Accordingly, the words are neither to be taken as: bound to the Holy Spirit, i.e. dependent on Him, my first edition; nor: constrained by the Holy Spirit; nor: fettered, i.e. already as good as fettered, I go at the instigation of the Holy Spirit; nor yet: fettered, i.e. vincula præsentium, in my spirit; but Paul expresses his consciousness of internal binding: bound, i.e. compelled and urged in my spirit, dative of more precise limitation. He knows, that as regards his journey to Jerusalem, he follows a necessity present to his higher self-consciousness and binding its freedom,—an irresistible internal drawing of his higher personal life. The relation to ver. 23 is as follows: Paul knew not specially what was to befall him at Jerusalem, but only in general it was testified to him by the Holy Spirit in every city, that bonds and afflictions were awaiting him there.

Ver. 23. Πλὴν ὅτι] except that, only knowing that. — το θνείμα το ἁγίου] namely, by prophets, who made this known to me. This explanation, and not any reference to an internal intimation of the Spirit, is required by κατά πόλιν, city by city, at which I arrive on this journey. That Luke has not as yet mentioned any such communication, does not justify the supposition of an unhistorical prolepsis, as he has related the journey, ver. 14 ff., only in a very summary manner.

Ver. 24. According to the reading ἀλλ’ ὁκουμένος λόγου ποιοῦμαι τὴν φυσικὴν τιμῶν ἐμαυτῷ (see the critical remarks), this verse is to be interpreted: But of no word do I account my soul, my life, worthy for myself, i.e. the preservation of my life for my own personal interest is not held by me as worth speaking of. According to the Recepta, as also according to Lachmann, it would have to be taken as: but to nothing do I take heed, I do not trouble myself about any impending suffering, even my life is not reckoned to me valuable for myself. — ὡς τελείωσιν κ.τ.λ.] purpose in this non-regarding of his own life: in order, not to remain stationary half-way, but to finish my course, etc. — καὶ τῆν διακονίαν κ.τ.λ.] Exposition of the preceding figurative expres-
sion. — το ἐναγγ. τ. χάρ. τ. Θεοῦ] the knowledge of salvation, whose contents is the grace of God, manifested in Christ. Comp. xiv. 8.

Ver. 25 points back to ver. 22, now representing the separation there announced, for which vv. 23, 24 have prepared them, as one of perpetuity for the life in time. — ἤκα] emphatic, as in ver. 22, and with deep emotion. — The ὅλα, δοκεῖ ὕποκεινται κ.τ.λ., rests, according to ver. 23, on the conviction which he has now (τὸν) obtained by the communications of the Holy Spirit received from city to city concerning the fate impending over him at Jerusalem, that the imprisonment and affliction there awaiting him would terminate only with his death. And he has not deceived himself! For the assumption that he was liberated from Rome and returned to the earlier sphere of his labours, is unhistorical. But precisely in connection with the unfolding of his destination to death here expressed by him with such certainty, there passed into fulfilment his saying pointing to Rome, however little he himself might be able at this time to discern this connection; and therefore, probably, the thought of Rome was again thrown temporarily into the background in his mind. The fact, that he at a later period in his imprisonment expected liberation and return to the scene of his earlier labours, cannot testify against the historical character of our speech, since he does not refer his ὅλα in our passage to a divinely-imparted certainty, and therefore the expression of his individual conviction at this time, spoken, moreover, in the excited emotion of a deeply agitated moment, is only misused in support of critical prejudgments. With this certainty of his at this time,—which, moreover, he does not express as a sad foreboding or the like, but so undoubtedly as in ver. 29,—quite agrees the fact, that he hands over the church so entirely to the presbyters as he does in ver. 26 ff.; nor do we properly estimate the situation of the moment, if we only assume, with de Wette, that Luke has probably thus composed the speech from his later standpoint after the death of the apostle. According to Baumgarten, II. p. 85 ff., who compares the example of King Hezekiah, the ὅλα κ.τ.λ. was actually founded on objective certainty: God had actually resolved to let the apostle die in Jerusalem, but had then graciously listened to the praying and weeping of the Gentile churches. But in such passages as Philem. 22, there is implied no alteration of the divine resolution; this is a pure fancy. — ὃς εἰς πᾶν ταῦτα, ἐν οἷς διηθήσον] all ye among whom I passed through. In his deep emotion he extends his view; with this address he embraces not merely those assembled around him, nor merely the Ephesians in general, but at the same time, all Christians, among whom hitherto he had been the itinerant herald of the kingdom. In ver. 26 the address again limits itself solely to those present.

Vv. 26, 27. Δοδ] because, namely, this now impending separation makes such a reckoning for me a duty. — μαρτύρωμαι] I testify, I affirm. — ἐν τῷ σιμ. ἡμετρ. hoc magnam declarandi vim habet," Bengel: it was, in fact, the

1 He does not say: that I shall not see you, but he says: that you shall not see me. He has not his own interest in view, but theirs.
2 See on Rom. Introduct. § 1.
3 xiv. 31.
4 Philem. 22; Phil. ii. 24.
5 Baur, Zeiller.
6 See on Gal. v. 3.
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20 day. — ἐν καθαρ. εἴμι (see the critical remarks): that I am pure from the blood of all,1 i.e. that I am free of blame in reference to each one, if he, on account of unbelief, falls a prey to death, i.e. to the eternal ἀπάλασια. Each one is affected by his own fault; no one by mine. καθαρος ἀπὸ2 is not a Hebraism, παντὸς; even with Greek writers καθαρ. is not merely, though commonly, joined with the genitive,3 but also sometimes with ἀπὸ.4 — ὅπως ἐπεστείλαμεν brought forward once more in accordance with ver. 20; so extremely important was it to him, and that, indeed, as the decisive premiss of the καθαρος εἴμι κ.τ.λ. — τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ: the divine counsel καί ἐξοχήν, i.e. the counsel of redemption, whose complete realization is the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Messianic kingdom; hence here ἀναγγ. . . . Θεοῦ, in ver. 24 διακρίνεται . . . Θεοῦ, and in ver. 25 κηρύσσω. τ. βασιλ. τ. Θεοῦ, denote one and the same great contents of the gospel, although viewed according to different aspects of its nature. — πᾶσαν: the whole, without suppressing, explaining away, or concealing aught of it.

Ver. 28. οὕτω Therefore, since I am innocent, and thus the blame would be chargeable on you. — εἰναρχεῖς κ. τ. θυγατρίασ] in order that as well ye yourselves, as the whole church,5 may persevere in the pure truth of the gospel.6 On the prefixing of εἰναρχεῖς, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 16. — τῷ τύχῳ τι. ἄγ. ἔθεσα This was designed to make them sensible of the whole sacredness and responsibility of their office. The Holy Spirit ruling in the church has Himself appointed the persons of the presbyters, not merely by the bestowal of His gifts on those concerned, but also by His effective influence upon the recognition and appreciation of the gifts so bestowed at the elections.7 — ἐπικεφαλείς, also very common with classical writers, as overseers, as stewards,8 denotes the official function of the presbyters, ver. 17, and is here chosen, not πρεσβυτέροις, because in its literal meaning it significantly corresponds to the ποιμαίνειν. "Ipso nomine admonet velut in specula locatos esse," etc., Calvin.9 The figurative10 ποιμαίνειν comprehends the two elements, of official activity in teaching, further specially designated in Eph. iv. 11;11 and of the oversight and conduct of the discipline and organization of the church. For the two together exhaust the ἐπισκοπεῖν.12 — On τ. ἐκκλησία τοῦ Κυρίου see the critical remarks.13 With the reading τοῦ Θεοῦ this passage was a peculiarly important locus for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ and the communicatio idiomatum against the Socinians. See especially Calvinius. — ὅπως παρεποιήθης κ.τ.λ. which He has acquired, for His possession,14 by His own blood, by the shedding of which He has redeemed believers from

1 Comp. on xviii. 6.
2 Tob. iii. 14.
3 Bernhardy, p. 174.
4 Kypke, II. p. 108 f.
5 Luke xii. 32; John x. 1 ff.
6 See vv. 29, 30.
7 See on xiv. 23. Comp. xili. 2, 4.
8 The comparison of the Athenian ἐπισκοποῖς in dependent cities, with a view to explain this official name (Rothe, p. 219 f.; see on these also Hermann, Staatsreth. § 157. 8), introduces something heterogeneous.
9 How little ground this passage gives for the hierarchical conception of the spiritual office, see on Eph. iv. 11; Höfling, Kirchenverf. p. 209 f.
10 Isa. xl. 11; Jer. ii. 8; Ezek. xxxiv. 2; John x. 14, xxvi. 15; and see Disen, ad Pind. Or. x. 9. p. 134.
11 Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 2.
12 1 Pet. v. 2.
13 Comp. Rom. xvi. 16; Matt. xvi. 18.
14 Eph. i. 14; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 9.
the dominion of the devil and acquired them for Himself as heirs of His eternal salvation. "Hic ergo grex est pretiosissimus," Bengel.¹

Vv. 29, 30. Ἐξε] with similar emphasis, as in ver. 25: After my departure—I know it—not only will enemies from without intrude among you—Ephesian Christians, as whose representatives the presbyters were present—who will be relentlessly destructive to the welfare of the church; but also within the church itself, out of the midst of you, will men with perverse doctrines arise. — That by the very common figure of ravenous tester, is not meant, as Grotius supposes, persecutio sub Neron. but false teachers working perniciously, is rendered probable by the very parallelism of ver. 30, and still more certain by the relation of εἰσέλθας. to μετὰ τὴν ἀφίξιν μοι, according to which Paul represents his presence as that which has hitherto withheld the intrusion of the λίκνον,—a connection which, in the case of its being explained of political persecutors, would be devoid of truth. — ἀφίξις is here not arrival, as almost constantly with Greek writers, but departure, going away.⁴ Paul does not specially mean his death, but generally his removal,⁵ on which the false teachers necessarily depended for the assertion of their influence. Moreover, his prediction without doubt rests on the observations and experiences⁶ which he had made during his long ministry in Ephesus and Asia. He must have known the existence of germs in which he saw the sad pledge of the truth of his warning; and we have no reason to doubt that the reality corresponded to this prediction. At the time of the composition of the Epistle to the Ephesians, the false teachers may not yet have been working in Ephesus itself, but in Colossae and its neighbourhood these—they were Judaists of an Essene-Gnostic type—had made themselves felt,⁷ and in Asia Minor generally the heretics of the First Epistle of John and probably also of that of Jude are to be sought, not to mention those of the Apocalypse and Pastoral Epistles. The indefinite and general expressions, in which the false teachers are here described, correspond to the character of prophetic foresight and prediction. According to Zeller, a later writer has by these sought to conceal his otherwise too glaring anachronism; whereas Baur finds the sectarian character, such as it existed at most toward the close of the first century, so definitely delineated, that he, from this circumstance, recognizes a cateniam post eventum! Thus the same expression is for the one too indefinite, and for the other too definite; but both arrive at the same result, which must be reached, let the Paul of the Book of Acts speak as he will. — ἀποστάσις κ.τ.λ.] to draw away, from the fellowship of true believers, after them. "Character falsi doctoris, ut velit ex se uno pendere discipulorum," Bengel.⁸

Ver. 31. Προηγοῦερε ἡ ἐκκήρυξις τοῦ ἔργου ἐπιστολῆς, Bengel,—and that, encouraged by the recollection of my own example, νῦν μημονετοντες, ἢ τι κ.τ.λ. — τρειάν}
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See on xix. 10. — μετὰ διαφοράς extorted both by afflictions and by the sympathetic fervour with which Paul prosecuted his quite special (ἐν τοῖς παιδίσκοις) pastoral care. — νίκται κ. ἡμέρ. See on Luke ii. 37. νίκται is here placed first, because it most closely corresponds to the figurative γρηγορείτης.

— As to the idea of νουθεσία, admonition, see on Eph. vi. 4.

Ver. 32. And now I commend you to God (xiv. 28) and to the word of His grace (ver. 24).—entrust you to Him to protect and bless you, and to the gospel to be the rule of your whole conduct,—to Him who is able to build up, to promote the Christian life, and to give you inheritance, a share in the Messianic blessedness, among all who are sanctified, consecrated to God by faith. — τῷ ἐναντίων is, with the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, de Wette, and others to be referred to God; so that a very natural hyperbaton occurs, according to which καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ appears as an inserted annexation to the general and main element τῷ Θεῷ of an accessory idea, which was not to be separated from τῷ Θεῷ, but which also does not prevent the continuance of the address by a more precise description of τῷ Θεῷ bearing on its object. We should, in reading, lay the emphasis on τῷ Θεῷ, and pass on more quickly over καὶ τῷ λόγῳ . . . αὐτοῦ. Others refer τῷ ἐναντίῳ to τῷ λόγῳ, and understand the λόγος either correctly of the doctrine, or erroneously, opposed to Luke's and Paul's mode of conception, of the personal, Johannean, Logos. But such a personification of the saving doctrine, according to which even the δόξα θεονομίας, evidently an act of God! is assigned to it, is without scriptural analogy. — As to θεονομία, transferred from the allotted share in the possession of Palestine (Παλαι) to the share of possession in the Messianic kingdom, see on Matt. v. 5; Gal. iii. 18; Eph. i. 11.

Vv. 33-35. Paul concludes his address, so rich in its simplicity and deeply impressive, by urging on the presbyters the complete disinterestedness and self-denial, with which he had laboured at Ephesus, as a ῥῦπα for similar conduct. Reason for this: not the obviating of a Judaistic reproach, not a guarding of the independence of the church in the world; but the necessity of the ἀντιλαμβάνοντας τῶν ἀδελφοῦντων, ver. 35. — ἀντιλαμβάνοντας. — ἤμερ. — ἵππος. — ἴματ. — specification of what are usually esteemed the most valuable temporal possessions. — αὐτοῖς without my needing to say it to you. — καὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ μετ᾽ ἐμοί] Thus also for his companions, to their necessities, he applied the gain of his manual labour. — αὐτοῖς he shows them, and certainly they were not soft and tender. — πάντα ἐνειλθήναι ὑμῖν, τοῖς] either in all points I have shown to you, by my example, that; or, all things

1 Ver. 19.
1 Cor. xi. 20, 11. 4.

2 Comp. Bernhardy, p. 459.

3 Kraus, Helrichs, Kulnoel, Lange, and others.

4 Gomarus, Witsius, Amelot.

5 Jas. i. 31.

6 Comp. Col. i. 12 f.; Gal. iv. 7; Luke xii. 23.

7 On ἐν τ. ἵπποις, comp. xxvi. 18; Eph. i. 2 Thess. iii. 9.

14 ff.; 2 Thess. iii. 8 ff.

11 Olshausen.

12 Baumgarten.

13 Comp. Jas. v. 2, 3.

14 1 Cor. x. 33; see on Eph. iv. 15; Lobeck, ad Aj. 1408; Kühner, § 557 A. 4. Lachmann, whom Klostermann follows, refers διὰ ταῦτα to ver. 34, as Beza already proposed. But if
I have showed to you, by my example, in reference to this, that, etc. The former is simpler. — οὖτω] so labouring, as I have done, so toiling hard. Not: my fellow-labourers in the gospel, which, at variance with the context, withdraws from οὖτω its significance. It is the example-giving οὖτωs. — τῶν ἁθετοῖσαν] is, with Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Er. Schmid, Bengal, and others, including Neander, Tholuck, Schneckenburger, Baumgarten, to be explained of those not yet confirmed in Christian principles and dispositions. These might easily consider the work of one teaching for pay as a mere matter of gain, and thus be prejudiced not only against the teacher, but also against the doctrine. But if, on the other hand, the teacher gained his livelihood by labour, by such self-devotion he obviated the fall of the unsettled, and was helpful to the strengthening of their faith and courage. This is that ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἁθετοῖσαν, in which Paul wished to serve as a model to other teachers and ecclesiastical rulers. Others render it: that they should help the poor and needy by support; which meaning would have to be derived not from the θέος λογιζείν of ἀθέτωv taken by itself, but, with Kuinoel, "qui non possunt laborando sibi ad vitam tuendam necessaria comparare," from the context. But the recommendation of liberality is remote from the context; the faithfulness and wisdom of the teacher manifesting itself in gaining his own support by labour, of which the text speaks, must have a spiritual object, like the teaching office itself —not the giving of alms, but the strengthening of the weak in faith. The more naturally this meaning occurs, the less would Paul, if he had nevertheless meant the poor, have expressed himself by ἁθετοῖσαν, but rather by τῶν χῶν or a similar word.—μνημονεύειν . . . λαμβάνειν] and to be mindful of the saying of the Lord Jesus, namely, that He Himself has said: It is blessed—i.e. bliss-giving; the action itself according to its moral nature, similarly to the knowing in John xviii. 3, is conceived as the blessedness of the agent—rather (potius) to give than receive. "The two being compared, not the latter, but rather the former, is the μακάριον." The special application of this general saying of Christ is, according to the connection in the mind of the apostle, that the giving of spiritual benefits, compared with the taking of earthly gain as pay, has the advantage in conferring blessedness; and the μακάριον itself is that of eternal life according to the idea of the Messianic recompense, Luke vi. 20 ff., 38, xiv. 14.—The explanatory δέ, dependent on μνημον., adduces out of the general class of τῶν λόγυ., τ. Kup. a single saying instead of all bearing on the point.—Whether

so, Paul, in ver. 24, would evidently have said too much, especially on account of xai rōi οὖν μὲν ἐμῶ. 1 ὅτι = εἰς ἔξειν, ὅτι, as in John ii. 18, ix. 17; 3 Cor. i. 18; Mark xvi. 14, et al. 8 Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 12. 9 Klostermann. 4 Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 24, 26; Phil. iii. 17. 5 Comp. Rom. xiv. 1, xv. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 22; 1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 21. 6 1 Cor. ix. 13. 7 Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 14. 8 Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, et al., including Wetstein, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olschewski, de Wette, Hackett. 9 Comp. Eph. iv. 28. 10 Comp. Arist. Pac. 626; Eur. Suppl. 483; Herod. ii. 88. See Valckenaer, ad Herod. viii. 51; and Raphel, Herod. in loc. 11 1 Cor. ix. 13. 12 Comp. xv. 15.
Paul derived this saying, not preserved in the Gospels,¹ from oral or written tradition, remains undecided.—References to the same saying: Const. ap. iv. 3. 1: ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Κύριος μακάριον εἴτε εἶναι τὸν δίδοντα ἢπερ τὸν λαμβάνοντα, perhaps also Clem. 1 Cor. 2: ήδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες. Analogous profane sayings² may be seen in Wetstein. The opposite: ἀνόητος ὁ δίδων, εὐφυχής δ’ ὁ λαμβάνων, in Athen. viii. 5.

Vv. 36–38. What a simple, true, tender, and affecting description!—κατεργίζων] denotes frequent and fervent kissing.⁴—θεωρεῖν] to behold, is chosen from the standpoint of the ὄνομάμενον. On the other hand, in ver. 25, ἰδεῖσθε. —προῆγεμ. of giving a convoy, as in xv. 3, xxi. 5.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(m²) After the uproar. V. 1–3.

Meyer correctly remarks this statement indicates the time, but not the motive, of the apostle’s departure, as he had previously determined to leave Ephesus, where he had remained longer than at any other city—three years. The extent of his success is attested by the conduct of Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen. The brief record given by Luke may be supplemented by a reference to the Epistles to the Corinthians, written about this time. The narrative condenses months of active labor into a single verse. The apostle having sent a deputation to Corinth, and also written a letter to that church, took an affectionate farewell of the church at Ephesus. He sailed from Ephesus to Troas, where, a door being opened, he preached for a time, while he awaited the arrival of Titus with tidings from Corinth. Titus came not, and the apostle, filled with anxiety as to the effects his severe letter might produce, crossed over into Macedonia, where he met Titus, who brought tidings which relieved and gladdened the faithful, yet tender-hearted apostle, and was the occasion of a second letter to Corinth. Six years had elapsed since Paul first visited Macedonia, and was beaten and imprisoned at Philippi. He doubtless now revisited the scenes of his former labor; and also during this period evangelized the western part of Macedonia, as he formerly had done the eastern. The entire province of Macedonia was evangelized, as the apostle had visited each of the four districts into which it was divided. The three months he was in Greece—the province of Achaia—was spent mainly at Corinth, its capital. At this time and from this place he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and probably the Epistle to the Galatians. When about to leave Corinth, the Jews entered into a conspiracy to take his life, probably when he was leaving the port. The plot being discovered, the apostle left by land, accompanied by several companions, among whom Luke seems to have been one, as the first person again appears in the narrative. When it is said that

² Artemidor. iv. 3.
³ It borders on wantonness to affirm that this impression of the speech is not so much that which the presbyters received from it, as that which “the reader of the Book of Acts is meant to receive from the previous narrative,” Zeller, p. 274.
⁴ Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 49; Luke xv. 20.
his companions went into, or as far as Asia, "it is not implied that they went no farther than to Asia; Trophimus and Aristarchus and probably others accompanied him to Jerusalem." (Alford.) Luke remained with Paul at Philippi till after the Passover. Whether Paul, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, kept the festival, as Meyer states, cannot be determined, though we do not think it probable. The rest of the company preceded the apostle to Troas, probably for the purpose suggested by Meyer.

(3) Τὴν εκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου. V. 28.

In his critical remarks Meyer discusses this reading at considerable length, and concludes that the evidence is in favor of κυρίου. On the text he remarks: "With the reading τοῦ Θεοῦ, this passage was a peculiarly important locus for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ." Gloag uses the reading of Tischendorf, κυρίου, but adds "not that, in itself, it seems preferable." Six different readings of this passage are given by Davidson; only the two already mentioned are entitled to consideration. Alford, who formerly approved of the reading κυρίου, writes: "On the whole then, weighing the evidence on both sides, seeing that it is more likely that the alteration should have been to κυρίου than to Θεοῦ; more likely that the speaker should have used Θεοῦ than κυρίου; and more consonant to the evidently emphatic position of the word, I have, on final revision, decided for the received reading, church of God, which on first writing I had rejected."

Bloomfield gives the reading, Θεοῦ, and prefixes the words κυρίου καὶ. Pumfrey favors the received reading. Wordsworth inclines to Θεοῦ. Hackett thinks the external testimony preponderates in favor of κυρίου; but Θεοῦ agrees best with the usage of Paul. The phrase "church of God" occurs in the Epistles of Paul eight times, and "churches of God" three times; but the expressions "church of the Lord" and "church of Christ" never occur in his epistles, and "churches of Christ" only once. Alexander, Abbot, Jacobus, and Schaff approve the received reading, and it is retained in the Revised Version. "Θεοῦ is now the undoubted reading of the Vatican, and of the newly discovered Sinaitic ms. Upon the whole, we are disposed to think that the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the reading τὴν εκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ." (Gloag.) Though authorities are very evenly divided, we may unhesitatingly receive the text as in our English versions.

(3) Paul's farewell address at Miletus. V. 18–38.

This address seems to be recorded just as it was delivered, in the words, we had almost said the tones, of the speaker. Taylor, speaking of this address, says: "For depth of pathos and fervor of appeal it seems to me to be well-nigh unrivalled, even in Holy Writ. It quivers all through with emotion. There is love in every sentence, and a tear in every tone. We cannot read it without a choking utterance and a moistened eye." Farrar writes thus: "After these words, which so well describe the unwearied thoroughness, the deep humility, the perfect tenderness of his apostolic ministry, he knelt down with them all and prayed. They were overpowered with the touching solemnity of the scene. He ended his prayer amid a burst of weeping, and as they bade him
farewell—anxious for his future, anxious for their own—they each laid their heads on his neck and passionately kissed him." "If Paul inspired intense hatreds, yet, with all disadvantages of person, he also inspired intense affection."

Renan says: "Then they all knelt and prayed. There was naught heard but a stifled sob. Paul's words, 'Ye shall see my face no more,' had pierced their hearts. In turn, the elders of Ephesus fell on the apostle's neck and kissed him." "Tears are thrice mentioned in this short passage—tears of suffering (19); of pastoral solicitude (31); and of personal affection (37)." (Monod.) Paul was a man of strong convictions and great force of character; but also possessed of exquisite tenderness and a wealth of affection. If he had to endure the strongest enmities he also won for himself the deepest and most enduring friendships. At once so gigantic and so gentle, his personality was a great power, and seemed wholly to overshadow his companions and followers, though, in themselves, men of great excellence and worth, such as Timothy, Titus, Silas, Luke, and others. No man holds a higher place in the esteem and affection of the Christian world than Paul.
CHAPTER XXI.

Ver. 3. κατάχθηκεν] A B E Ε, 34, Vulg. al. have κατάλθηκεν. So Lachm. A gloss. — Ver. 4. Both ἀνευρ. δι’ (Tisch.) and τοὺς before μαθ. (which Beng. Matth. Rinck condemn) have decided attestation. — αὐτοί] A E G, 68, 73 have αὐτοῖς; so Lachm. Alteration to suit οἰτινεῖς. “Ubique in s. s. αὐτοῦ repertum est, scrupulum legentibus injectit,” Born. — ἀναβ.] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐπιβ., according to important testimony. Rightly; the more usual word was inserted. — Vv. 5, 6. προσευχῆμενα. Καὶ ἀπεσαμένοι] Lachm. and Tisch. read προσευχῆμενοι ἀπησαμένα, and then καὶ before ἐπέβ. So A B C E Ε, min. Rightly. The Reception has arisen partly through a simplifying resolution of the participle προσευχῆμενοι, and partly through offence at the compound ἀπεσαμένα not elsewhere occurring. — Ver. 6. ἐπιβῆμεν] Lachm. reads ἐνεῖβ., and Tisch. ἀνεί. The witnesses are much divided. As, however, a form with N is at all events decidedly attested, A C Ε* having ἀνεῖβ., and B E Ε** εἰνεῖβ.; ἐπιβῆμεν is to be preferred, instead of which ἐνεῖβ., the more usual word for embarking, slipped in, and ἐπείδ. was inserted from ver. 2, comp. xxviii. 2. — Ver. 8. After ἔξελθ. Elz. has αὶ πέρι τ. Παύλου (comp. xiii. 13), against decisive testimony. With ἔξελθ. there begins a church-lesson. — Ver. 10. ἡμῶν is condemned by A B C H, min., as an addition. — Ver. 11. τε αὐτοῦ] A B C D E Ε, min. have θαυμ. Approved by Griesb. Rinck, and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., and rightly on account of the decisive testimony. Orig. also testifies for it (εὐαυτῷ χειρῶν κ. τ. λ.). — ταῖς χειραῖς κ. τ. πόδας] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read τ. πόδ. κ. τ. χ., preferred also by Rinck, following important witnesses (not A), but evidently a transposition, in accordance with the natural course of the action. — ἐν Ἰερουσ. Born. reads εἰς Ἰερουσ., but only according to D, min. Chrys. Epiph. It arose from a gloss (Orig.: ἀπελθάντα εἰς Ἰερουσ.). — Ver. 14. On decisive evidence read with Lachm. and Tisch. τοῦ Κυρίου τῷ δήλῳ γινέσθω. — Ver. 15. ἐπισκ. Elz. Scholz read ἀπόσκ., only according to min.; so that it must be regarded as a mere error of transcription. The decidedly attested ἐπισκ. is rightly approved or adopted by Mill. Beng. Griesb. Matthaei, Knapp, Rinck, Lachm. Tisch. The readings παρασκ. (C. 7. 69, 73) and ἀποσταζίμ. (D. Born.) are interpretations. — Ver. 20. θείον] Approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch., according to A B C E G Ε, min. Chrys. Theophyl. and most vss. Elz. Scholz, Born. read κύριον, against these decisive witnesses. — Ἰουδαῖοι] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, which is to be adopted, according to A B C E, min. Vulg. Aeth. Copt. The ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ in D, Syr. Sahid. Jer. Aug. speaks also for this (so Born.). The Reception was occasioned by the following τῶν πεπιστευκότων, after which accordingly in some Fathers Ἰουδαίων has found its place. Ε, Oec. and some min. have merely τῶν πεπιστ., which makes all these additions suspicious, yet the testimony is not sufficiently strong for their deletion. — Ver. 21. πάντας] deleted by Lachm., according to A D E, 13, Vulg. Copt. Jer. Aug. The omission appears to be a historical emendation. — Ver. 24. γνώσοντας] Elz. reads γνωσαντίς, in opposition to A B C D E Ε, min. Aug. Jer.
and some vss. A continuation of the construction of ἣνα. — Ver. 25. ἐπεστείλα-
μέν] Lachm. Born. read ἐπεστείλαμεν, according to B D, 40, and some vss. 
Rightly; the Recapta is from xv. 20. — μπόνα to μή is wanting in Α B D Κ, 13, 40, 
31, and several vss. Condemned by Mill and Bengel, and deleted by Lachm. 
But if it had been added, the expressions of xv. 28 would have been used. On 
the other hand, the omission was natural, as the direct instruction μπόνα τοιοῦτον 
τετείνι is not contained in the apostolic decree. — Ver. 28. The form παραφύ 
ει is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be adopted according to decisive evidence; it is 
not elsewhere found in the N. T. — Ver. 31. συγχωρεῖν] Lachm. and Born. read 
συγκυρεῖται, according to Α B D Κ (in C. ver. 31 to xxii. 30 is wanting). 
With this preponderating testimony (comp. Vulg.: confunditur), and as, after ver. 30, 
the perfect easily presented itself as more suitable, the present is to be pre-
ferred. — Ver. 32. παραλαβ. ] Lachm. reads λαβὼν, only according to B. — Ver. 34. 
ἰδών] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἔπειρὼν, according to Α B D E Κ, min., 
which witnesses must prevail. — μή δυνάμενος ὅ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. (yet 
the latter has deleted ὅ) read μὴ δυνάμενον ὅ ὁ στρατιώ, according to decisive testi-
mony. The Recapta is a stylistic emendation. — So κράζον, ver. 36, is to be 
judged, instead of which κράζοντες is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be preferred. 

Vv. 1, 2. Ἀποσπάσθ.] denotes the painful separation, wrung from them 
by the consciousness of necessity.1 — On the small island Cos, now Co, or 
Stanhio in the Aegean Sea, celebrated for its wine and manufacture of 
costly materials for dress, see Kuster.2 — τὰ Πάραρα] a great seaport of 
Lyca, with an oracle of Apollo active only during the six winter months.3 
— διατερῶν] which was in the act of sailing over. For ἀναχθηναί, comp. on 
xxii. 13.

(στ.). Ver. 3. Ἀναφαντώντες ὃ τὴν Κιπρ. ] but when we had sighted Cyprus. 
The expression is formed analogously to the well-known construction 
πειστεύμεναι τὸ εἰς ἀγαθόν and the like.4 — εἰς ὄνομαν] an adjective to οἰκία.5 — 
ἐν συναφία] towards Syria.6 — κατάγεσθαι, to run in, to land, the opposite of 
ἀνάγεσθαι,7 often with Greek writers since the time of Homer. — ἐκείσε γὰρ 
. . . γόμον], for thither the ship unladed its freight; ἐκείσε denotes the direc-
tion toward the city which they had in view in the unlading in the harbour. 
— ἀναφορεῖς.] does not stand pro futuro, in opposition to Grotius, Valcke-
naer, Kuinoel, and others, but ἦν ἀνοφ. means: it was in the act of its 
unloading.8

Ver. 4. Ἀνευρώντες] See on Luke ii. 16. The Christians there (τῶν ἀμαθ.,) 
were certainly only few,9 so that they had to be sought out in the great city 
of Tyre. πάνω . . . τίποιο, ver. 5, also points to a small number of 
Christians. — διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος] so that the Holy Spirit, speaking within 
them, was the mediating occasion. The Spirit had testified to them that 
a fate full of suffering awaited Paul in Jerusalem, and this in their loving

1 See on Luke xxii. 41.
2 De Co insula, Hal. 1888. On the accusa-
tive form, see Locella, ad Ξεν. Εριθ. p. 156 f.
3 For its ruins, see Fellows, Ask. Minor, p. 219 f.
4 Winer, p. 244 (E. T. 286) ; Buttman, new.
5 Gr. p. 184 (E. T. 190).
6 See Kühner, § 895, and examples in Wet-
7 See on Gal. i. 21.
8 v. 1, 2, xxvii. 2, xxviii. 12 ; Luke v. 11.
9 Comp. Winer, p. 288 (E. T. 489).
10 See xi. 19, xv. 3.
zealous care they took as a valid warning to him not to go to Jerusalem. But Paul himself was more fully and correctly aware of the will of the Spirit; he was certain that, in spite of the bonds and sufferings which the Spirit made known to him from city to city, he must go to Jerusalem, xx. 22 (q).

Vv. 5, 6. Ἐξαπρίσων cannot here denote to fit out,¹ to provide the necessaries for the journey, partly because the protasis: "but when we fitted out in those days"—not: had fitted out—would not suit the apodosis, and partly because in general there was no reason for a special and lengthened provisioning in the case of such a very short voyage. Hence we must adhere to the rendering usual since the Vulgate (expletis diebus) and Chrysostum (πληρώσας): but when it happened that we completed the seven days of our residence there, i.e. when we brought these days to a close. And that ἐξαπρίσων was really so used by later writers, is to be inferred from the similar use of ἀπαρτίζων. — σὺν γυναικὶ κ. τεκν. the more readily conceivable and natural in the case of the small body of Christians after so long a stay. Baumgarten finds here the design of a special distinction of the church. — ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγαλ. on the shore, because this was the place of the solemn parting. Hammond, overlooking this natural explanation, imagined quite arbitrarily that there was a προσευχή on the shore. — ἀνασπασμένα (see the critical remarks): we took leave of one another.⁴ Lachmann unnecessarily conjectures ἀναπαύσαμεν. — εἰς τὰ ίδα to their habitations.⁶—Whether the ship prepared for the voyage (τὸ πλοῖον) was the same in which they had arrived, cannot be determined.

Ver. 7. Διανευόμενον to complete entirely, only here in the N. T., but very often in classical writers, particularly of ways, journeys, and the like. But we, entirely bringing to an end (διανεαντεῖσ is contemporaneus with κατηγοροεῖσαν) the voyage, arrived from Tyre, from which we had sailed for this last stage, at Ptolemais, from which we now continued our journey by land. — τ. πλοίον] from Macedonia, xx. 6. Πτολεμαίς, the ancient 122, even yet called by the Arabs א, by the Europeans St. Jean d’Acre, on the Mediterranean Sea, belonging to the tribe of Asher,⁷ but never possessed by the Jews,⁸ reckoned by the Greeks as belonging to Phoenicia,⁹ and endowed by Claudius with the Roman citizenship.

Vv. 8, 9. Κασάρσιν.] See on viii. 40. — What induced the travellers to make their journey by way of Caesarea? Baumgarten thinks that, as representatives of the converted Gentiles, they wished to come in contact on the way only with Gentile churches. No; simply, according to the text, because Philip dwelt in Caesarea, and with this important man they purposed to spend some time in the interest of their vocation. — τὸν εἰσαγ. δοτός ἐκ τῶν ἐπτάρα] Since it was not his former position as overseer of the poor, but his

¹ Lucian, V. H. 1. 33; Joseph. Antt. iii. 9. 2; comp. 2 Tim. iii. 17. ³ Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 447. ² See on xvi. 18. ⁴ Himerius, p. 184. ⁵ Praef. p. IX. ⁶ Comp. on John xvi. 32, xix. 27; and see Valckenaer, p. 561 f. ⁷ Judg. l. 13. ⁸ Hence Hier. Gitt. f. 43. 3: "In Acone est terra Israëltica et non." [v. 17. ⁹ Ptol. v. 15; Strabo, xvi. p. 766; Plin. N. H.
present position as evangelist, that made him so important to the travellers, namely, through his participation in the calling of a teacher, the words are not to be rendered: because he was one of the seven, vi. 5;^1 but the comma after εικεγγελτικς is to be deleted (so also Tisch. Born.), and the whole is to be taken together: who was the evangelist out of the seven. He was that one of the seven, who had embraced and prosecuted the calling of an evangelist. The fact that he now dwelt at Caesarea presupposes that he no longer filled the office which he held in Jerusalem. Perhaps the peculiar skill in teaching which he developed as an emigrant^2 was the reason why he, released from his former ministry, entered upon that of an evangelist. To regard the words ἄντις εἰς τ. ἐπίτα as an addition of the compiler,^3 and also to suspect ὁ εἰκεγγελτικς,^4 there is no sufficient reason. Evangelists were assistant-missionaries, who, destined exclusively for no particular church, either went forth voluntarily, or were sent by the apostles and other teachers of apostolic authority now here and now there, in order to proclaim the εἰκεγγελτικς of Jesus Christ, and in particular the living remembrances of what He taught and did,^5 and thereby partly to prepare the way for, and partly to continue, the apostolic instruction. — Euseb. iii. 31, 39, v. 24, following Polycrates and Caius, calls this Philip an apostle, which is to be regarded as a very early confusion of persons, going back even to the second century and found also in the Constitt. ap. vi. 7. 1, and is not to be disposed of, with Olshausen, to the effect that Eusebius used ἀποστόλος in the wider sense, which considering the very sameness in name of the apostle and evangelist, would be very inappropriate. But Gieseler's view also^7 that the apostle Philip had four daughters, and that ver. 9 is an interpolation by one who had confounded the apostle with the deacon, is to be rejected, as the technical evidence betrays no interpolation, and as at all events our narrative, especially as a portion of the account in the first person plural, precedes that of Eusebius. — θυγατέρες γυνῖν] virgin^6 daughters. — προφητ.] who spake in prophetic inspiration, had the χάριμα of προφητεία. — The whole observation in ver. 9 is an incidental remarkable notice, independent of the connection of the history;^11 to the contents of which, however, on account of

---

1 Comp. Winer, p. 297 (R. T. 165), de Wette.
2 Zeller.
3 Στελλάς in the Stud. u. Κριτ. 1883, p. 510. They had thus in common with the apostles the vocation of the εἰκεγγελτικς; but they were distinguished from them, not merely by the circumstance that they were not directly called by Christ, and so were subordinate to the apostles, 2 Tim. iv. 5, and did not possess the extraordinary specifically apostolic χαρίσματα; but also by the fact that their ministry had for its object less the summing up of the great doctrinal system of the gospel (like the preaching of the apostles) than the communication of historical incidents from the ministry of Jesus. Pelagius correctly remarks: "Omnia apostolus evangelistae, non omnia evangelista apostolus, sicut Philippus." See generally, Ewald, p. 285 ff., and Jahrb. II. p. 181 ff. — Nothing can be more perverse than, with Sepp, to interpret the appellation evangelist in the case of Philip to mean, that he had brought the Gospel of Matthew into its present form. The evangelists were the oral bearers of the gospel before written gospels were in existence.
4 Eph. iv. 11 ; Eus. H.E. iii. 27.
6 Intactae.
7 On the adjective γυνῖν, comp. Xen. Mem. i. 5. 2: θυγατέρες γυνῖν, Cyrop. iv. 6. 9 ; Lobeck, ad Aj. 1190.
8 See on xi. 27.
9 If this circumstance was meant to be regarded (in accordance with Joel iii. 1 [li. 26])
its special and extraordinary character, the precept in 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 1 Tim. ii. 12, is not to be applied; nor yet is any justification of the life of nuns to be founded on it, with the Catholics. Baumgarten thinks that the
virginity of the daughters corresponds to the condition of the church, which looks forward to her betrothal only in the future. This is exegetical trifling (n').

Vv. 10, 11. 'Επιμενόντων] without a subject (see the critical remarks). There is no reason against the assumed identity of this person with the one mentioned in xi. 28. Luke's mode of designating him, which does not take account of the former mention of him, admits of sufficient explanation from the special document giving account of this journey, which, composed by himself before his book, did not involve a reference to earlier matters, and was left by him just as it was; nor did it necessarily require any addition on this point for the purpose of setting the reader right. — δάχει] he took it up, from the ground, or wherever Paul had laid it. — δόρας . . . πόδας] as also the old prophets often accompanied their prophecies with symbolic actions. On the symbol here, comp. John xxi. 18. — ἑαυτῷ] his own; for it was not his girdle, but Paul's. This self-binding is to be conceived as consisting of two separate acts. — τὸ πν. τ. ἅγ.] whose utterance I, namely, as His organ express (n').

Vv. 12-14. Οἱ ἐντοποιοὶ] the natives, the Christians of Caesarea, only here in the N. T., but classical. — τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες;] What do ye, that ye weep? Certainly essentially the same in sense with τί κλαίετε; but the form of the conception is different. Comp. Mark xi. 5, also the classical οἷον ποιεῖς with the participle. — Κ. συνθρ. μ. τ. καρδ. and break my heart, make me quite sorrowful and disconsolate. The συνθριπτεῖν had actually commenced on the part of those assembled, but the firm τοίμως ἐκχ. κ.τ.λ. of the apostle had immediately retained the upper hand over the enervating impressions which they felt. "Vere incipit actus, sed ob impedimenta caret eventu."

The verb itself is not preserved elsewhere, yet comp. δριπτεῖν τὴν ψυχήν, and the like, in Plutarch and others. — γαρ] refers to the direct sense lying at the foundation of the preceding question: "do not weep and break my heart," for I, for my part, etc. Observe the holy boldness of consciousness in this ἔγω. — εἰς Ιερουσαιμ.] Having come to Jerusalem. — ἐντ. τού ὀν.] See on v. 41, ix. 16. — ἠσπάσαμεν] we left off further address. — τ. Κυπρίων not "quod Deus de te decrevit," but the will of Christ. The submission of
PAUL AT JERUSALEM.

his friends expresses itself with reference to the last words of the apostle, ver. 18, in which they recognised his consciousness of the Lord’s will.

Vv. 15, 16. 'Εστηκεναν.] after we had equipped ourselves—præparati, Vulg.—made ourselves ready; i.e. after we had put our goods, clothes, etc., in a proper state for our arrival and residence in Jerusalem. ¹ The word, occurring here only in the N. T., is frequent in Greek writers and in the LXX. Such an equipment was required by the feast, and by the intercourse which lay before them at the holy seat of the mother church and of the apostles. Others arbitrarily, as if ὑπεξῆγα stood in the text; "‘sarcinas jumentis imponere," Grotius. — τῶν μαθητ. sc. τινὲς. ² — ἄγοντες παρὰ ψευδομανάσων, παρ᾽ ἡνευμάθης. ³ who brought us to Mnason, with whom we were to lodge in Jerusalem. So correctly Luther. The dative Mnása. is not dependent on ἄγοντες, ⁴ but to be explained, with Grotius, from attraction, so that, when resolved, it is: ἄγοντες παρὰ Mnása, παρ᾽ ἡνευμάθης. ⁵ The participle ἄγοντες indicates what they by συνήλθον. σ. ἡμῖν not merely visited (indefinite), but at the same time did: they came with us and brought us, etc. ⁶—Others ⁷ take the sense of the whole passage to be: adducentes secum apud quem hospitaremn Mnasonem. Likewise admitting of justification linguistically from the attraction; ⁸ but then we should have to suppose, without any indication in the context, that Mnason had been temporarily resident at Caesarea precisely at that time when the lodging of the travellers in his house at Jerusalem was settled with him.—Nothing further is known of Mnason himself. The name is Greek, ⁹ and probably he was, if not a Gentile-Christian, at any rate a Hellenist. Looking to the feeling which prevailed among the Jewish Christians against Paul, ¹⁰ it was natural and prudent that he should lodge with such a one, in order that he should enter into further relations to the church. — ἀρχαίοι μαθ. ¹¹ So much the more confidently might Paul and his companions be entrusted to him. He was a Christian from of old, not a νέφωμος, ¹² Tim. iii. 6; whether he had already been a Christian from the first Pentecost, or had become so, possibly through connection with his countryman Barnabas, or in some other manner, cannot be determined.

¹ The erroneous reading ἀνωτέρως, though defended by Olshausen, would at most admit the explanation: after we had conveyed away our baggage (Polych. iv. 81. 11; Diod. Sic. xiii. 91; Joseph. Ant. xiv. 16. 2), according to which the travellers, in order not to go as pilgrims to the feast at Jerusalem encumbered with much luggage, would have sent on their baggage before them. The leaving behind of the superfluous baggage at Caesarea (Wolf, Olshausen, and others), or the laying aside of things unworthy for their entrance into and residence in Jerusalem (Ewald), would be purely imported ideas. Valkenaer, p. 584, well remarks: "Putidum est lectiones tam aperte mendaces, uti versa repertae fuere, in sanctis ante libris relinquir." ² Xen. Hell. vii. 2. 18. ³ Winer, p. 548 (E. T. 737); Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 138 (E. T. 156). ⁴ In opposition to Knatchbull, Winer, p. 501 (E. T. 283 f.), and Fritzschke, Conject. I. p. 43; and see on ii. 28. ⁵ See on Rom. iv. 17. Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 177 (comp. on Rosenmüller, Repert. II. p. 239); Buttmann, p. 244 (E. T. 284); Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 233 f. ⁶ See Hermann, ad Vig. p. 773; Bernhardy, p. 477. ⁷ Vulgate, Erasmus, Castallo, Beza, Calvin, Wolf. ⁸ Kühner, II. 508; Valkenaer, Schol. i. p. 586; Hermann, ad Soph. Et. 643. 651. ⁹ Ael. V. H. iii. 19; Athen. vi. p. 364 C, 372 B; Lucian, Philops. 22. ¹⁰ v. 30, 31.
Chap. XXI., 17-23.

Vv. 17-19. Γενομ., having arrived at; xiii. 5. — oi ἄδελφοι] the Christians, to whom we came,—Menason and others who were with him. It was not until the following day, ver. 18, that they, with Paul at their head, presented themselves to the rulers of the church. Accordingly, there is not to be found in this notice, ver. 17, any inconsistency with the dissatisfaction towards Paul afterwards reported; and oi ἄδελφοι is not to be interpreted of the apostles and presbyters. — σὺν ἡμῖν] witnesses to the historical truth of the whole narrative down to ver. 26: those who combat it are obliged to represent this σὺν ἡμῖν as an addition of the compiler, who wished "externally to attach" what follows to the report of an eye-witness. — πρὸς Ἰάκωβου] the Lord's brother, xii. 17. xv. 13. Neither Peter nor any other of the Twelve can at this time have been present in Jerusalem; otherwise they would have been mentioned here and in the sequel of the narrative. — ἦν] τοῖς ἄ. Usual attraction.

Vv. 20, 21. The body of presbyters—certainly headed by its apostolic chief James as spokesman—recognizes with thanksgiving to God the merits of Paul in the conversion of the Gentiles, but then represents to him at once also his critical position towards the Palestinian Jewish-Christians, among whom the opinion had spread that he taught all the Jews living in the διασπορά among the Gentiles, when preaching his gospel to them, apostasy from the law of Moses. This opinion was, according to the principles expressed by Paul in his Epistles, and according to his wisdom in teaching generally, certainly erroneous; but amidst the tenacious overvaluing of Mosaicism on the part of the Judaists, ever fomented by the anti-Pauline party, it arose very naturally from the doctrine firmly and boldly defended by Paul, that the attainment of the Messianic salvation was not conditioned by circumcision and the works of the law, but purely by faith in Christ. What he had taught by way of denying and guarding against the value put on Mosaicism, so as to secure the necessity of faith, was by the zealous Judaists taken up and interpreted as a hostile attack, as a direct summons to apostasy from the Mosaic precepts and institutions. See Ewald, p. 563 ff., on these relations, and on the greatness of the apostle, who notwithstanding, and in clear consciousness of the extreme dangers which threatened him, does not sever the bond with the apostolic mother-church, but presents himself to it, and now again presents himself precisely amidst this confuence of the multitude to the feast, like Christ on his last entrance to Jerusalem. — θεωρεῖ] is not, with Olshausen, to be referred to the number of the presbyters present, who might represent, as it were, the number of believers: for only the presbyters of Jerusalem were assembled with James, but to the Judaean Christians themselves, Christians of the Jewish land, the view of

1 Baur.
2 Kinoel.
3 Zeller, p. 532. See, in opposition to this wretched shift, Ewald, Jahrb. IX. p. 66.
4 Nevertheless, on the part of the Catholics (see Cornelius & Lapidus), the presence of all the apostles is assumed; Mary having at that time died, and risen, and ascended into heaven. According to other forms of the variously-coloured legend, it occurred twelve years after the death of Jesus. See Sepp, p. 66 ff.
5 Gal. i. 19.
6 See especially Rom., Gal., and 1 Cor.
7 Ver. 18.
ADDRESS AND VOW.

whose many myriads might present itself to Paul at Jerusalem in the great multitude of those who were there, especially at the time of the feast. — πῶσα μυριάδος a hyperbolical expression\(^1\) of a very great indefinable number,\(^2\) the mention of which was to make the apostle the more inclined to the proposal about to be made; hence we are not, with Baur,\(^3\) to understand orthodox Jews as such, believing or unbelieving. The words, according to the correct reading (see the critical remarks), import: how many myriads among the Jews there are of those who are believing, i.e. to how many myriads those who have become believers among the Jews amount. — χηλωταί τ. νόμον zealrous observers and champions of the Mosaic law.\(^4\) — κατεχθόσων they have been instructed\(^5\) by Judaistic anti-Pauline teachers. Actual instruction,\(^6\) not generally audierunt,\(^7\) nor bare suspicion,\(^8\) is expressed. — μὴ περιττεύων αὐτοίς κ.τ.λ.\(^9\) according to the notion of commanding, which is implied in λέγων.\(^10\) — τοῖς ἔθεαι observing the Mosaic customs.\(^11\) — The antagonism of Judaism to Paul is in this passage so strongly and clearly displayed, that the author, if his book were actually the treatise with a set purpose, which it has been represented as being, would, in quite an incomprehensible manner, have fallen out of his part. In the case of such a cunning inventor of history as the author, according to Baur and Zeller, appears to be, the power of historical truth was not so great as to extort “against his will”\(^12\) such a testimony at variance with his design.

Vv. 22, 23. Ti oiv ἐστιν;]\(\text{What is accordingly the case? How lies then the matter?}\) The answer τοῦτο πάθειν has the reason for it in the first instance more precisely assigned by the preliminary remark, πάθειν τὰ ... ἔλθατας: a multitude, of such Jew-Christians, must, inevitably will, come together, assemble around thee, to hear thee and to observe thy demeanour, for, etc. That James meant a tumultuary concourse, is not stated by the text, and is, on the contrary, at variance with the sanguine δεί; but Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and many others erroneously hold that πλήθ. αὐτοῖς refers to the conveoking of the church, or\(^13\) to the united body of the different household-congregations—in that case το πλήθ. must at least have been used. — εἰς ἔτοι εἰς ἑαυτῶν.] having a vow\(^14\) for themselves. This εἰς ἑαυτῶν represents the having of the vow as founded on the men’s own wish and self-interest, and accordingly exhibits it as a voluntary personal vow, in which they were not dependent on third persons. The use of εἰς ἑαυτῶν in the sense of for oneself, at one’s own hand,[and the like,\(^15\) is a classical one,\(^16\) and very common.\(^17\)

---

\(^1\) But yet, comp. with i. 15, ii. 41, iv. 4, Gal. i. 29. an evidence of the great progress which Christianity had thus made in Palestine with the lapse of time.
\(^2\) Comp. Luke xii. 1.
\(^3\) I. p. 380. ed. 2.
\(^4\) Comp. Gal. i. 14.
\(^5\) Luke i. 4; Acts xviii. 25; Rom. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xiv. 19; Gal. vi. 6; Lucian, Aes. 49.
\(^6\) Comp. Chrysostom.
\(^7\) Vulg.
\(^8\) Zeller.
\(^9\) The Jewish-Christians zealous for the law must thus have continued to circumcise the children that came to be born to them.
\(^10\) See on xv. 24.
\(^11\) Comp. τὸν νόμον φωλίσασαν, ver. 23. The dative is as in ix. 31.
\(^12\) Baur.
\(^13\) See on 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Rom. iii. 9.
\(^14\) So Lange.
\(^15\) xviii. 13. [correct.
\(^16\) He reads εἰς ἑαυτῶν, a gloss substantially.
\(^17\) Hermann, ad Viger. p. 869; Kühner, II.
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A yet more express mode of denoting it would be: αἱρεῖ εὐ  ἐπιτραπέζων. With this position of the vow there could be the less difficulty in Paul's taking it along with them; no interest of any other than the four men themselves was concerned in it. Moreover, on account of ver. 26, and because the point here concerned a usage appointed in the law of Moses, otherwise than at xviii. 18, we are to understand a formal temporary Nazarite vow, undertaken on some unknown occasion.¹

Ver. 24. These take to thee, bring them into thy fellowship, and become with them a Nazarite—ἀγνισθήτω, be consecrated, LXX. Num. vi. 3, 8, corresponding to the Hebrew מזלות—and make the expenditure for them, ἵνα αἱροῖς, on their account,² namely, in the costs of the sacrifices to be procured.³ These apud Judeos receptum erat, et pro insigni pietatis officio habebatur, ut in pauperum Nazaraiorum gratiam portarem sumtus erogaret ad sacrificia, quae, dum illi onerentur, offerre necesse erat,' Ῥυκυ.⁴ The attempt of Wieseler,⁵ to explain away the taking up of the Nazarite vow on the part of the apostle, is entirely contrary to the words, since ἀγνισθήτω, in its emphatic connection with σίν αἱροῖς, can only be understood according to the context of entering into participation of the Nazarite vow, and not generally of Israelitish purification by virtue of presenting sacrifices and visiting the temple, as in John xi. 55. — ἵνα ἔξυπνα.] contains the design of ἵνα αἱρ., in order that they, after the fulfilment of the legal requirement had taken place, might have themselves shorn, and thus be released from their vow. The shearing and the burning of the hair of the head in the fire of the peace-offering, was the termination of the Nazaritic vow.⁶ — καὶ γνωσοῦσαι κ.τ.λ. and all shall know: not included in the dependence on ἵνα, as in Luke xxii. 80. — ἵνα] as in ver. 19. — οὐδεν ὡς[ that nothing has a place, is existent, so that all is without objective reality.⁷ — καὶ αἱροῖς also for thy own person, whereby those antinomistic accusations are practically refuted. On στοῖχοι, in the sense of conduct of life, see on Gal. iv. 25.

Ver. 25. "Yet the liberty of the Gentile Christians from the Mosaic law remains thereby undiminished; that is secured by our decree," chap. xv. The object of this remark is to obviate a possible scruple of the apostle as to the adoption of the proposal. — ἣνει άπαντεῖλανεν (see the critical remarks), we, on our part, have despatched envoys, after we had resolved that they have to observe no such thing, nothing which belongs to the category of such legal enactments. The notion of δειν⁸ is implied in the reference of κριβαντες, necessarium esse consensum.⁹ — καὶ ψυλλασσοθαῖς κ.τ.λ. except that they should guard themselves from, etc.¹⁰ On ψυλλασσοθαίς τι οτι ἄνα, to guard oneself from, comp. 2 Tim. iv. 15.¹¹ — This citation of the decree of the

¹ Num. vi., and see on xviii. 18. See on such vows, Kiel, Archäol. I. § 67; Oehler in Herzog's Encycl. X. p. 205 ff.
² See Bernhardt, p. 250.
³ Num. vi. 14 ff.
⁴ See Joseph. Antt. xix. 6. 1, Bell. ii. 15. 1; Misch. Nasi® ii. 5. 6; Wetstein, in loc.; also Oehler, loc. p. 210.
⁵ See Num. vi. 18.
⁶ Comp. on xxv. 11.
⁸ See Num. vi. 14 ff.
⁹ See xv. 28.
¹⁰ See xv. 28. [vii. 136.]
¹¹ Wisd. i. 11; Ecclus. xix. 9; Herod. i. 108.
apostolic synod told Paul wh.t was long since accurately known to him, but was here essentially pertinent to the matter. And for Paul himself that portion of the contents of the decree which was in itself indifferent was important enough, in view of those whose consciences were weak,\(^1\) to make him receive this reminiscence of it now without an express reservation of his higher and freer standpoint, and of his apostolic independence,—a course by which he complied with the δουλεύειν τῷ καρπῷ, Rom. xii. 11.

Vv. 26, 27. James had made his proposal to Paul—by a public observance of a custom, highly esteemed among the Jews, and consecrated by Moses, practically to refute the accusation in question—in the conviction that the accusation was unfounded, and that thus Paul with a good conscience, without contradiction of his principles, could accept the proposal.\(^2\) And Paul with a good conscience accepted it; in which case it must be presumed that the four men also did not regard the Nazarite vow as a work of justification;\(^3\) otherwise Paul must at once on principle have rejected the proposal, in order not to give countenance to the fundamental error, opposed to his teaching, of justification by the law, and not to offer resistance to Christ Himself as the end of the law.\(^4\) In fact, he must have been altogether convinced that the observance of the law was not under dispute, by those who regard him as an opponent of it, in the sense of justification by the law; otherwise he would as little have consented to the proposal made to him as he formerly did to the circumcision of Titus; and even the furnishing of explanations to guard his action, which Schneckenburger\(^5\) supposes that we must assume, would not have sufficed, but would rather have stamped his accommodation as a mere empty show. Moreover, he was precisely by his internal complete freedom from the law in a position, without moral self-offence, not only to demean himself as, but really to be, a φιλάσσων τὸν νόμον, where this φιλάσσων was enjoined by love, which is the fulfillment of the law in the Christian sense,\(^6\) as here, seeing that his object was—as μὴ ἐν αὐτῶς ἔπος νόμον, but ἐν νομισμα νοµιστι— to become to the Jews ὡς Ἰουδαίος, in order to win them.\(^7\) Thus this work of the law—although to him it belonged in itself to the στοιχεῖα τῶν κόσμων—became a form, determined by the circumstances, of exercising the love that fulfils the law, which, however different in its forms, is imperishable and the completion of the law.\(^8\) The step, to which he yielded, stands on the same footing

---

\(^{1}\) 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff.; Rom. xiv. 1 ff.

\(^{2}\) For if James had, in spite of Gal. ii. 9, regarded Paul as a direct adversary of Messiah, he would, on account of what he well knew to be Paul’s decision of character, have certainly not proposed a measure which the latter could not but have immediately rejected. It remains possible, however, that, though not in the case of James himself, yet among a portion of the presbyters there was still not complete certainty, and perhaps even different views prevailed with regard to what was to be thought of that accusation. In this case, the proposal was a test bringing the matter to decisive certainty, which was very correctly calculated in view of the moral steadfastness of the apostle’s character.

\(^{3}\) They were still weak brethren from Judaism, who still clung partially to ceremonial observances. Calvin designates them as novitios, with a yet tender and not fully formed faith.

\(^{4}\) Rom. x. 4.

\(^{5}\) p. 65.

\(^{6}\) Rom. xiii. 8, 10.

\(^{7}\) 1 Cor. ix. 19 ff.

\(^{8}\) Gal. iv. 3; Col. ii. 8.

\(^{9}\) Matt. v 17.
with the circumcision of Timothy, which he himself performed,\(^1\) and is subject essentially to the same judgment. The action of the apostle, therefore, is neither, with Trip, following van Hengel,\(^2\) to be classed as a weak and rash obscuraness, this were indeed to Paul, near the very end of his labours, the moral impossibility of a great hypocrisy; nor, with Thiersch, are we to suppose that he in a domain not his own had to follow the direction of the bishop;\(^3\) nor, with Baumgarten,\(^4\) are we to judge that he, by here externally manifesting his continued recognition of the divine law, "presents in prospect the ultimate disappearance of his exceptional standpoint, his thirteenth apostleship,\(^5\) which there is nothing in the text to point to, and against which militates the fact that to the apostle his gospel was the absolute truth, and therefore he could never have in view a re-establishment of legal customs which were to him merely σιὰ τῶν μελλόντων.\(^6\) Not by such imported ideas of interpreters, but by a right estimate of the free standpoint of the apostle,\(^7\) and of his love bearing all things, we are prevented from regarding his conduct in this passage, with Baur, Zeller, and Hausrath, as un-Pauline and the narrative as unhistorical.\(^8\) — σίν αὐτοῖς ἀγνοεῖτι] consecrated with them, i.e. having entered into participation of their Nazarite state, which, namely, had already lasted in the case of these men for some considerable time, as ver. 23 shows. They did not therefore only now commence their Nazarite vow,\(^9\) but Paul agreed to a personal participation in their vow already existing, in order, as a joint-bearer, to bring to a close by taking upon himself the whole expense of the offerings. According to Nasir. i, 8,\(^10\) a Nazarite vow not taken for life lasted at least thirty days, but the subsequent accession of another during the currency of that time must at least have been allowed in such a case as this, where the person joining bore the expenses. — εἰσεῖν εἰς τ. ἱερ.] namely, toward the close of the Nazarite period of these men, with which expired the Nazarite term current in pursuance of the σίν αὐτοῖς ἀγνοεῖτι for himself. — διάγγειλα] notifying, namely, to the priests,\(^11\) who had to conduct the legally-appointed sacrifices,\(^12\) and then to pronounce release from the vow.\(^13\) The connection yields this interpretation, not: omnibus edicere,\(^14\) or\(^15\) with the help of friends spreading the news, which in itself would likewise accord with linguistic usage.\(^16\) — τὴν ἐκπληροσίν τῶν ἡμερ. τ. ἁγν.] i.e. he gave notice that the vowed number of the Nazarite days had quite expired, after which only the concluding offering was required. This idea is expressed by εἰς τὸ προσπωτέχθη κ.τ.λ., which immediately attaches itself to τὴν ἐκπληροσίν κ.τ.λ. : the

---

1 xvi. 3. [861 ff.]
2 In the Godeseerd. Bijdragen, 1869, p.
3 But see Gal. ii. 6.
4 If. p. 149.
5 Rom. xi. 26 ff.
6 Col. ii. 17.
7 1 Cor. iii. 21 ff.
8 See, on the other hand, Neander, p. 486 ff.
9 Neander.
10 Comp. Joseph. Bell. ii. 15. 1.
11 Comp. Thuc. vii. 73. 4; Herodian, ii. 3. 5;
Xen. Anab. 1. 6. 2.
12 Num. vi. 13 ff.
13 The compound (internuntiare) is purpose-
ly chosen, because Paul with his notice acted as internuntius of the four men. So com-
monly διάγγελλων is used in Greek writers, where it signifies to notify, to make known.
Comp. also 2 Macc. i. 33.
14 Grotius.
15 Bornemann.
16 Luke ix. 60; Rom. ix. 17.
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fulfilment of the Nazarite days, until the offering for each individual was presented by them, so that ἐς ὁ ἱερόν προσελθείη κ.τ.λ. contains an objective more precise definition of the ἵκκηρως added from the standpoint of the author: which fulfilment was not earlier than until there was brought, etc. Hence, Luke has expressed himself not by the optative or subjunctive,¹ which Lachmann, Praef. p. ix., has conjectured, but by the indicative aorist, "the fulfilment up to the point that the presentation of the offering took place." Wieseler arbitrarily² makes ἐς ὁ dependent on ἵσει τὸ ἱερόν, supplying "and remained there."—Observe, further, that in αὐτῶν Paul himself is now included, which follows from σὺν αὐτοῖς ἅγνισθείς, as well as that ἐν ἵκαστον is added, because it is not one offering for all, but a separate offering for each, which is to be thought of (τοῦ). — Ver. 27. αἱ εἰπτὰ ἡμεραί] is commonly taken as: the seven days, which he up to the concluding sacrifice had to spend under the Nazarite vow which he had jointly undertaken, so that these days would be the time which had still to run for the four men of the duration of their vow. But against this may be urged, first, that the ἵκκηρως τῶν Ἰμ. τ. ἄγν., ver. 26, must in that case be the future fulfilment, which is not said in the text; and, secondly and decisively, that the αἱ εἰπτὰ ἡμ., with the article, would presuppose a mention already made of seven days.³ Textually we can only explain it as: the well-known seven days required for this purpose,⁴ so that it is to be assumed that, as regards the presentation of the offerings,⁵ very varied in their kind, the interval of a week was usual. Incorrect, because entirely dissociated from the context, is the view of Wieseler,⁶ that the seven days of the Pentecostal week, of which the last was Pentecost itself, are meant. So also Baumgarten, and Schaff.⁷ See, on the other hand, Baur,⁸ who, however, brings out the seven days by the entirely arbitrary and groundless apportionment, that for each of the five persons a day was appointed for the presentation of his offering, prior to which five days we have to reckon one day on which James gave the counsel to Paul, and a second on which Paul went into the temple. On such a supposition, besides, we cannot see why Luke, in reference to what was just said, ἵσει ἐν ἵκαστον αὐτῶν, should not have written: αἱ πέντε ἡμέραι. — αἱ ἁπτ. τ. Ἀσίας Ἰου.⁹ "Paulus, dum fidelibus—the Jewish-Christians—placandis intentus est, in hostium—the unconverted Asiatic Jews—furorem incurrivit," Calvin. How often had those, who were now at Jerusalem for the feast of Pentecost, persecuted Paul already in Asia! ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ Ἦφα][To see the destroyer of their ancestral religion in the temple, goaded their wrath to an outbreak. — σωτηρον] xix. 32.

Vv. 28, 29. ὁ τόπον τοῦτο.] vi. 14. — ἵσει τῇ καὶ Ἑλληνῶν κ.τ.λ.] and, besides, he has also, further, in addition thereto, brought Greeks, Gentiles, into the temple. As to τῇ καί, see on xix. 27. That by τῷ ἱερῷ we have to under-

¹ Comp. xxiiii. 12.
² Comp. already Erasmus, Paraph.
³ Comp. Judith viii. 15; comp. vili. 89.
⁴ Comp. Erasmus, Paraphrase: "Totum hoc septem diebus erat peragendum; quibus jacta expletia," etc.; also Ewald, p. 871.
⁵ According to Num. vi. 18 ff.
⁷ p. 948 ff.
⁸ In the theol. Jahrb. 1844, p. 468 ff.
stand the court of the Israelites, is self-evident, as the court of the Gentiles was accessible to the Greeks. — ἔλληνας the plural of category, which ver. 29 requires; so spoken with hostile intent. — Ver. 29 is not to be made a parenthesis. — ἦσαν γὰρ προσωρικῶτες κτ.λ. there were, namely, people, who had before, before they saw the apostle in the temple, ver. 27, seen Trophimus in the city with him. Observe the correlation in which the προσώρ. stands with ἄνασαμένοι, and the ἐν τῇ πόλει with ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ on the one hand, and with εἰς τῷ ἱερῷ on the other. So much the more erroneous is it to change the definite προσ, before, into an indefinite formerly, which Otto dates back even four years, namely, to the residence in Jerusalem mentioned in xviii. 22. Beyond doubt the προ before does not point back farther than to the time of the present stay in Jerusalem, during which people had seen Trophimus with Paul in the city, before they saw the latter in the temple. — Τρόφιμον τῶν Ἑβραίων] see xx. 4. Among those, therefore, who accompanied the apostle ἀρχι τῆς Ἀσίας, Trophimus must not have remained behind in Asia, but must have gone on with the apostle to Jerusalem. — ἐν χώραν. The particular accusation thus rested on a hasty and mistaken inference; it was an erroneous suspicion expressed as a certainty, to which zealotry so easily leads! — ὀψ ἐν χώραν στιχ.] comp. John viii. 54.

Ver. 30. Ἐξώ τοῦ ἱεροῦ] in order that the temple enclosure might not be defiled with murder; for they wished to put Paul to death, ver. 32. Bengel and Baumgarten hold that they had wished to prevent him from taking refuge at the altar. But the right of asylum legally subsisted only for persons guilty of unintentional manslaughter. — ἐκλείσω.] by the Levites. For the reason why, see above. Entirely at variance with the context, Lange holds that the closing of the temple intimated the temporary suspension of worship. It referred only to Paul, who was not to be allowed again to enter.

Vv. 31—33. But while they sought to kill him, to beat him to death, ver. 33, information came up, to the castle of Antonia, bordering on the northwest side of the temple, to the tribune of the Roman cohort. — τῷ χιλιάρχῳ a simple dative, not for πρὸς τὸν χ. — ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς upon them. — ἐκλ. δεσπότ.] because he took Paul to be an at that time notorious insurgent, abandoned to the self-revenge of the people. In order, however, to have certainty on

---

1 On the screen of which were columns, with the warning in Greek and Latin: μη δειν ἄλλα μάλιστα ἐντὸς τοῦ ἄγιον προσώριν. Joseph. Bell. v. 5. 2.
2 Lightfoot, ad Matth. p. 59 f.
3 The προσ is not local, as in ii. 35 (my former interpretation), but, according to the context, temporal. The usus logiendi alone cannot here decide, as it may beyond doubt be urged for either view; see the lexicons. So also is it with προσδείν. The Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, and others neglect the προσ entirely. Beza correctly renders: anteav viderunt.
6 Comp. on xxi. 8.
7 Therefore they would hardly suppose that Paul would fly to the altar. Besides, they had him sure enough! See Ex. xxii. 13, 14: 1 Kings ii. 38 ff. Comp. Ewald, Alterth. p. 228 ff.
8 Claudius Lysias, xxii. 25.
9 On φῶς, comp. Dem. 798. 16. 1928. 6; Polux, vili. 6. 47 f.; Susannah 55; and see Wetstein. [II. p. 283.
10 See Bornemann and Rosenmüller, Repert.
11 On ὑπερήφανον, to run down, comp. Xen. Anab. v. 4. 28, xii. 1. 20.
12 Ver. 38.
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the spot, he asked, the crowd: τίς ἥν εἰδεν καὶ τί ιστήν πεπονεμένος] who he might be, subjective possibility, and of what he had done—that he had done something, was certain to the inquirer.¹—εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν in castra, i.e. to the fixed quarters of the Roman soldiery, the military barracks of the fortress.²

Vv. 35, 36. Ἐπὶ τ. ἀναβαθμῷ] when he came to the stairs leading up to the fortress.³ See examples of the form βαθμός, and of the more Attic form βασμός, in Lobeck.⁴—συνθέσει βαστάζων αὐτόν] brings forward what took place more markedly than the simple ἐβαστάζω. Either the accusative, as here, or the nominative may stand with the infinitive.⁵—αιρεῖν aitóν] The same cry of extermination as in Luke xxiii. 18.⁷ On the plural κράζουσις, see Winer.⁸

Vv. 37, 38. Εἰ ἔξεται κ.τ.λ. as in xix. 2; Luke xiv. 3; Mark x. 2. "Modeste alloquitur," Bengal. —Ἐλληνιστί γνώσκεις understandest thou Greek? A question of surprise at Paul's having spoken in Greek. The expression does not require the usually assumed supplement of λαλεῖν,⁹ but the adverb belongs directly to the verb γνωσκεις.¹⁰—οἶκ ἄρα σὺ εἰ κ.τ.λ.] Thou art not then, as I imagined, the Egyptian, etc. The emphasis lies on ὦ, so that the answer would again begin with ὦ.¹¹ Incorrectly, Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, and others: nonne tu es, etc.—The Egyptian, for whom the tribune had—probably from a mere natural conjecture of his own—taken Paul, was a phantastic pseudo-prophet, who in the reign of Nero wished to destroy the Roman government and led his followers, collected in the wilderness, to the Mount of Olives, from which they were to see the walls of the capital fall down. Defeated with his followers by the procurator Felix, he had taken to flight;¹² and therefore Lysias, in consequence of his remembrance of this event still fresh after the lapse of a considerable time,¹³ lighted on the idea that the dreaded enthusiast, now returned or drawn forth from his long concealment, had fallen into the hands of popular fury. —περικοίσας.] Josephus¹⁴ gives the followers of the Egyptian at τρισμυρίως; but this is only an apparent inconsistency with our passage, for here there is only brought forward a single, specially remarkable appearance of the rebel, perhaps the first step which he took with his most immediate and most dangerous followers, and therefore the reading in Josephus is not to be changed in accordance with our passage, in opposition to Kuinoel and Olshausen.¹⁵—How greatly under the worthless

³ So xxii. 24, xxiii. 10, 16, 33.
⁵ ad Phryn. p. 384.
⁶ See Stullib. ad Plat. Phaed. p. 67 C.
⁷ Comp. Acts xxii. 32.
⁹ Heb. xlii. 34.
¹³ For different combinations with a view to the more exact determination of the time of this event, which, however, remains doubtful, see Wieseler, p. 79 ff.; Stölling, Bel. s. Eusebe d. Paul. Br. p. 190 ff.
¹⁴ Bell. L.c.
¹⁵ But there remains in contradiction both with our passage and with the τρισμυρίως of Josephus himself, his statement, Ant. xx. 8. 6, that 400 were slain and 200 taken prisoners; for in Bell. ii. 13. 5, he informs us that the
Felix the evil of banditti prevailed in Jerusalem and Judaea generally, see in Josephus. Ant. xx. 6 f.

Vv. 39, 40. I am indeed (μέν) — not the Egyptian, but — a Jew from Tarsus, and so apprehended by thee through being confounded with another, yet I pray thee, etc. — ἀνθρωπος] In his speech to the people Paul used the more honourable word ἄνθρωπος. — οἶκος ἀνόμου] See examples of this litotes in the designation of important cities, in Wetstein ad loc. A conscious feeling of patriotism is implied in the expression. — κατέστρεψα τ. χ.] See on xii. 17. — πολλοίς δὲ αιγύπτις γενομ. "Conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant." — τῆς Ἑβρ. διαλ. thus not likewise in Greek, as in ver. 37, but in the Syro-Chaldaic dialect of the country, in order, namely, to find a more favourable hearing with the people. — We may add, that the permission to speak granted by the tribune is too readily explainable from the unexpected disillusion which he had just experienced, ver. 39, to admit of its being urged as a reason against the historical character of the speech, just as the silence which set in is explainable enough as the effect of surprise in the case of the mobile vulgus. And if the following speech, as regards its contents, does not enter upon the position of the speaker towards the law, it was, in presence of the prejudice and passion of the multitude, a very wise procedure simply to set forth facts, by which the whole working of the apostle is apologetically exhibited.

Notes by American Editor.

ρέους εὐκαπίων, the daggersmen, see Suidoc. Thee. II. p. 957: the article denotes the class of men.


Comp. Jacobs, ad Achill. Tat. p. 718.

Virgil: Aen. ii. 1.

I. 19.

Baur, Zeller.
At Paphlagonian, a seaport of Lycia, near the mouth of the river Xanthus, was a famous oracle of Apollo, which was held as scarcely inferior to that at Delphi, hence Horace describes the god as the "Delius et Pateaens Apollo." Here the apostle landed, and embarked in another vessel. The place is now in ruins, its harbor filled with sand-banks, its temple demolished, and its oracles dumb.

"The oracles are dumb;
No voice nor hideous hum
Runs through the arch'd roof in words deceiving;
Apollo from his shrine
Can no more divine,
With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving;
No nightly trance or breath'd spell
Inspires the pale-eyed priests from the prophetic cell."

(Milton.)

(qf) Disciples at Tyre. V. 4.

A small church had been gathered here, probably through the labors of some of the dispersion, possibly by the preaching of Philip. While waiting for the departure of the vessel, the apostle spent a week with these disciples, and we can well imagine what a precious season they enjoyed, and we wonder not that they all—men, women, and children—came to the shore with him, nor that, having intimation of the trials and sufferings which awaited the apostle at Jerusalem, they sought to dissuade him from going. We must ever distinguish between the divine intimations and human inferences. These disciples at Tyre had received some foreshadowings of coming affliction to Paul, yet had not received so full a revelation of the divine mind, as was given to Paul, hence their counsel was opposed to his decision. The period of seven days "mentioned at Troas, and again at Puteoli, seems to indicate that Paul arranged to be at Troas, Puteoli, and Tyre over the Sabbath, and to partake with them of the Lord's Supper."

(qf) Philip's four daughters. V. 9.

The remarks of Meyer on this verse are just. Gloss observes: "This remark does not seem to be merely incidentally introduced; but is probably an indication that the daughters of Philip, influenced by the spirit of prophecy, foretold the sufferings which awaited the apostle at Jerusalem." Honeson says: "There seems to have been an organization at Ephesus of 'widows' of an advanced age, who spent their days in charitable work in connection with the church. But we find no trace of any order of virgins in the early church." Hackett writes: "Luke mentions the fact as remarkable, and not as in any way related to the history. It is hardly possible that they too foretold the apostle's approaching captivity." Alford says: "To find an argument for the so-called 'honor of virginity' in this verse only shows to what resources those will stoop who have failed to apprehend the whole spirit and rule of the gospel in the matter." Alexander remarks: They "were inspired, literally, prophesying, not as public teachers, but in private, perhaps actually prophesying in the strict sense, at the time of Paul's arrival, i.e. predicting what was to befall him, like the Tyrian disciples." "Their virginity is probably referred to only as a
reason for their being still at home, and not as having any necessary connection with their inspiration." We concur fully in the remarks of Dr. Taylor: "At this time his four unmarried daughters, who were possessed of the gift of prophecy, were living under his roof; and though it is not said in so many words that they foretold what was to happen to the apostle, yet it seems likely that they also renewed the warnings which he had already so frequently received," and he justly adds in a note, there seems no foundation whatever for the notion of Plumptre that they were under a vow. Furrar says: "The house of Philip was hallowed by the gentle ministries of four daughters, who, looking for the coming of Christ, had devoted to the service of the gospel their virgin lives."

(s) Torrid many days. V. 10.

The phrase is literally more days, rendered by the words some, several, implying that he spent a longer time there than in other places on the way, or than he had intended to spend at least a number of days—probably two weeks. He left Philippi with the design of reaching Jerusalem before Pentecost. He was at Philippi during the Passover. And from the Passover to Pentecost there are fifty days. We may reckon the time thus: From Philippi to Troas 5 days, at Troas 7. To Assos and Mitylene 1, to Chios, Samos, and Miletus 3; at Miletus and to Cos about 3; Rhodes and Patara 2; to Tyre 2; at Tyre 7; Ptolemais 2; to Cesarea 1. Making 33 days in all, leaving 17 to spend at Cesarea; and to go to Jerusalem, which would not require more than 2 days.

(r) Paul purifying himself. V. 26.

The views of Meyer on this act of the apostle are fully expressed, and commend themselves to general acceptance—that the apostle acted in full view of the absolute truth of the gospel, and in the exercise of Christian freedom and condescending charity. Alford says: "James and the elders made this proposal, assuming that Paul could comply with it salvā conscientiā; perhaps also as a proof to assure themselves and others of his sentiments; and Paul accepted it salvā conscientiā. But this he could only have done on one condition, that he was sure by it not to contribute in these four Nazarites to the error of justification by works of the law." Paul, in compassion to the weak faith of his Jewish brethren, associated himself with four members of the church who had a vow, and this he did, without implying that it was necessary for any, and certainly not for the Gentile Christians, to do the same thing. Neander writes: "Let us recollect that the faith in Jesus as the promised Messiah was the fundamental doctrine, on which the whole structure of the church arose. Accordingly the first Christian community was formed of very heterogeneous materials. It was composed of such as differed from other Jews only by the acknowledging of Jesus as the Messiah; of such as still continued bound to the same contracted Jewish notions, which they had entertained before; and of such as by coming to know Jesus more and more as the Messiah in the higher spiritual sense, were becoming more completely freed from their besetting errors. As Christ himself had faithfully observed the Mosaic law, so the faithful observance of it was adhered to at first by all believers." Furrar re-
marks: "Still there were two great principles which he had thoroughly grasped, and on which he had consistently acted. One was acquiescence in things indifferent for the sake of charity, so that he gladly became as a Jew to Jews that he might save Jews; the other that, during the short time which remained, and under the stress of the present necessity, it was each man's duty to abide in the condition wherein he had been called. His objection to Levitism was not an objection to external conformity, but only to that substitution of externalism for faith, to which conformity might lead. He did not so much object to ceremonies as to placing any reliance on them. He might have wished that things were otherwise, and that the course suggested to him involved a less painful sacrifice." Glocg observes: "According to Paul's views the ceremonies of the law were matters of indifference; he himself appears to have observed them, though with no great strictness; hence he felt himself at liberty to accommodate himself to the conduct of others in these indifferent things. And it was this very liberality of spirit, this freedom of action, that enabled him to comply with the request of James and the elders. Christian love, which was the grand moving principle of his conduct, caused him to accommodate himself to the views of the Jews, when he could do so without any sacrifice of principle, in order to remove their prejudices."

Schaff says: "And as to Paul, he was here not in his proper Gentile-Christian field of labor. His conduct, on other occasions, proves that he was far from allowing himself from being restricted in this field. He reserved to himself entire independence in his operations. But he stood now on the venerable ground of the Jewish-Christian mother church, where he had to respect the customs of the Fathers, and the authority of James, the regular bishop or presiding elder. Clearly conscious of already possessing righteousness and salvation in Christ, he accommodated himself, with the best and noblest intentions, to the weaker brethren."
CHAPTER XXII.

Ver. 1. ἔνω] is decided by its attestation. Elz. has νέν. — Ver. 2. προστεφώνει] Tisch. Born read προσφώνει, following D E min. Theoph. Oec. Rightly; the Recepta is a mistaken alteration in accordance with xxi. 40, from which προστεφώνεσεν is inserted in G, min. — Ver. 3. μὲν] is wanting in important witnesses; deleted by Lachm. Born. But its non-logical position occasioned the omission. — Ver. 9. καί ἑμοίῳ ἐγένοντο] is wanting in A B H Ἐ, min. and several vss. Deleted by Lachm. But the omission is explained by the homooeoteledon. Had there been interpolation, ἐνεώ from ix. 7 would have been used. — Ver. 12. εἰσεβής] is wanting in A, Vulg. Condemned by Mill. On the other hand, B G H Ἐ, and many min. Chrys. Theophyl. have εὐλαβής, which Lachm. and Tisch. read. The omission of the word is to be considered as a mere transcriber's error; and εὐλαβής is to be preferred, on account of the preponderance of evidence. — Ver. 16. αὐτόν] Elz. has τοῦ Κυρίου, against decisive attestation. An interpretation, for which other witnesses have Ἰησοῦ. — Ver. 20. Ἐγένον] is wanting only in A, 68, and would fall, were it not so decidedly attested, to be considered an addition. But with this attestation the omission is to be explained by an error in copying (Στεφανοῦ Ὑ τοῦ). — After συνεδριάκων Elz. has τῷ ἀναρέσει αὐτῶν, which, however, is wanting in A B D E Ἐ, 40, and some vss., and has come in from viii. 1 (in opposition to Reiche, nov. descrip. odd. N. T. p. 28). — Ver. 22. καθήκεν] Elz. has καθήκου, supported by Rinck, in opposition to decisive testimony. — Ver. 23. ἀπά] D, Syr. Cassiod. have ὁφράνου. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Born. But the evidence is too weak, and ὅφρ. bears the character of a more precise definition of ἀπά. — Ver. 24. εἰσύγεοθα] Elz. has ἐγεθα, against greatly preponderating evidence. EIX was absorbed by the preceding ΟΣ. εἰπά is to be read instead of εἰπών, according to decisive testimony, with Tisch. and Lachm. — Ver. 25. προστείνειν] has, among the many variations,—προτείνειν (Elz.), προστείνειν, προστείνειν, προστείνευν,—the strongest attestation. The change of the plural into the singular is explained by the fact that the previous context contains nothing of a number of persons executing the sentence, and therefore ὁ χιλιαρχός was still regarded as the subject. — Ver. 26. Before τι Elz. has ὅ, against A B C E Ἐ, min. Vulg. and other vss. So also Born., following D G H, min. vss. Chrys. Certainly "vox innocentissima" (Born.), but an addition by way of gloss according to these preponderating witnesses. — Ver. 30. παρά] Lachm. and Born. read ὧπο, according to A B C E Ἐ, min. Theophyl. Oec. The weight of evidence decides for ὧπο. — After ἐλευθ. aὐτ. Elz. has ἀπὸ τ. δεσμῶν. An explanatory addition, against greatly preponderating testimony. — Instead of συνελθεῖν Elz. has ἔλθειν, against equally preponderant evidence. How easily might ΣΥΝ be suppressed in consequence of the preceding ΣΕΝ! — πᾶν τὸ συνήθμον] Elz. has ἄλοιπον τὸ συνεδρ. αὐτῶν, against decisive evidence, although defended by Reiche, l.c. p. 28.
Vv. 1–3. 'Αδελφοί κ. πατέρεσ] quite a national address.¹ Even Sanhedrists were not wanting in the hostile crowd; at least the speaker presupposes their presence. — ἀκούσας κ. τ. λ.] hear from me my present defence to you (w²). As to the double genitive with ἀκούσας, comp. on John xii. 46. — After ver. 1, a pause. — ἵνα μὲν] Luke has not at the very outset settled the logical arrangement of the sentence, and therefore mistakes the correct position of the μὲν, which was appropriate only after γεγένη. Similar examples of the deranged position of μὲν and ἀντί often occur in the classics.² — ἀνατεθραμμένος ... νόμος] Whether the comma is to be placed after ταίνη ³ or after Γαμαλιήλ,⁴ is—seeing that the meaning and the progression of the speech are the same with either construction—to be decided simply by the external structure of the discourse, according to which a new element is always introduced by the prefixing of a nominative participle: γεγενημένος, ἀνατεθραμμένος, πεπαλαιμένος: born at Tarsus in Cilicia, but brought up in this city, Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel,¹ inscribed according to the strictness of the ancestral law. The latter after the general ἀνατεθραμμένος, κ. τ. λ. brings into relief a special point, and therefore it is not to be affirmed that παρὰ τ. πάτ. Γαμ. suits only πεπαλαί.² — παρὰ τούς πόδας] a respectful expression, τὴν πολλὴν πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα αἰῶν̣ δεικνύς,³ to be explained from the Jewish custom of scholars sitting partly on the floor, partly on benches at the feet of their teacher, who sat more elevated on a chair.⁴ The tradition that, until the death of Gamaliel, the scholars listened in a standing posture to their teachers,⁵ even if it were the case,⁶ cannot be urged against this view, as even the standing scholar may be conceived as being at the feet of his teacher sitting on the elevated cathedra.¹¹ — κατὰ ἀκριβές τοῦ πατρίου νόμον] i.e. in accordance with the strictness contained in, living and ruling in, the ancestral law. The genitive depends on ἀκριβές. Erasmus, Castalo, and others connect it with πεπαλαί, held to be used substantively: ¹² carefully instructed in the ancestral law. Much too tame, as careful legal instruction is after ἀνατεθρ. ... παρὰ τ. πάτ. Γαμαλ. understood of itself, and therefore the progress of the speech requires special climactic force. — The πατρίου νόμος is the law received from the fathers,¹¹ i.e. the Mosaic law, but not including the precepts of the Pharisees, as Kuinoel supposes—which is arbitrarily imported. It concerned Paul here only to bring into prominence the Mosaically orthodox strictness of his training;

¹ Comp. on vil. 2.
² See Bammel, Partikl. p. 168; Winer, p. 550 (E. T. 700.).
³ Alberti, Wolf, Griesbach, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Lachmann, Tißendorf, de Wette.
⁴ Calvin, Beza, Castalo, and most of the older commentators, Bornemann.
⁵ See on v. 34.
⁶ De Wette.
⁷ Chrysostom.
⁸ Schoettig, in loc.; Bornemann, Schol. in Luc p. 179.
¹⁰ But see on Luke ii. 46.
¹¹ Matt. xxiii. 2; Vitrings, Lc. p. 169 f.
¹² Hermann, ad Viper. p. 777.
¹³ πατρίου μὲν τὸ ἐκ πατρίου εἰς νόμος χρηστάντα. Ammonius, p. 111. Concerning the difference of πατρίου, πάτριος, and πατρίδος, not always preserved, however, and often obscured by interchange in the codex, see Schoemann, ad In. p. 218; Mastin, ad Lycurg., p. 197; Eilhard, Lex. Sophr. II. p. 531 f. On πατρίου νόμος, comp. 2 Macc. vi. 1; Joseph. Antt. xii. 3. 3; Xen. Hell. ii. 3. 2; Thuc. viii. 78. 6: πατρίδος νόμος. Comp. xxiv. 14, xcviii. 17.
the other specifically Pharisaic element was suggested to the hearer by the mention of Gamaliel, but not by τ. παρ. νόμου. Paul expresses himself otherwise in Phil. iii. 5 and Gal. i. 14.—ζηλωτής ἵππαρχ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] so that I was a zealot for God, for the cause and glory of God, contains a special characteristic definition to παρὰδεμένος . . . νόμου.1 "Uterque locus quiddam ex mimesi habet; nam Judæi putabant se tantum tribuere Deo, quantum detraherent Jesu Christo," Bengel.

Vv. 4, 5. Ταύτ. τ. ὀδόν] for Christianity was in his case the evident cause of the enmity.2 —ἀχριθανάτον Grotius appropriately remarks: "quantum scil. in me erat." It indicates how far the intention in the εἰς ἡμᾶς went, namely, even to the bringing about of their execution. —ὁ ἀρχιερ. The high priest at the time, still living.3 —μαρτυρεῖ] not futurum Atticum, but: he is, as the course of the matter necessarily involves, my witness. —καὶ πάντα πρεσβυτ.] and the whole body of the elders.4 —πρὸς τοὺς ἁδελφοῖς] i.e. to the Jews.5 Bornemann: against the Christians. Paul would in that case have entirely forgotten his pre-Christian standpoint, in the sense of which he speaks; and the hostile reference of πρὸς must have been suggested by the context, which, however, with the simple ἐπιστ. δεξάμ. πρὸς is not at all here the case. —καὶ τοὺς ἵκεις, i.e. εἰς Δαμασκόν, ὄντες] also those who were thither. Paul conceives them as having come thither, since the persecution about Stephen, and so being found there; hence ἵκει does not stand for ἵκει, so still de Wette, but is to be explained from a pregnant construction common especially with later writers.6

Vv. 6-11. See on ix. 8-8. Comp. xxvi. 18 ff. ἴκανον] i.e. of considerable strength. It was a light of glory7 dazzling him; more precisely described in xxvi. 12. —Ver. 10. ὁν τίττακαί σοι ποίησαι] what is appointed to thee to do; by whom, is left entirely undetermined. Jesus, who appeared to him, does not yet express Himself more precisely, but means: by God. ver. 14. —Ver. 11. ὡς δέ οἰκε ἐνβλέπων] but when I beheld not, when sight failed me; he could not open his eyes, ver. 13.8

Vv. 12-15. But Ananias, a religious man according to the law, attested9 by all the Jews resident in Damascus, thus a mediator, neither hostile to the law nor unknown! —ἀνβλέπων . . . ἐνβλέπην εἰς αὐτόν] ἀνβλέπων, which may signify as well to look up, as also visum recuperare,10 has here11 the former meaning, which is evident from εἰς αὐτόν: look up! and at the same hour I looked up to him. We are to conceive the apostle as sitting there blind with closed eyelids, and Ananias standing before him. —προεξιπ.] has appointed thee thereto.12 —τῶν δικαίων] Jesus, on whom, as the righteous,13

---

1 Comp. Rom. x. 2.
2 Comp. on δῶκε, ix. 2, xviii. 25, xix. 2, 23.
3 See on ix. 2.
5 See ix. 2.
6 Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 44; comp. ii. 39, xxl. 8.
7 Ver. 11.
8 Comp. on the absolute ἐνβλέπων, Xen. Mem. iii. 11. 10; 2 Chron. xx. 24.
9 Praised, comp. x. 22, vi. 8.
10 See on John ix. 11, and Fritzsch, ad Marc. p. 338.
11 It is otherwise in ix. 17, 18.
12 See on xli. 20; comp. xxvi. 16.
13 2 Cor. v. 21.
the divine will to save, τὸ θέλημα αἰτοῦ, was based. — πρὸς πάντα ἀνθρώ.]

Direction of the ἐγγ. μάρτ., as in xiii. 31: to all men. Ver. 16. Τι μέλεις; [Why tarriest thou? μέλεις so used only here in the N. T.; frequent in the classics. The question is not one of reproach, but of excitement and encouragement. — ἀπόλογωσι τὸς ἀμαρτ. σου] let thyself be baptized, and thereby wash away thy sins. Here, too, baptism is that by means of which the forgiveness of the sins committed in the pre-Christian life takes place. Calvin inserts saving clauses, in order not to allow the grace to be bound to the sacrament. As to the purposely-chosen middle forms, comp. on 1 Cor. x. 2. — ἐπικαλ. τὸ δύναμιν αἰτοῦ] Wolf appropriately explains: "postquam invocaveris atque ita professus fueris nomen Domini, as the Messiah. Id scilicet antecedere olim debebat initiationem per baptismum faciendum."

Vv. 17, 18. With this the history in ix. 26 is to be completed. — καὶ προσευχήματον μοι] a transition to the genitive absolute, independent of the case of the substantive. — ἐκστάσει] see on x. 10. The opposite: γίνεσθαι ἐν θανάτῳ, xin. 11. Regarding the non-identity of this ecstasy with 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ff., see in loc. — σὺ παράδειξα, σ. τ. μάρτρις, περὶ ἑμοῦ] περὶ ἑμοῦ is most naturally to be attached to τ. μάρτρις, as μαρτυρεῖν περὶ is quite usual, very often in John. Winer connects it with παράδειγμα. Observe the order: thy witness of me.

Vv. 19—21. "I interposed by way of objection the contrast, in which my working for Christianity, my μάρτυρια, would appear toward my former hostile working, which contrast could not but prove the truth and power of my conversion and promote the acceptance of my testimony, and — Christ repeated His injunction to depart, which He further specially confirmed by διὰ γιὰ τὸ ἐννέα μακρὰ ἦσαντος σε."

"Commemorat hoc Judaicus Paulus, ut eis declararet sumnum amorem, quod apud eos cupivit manere iisque praedicare; quod ergo ipsis relictis ad gentes ierit, non ex suo voto, sed Dei iussu compulsu fuisset," Calovius. — αὐτοὶ ἐπίστορ.) is necessarily to be referred to the subject of παραδείγματα, ver. 18, to the Jews in Jerusalem, not to the foreign Jews. — ἐκ ημῶν ν. τ. λ.] I was there, etc. — καὶ αὐτοῖς et ipsis, as well as other hostile persons. On συνεδρ. comp. viii. 1. — Ver.

1 Comp. ill. 14, xiv. 58.

2 That is, according to the popular expression: before all the world. Frequently so in Isocrates. See Bremi, ad Pau-evagr. 33, p. 58. But the universal destination of the apostle is implied therein. Comp. ver. 21.

3 Comp. the Homeric ἀδολουμεκανέοντα, Ἰ. l. 119 f., and Nägelsbach in loc. Comp. ill. 88; Eph. v. 30; and see on 1 Cor. vi. 11.

4 See Bernhardt, p. 474; Kühner, § 681; Stallb. ad Flat. Rep. p. 518 a.

5 p. 130 (E. T. 172).

6 Ewald, p. 428, understands ver. 19 f. not as an objection, but as asseverating: "however humanly intelligible it might strictly be, that the Jews would not hear him." But the extraordinary revelation in itself most naturally presupposes in Paul a human conception deviating from the intimation contained in it, to which the heavenly call runs counter, as often also with the prophets (Moses, Jeremiah, etc.), the divine intimation encounters human scruples. If, moreover, the words here were meant as asseverating, we should necessarily expect a hint of it in the expression (such as: ἐκ, εὔπρεπος).

7 In which I was engaged in bringing believers to prison (φυλακῖς, Wisd. xviii. 4), and in scourging them (Matt. x. 17), now in this synagogue, and now in that (καὶ ρᾶς ὑπερευκω. Comp. xxvi. 11.

8 Ver. 21.

9 Heinrichs.
21. ἵψαστε] with strong emphasis. Paul has to confide in and obey this I. — ἵψαστε by [i.e. εἰς ὑποῦεν] This promised future sending forth ensued at xiii. 2, and how effectively! see Rom. xv. 19. — εἰς ὑποῦεν] among Gentiles.

Vv. 22. Ἀχρι τοῦτον τοῦ λόγου] namely, ver. 21, εἰπε πρὸς μὲ παρεβοῦ, ὅτι εἰς ὑποῦεν ὅπως ἐξαποστελθήσεται. This expression inflamed the jealousy of the children of Abraham in their pride and contempt of the Gentiles, all the more that it appeared only to confirm the accusation in xxi. 28. It cannot therefore surprise us that the continuation of the speech was here rendered impossible, just as the speech of Stephen and that of Paul at the Areopagus was broken off on analogous occasions of offence, which Baur makes use of against its historical character. — οὔ γὰρ καθήκεν κ.τ.λ.] for it was not fit that he should remain in life; he ought not to have been protected in his life, when we designed to put him to death.¹

Ver. 23. They cast off their clothes, and hurled dust in the air, as a symbol of throwing stones,—both as the signal of a rage ready and eager personally to execute the alpe ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῶν τοιούτων! The objection of de Wette, that in fact Paul was in the power of the tribune, counts for nothing, as the gesture of the people was only a demonstration of their own vehement desire. Chrysostom took it, unsuitably as regards the sense and the words, of shaking out their garments—τὰ ἰμάτια ἐκτίσασθαι κοντὲρτον ἐμαυλοῦ ὡσε χαλεπωτέραν γενέσθαι τὴν στάσιν τούτο ποιοῦσιν, ἢ καὶ φοβῆσαι βουλήμενοι τὸν ἄρχοντα. Wetstein, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Hackett, and others explain it of waving their garments, by which means those at a distance signified their assent to the murderous exclamations of those standing near; and the throwing of the dust at all was only signum tumultus. But the text contains nothing of a distinction between those standing near and those at a distance, and hence this view arbitrarily mutilates and weakens the unity and life of the scene. The βιπτ. τ. ἰμάτιν is not to be explained from the waving of garments in Lucian;² but—in connection with the cry of extermination that had just gone before—from the laying aside of their garments with a view to the stoning,³ to which, as was well known, the Jews were much inclined.⁴

Ver. 24. It is unnecessarily assumed by Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and de Wette that the tribune did not understand the Hebrew address. But the tumult, only renewed and increased by it, appeared to him to presuppose some secret crime. He therefore orders the prisoner to be brought into the barracks, with the command εἰπας,⁵ to examine him by the application of scourging,⁶ in order to know on account of what offence they so shouted to him—to Paul.⁷—aireph] for the crying and shouting were a hostile reply to him, 22, 23.⁸ Bengel well remarks: "acclamare dicuntur auditores verba

¹ xxi. 31. Comp. Winer, p. 365 (E. T.) 352.
² De salut. 53 (but see the emendation of the passage in Bast, ad Aristotel. ed. Boisson.), Ovid, Amor. liv. 2. 74 (when it is a token of approbation, see Wetstein).
³ Ver. 23. vi. 58.
⁵ See Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 238 f. (E. T. as νευρασθέναι, Susannah 14, Judg. vi. 29, not preserved in Greek writers, who have ἵψασται-ζέονται.
⁶ xiii. 23, xxiii. 28, xxv. 18, xxviii. 18.
⁷ Comp. xxiii. 18.
⁸ On εἰπας τὸν, comp. Plat. Pomp. 4.
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facienti."—Moreover, it was contrary to the Roman criminal law for the
tribune to begin the investigation with a view to bring out a confession by
way of torture, not to mention that here it was not a slave who was to be
questioned. As in the case of Jesus, it was perhaps here also the content-
ment of the people that was intended. Comp. Chrysostom: ἀπὸς τῆς ἐξουσία
χράται (the tribunal), καὶ ἐκείνος πρὸς χάριν τουεί... ὡς πάσης τὸν ἐκείνων
συνών ἄνων ὄντα.

Vv. 25-27. Ὅτι δὲ προτείνειν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἰμάσι. But when they had stretched
him before the thongs. Those who were to be scourged were bound and
stretched on a stake. Thus they formed the object stretched out before the
thongs, the scourge consisting of thongs. Comp. Beza: "quum autem
eum distendisset loris, caedendum." The subject of προέτ. is those charged
with the execution of the punishment, the Roman soldiers. Following
Henry Stephanus, most expositors, among them Grotius, Homberg, Loesner,
Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, take προτείνειν as equivalent to προβάλλειν
(Zonaras: προτείνοντις ἀντὶ τοῦ προτειέσαι καὶ προβάλλονται; cum loris eum
vulturns s. tradidissent. But προτείνειν never means simply tradere, but
always to stretch before, to hold before, sometimes in the literal, sometimes in
a figurative sense. But here the context, treating of a scourging, quite
demands the entirely literal rendering. Others take τοῖς ἰμάσιν instrument-
ally, of the thongs with which the delinquent was either merely bound, or,
along with that, was placed in a suspended position. But in both
cases not only would τοῖς ἰμάσιν be a very unnecessary statement, but also
the προετ. would be without reference; and scourging in a sus-
pended position was not a usual, but an extraordinary and aggravated, mode
of treatment, which would therefore necessarily have been here definitely
noted. —ri ἄνθ. Ἐρω. κ. ἀκατάκρ. κ.τ.λ.] See on xvi. 37. The problematical
form of interrogation: whether, etc., has here a dash of irony, from the
sense of right so roughly wounded. The καί is: in addition thereto. Δῶ
τὰ ἐγκλήματα· καὶ τὸ ἄνων λόγου καὶ τὸ Ῥωμαίων ὄντα, Chrysostom. On the non-
use of the right of citizenship at Philippi, see on xvi. 23. —Ver. 27. Thou
art a Roman? A question of surprise, with the emphatic contemptuous
σὺ (v 2).

Vv. 28, 29. Ἐγὼ πολλῶν κεφαλ. κ.τ.λ.] The tribunal, to whom it was known
that a native of Tarsus had not, as such, the right of citizenship, thinks
that Paul must probably have come to it by purchase, and yet for this the
arrested Cilician appears to him too poor. With the sale of citizenship, it
was sought at that time—by an often ridiculed abuse—to fill the imperial

1 Com. xli. 22. Luke xviii. 21; 3 Macc. 6. 19
3 L. 6. ibid.
4 John xix. 1.
5 Comp. bubali coddab. Plant. Trin. iv. 3. 4.
6 On ἰμάσι of the leather whip, comp. already Hom. L. xxiii. 388; Anthol. vi. 194;
Artemidor. ii. 53.
7 For example, of the holding forth or offering of conditions, of a gain, of money, of the
hand, of friendship, of a hope, of an enjoyment, and the like, also of pretexts. See
Bornemann, Schol. in Lec. p. 181 f.; Valck-
enser, ad Callim. fragm. p. 204. [loris."
8 Comp. Vulg.: "cum adstrinisset eum
9 Erasmus, Castalo, Calvin, de Dieu, Ham-
mond, Bengel, Michaelis, also Luther.
11 Comp. on l. 5.
12 Dio Cass. ix. 17.
chest. But I am even so (kai) born, namely, as "Romaios, so that my politeia, as hereditary, is even genestisera! a bold answer, which did not fail to make its impression. — kai o xil. de epoβ. and the tribune also was afraid. On kai . . . de, atque etiam, see on John vi. 51. "Facinus est, vinciri civem Romanum; scelus, verberari; prope parricidium necari." And the binding had taken place with arbitrary violence before any examination. It is otherwise xxiv. 27, xxvi. 29. See on these two passages. Therefore deekos, which evidently points to xxi. 33, is not to be referred, with Böttger 4 to the binding with a view to scourging, on account of ver. 30; nor, with de Wette, is the statement of the fear of the tribune to be traced back to an error of the reporter, or at all to be removed by conjectural emendation. 6 And that Paul was still bound after the hearing, 7 was precisely after the hearing and after the occurrences in it in due order. — kai de] dependent on epoβ. : and because he was in the position of having bound him.

Ver. 30. To τι κατηγ. παρά τ. 'Ιουδ.] is an epexegetical definition of το ἀσφαλείς. The article, as in iv. 21. The τι is nominative. 8 — ελυσεν αἰτόν] Lysias did not immediately, when he learned the citizenship of Paul, order him to be loosened, but only on the following day, when he placed him before the chief priests and in general the whole Sanhedrin. 9 This was quite the proceeding of a haughty consistency, according to which the Roman, notwithstanding the epoβίδη, could not prevail upon himself to expose his mistake by an immediate release of the Jew. Enough, that he ordered them to refrain from the scourging not yet begun; the binding had at once taken place, and so he left him bound until the next day, when the publicity of the further proceedings no longer permitted it. Kuinoel's view, that ελυσεν refers to the releasing from the custodia militaris, in which the tribune had commanded the apostle to be placed, bound with a chain to a soldier, after the assurance that he was a Roman citizen, is an arbitrary idea forced on the text, as ελυσεν necessarily points back to deekos, ver. 28, and this to xxi. 33. — καταγαγόν] from the castle of Antonia down to the council-room of the Sanhedrin. 10 Comp. xxiii. 10.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(οuos) Paul's defence. V. 1.

In this speech to the multitude, the apostle gives a skilfully arranged account of his past experience and conduct with the view of allaying the fanati-

1 Comp. Wetstein and Jacobs, ad Del. Epigr. p. 177.—See examples of κεφάλαιον. capital, sum of money,—as to the use of which in ancient Greek (Plat. Legg. v. p. 742 C) Beza was mistaken—in Kypke II. p. 116.

2 Cic. Ferr. v. 66. Comp. on xvi. 37.

3 During imprisonment preparatory to trial binding was legally admissible, so far as it was connected with the custodia militaris.

4 Beitr. II. p. 6.

5 Rinck: δεδέραστος.

6 xxiii. 18.

7 See Böttger, l.c.; Wieseler, p. 377.


10 See also Wieseler, Beitr. 2. Würdlg. d. Ev. p. 211.
cal excitement of many of the Jews, and of replying to their unfounded accusations against him. He avows himself to be a Jew, both by birth and training; refers to his former fierce persecutions of the Christians; gives an account of his wonderful and memorable conversion; explains how he was baptized and admitted into the fellowship of the disciples by a pious Jew, and refers to his labors among the Gentiles. Throughout the address, he depreciates himself, exalts Christ, and makes conversion to him an epoch in a man's life. It is interesting to note how the addresses delivered by Paul on this occasion, and when brought before Agrippa, differ from each other, and from the narrative given by Luke, and yet how they harmonize in all material points. The discrepancies in the several statements present no serious difficulties to any, except those who seek to find and multiply contradictions in Scripture. A careful consideration of the object which the apostle had in view in each of his addresses will furnish a natural explanation of the various changes in the narrative of the events. In the ninth chapter we have a historical outline of the main facts of the case, and in his speeches, the apostle, drawing upon his own distinct recollection of the facts, gives prominence to such aspects of the event as were best adapted to the emergency of the occasion. Howson remarks: "If indeed there were, in these instances"—the accounts of the conversion of Cornelius and of Paul—"mere reiteration in the speeches of Peter and Paul of narratives previously given, we should have no ground for casting any imputation on the authority of the Acts of the Apostles. But, in fact, there is much more than reiteration. The same story is told more than once, but so retold as to have in the retelling a distinct relation to the speaker and the audience." It is observable that in speaking to the Jews from the stairs of the castle, Paul not only uses the Hebrew dialect, but gives a Jewish coloring to the entire narrative; while, when addressing Agrippa and his associates in the royal hall, in keeping with the place and the parties, he gives the story a strong Gentile coloring, speaking of the hostility of the Jews, and of the persecuted Christians as saints.

(\$) Art thou a Roman? V. 27.

When the apostle in his address referred to his being sent to the Gentiles, the national pride of the Jews was wounded, and their intense bigotry aroused. With a wild and cruel fanaticism, they shouted, "Away with him, away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live." "Thus began one of the most odious and despicable spectacles which the world can witness, the spectacle of an Oriental mob, hideous with impotent rage, howling, yelling, cursing, gnashing their teeth, flinging about their arms, waving and tossing their blue and red robes, casting dust into the air by handfuls, with all the furious gesticulations of an uncontrolled fanaticism." Paul was rescued from the maddened mob by Lysias, the chief captain, who, however, ordered him to be examined under the scourge. When bound and ready for the torture, Paul quietly asked whether it were lawful to scourge a Roman citizen. The centurion, to whom this question was addressed, hastened to inform and warn the commandant, who came immediately to Paul, and said to him, "Art thou a Roman?" as if the fact were almost incredible, and added, "The privilege of citizenship cost me much." To this Paul, with great dignity replied, "I
have been a citizen from my birth." By the Lex Porcia, Roman citizens were exempted from all degrading punishment, such as that of scourging. The words, *civis Romanus sum*, acted like a magical charm in disarming the violence of provincial magistrates. It was the heaviest of all the charges brought by Cicero against Verres, that he had violated the rights of citizenship. "Facinus est vincere civem Romanum, scelus verberare, proper parricidium necare; quid dicam in crucem tollere?"—It is a crime to bind a Roman citizen; a heinous iniquity to scourge him; next to parricide to kill him; what shall I say to crucify him?—and further, "Whoever he might be whom you were hurry\-ing to the cross, were he even unknown to you, if he but said he was a Roman citizen, he would necessarily obtain from you, the pretor, by the simplest mention of Rome, if not an escape, yet at least a delay of his punishment." According to the Roman law, it was death for any one falsely to assert a claim to the immunities of citizenship, one of which was exemption from the lash. "*Lex porcia virgas ab omnium civium Romanorum corpore amovit*"—The Porcian law removes the rod from the bodies of all Roman citizens. The claim of Paul was acknowledged. It is probable that in return for some important service rendered, or sum of money paid, Paul's father or grandfather had obtained this distinction, hence Paul received it by inheritance.
CHAPTER XXIII.

VER. 6. ιδίς Φαρσαίων] approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to A B C διήλ., min. Syr. Vulg. Tert. But Elz. and Scholz have ιδίς Φαρσαίων. The sing. was inserted, because people thought only of the relation of the son to the father. — VER. 7. λαλήσαντος] Lachm. reads εἰπόντος, only according to A E διήλ., min. — τῶν Σααδ.] The article is to be deleted with Lachm. Tisch. Born. on preponderating evidence. — VER. 9. οἱ γραμματεῖς τού μέρους τῶν Φαρίσ.] A E διήλ., min. Copt. Vulg. have τινὲς τῶν Φαρίσ.; so Lachm. But B C διήλ., min. vss. and Fathers have τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρ. τὸν Φαρίσ.; so Born. Lastly, G H, min. Aeth. Occ. have γραμματεῖς τοῦ μέρ. τὸν Φαρίσ.; so Tisch. At all events, τινὲς is thus so strongly attested that it must be regarded as genuine. It was very easily passed over after ἀναστάντες. But with τινὲς the genitive τῶν γραμμάτων κ.τ.λ. originally went together, so that the omission of τινὲς drew after it the conversion of τῶν γραμμάτων into γραμματεῖς (Tisch.) and οἱ γραμματεῖς (Elz.). The reading of Lachm. is an abbreviation, either accidental (from homeoteleuton) or intentional (from the deletion of the intervening words superfluous in themselves). We have accordingly, with Born., to read: τινὲς τῶν γραμμάτων τοῦ μέρ. τῶν Φαρίσ.— After ἀγγέλος Elz. has, against greatly preponderating testimony, μὴ θεορήσωμεν, which was already rejected by Erasm. and Mill as an addition from v. 39, and following Griesb., by all the more recent editors (except Reiche, l.c. p. 28). — VER. 10. εὐλαβήσεσι] Preponderant witnesses have indeed φοβθεῖσι, which Griesb. has recommended and Lachm. adopted; but how easily was the quite familiar word very early substituted for εὐλαβεῖ, which does not elsewhere occur in that sense in the N. T. ! — VER. 11. After βαπτισμός Elz. has Πατρίς, in opposition to A B C διήλ., min. vss. Theophyl. Oec. Cassiod. Ambrosiast. An addition for the sake of completeness. VER. 12. συντροφῆν ό Ἠσαΐας] Elz. Rinck read τινὲς τῶν Ἠσαίαν συντρ., in opposition to A B C διήλ., min. Copt. Syr. p. Aeth. Arm Chrys. Occasioned by ver. 13. — VER. 13. πανταραμόνοι is to be read instead of πεποιηκότες, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., on decisive testimony. — VER. 15. After δῆς Elz. has αὐθο. An addition from ver. 20, against decisive evidence. — πρὸς ψῶς] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read εἰς ψῶς, following A B C διήλ., loth Sahid. Rightly; πρὸς is the more usual. — VER. 16. τὴν ἐνθρόνον] B G H, min. Chrys. Theophyl. Oec. have τὸ ἐνθρόνον, which Griesb. and Rinck have recommended, and Tisch. and Born. (not Lachm.) have adopted. But the preponderance of the Codex, is in favour of τὴν ἐνθρόνον. The neuter was known to the transcribers from the LXX., therefore the two forms might easily be interchanged. — VER. 20. μέλλοντες] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read μέλλων, after A B C διήλ., min. Copt. Aeth. The very weakly attested Recepta is from ver. 15. διήλ. has μέλλων, διήλ. μέλλοντων. — VER. 25. περιέχοντας] Lachm. Born. read ἰχθύσαν, according to B E διήλ., min. Neglect of the (not essential) compound. — VER. 27. αὐθο.] is wanting in A B C διήλ., min. Chrys. Oec. Deleted by Lachm. and Born. But how easily was the quite unessential word passed over! — VER. 30. μέλλειν ἐσοθαὶ] Lachm. Born. have only ἐσοθαὶ, according to
A B E Ν, min. But the future infinitive made μελέειν appear as superfluous; there existed no reason for its being added. — After ἑστάθαι Elz. Scholz have ὑπὸ τὸν 'Ιωάννα, which is deleted according to preponderant evidence as a supplementary addition. Instead of it, Lachm and Born. have ἐκ αὐτῶν (with the omission of ἐξαιτίας), following A E Ν, min. var. But ἐκ αὐτῶν is also to be regarded as a marginal supplement (as the originators of the ἐπισκοπή are not mentioned), which therefore displaced the original ἐξαιτίας. — The conclusion of the letter ἐφρωσο is wanting in A B 13, Copt. Aeth. Sahid. Vulg. ms. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born.; and rightly, as it is evidently an addition from xv. 29, from which passage H, min. have even ἐφρωσε. — Ver. 34. After ἄγαν. δὲ Elz. has ὁ ἡγεμὼν, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 35. ἐκείσαστε τῇ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read κελεύας, after A B E Ν** (Ν* has κελεύαντος) min. Syr. p. The Recepta is a stylistic emendation.

Vv. 1, 2. Paul, with the free and firm look, ἀτενίσας τῷ συνεδρ., in which his good conscience is reflected, commences an address in his own defence to the Sanhedrim, and that in such a way as—without any special testimony of respect¹ for the sacred court, and with perfect freedom of apostolic self-reliance, which is recognisable in the simple ἀνάφες ἀδελφι— to appeal first of all to the pure self-consciousness of his working as consecrated to God. The proud and brutal¹ high priest sees in this nothing but insolent presumption, and makes him be stopped by a blow on the mouth from the continuance of such discourse. — πάση συνεδρ. ἁγ. ] with every good conscience, so that in every case I had a good conscience, i.e agreeing with the divine will.² — In the ἑγὼ, at the commencement is implied a moral self-consciousness of rectitude. — πεποιθείς τῷ θεῷ I have administered—and still administer, perfect—mine office for God, in the service of God; dative of destination. He thus designates his apostolic office in its relation to the divine polity of the church.³ — ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνανίας] Ver. 4 proves that this was the high priest actually discharging the duties of the office at the time. He was the son of Nebadæus⁴ the successor of Joseph the son of Camydus,⁵ and the predecessor of Ishmael the son of Phabi.⁶ He had been sent to Rome by Quadratus, the predecessor of Felix, to answer for himself before the Emperor Claudius;¹⁰ he must not, however, have thereby lost his office, but must have continued in it after his return.¹¹ As ver. 4 permits for δ ἀρχιερ. only the strict signification of the high priest performing the duties, and not that of one of the plurality of ἀρχιερεῖς,¹² and as the deposition of Ananias is a mere supposition, the opinion defended since the time of Lightfoot,¹³ by several more recent expositors, particularly Michaelis, Eichhorn, Kuinoel, Hildebrand, Hemsen, is to be rejected,—namely, that Ananias, deposed from the time of his suit at Rome, had at this time only

¹ Comp. iv. 8, vili. 2.  
³ 1 Tim. 1. 5, 19; 1 Pet. iii. 16. Comp. on  
⁴ Rom. i. 9.  
⁵ See on Phil. 1. 27.  
⁶ See Krebs, Obs. Flav. p. 244 ff.  
⁷ Joseph. Antt. xx. 5. 2.  
⁸ Antt. xx. 1. 8, 5. 2.  
⁹ Antt. xx. 8. 8, 11.  
¹¹ See Anger, de temp. jud. p. 98 ff.  
temporarily administered (usurped) the office during an interregnum which took place between his successor Jonathan and the latter’s successor Ishmael. Against this view it is specially to be borne in mind, that the successor of Ananias was Ishmael, and not Jonathan, who had been at an earlier period high priest; for in the alleged probative passages, where the murder of the ἀρχιερεύς Jonathan is recorded, this ἀρχιερ., is to be taken in the well-known wider titular sense. Lastly, Basnage quite arbitrarily holds that at this time Ishmael was already high priest, but was absent from the hastily (?) assembled Sanhedrim, and therefore was represented by the highly respected Ananias. — τοίς παρεστ. αἰτὼν] to those who, as officers in attendance on the court, stood beside him, Luke xix. 24. — τυπτ. αἰτῶν τῷ στρ. 1) to smite him on the mouth. 1

Ver. 3. The words contain truth freely expressed in righteous apostolic indignation, and require no excuse, but carry in themselves (καὶ σὺ κάθη κ.τ.λ.) their own justification. Yet here, in comparison with the calm meekness and self-renunciation of Jesus, the ebullition of a vehement temperament is not to be mistaken. — τύπτειν σε μέλλεις ὁ Θεός is not to be understood as an imprecation, but—for which the categorical μέλλεις is decisive—as a prophetic announcement of future certain retribution; although it would be arbitrary withal to assume that Paul must have been precisely aware of the destruction of Ananias as it afterwards in point of fact occurred—he was murdered in the Jewish war by sicarii. — τοῖς κεκο.] figurative designation of the hypocrite, inasmuch as he, with his concealed wickedness, resembles a wall beautifully whitened without, but composed of rotten materials within. — κρίνων] comprises the official capacity, in which the high priest sits there; hence it is not, with Kuinoel, to be taken in a future sense, nor, with Henry Stephanus, Pricaus, and Valckenae, to be accented κρίνων. The classical παρανοεῖν, to act contrary to the law, is not elsewhere found in the N. T.

Ver. 4, 5. Παρεστ.αγέτες] as in ver. 2. — τὸν ἀρχιερ. τ. Θεοῦ] the holy man, who is God’s organ and minister. — οὐκ ἦδειν κ.τ.λ.] I know not that he is high priest. It is absolutely incredible that Paul was really ignorant of this, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Lyra, Beza, Clarinus, Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Delying, Wolf, Michaelis, Sepp, and others assume under vari-

3 Joseph. Antt. xviii. 4. 3. 5. 3.
4 Antt. xx. 8. 5. Bell. ii. 13. 3.
5 Ad an. 56. § 54.
6 Antt. xxx. 9. 2.
7 Comp. as to the αἰτῶν placed first, on John ix. 15. xii. 26. 46.
8 John xviii. 22; comp. Matt. v. 29.
9 Camerarius, Bolten, Kuinoel. Observe the prefixing of the τυπτ.εῖν, which returns the blow just received in a higher sense on the high priest. That the command of the high priest was not executed (Baumgarten, Trnp), is an entirely arbitrary assumption. Luke would have mentioned it, because otherwise the reader could not but understand the execution as having ensued.
10 Joseph. Bell. ii. 17. 9.
12 Rejecting the ironical view, Chrysostom says: καὶ σφόδρα τείχομαι, μὴ εἰδέναι αἰτῶν, ὅτι ἀρχιερεύς ἦτε: διὰ μακροῦ μὲν ἐπανελθόντα χρόνον, μὴ συγγενέςκας καὶ συνοίκου ἱερατεύς, δρόμον δὲ καὶ ἔκκλησι ἐν τῷ μέσῳ μετὰ καλλίων καὶ ἔτερων. [Trip.]
13 Comp. also Ewald, Holtzmann, p. 284.
ous modifications. For, although after so long an absence from Jerusalem he might not have known the person of the high priest—whose office at that time frequently changed its occupants—by sight, yet he was much too familiar with the arrangements of the Sanhedrin not to have known the high priest by his very activity in directing it, by his seat, by his official dress, etc. The contrary would be only credible in the event of Ananias not having been the real high priest, or of a vacancy in the office having at that time taken place, or of such a vacancy having been erroneously assumed by the apostle, or of the sitting having been an irregular one, not at least superintended by the high priest, and perhaps not held in the usual council-chamber,—which, however, after xxii. 30, is the less to be assumed, seeing that the assembly, expressly commanded by the tribune, and at which he himself was present, was certainly opened in proper form, and was only afterwards thrown into confusion by the further sanguacious conduct of the apostle, ver. 6 ff. Entirely in keeping, on the other hand, with the irritated frame of Paul, is the ironical mode of taking it, according to which he bitterly enough—and ἄρχεσθαι makes the irony only the more sharp—veils in these words the thought: "a man, who shows himself so unholy and vulgar, I could not at all regard as the high priest." Comp. Erasmus. What an appropriate and cutting defence against the reproach, ver. 4! It implies that he was obliged to regard an ἄρχεσθαι, who had acted so unworthily, as an ὁ λόγος ἄρχεσθαι. Others, against linguistic usage, have endeavoured to alter the meaning of ὁ λόγος ἄρχεσθαι, either: non agnosco, so, with various suggestions, Cyprian, Augustine, Beda, Piscator, Lightfoot, Keuchen, and others, or non reputabam, so Simon Episcopius, Limborch, Wetstein, Bengel, Morus, Stolz, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others, also Neander, so that Paul would thus confess that his conduct was rash. This confession would be a foolish one, inconsistent with the strong and clear mind of the apostle in a critical situation, and simply compromising him. Baumgarten has the correct view, but will not admit the irony. But this must be admitted, as Paul does not say ὁ λόγος ἄρχεσθαι, or the like; and there exists a holy irony. Lange imports ideas into the passage, and twists it thus: "Just because it is written, Thou shalt not curse the ruler of thy people, and ye have cursed the high priest of our people, Christ, for that reason I knew not that this is a high priest." Zeller understands the words, left by de Wette without definite explanation, as an actual untruth, which, however, is only put into the mouth of the apostle by the narrator. But such a fiction, which, according to the

---

1 But see on ver. 2.
2 This hypothesis cannot be accepted, as Paul had already been for so many days in Jerusalem; therefore the interpretation of Beelen: "Je ne savais pas, qu'il y est un souverain Pontife," is a very unfortunate expedient. ἀρχεσθαι did not require the article any more than in John xviii. 13, xi. 69, 81.
3 Ver. 10.
4 τινς already in Chrysostom, further, Calvin, Camerarius, Lorinus in Calovius, Marnixius, in Wolf, Thiese, Heinrici; comp. also Grosius.
5 Baur also, I. 287, ed. 2, recognises the admissibility of no other view than the ironical; but even thus he sees in it an element of the unworthiness of the (flaccitous) story.
6 2 Mac. iv. 18.
7 Comp. on vii. 18.
naked meaning of the words, would have put a lie into the mouth of the holy apostle, is least of all to be imputed to a maker of history. The exceptionableness of the expression helps to warrant the certainty of its originality. — γέραπτας γάρ] gives the reason of our oик γεῖν. In consequence, namely, of the scriptural prohibition quoted, Paul would not have spoken οικως against the high priest, had not the case of the oик γεῖν occurred, by the conduct of the man. The passage itself is Ex. xxii. 28, closely after the LXX: a ruler of thy people thou shalt not revile = κακολογεῖν, xix. 9. The opposite: εὖ εἰσείν, to praise, εὖ λέγειν. The senarian metre in our passage is accidental (w').

VV. 6, 7. Whether the irony of ver. 5 was understood by the Sanhedrists or not, Paul at all events now knew that here a plain and straightforward defence, such as he had begun, was quite out of place. With great presence of mind and prudence he forthwith resorts to a means—all the more effectual in the excited state of their minds— of bringing the two parties, well known to him in the council, into collision with one another, and thereby for the time disposing the more numerous party, that of the Pharisees, in favour of his person and cause. He did not certainly, from his knowledge of Pharisaism and from his previous experiences, conceive to himself the possibility of an actual "internal crisis" among the Pharisees; but by the enlisting of their sectarian interests, and preventing their co-operation with the Sadducees, much was gained in the present position of affairs, especially in presence of the tribunal, for Paul and his work. — εὖ τῷ συνεδρ. so that he thus did not direct this exclamation (εἰκαζεῖν) to any definite individuals. — εὖ Φαρισα. εἰμι, ἴδις Φαρισα. i.e. I for my part am a Pharisee, a born Pharisee. The plural Φαρισαίων refers to his male ancestors, father, grandfather, and perhaps still further back, not, as Grotius thinks, to his father and mother, as the mother here, where the sect was concerned, could not be taken into account. We may add, that Paul's still affirming of himself the Φαρισαίον εἶναι is as little untrue as Phil. iii. 5, in opposition to Zeller. He designates himself as a Jew, who, as such, belonged to no other than the religious society of the Pharisees; and particularly in the doctrine of the resurrection, Paul, as a Christian, continued to defend the confession of the Pharisees, in opposition to all Sadduceeism, according to its truth confirmed in the case of Christ Himself. His contending against the legal righteousness, hypocrisy, etc., of the Pharisees, and his consequent labouring in an anti-Pharisaical sense, were directed not against the sect in itself, but against its moral and other perversions. Designated a Jew, Paul still remained what he was from his birth, a Pharisee, and as such an orthodox Jew, in contrast to Sadducean naturalism. — περὶ ἡλ. καὶ ἀνασ. εκρ. εὖ κριν.] on account of hope, etc.; hope and—and indeed, as regards its object— resurrection of the dead it is, on account of which I (εὖ has the emphasis of the aroused consciousness of unjust treatment) am called in question.
As the accusations contained in xxi. 28, ὠτὸς . . . διδάσκαλον, were nothing else than hateful perversions of the proposition: "This man preaches a new religion, which is to come in place of the Mosaic in its subsisting form;" and as in this new religion, in point of fact, everything according to its highest aim culminated in the hope of the Messianic salvation, which will be realized by the resurrection of the dead: so it follows that Paul has put the cause of the κρίνων in the form most suited to the critical condition of the moment, without altering the substance of the matter as it stood objectively.—στάσις τῶν Φαρισ. καὶ Σαδδ.] without repetition of τῶν (see the critical remarks): the Pharisees and Sadducees, the two parties conceived of together as the corporation of the Sanhedrin, became at variance, and the multitude of those assembled — was divided (x).

Ver. 8. For the Sadducees, indeed, maintained, etc. — μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεύμα] not even angel or spirit, generally. The μήτε πνεύμα is logically subordinate to the μήτε ἄγγελον, inasmuch as πνεύμα is conceived as being homogeneous with ἄγγελον; for τὰ ἀμφότερα divides the objects named into two classes, namely (1) ἀνάστασις, and (2) ἄγγελος and πνεύμα. Hence μήτε before ἄγγελον is to be defended, and not, in opposition to Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 158, and Lachmann, to be changed into μήτε. In the certainly very important codd. which have μήτε, this is to be viewed as a grammatical correction, originating from the very old error, which already Chrysostom has and Kuinoel still assumes: ἀμφότερον . . . καὶ περὶ τριῶν λαμβάνεται. — The Sadducees denied — as materialists, perhaps holding the theory of emanations — that there were angels and spirit-beings, i.e. independent spiritual realities besides God. To this category of πνεύμα, denied by them, belonged also the spirits of the departed; for they held the soul to be a refined matter, which perished (συναφικὰ) with the body. But it is arbitrary, with Bengel, Kuinoel, and many others, to understand under πνεύμα anima defuncti exclusively. Reuss has a view running directly counter to the clear sense of the narrative.

Ver. 9. The designed stirring up of party-feeling proved so successful,
CONSPIRACY TO SLAY PAUL. 431

that some scribes,¹ who belonged to the Pharisaic half of the Sanhedrin, rose up and not only maintained the innocence of Paul against the other party, but also, with bitter offensiveness towards the latter, added the question: But if a spirit has spoken to him, or an angel? The question is an apostrophen,² indicating the critical position of the matter in the case supposed, without expressing it, quid vero, si, etc. We may imagine the words uttered with a Jesuitically-treacherous look and gesture toward the Sadducees, to whom the speakers leave the task of supplying in thought an answer to this dubious question. — πνεύμα] is not, with Calovius and others, to be taken of the Holy Spirit, but without more precise definition as: a spirit, quite as in ver. 8, where Luke by his gloss prepares us for ver. 9. — έλαλησεν] giving him revelation concerning the ἐξίς and ἀνάστασις, ver. 6. A reference precisely to the narrative, which Paul had given of his conversion at xxii. 6 ff., is not indicated.

Ver. 10. Μία διάκονος] that he might be torn in pieces.³ The tribune saw the two parties so inflamed, that he feared lest they on both sides should seize on Paul—the one to maltreat him, and the other to take him into their protection against their opponents—and thus he might at length even be torn in pieces, as a sacrifice to their mutual fury! — ἐξήκ. τὸ στράτ. καταβ. κ.τ.λ.] he ordered the soldiery to come down from the Antonia, and to draw him away from the midst of them. The reading καταβηγναι καὶ is a correct resolution of the participial construction.⁴

Vv. 11–14. Whether the appearance of Christ encouraging Paul to further stedfastness was a vision in a dream, or a vision in a waking state, perhaps in an ecstasy, cannot be determined, in opposition to Olshausen, who holds the latter as decided (x). — εἰς Ἰερουσ. and εἰς Ῥώμ.] The preacher coming from without preaches into the city.⁵ Observe also, that Jerusalem and Rome are the capitals of the world, of the East and West. But a further advance, into Spain, were it otherwise demonstrable, would not be excluded by the intimation in this passage, since it fixes no terminus ad quem.⁶ — Ver. 12. αὐτορευθη] a combination,⁷ afterwards still more precisely described by αὐτομοιοια, a conspiracy. That the conspirators were zealots and sicarii, perhaps instigated by Ananias himself, concerning whom, however, it is not demonstrable that he was himself a Sadducee, as Kuinoel thinks, is not to be maintained. Certainly those Asiatics in xxi. 27 were concerned in it. — οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι] the Jews, as the opposition. This general statement is afterwards more precisely limited, ver. 13. — ἀνεβηκ. ἐστιν Χριστοῦ] the Jesus, as the opposition.

¹ "Os partis susae," Bengal.
² Comp. on John vi. 63 ; Rom. ix. 29.
³ Comp. Symm., 1 Sam. xv. 33 ; Herod. iii. 18 ; Dem. 136. 15 ; Lucian, Asis. 33.
⁴ See Hermann, ad Viger. p. 774.
⁵ See on xvi. 9.
⁶ Comp. Mark xiv. 9. See on Mark i. 39, also on ix. 28, xxvi. 20.
⁷ In opposition to Otto, Pastorulor. p. 171.
⁸ xix 40 ; 1 Macc. xiv. 44 ; Polyb. iv. 34. 6.
they cursed themselves, pronounced on themselves, in the event of transgression, the δικαίωμα, the curse of divine wrath and divine rejection, declaring that they would neither eat nor drink¹ until, etc. See on similar self-imprecations, which, in the event of the matter being frustrated, without the person's own fault, could be removed by the Rabbins, Lightfoot in loc., Selden.² — ἐνεχθῆς with the subjunctive, because the matter is contemplated directly, and without ἦν.³ — Ver. 14. τοῖς ἀρχ. κ. τ. προεβάλ. That they applied to the Sadducean Sanhedrists, is evident of itself from what goes before. — ἀνεφέσται. ἀναθέματον.] Winer, p. 484 (Ε. Τ. 584).

Ver. 15. Υμεῖς answering to the subsequent ἡμεῖς δὲ. Thus they arrange the parts they were to play. — σὺν τῷ συνδικῷ non vos soli, sed una cum collegis vestris, of whom doubtless the Pharisees were not to be allowed to know the murderous plot, quo major significatio sit auctoritas, Grotius. — ὑπὸς αὐτῶν κ. τ. λ. design of the ἐμφανισατε τ. χιλ. From this also it follows what they were to notify, namely, that they wished the business of Paul to be more exactly taken cognisance of in the Sanhedrin than had already been done.⁴ — τοῦ ἀνελ. αὐτ. The design of ἐπομοί ἐσμέν.⁵ — πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίασαι αὐτ.] so that you shall have nothing at all to do with him.

Vv. 16–20. Whether the nephew of Paul was resident in Jerusalem; whether, possibly, the whole family may have already, in the youth of the apostle, been transferred to Jerusalem, as Ewald conjectures, cannot be determined (τοῦ). — παραγεν.] belongs to the vivid minuteness with which the whole history is set forth. — Ver. 18. The centurion on military duty, without taking further part in the matter, simply fulfils what Paul has asked. — δὲ διότι Παύλος he is now, as a Roman citizen, to be conceived in custodia militaris.⁶ — Ver. 19. ἐπέλαβεν ὅτι τις χειρ.] "ut fiduciam adolescentis confirmaret," Bengel. — ἀναχωρ. καὶ ιδιαὶ in order to hold a private conversation with him, he withdrew, with him, without the addition of a third person, perhaps to a special audience-chamber.⁷ — Ver. 20. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.] have made an agreement to request thee.⁸ — ὡς μὴ οὖσα] i.e. under the pretense, as if they would.⁹

Vv. 21, 22. And now¹⁰ they are in readiness to put into execution the ἀνελείμα αὐτοῦ,¹¹ expecting that on thy part the promise, to have Paul brought on the morrow to the Sanhedrin, will take place. — ἐπιγρ. is neither justum¹² nor nuntius,¹³ but, according to its constant meaning in the N. T., promissio. — ἐκκλησία.] he commanded to tell it, to divulge it, to no one.¹⁴ — ἐπιφ. πρὸς μέ] Oratio variata. See on i. 4.

Ver. 23. Διὸ τοῦτο] some two; see on xix. 14.¹⁵ It leaves the exact num-
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¹ See Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec. 1159. It is otherwise in ver. 15: in the opinion, as, etc.
² See Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 499; Winer, p. 279 (Ε. Τ. 371.)
³ Comp. xxiv. 29.
⁴ 9 Chron. vi. 3; Ezek. xxx. 11; 1 Macc. iii. 58, v. 29, xiii. 37. Comp. also ver. 20.
⁵ Comp. on xxii. 30. See on xxiv. 37.
⁷ Comp. on John ix. 28.
⁸ See Pfugk, ad Eur. Hec. 1159. It is otherwise in ver. 15: in the opinion, as, etc.
⁹ 9 Ew. see Hartung, Partikel. I. p. 185.
¹⁰ Comp. ver. 15.
¹¹ Münthe, Rosenmüller.
¹² Beza, Camerarius, Grotius, Alberti, Wolf; Henry Stephanus even conjectured ἀσέβεια.
¹³ Comp. Dem. 884. 23; Judith viii. 9; not elsewhere in N. T. (vul. 19.
¹⁴ Comp. Thuc. viii. 100. 5: τοῦτο δὲ. Luke
ber in uncertainty. So considerable a force was ordered, in order to secure again any possible contingency of a further attempt. — στρατιώτας is, on account of the succeeding ἵππες, to be understood of the usual Roman infantry. milites gravis armaturae, distinguished also from the peculiar kind of light infantry afterwards mentioned as δεξιολάβοι. — δεξιολάβους a word entirely strange to ancient Greek, perhaps at that time only current colloquially, and not finding its way into the written language. It first occurs in Theophylactus Simocatta, and then again in the tenth century. At all events, it must denote some kind of force under the command of the tribune, and that a light-armed infantry, as the δεξιολ, are distinguished both from the cavalry and from the στρατιώτας. That they were infantry, their great number also proves. It is safest to regard them as a peculiar kind of the light troops called rorarii or velites, and that either as jaculares, javelin-throwers, or funditores, slingers, for in Constant. Porphyry, they are expressly distinguished from the sagittarii, or bowmen, and from the targetees, the peltastae, or cetrales. Detailed grounds are wanting for a more definite decision. The name δεξιολ, those who grasp with the right hand, is very naturally explained from their kind of weapon, which was restricted in its use to the right hand, it was otherwise with the heavy-armed troops, and also with the bowmen and peltastae. This word has frequently been explained halberdiers, life guardsmen, who protect the right side of the commander, to which, perhaps, the translation of the Vulgate: lancearios, from the spear which the halberdiers carried, is to be referred. Already the Coptic and Syriac p. translate stipatares. Meursius, on the other hand: military lictors. But even apart from the passages of Theophyl. Simocatta, and Constant. Porphyry, of whom the latter particularly mentions the δεξιολ, alongside of the purely light-armed soldiers, and indeed alongside of mere ordinary soldiers: the great number of them is decisive against both views. For that the commander of a cohort should have had a body-guard, of which he could furnish two hundred men for the escort of a prisoner, is just as improbable, as that he should have had as many lictors at his disposal. On the whole, then, the reading δεξιοβῆλον in A, approved by Grotius and Valckenaer, is to be considered as a correct

1 Krüger, § 11, 16. 4.
2 σοί στρατιώται, Herod. i. 13. 10.
3 In the seventh century. The passage in question, iv. 1, is as follows: ἐρωτήτων δὲ καὶ δεξιολάβους δυνάμεις ἵππες, τὰς ἄρμας πάσας κατασφαλίζοντο. From this it only follows that they must have been a light-armed force. [Weinstein].
4 In Constant. Porphyry.Themal. i. 1 (see Liv. xxxi. 51).
5 ei δὲ λεγόμενος τουρμάρχος εἰς ὑπογράφων τῶν στρατιῶτων ἵππων. Σημειάζει δὲ τούτων ἀκομὴ τὴν ἔμοια τῆς ὑπογράφων στρατιῶτας τοιοῦτον πεπεσθέντων, καὶ πελατικὰς τραπεζάς, καὶ δεξιολάβους ἐκαύσας. Τοῦτο.
6 See Liv. xxxi. 51.
7 Ewald, p. 577, now explains it from λαβεῖ, grasp of the sword; holding that they were speculatores cum lanceis (Sueton. Claudi. 28); and that they carried their sword, not on the left, but on the right. But we do not see why this was necessary for the sake of using their spears by the right hand. The sword on the left side would, indeed, have been least a hindrance to them in the use of the spear. Earlier, Ewald took them to be slingers.
8 Following Suidas: παραφώλικες. 
9 Also Ath. and Sahidic.
10 In the Glossar.
11 "Manum nihilum injicelbat malefici." 
12 Syr. juculantem dextra; Erp. juculatorum.
interpretation, whether they be understood to be javelin-throwers or slingers. — ἀνδρωπὸς ἡρας τίς νυκτῶν] from this time, about nine in the evening, they were to have this force in readiness, because the convoy was to start, for the sake of the greatest possible security from the Jews, at the time of darkness and of the first sleep.

Ver. 24. Κτήνη τε παραστάσει] still depends on εἰπεν, ver. 23. The speech passes from the direct to the indirect form. — κτήνη] sarcinia jumenta. Whether they were asses or pack-horses, cannot be determined. Their destination was: that they, the centurions to whom the command was given, should make Paul mount on them, and so should bring him uninjured to Felix the procurator. The plural number of the animals is not, with Kuinoel, to be explained "in usum Pauli et militia iepius custodia," but, as in εἰπε, τ. Παύλ. requires, only in usum Pauli, for whom, as the convoy admitted of no halt, one or other of the κτήνη was to accompany it as a reserve, in order to be used by him in case of need. — On Félix, the freedman of Claudio — by his third wife son-in-law of Agrippa I. and brother-in-law of Agrippi II., and brother of Pallas the favourite of Nero,—that worthless person, who "per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio in Judaea provincia exercuit," and after his procuratorship was accused to Nero by the Jews of Caesarea, but was acquitted through the intercession of Pallas, see Walch.

Vv. 25, 26. Γράφατε] adds to εἰπεν, ver. 23, a contemporaneous accompanying action. Such passports, given with transported prisoners, were called at a later period, in the Cod. Theod., elogia. — περιέχει τ. τίπον τούτ. which contained the following form; τίπος, the same as τρόπος, elsewhere, corresponds entirely to the Latin exemplum, the literal form, the verbal contents of a letter. — The lie in ver. 27* is a proof that in what follows the literal expression is authentically contained; therefore there is no reason, with Olschhausen, to regard the letter as a literary production of Luke. A documentary source, it is true, from which the verbal form came to him, cannot be specified, although possibilities of this nature may well be imagined. — τῷ κρατίστῳ See on Luke, Intro. § 3.10

Vv. 27–30. συλληφθέν] without the article: after he had been seized. Observe, that Lysias uses not τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν, but with a certain respect, and that not only for the Roman citizen, but also for the person of his prisoner, τ. ἄνθρω. — ἐξειλομένον αὐτῶν, μαθῶν ὦτι ἀρμ. ἐστι] contains a cunning falsification of the state of the facts; for ver. 28 comp. with xxii. 30 proves that the tribune did not mean the second rescue of the apostle, xxiii. 10. Therefore the remark of Grotius is entirely mistaken, that μαθῶν denotes "nul-

---

1 See on xix. 27.
2 Caes. Bell. civ. l. 81.
3 vy. 31, 32.
4 Tac. Hist. v. 9.
5 Diss. de Pelio Judaore, procur. Jen. 1747;
6 Ewald, p. 549 ff.; Gerlach, d. Röm. Statthalter
7 in Syr. u. Jud. p. 73 ff.
8 3 Macc. iii. 30.
9 Kypke, II. p. 119; Grimm. on 1 Macc. xi.
10 29.
11 Cic. ad Div. x. 5: "literae binae eodem exemplo."
12 See in loc.
13 Comp. xxiv. 8, xxvi. 25. [19 ff.
14 See xxi. 30–34, xxii. 83, 27, 30, xxiii. 1 ff.,
15 xxi. 31–34 and xxii. 25 ff.
lum certum tempus” but merely καὶ μαθόν generally;¹ and so is Beza’s proposal to put a stop after αὐτῶν, and then to read: μαθὸν δὲ οὖν κ. τ. λ. — αὐτῶν.² — Ver. 30. μυρνθείσας . . . ἡσσανα] The hurried letter-writer has mixed up two constructions: (1) μυρνθείσας δὲ μοι ἐπιβουλὴ τῆς μελλόντος ἡσσανας, and (2) μυρνθείντος δὲ μοι ἐπιβουλὴ μέλλειν ἡσσανας.³ Similar blendings are also found in the classics.⁴ As to the import of μυρνθείνειν, see on Luke xx. 87.

Vv. 31–34. Antipatris, on the road from Jerusalem to Caesarea, built by Herod I., and named after his father Antipater, was 26 miles, thus 5½ geographical miles, distant from Caesarea.⁵ — διὰ τῆς νυκτίς] as in xvii. 10. Inexact statement a potiori; for, considering the great distance between Jerusalem and Antipatris, about 8 geographical miles, and as they did not set out from Jerusalem before nine in the evening,⁶ besides the night a part of the following forenoon must have been spent on the journey to Antipatris, which must, moreover, be conceived of as a very hurried one; yet the following night is not, with Kuinoel,⁷ to be included. — Ver. 32. ἰδανας κ. τ. ἐ.] thus from their own foresight, because such a strong force was unnecessary at the distance which they had reached, and might be required in case of an uproar at Jerusalem, not according to the literal command of the tribune, ver. 28. — τοῖς Ἰππείς] not also the ἰερολάβους, whom they took back with them, as may be concluded from their not being mentioned. — Ver. 33. οἴτιμες] “ad remotius nomin, secus atque expectaveris reftur.”⁸ — καὶ τ. Παιλ.] simul et Paulum. — Ver. 34. Felix makes only a preliminary personal inquiry, but one necessary for the treatment of the cause and of the man, on a point on which the elogium contained no information. — ποια] is qualitative: from what kind of province. Cilicia was an imperial province.

Ver. 35. Διακόσμωμαι] denotes the full and exact hearing,¹⁰ in contrast to what was now held as merely preliminary. — τὸ πραγμάτων τοῦ Ἱρ.] was the name given to the palace which Herod the Great had formerly built for himself, and which now served as the residence of the procurators. From our passage it follows that the place, in which Paul was temporarily kept in custody, was no common prison,¹¹ but was within the praetorium. The determination of the manner of the custodia reorum depended on the procurator,¹² and the favorable elogium might have its influence in this respect.

¹ Nor does it mean, as Otto suggests: “on which occasion (in consequence of which) I learned.” The Vulgate, Erasmus, and Calvin correctly render: cognitio, comp. Phil. ii. 19. Beza also correctly renders by edoctus, with the remark: “Disstimulat ergo tribunus id, de quo reprehendi jure potuisse.” Castalio anticipated the misinterpretation of Grotius and Otto: “cripul ac Romanum esse dixider.” And so also Luther. The μαθόν δὲ κ. τ. λ. is nothing else than εἰς τινας ἐν Ρω μαίοις ἐκκ. xxii. 23. Comp. evl. 38.
² Compare on this resumption after a long intervening sentence, Plat. Rep. p 368 A; and see, moreover, Matthiae, § 472; Winer, p. 139 f. (E. T. 194.)
³ Comp. Polyaeus, ii. 14 1.
⁴ See Grotius in loc.; Fritzsch, Conjectur. I. p. 89 f.; Winer, p. 583 (E. T. 710.)
⁵ Bornemann, ad Xen. Anaib. iv. 4. 18.
⁷ Ver. 35. (XVII. p. 871.)
⁸ Against ver. 33.
⁹ Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 368.
¹⁰ Xen. Oec. II. 1. 4; Orig. iv. 4. 1; Polyb. iii. 15. 4; Dorvill. ad Char. p. 670.
¹¹ v. 18.
¹² L. i. D. xiviii. 3.
NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(*) I did not know that he is the high priest. V. 5.

Scarcely had the apostle commenced his defence before the Jewish council, when Ananias, the high priest, in a spirit of injustice and brutality which characterized his general conduct, ordered him to be smitten on the mouth. "Stung by an insult so flagrant, an outrage so undeserved, the naturally choleric temperament of Paul flamed into that sudden sense of anger, which ought to be controlled, but which can hardly be wanting in a truly noble character." And he exclaimed, "God shall smite thee, thou whitened wall." His attention being directed, by some one standing by, to his severe utterance, he immediately "apologized with exquisite urbanity and self-control." Meyer thinks the apostle's reply was ironical; but this seems inconsistent with the character of the apostle, and the appeal to Scripture would in that state of mind be akin to irreverence. Numerous other explanations have been offered, the most satisfactory, though not free from objections, is that given by Bengel, Neander, Hackett, Schaff, Housen and others; which supposes that Paul meant that he did not recollect or consider that it was the high priest whom he was addressing. Gloag also approves, generally, of this solution. Farrar suggests that "in a crowded assembly he had not noticed who the speaker was. Owing to his weakened sight, all that he saw before him was a blurred white figure, issuing a brutal order, and to this person, who, in his external whiteness and inward worthlessness, thus reminded him of the plastered wall of a sepulchre, he had addressed his indignant denunciation. That he should retract it, on learning the hallowed position of the delinquent, was in accordance with that high breeding of the perfect gentleman, which in all his demeanor he habitually displayed." This is the view which Alford, though not entirely satisfied with it, prefers. We concur with Taylor, who adopts this view, that Paul did not know what person had given the command to smite him, and adds, "If I am asked for an explanation of this ignorance of Paul, I find it in one or other of three suppositions: either the high priest did not wear the official robes by which he was usually distinguished; or he was not at that time president of the council; or, more simply still, the near-sightedness of the apostle prevented him from recognizing the official dignity of the man who spoke so roughly." After discussing at length the various hypotheses concerning the meaning of the words used by Paul, Eusis comes to the conclusion: "that the apostle had not the knowledge present to his mind that it was the high-priest whom he was addressing. He does not formally apologize, but perhaps he intimates that the words might have been differently couched, that he might have uttered the malediction more solemnly, and with less of personal feeling mingled up with it. Nor does he retract it, though he may regret that it did fall upon a successor of Aaron."

(+) Pharisees and Sadducees. V. 7.

The apostle, perceiving from the interruption which had already taken place, that all hope of a full hearing or fair treatment was vain, with commendable policy threw an apple of discord into the council. He knew that
the council was composed of Pharisees—with whom he held many things in
common, such as the resurrection of the dead, the coming of the kingdom of
God, the advent of the Messiah, and the intercourse of God with men, by
means of angels, visions, and dreams—and of Sadducees, who denied all these
doctrines and the idea of the supernatural generally. Therefore he said, "I am
a Pharisee, and am being judged about the hope of the resurrection." The two
parties, which had long entertained toward each other an internecine enmity,
now disagreed, and the strife became so violent that the apostle's life was
again in jeopardy; but the chief captain interfered, and rescued him out of
their hands. *Josephus* says: "The Pharisees are those who are esteemed most
skilful in the exact explication of their laws. These ascribe all to fate and to
God, and yet allow that to act what is right, or the contrary, is principally in
the power of men. They say that all souls are incorruptible, but that the souls
of good men only are removed into other bodies, but that the souls of bad
men are subject to eternal punishment. The Sadducees take away fate entirely,
and suppose that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil,
and they say that to act what is good or what is evil is at men's own choice.
They also take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul, and the
punishment and reward in Hades."

Some, as Furrar, question the propriety of the course pursued by Paul at
this crisis. But *Alford* justly says, "Surely no defence of Paul for adopting
this course is required, but all admiration is due to his skill and presence of
mind." *Thomas* writes: "Do not get a wrong impression of Paul's policy.
Though we have seen him on various occasions displaying great accommoda-
tiveness—now taking part in a Nazarite's vow, in order to disarm the unreas-
soning hostility of his countrymen; now putting forward all the considera-
tions which truth would authorize, in order to conciliate the mind of his Jew-
ish audiences; now availing himself of his Roman citizenship, in order to
avoid the infliction of a cruel and unjust torture; and now, in the case before
us, taking advantage of the doctrine that divided his judges, in order to avoid
their verdict of condemnation—in none of these strokes of policy is there the
slightest approach to the disingenuous, the evasive, the shifting. In all
there is an unbending honesty and an invincible courage."

(2*) The Lord stood by him. V. 11.

We have in the Acts the record of three such experiences in the life of Paul,
after the Lord Jesus was seen of him on his way to Damascus. One in Cor-
inth, when he was "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling;" one
on board the vessel during a long severe storm at sea; and another in the pres-
ent instance. On this passage *Alford* has the following excellent remarks:
"By these few words, the Lord assured him of a safe issue from his present
troubles, of an accomplishment of his intention of visiting Rome, of the cer-
tainty that he should preach the gospel and bear testimony there. So that
they upheld and comforted him in the uncertainty of his life from the Jews,
in the uncertainty of his liberation from prison at Caesarea, in the uncertainty
of his surviving the storm in the Mediterranean, in the uncertainty of his fate
on arriving at Rome. So may one crumb of divine grace and help be multi-
plied to feed five thousand wants and anxieties." *Jacobs* says on this verse:
"It was a personal appearing of our Lord to Paul, not in a dream, but in an
apparition, in which he was seen by Paul, as standing beside him, and was heard as addressing him." Alexander says: "Standing by, or over, him, perhaps as he lay upon his bed, though not necessarily in a dream, but rather in a waking vision." He regards this divine message to Paul as an unqualified approval of the course he had been led to take before the council. In this opinion Barnes concurs: "The appearance of our Lord in this case was a proof that he approved the course which Paul had taken before the Sanhedrim."

\[\text{**Paul's sister's son.** V. 16.}\]

This is the only direct reference in Scripture to Paul's family. It is uncertain whether Paul's sister resided in Jerusalem, or whether the young man may have come up to Jerusalem with Paul, or had been sent thither for his education, as his uncle was before him. We know not even whether the act of kindness was prompted merely by natural affection, or by Christian sympathy as well. All that we know is that this obscure youth, probably only a lad, rendered to his celebrated uncle a very important service, the mention of which has immortalized his memory.
CHAPTER XXIV.

Ver. 1. τὸν πρεσβ. Lachm. and Born. read πρεσβ. τινὰν, according to A B E Ν, min. Sahid. Arm. Sahid. Arm. Syr. p. Vulg. Theophyl. τινὰν was written on the margin as a gloss (see the exegetical remarks). — Ver. 3. κατορθωμάτων] Lachm. and Born. (following A B E Ν) read διορθωμάτων, which already Griesb. recommended. Neither occurs elsewhere in the N. T. The decision is given by the preponderance of evidence in favour of διορθ., which, besides, is the less usual word. — Ver. 5. στάσεως] A B E Ν, min. Copt. Vulg. Chrys. Theophyl. Oec. have στάσεις. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Born. And rightly; στάσεως was easily enough occasioned by the writing of στάσεις instead of στάσεως (comp. Ν). — Vv. 6–8. From καὶ κατὰ to κτιστέω is wanting in A B G H Ν, min. vss. Beda. And there are many variations in detail. Condemned by Mill, Beng., Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; it is a completion of the narrative of the orator. Had the words been original (Matth. and Born. defend them), no reason can be assigned for their omission. For κατὰ τ. ἡμετ. νῦν. ἔφυλ. κρίνειν in the mouth of the advocate who speaks in the name of his clients could be as little offensive as the preceding ἐκρατήσαμεν; and the indirect complaint against Lysias, ver. 7, was very natural in the relation of the Jews to this tribune, who had twice protected Paul against them. But even assuming that this complaint had really caused offence to the transcribers, it would have occasioned the omission of the passage merely from παρελθόντων, not from καὶ κατὰ. — Ver. 9. συνεπεθέντο] is decidedly attested, in opposition to the Receptra συνεπεθέντο. — Ver. 10. ἐνθυμότερον] A B E Ν, min. Vulg. Ath. have ἐθυμοῦμεν. Approved by Griesb., following Mill and Bengel; adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. But how much easier it is to assume that the reference of the comparative remained unrecognised, than that it should have been added by a reflection of the transcribers! — Ver. 11. ἐν Ἰερον.] Lachm. Tisch. Born. have, and also Griesb. approved, εἰς Ἰερον., according to A E H Ν, min. This weight of evidence is decisive, as according to the difference in the relation either preposition might be used. Ver. 12. ἐπισταυροῦν] Lachm. reads ἐπισταυράυν, according to A B E Ν, min. A transcriber's error. — Ver. 13. After διώνυσαν Lachm. and Born. have σοι, according to A B E Ν, min., and several vss. Some have it before δύν. ; others have, also before δύν., sometimes μοι and sometimes με (so Mill and Matth.). Various supplementary additions. — Ver. 14. τοῖς ἐν τοῖς] Elz. has merely ἐν τοῖς. But against this the witnesses are decisive, which have either τοῖς ἐν τοῖς (so Griesb., Scholz, and others) or simply τοῖς (so Lachm. Tisch. Born., following Matth.). If τοῖς ἐν τοῖς were original (so Ν*), then it is easy to explain how the other two readings might have originated through copyists—in the first instance, by oversight, the simple τοῖς (A G H Ν* vss. Theophyl. Oec.), and then by way of explanation ἐν τοῖς (B). If, on the other hand, τοῖς were original, then indeed the resolution of the dative construction of the passive by ἐν might easily come into the text, but there would be no reason for the addition of τοῖς before ἐν. — Ver. 15. After
CHAP. XXIV., 1–3.

ἐνσοῦν Elz. Scholz have νεκρὸν which, in deference to very important evidence, was suspected by Griesb. and deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. A supplementary addition. — Ver. 16. καὶ αὐτῶς] so A B C E G Ψ, min. vss. Approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. Scholz have δὲ αὐτῶς. The reference of καὶ was not understood, and therefore sometimes δὲ, sometimes δὲ καὶ was put. — Ver. 18. εἰν αἷς] A B C E Ψ, min. have εἰν αἷς, which Griesb. recommended, and Lachm., Scholz, Born. adopted. But the fem., in spite of the preponderance of its attestation, betrays its having originated through the preceding προοίμιας. — τινὲς δὲ] Elz. has merely τινὲς, against decisive testimony. The δὲ was perplexing. — Ver. 19. ἑδει] B G H, min. Sahid. Aeth. Slav. Chrys. 1. Oec. have ἑδει. Recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Beng. and Matth. But ἑδει is preponderantly attested by A C E Ψ, min. Syr. utr. Copt. Vulg. Chrys. 1. Theoph., and is much more delicate and suitable than the demanding ἑδει. — Ver. 20. τί] Elz. has εἰ τί, against decisive witnesses. From ver. 19. — Ver. 22. ἀνεβαλά. δὲ αὐτ. ὁ Φησιτ] Adopted, according to decisive testimony, by Griesb. and all modern critics except Matth. But Elz. has ἀνέβησα δὲ ταύτα ὁ. ἀνεβάσ. αὐτούς, which Rinck defends. An amplifying gloss. — Ver. 23. αὕτων] Elz. has τὸν Παύλου, against decisive attestation. — ἢ προστρέψοντοι wanting in A B C E Ψ, min., and several vss.; amplifying addition, perhaps after χ. 28. — Ver. 24. After τῇ γυναικὶ Elz. has αὐτοῦ, and Lachm.: τῇ ἴδιᾳ γυναικί. The critical witnesses are much divided between these three readings; indeed several, like Α, have even ἴδιον and αὐτοῦ. But in view of this diversity, both ἴδιον and αὐτοῦ appear as additions, in order to fix the meaning σωματικά on τῇ γυναικί. — After Χριστὸν B E G Ψ* min. Chrys. and several vss. have Ιησοῦ, which Rinck has approved, and Lachm., Scholz, Born. adopted. A frequent addition, which some vss. have before Χριστὸν. — Ver. 25. τοῦ μέλλουσιν κρίματος] τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος (Lachm. Tisch. Born.) is preponderantly attested, and therefore to be adopted. So also Elz., which, however, adds ἐνσοῦν (deleted by Scholz); and Tisch. has again inserted it, following G H min. and some Fathers. The word, just as being in itself quite superfluous, would have to be received, if it were more strongly attested. — Ver. 26. After Παύλου Elz. has ὡς λόγοι αὐτοῦ, against preponderating testimony. A gloss. — 27. χάριτας] Lachm. and Born. read χάριτα, according to A B C Ψ* and some min.; E G Ψ** min. have χαρίν. Thus for χάριτας there remains only a very weak attestation (H, min. and some Fathers; no vss.). The best attested reading, χάρις, is the more to be adopted, as this accusative form, not elsewhere used in the N. T. (although to be read also in Jude 4), could not but occasion offence.

Ver. 1. Μετὰ δὲ πέντε ἡμέρας] The point of commencement is not to be reckoned, with Cajetanus, Basnage, Michaelis, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Morus, Hildebrand, as the arrest of Paul in Jerusalem,—an opinion which has arisen from an erroneous computation of the twelve days in ver. 11,—nor yet with Calovius, Wetstein, and others, as the arrival of Paul at Caesarea, but as his departure for Caesarea. We may add that the popular mode of expression does not necessarily denote that the fifth day had already elapsed, but may just as well denote on the fifth day.¹ That the latter view is to be assumed here, see on ver. 11. — μετὰ τῶν πρεσβ.² of course, not the whole

¹ See on ver. 11. ² Comp. Matt. xxvii. 63, and see on Matt. xii. 40.
Paul Accused by Tertullus.

Sanhedrists, but deputes who represented the council. It is obvious, withal, that the two parties in the Sanhedrim, after the variance temporarily aroused between them, had in the interval bethought themselves of the matter, and united against the common enemy, in order to avert his eventual acquittal by the Roman authority.—Tertullus, a common Roman name, was an orator forensis, a public causidicus. Such speakers, who were very numerous in Rome and in the provinces, bore the classical name of the public orators: ἴτορες, in the older Greek ανήγγειλε, the advocates of the accusers.

—ἔεντο τῷ ἴγνατῳ τῶν II. [they laid information before the procurator against Paul. That this took place in writing, by a libel of accusation, is not affirmed by the text, which, by κατεξήγης and καὶ ἐκτίμης immediately following, does not point to more than oral accusation. The reciprocal rendering, compararerunt, is an unnecessary deviation from the usage in the N. T., xxiii. 15, 22, xxv. 2, 15; John xiv. 21 f.; Heb. xi. 14, and elsewhere also not capable of being made good.

(Δ*) Vv. 2, 3. After the accusation brought against Paul the accused is summoned to appear, and now Tertullus commences the address of accusation itself, and that, after the manner of orators, with a captatio benevolentiae, yet basely flattering, to the judge. — The speech, embellished with rhetorical elegance, is to be rendered thus: As we are partaking, continuously, of much peace through thee, and as improvements have taken place for this people on all sides and in all places through thy care, we acknowledge it, most excellent Felix, with all thanksgiving. Observe here, (1) that the orator with πολλῷς εἰρήνης κ.τ.λ. praises Felix as pacator provinciae, which it was a peculiar glory of procurators to be; (2) that the object of ἀποδεχόμεθα is evident of itself from what precedes; (3) that πάντα τε καὶ πανταχοῦ is not to be referred, as usually, to ἀποδεχόμαι, but, with Lachmann, to γινομένων, because, according to the flattering character of the speech, ἀναδοξημ. γινομ. requires a definition of degree, and it is arbitrary mentally to supply πολλῶν. — Ἀρνήματα (see the critical remarks) are improved arrangements in the state and nation. κατορθώματα would be successes, successful accomplishments. — πάντα] only here in the N. T., not semper, but towards all sides, quaqueruntus, as in all classical writers; with iota subscriptum, in opposition to Buttmann and others. — On ἀποδέχομαι, prōbave, "admittere cum assensu, gaudio, congratulante." — How little, we may add, Felix, although he waged various conflicts with sicarii, sorcerers, and rebels, merited this
praise on the whole, may be seen in Tacitus; and what a contrast to it was the complaint raised against him after his departure by the Jews before the emperor! 8

Ver. 4. That, however, I may not longer, by a more lengthened discourse than I shall hold, detain thee, keep thee from thy business. — λεγόντων is not to be supplied with συντρόμως, but it contains the definition of measure to ἀκόσμου. The request for a hearing of brief duration is, at the same time, the promise of a concise discourse. — τῷ σῷ ἐπιεὶκ. with thy, thine own peculiar, clemency. 9

Vv. 5-8. Kai κατὰ . . . ἐπὶ σά is to be deleted. See the critical remarks (b*). — εἰρόντες γὰρ κ.τ.λ. The structure of the sentence is anaecoluthic, as Grotius already saw. Luke has departed from the construction; instead of continuing, ver. 6, with εκπράγμασιν αἰτῶν, he, led astray by the preceding relative construction, brings the principal verb also into connection with the relative. — The γὰρ is namely. — Examples of λοιμάς and πεσίς, as designating men bringing destruction, may be seen in Grotius and Wetstein. — τὸν οἶκον. 10 is here, in the mouth of a Roman, before a Roman tribunal, to be understood of the Roman orbis terrarum. — πρωτοστάτην] front-rank man, file-leader. — τὸν Ναζωραῖον] a contemptuous appellation of Christians as the followers of Jesus of Nazareth, whose presumed descent from Nazareth stamped Him as a false Messiah. — ὡς καὶ τ. εἰρόν κ.τ.λ. who even the temple, etc. — Ver. 8. παρ' οὗ] refers, as the preceding mention of Lysias is spurious, to Paul, to whom, however, it could not have been referred, were the preceding portion genuine, in opposition to Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Limborch, Rosenmüller, who have, moreover, arbitrarily understood ἀνακρίνας of a quaestio per tormenta; it denotes judicial examination generally. — δῦν = ά by attraction. — That we have not before us the speech of Tertullian, in a quite exact reproduction is obvious of itself, as the source of the narrative could only be the communication of Paul. The beginning, so much in contrast with the rest, is doubtless most faithfully reproduced, impressing itself, as it naturally did, alike as the commencement of the imposing trial and by reason of the singularly pompous flattery, with the most literal precision on the recollection of the apostle and, through his communication, on the memory of Luke.

Ver. 9. Συνεπέδεντο κ.τ.λ. but the Jews also jointly set upon him; they united their attack against Paul with that of their advocate, inasmuch as they indicated the contents of his statements to be the true state of the case. — φάσκοντες] comp. xxv. 19; and see on Rom. i. 23.
Ver. 10. In what a dignified, calm, and wise manner does Paul open his address! — ἐκ πολλῶν ἑών] therefore thou hast an ample judicial experience as regards the circumstances of the nation and their character. "Novus aliquid præses propter inscitiam forte perculsus esset tam atroc delectione," Calvin. — Felix entered on the procuratorship after the banishment of his predecessor Cumanus, in the year 52. Even in the time of Cumanus he had great influence, particularly in Samaria, without, however, being actually governor of that country, as is incorrectly stated in Tac. Ann. xii. 54 in contradiction to Josephus, or of Upper Galilee, as is erroneously inferred by Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Hildebrand, and others. He was thus at this time probably in the seventh year of his procuratorship. — ἑκτὸν] is not, with Beza, Grotius, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others (after LXX), to be taken generally as praefectus, rector, but specially as judge; for the judicial position of Felix in his procuratorship was the point here concerned. — εἰς ὅμορπον] the more cheerfully, namely, than I would be able to do if thou wast still new in this judicial office. — τὰ πρisci ἐμαντοῖν ἀπολογοῦμαι] I bring forward in defence the things concerning myself.

Ver. 11. Paul adds a more special reason subordinate to the general one (ver. 10), for his εἰς ὅμορπον . . . ἀπολογοῦμαι. Since he had returned from abroad only twelve days ago, and accordingly the ground of facts on which they wished him condemned was still quite new, the procurator, with his long judicial experience among the Jewish people, could the less avoid the most thorough examination of the matter. — οὗ πλείον . . . ἡμέρας δεκαδόν] without η, which Elz. has as a gloss. — άφι ἵκτιν] from the day on which I had come up. This is the day of the accomplished ἀναβαίνειν, the day of the arrival, not of the departure from Caesarea. As to the reckoning of the twelve days, it is to be observed: (1) That by the present εἰς the inclusion of the days already spent at Caesarea is imperatively required. Hence the assumption of Heinrichs, Hildebrand, and others is to be rejected as decidedly erroneous: "Dies, quibus P. jam Caesaream fuerat, non numerantur; ibi enim (! !) in custodia tumultum movere non poterat."

(2) That οὗ πλείον εἰς permits us to regard as the current day on which the discussion occurred, either the twelfth or the (not yet elapsed) thirteenth;
as, however, Paul wished to express as short a period as possible, the latter view is to be preferred. There accordingly results the following calculation:

I. Day of arrival in Jerusalem, xxi. 15-17.
II. Meeting with James, xxi. 18 ff.
III. Undertaking of the Nazarite vow and offerings, xxi. 26.
IV. The seven days' time of offering broken off by the arrest, xxi. 27.
V. VII. Arrest of the apostle, xxi. 27 ff.
VIII. Paul before the Sanhedrin, xxi. 30, xxiii. 1-10.
IX. Jewish conspiracy and its disclosures, xxiii. 12 ff. On the same day Paul, before midnight, is brought away from Jerusalem, xxiii. 23, 31.
X. Μετὰ δὲ πέντε ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ., xxiv. 1.
XI. XII. The current day.

It further serves to justify this calculation: (1) that it sufficiently agrees with the vague statement in xxi. 27: ὡς δὲ ἠκολούθον αὐτὶ ἡμέρας συνετελήσας, to place the arrest on the fifth day of that week; (2) that, as terminus a quo for μετὰ πέντε ἡμέρας, xxiv. 1, the ninth day may not only be assumed generally, because the immediately preceding section of the narrative, xxiii. 31 ff., commences with the departure of Paul from Jerusalem, but is also specially indicated by the connection, insomuch as this μετὰ πέντε ἡμέρας corresponds to the τῇ δὲ ἐπαύεσθι, xxiii. 32, that there is presented for both statements of time one and the same point of commencement, namely, the day on which the convoy, after nine in the evening, left Jerusalem. Anger deviates from this reckoning in the two points, that he places as the first of the five days, xxiv. 1, the day of the arrival at Caesarea; and he does not include at all in the reckoning the day on which Paul came to Jerusalem, because Paul reached it, perhaps, only after sunset. But the former would not only be at variance with Paul's own words, οὐ γὰρ ἢν ἀνέβην προσκυνήσας ἐν 'Ἰερού., ver. 11, by which the day of arrival was included, but also would bring the reckoning of the apostle into contradiction with xxi. 17, 18 (τῇ δὲ ἐπαύεσθι). Wieseler has reckoned the days in an entirely different manner—but in connection with his opinion; not to be approved, that the ἡμέρας in xxi. 27 are to be understood of the Pentecostal week—namely: two days for the journey to Jerusalem; the third day, interview with James; the fourth, his arrest in the temple, Pentecost; the fifth, the sitting of the Sanhedrin; the sixth, his removal to Caesarea; the seventh, his arrival there; the twelfth, the departure of Ananias from Jerusalem, xxiv. 1; the thirteenth, the hearing before Felix. — προσκυνήσων thus with quite an innocent and legally religious design.—εἰς 'Ἰερού.] (see the critical remarks) belongs to ἀνέβην.
PAUL'S DEFEENCE.

Vv. 12–21. In the following speech Paul first disclaims the accusations of his opponents generally and on the whole as groundless; then gives a justifying explanation of the expression πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζωρίων, by which they had maliciously wished to bring him into suspicion; and lastly refutes the special accusation: καὶ τὸ ἐπείρ. βεβηλίσαι.

Vv. 12, 13. Ἐπιστολάσαν ἦπροα. — Both after ὅποτε ἐν ταῖς σωµατ. and after ὅποτε κατὰ τὴν πόλιν, throughout the city, εἰρήν μὲ πρὸς τινα διαλεγόµενον, ἡ ἐπιστολάσαν παραφέρει δῆλον is mentally to be supplied.

Vv. 14, 15. Ἄρτος] opposes the positive confession, which now follows, to the preceding merely negative assurance; but, doubtless, I confess: "As a Christian I reverence the same God with the Jews, follow the same rule of faith, and I have the same hope on God, that there shall be a resurrection," etc. Thus, notwithstanding that malicious πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζ. Αἰρ., I am in nowise an enemy of the existing religion, protected by the Roman laws! And with full truth could this "confessio ingenua, voluntaria, plena" be furnished by Paul, as he recognised in Christianity the completion of the divine law and the fulfilment of the prophets; and this recognition, as regards the law, necessarily presupposes the belief in all that is written in the law, namely, in its connection with the fulfilment effected by Christ, although the law as a rule of justification has reached its end in Christ. — κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν κ.τ.λ.] according to the way, which, etc., according to the Christian mode of life. — ἐπὶ λίγη. ἀφεθήν] for Tertullus had, ver. 5, used ἀφεθήσθη, in itself a vox media, school, party, in a bad sense, a schismatic party, sect. — τῷ πατρῷῳ Θεῷ] the God worshipped by the ancestors of my nation and from them received. How inviolable were even to the heathen their ancestral gods! — πατείνων κ.τ.λ.] is now that which is emphatically indicated by ὅποτε: in this way: namely, believing all things, etc. — κατὰ τὸν νόµον throughout the law-book. — ἐλπίδα ἔχον] contains a characteristic circumstance accompanying πατείνων πᾶσιν κ.τ.λ. — καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτωι] even they themselves there, is spoken δεικτικῶς to those present as the representatives of the nation in the transaction. It was natural that this point of view in its generality, should admit no reference to the Sadducean deviation from the national belief of the resurrection, or at all to special differences concerning this dogma. It is just as certain that Paul understood δικαίων and ὀδίκων morally, and not according to the sense of the self-conceit of the descendants of Abraham. — προσδέχονται] expectant. The hope is treated as objective.  

Ver. 16. Ἐν τῷ ὑπέρ] on this account, as in John xvi. 20. It refers to the whole contents of the confession just expressed in vv. 14, 15, as that on which the moral striving, which Paul constantly (διασαρκών) has, has its causal basis. — καὶ αὑτός] et ipse, like other true confessors of this faith and this hope. — ἰδίω] I exercise myself; i.e. in eo laboro, studio;¹ often also in classical writers with the infinitive. — πρὸς τὸν Θεόν κ.τ.λ.] ethical reference.² The good conscience, xxiii. 1 is conceived as having suffered no offence,⁴ i.e. as unshaken, preserved in its unimpaired equilibrium.

Ver. 17. Δι' ἐτών δὲ πλείων] interjectis autem pluribus annis. The δὲ leads over to the defence on the special point of accusation in ver. 6. Regarding διά, after.⁵ Paul means the four years, which had elapsed since his last visit to Jerusalem.⁶ How does the very fact of this long aliis, preceding the short period of my present visit, witness against that accusation! — εἰς τὸ εἰδώλου μου] for my nation. What a contrast in this patriotic love to the hostile calumnies of his accusers! And Paul might so speak, for the Greek and Asiatic contributions which he had brought were destined for the support of the Jerusalem Christians, who for the most part consisted of native Jews. If he convened alms for these, he assisted in them his nation, in doing which he cherished the national point of view, that the Gentiles, having become partakers of the spiritual blessings of the Jews, owed corporeal aid to these in turn. — προσφοράς] i.e. festival offerings. The performance of these had been among the objects of the journey. The taking on him the Nazarite offerings was only induced after his arrival by circumstances. Whether Paul defrayed the expenses of the Nazarite offerings from the contribution-mones,⁸ is neither here nor elsewhere said, and cannot be determined.

Vv. 18, 19. Ἐν οἷς, during which, applies to the προσφοράς, during which sacrificial occupations.” “Graeci, licet aliquis nomen praecesserit, saepe neuto plurali pronominis utuntur, generalam vocabuli notionem respicientes.”¹⁰ — ἡ νυμφήν] purified, as a Nazarite,¹¹ thus, in an unobjectionable and holy condition, without multitude and without tumult. — A point is not, with Griesbach, Scholz, and de Wette, to be placed after διάτησιν, because otherwise τινές δὲ κ.τ.λ. would be an imperfect sentence, which the simplicity of the structure of the discourse¹² does not justify our assuming. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Bornemann have correctly put only a comma.

It is accordingly to be explained in such a way, that Paul with τῷ πρὸν . . .

131; Job ii. 9; Isa. xxviii. 10; Tit. ii. 13; and comp. on Gal. v. 5.
¹ Stallb. ad Plat. Rep. p. 389 C.
³ Rom. v. 1.
⁴ ἀνώπος, here passive, comp. on Phil. i. 10.
⁵ Not while (in opposition to Stöltzing, Beitr. s. Exegete d. Paulin. Briefe, 1866, p. 163 f.), as if Paul would say; while I have done this (the ἀνώπος κ.τ.λ.) already for several years; which neither stands in the text, nor would be suitable after the διασαρκώς already express-
⁶ Rom. xv. 27.
⁷ 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ff.; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Rom. xv. 25.
⁸ Rom. xv. 27.
⁹ Baumann.
¹¹ See xxii. 27.
¹² It is otherwise in ver. 5 f.
HIS CONFINEMENT. 447

τινές δὲ κ.τ.λ. glances back to what was said in ver. 5 f., which had sounded as if the Sanhedrists had found him. On the other hand, τινές δὲ forms the contrast, introducing the actual position of the matter, in which δὲ withal refers to suppressam aliquam partem sententiae, 1 thus: Thereupon there found me—not these, as they asserted, ver. 5,—but doubtless certain Asiatic Jews. 2 — ἔδω] The sense of the praetere, and that without ἄν, is here essential; for the Asiatics must have appeared, like the Sanhedrists, before the procurator, if they, etc. That this did not happen, is a fact of the past. 3 — τι τι θαυμάζων, in so far as they should have ought, subjective possibility. On τι with the optative, and in the following sentence the indicative, see Bernhardy. 4

Vv. 20, 21. Or else let these there, pointing to the Sanhedrists present, say what wrong they found in me, while I stood before the Sanhedrim, unless in respect to this one exclamation, which I made, etc. — στάντος μον κ.τ.λ. forbids us to refer οἴνοι to the Asiatic Jews, ver. 18. 5 — ἢ περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς] The comparative ἢ after τι without ἀλλο is found also in the classics. 7 The article is not placed before φωνῆς, because the sense is: περὶ ταύτης μιᾶς οίνος φωνῆς. 8 The exclamation, xxiii. 6, was really the only one which Paul had made in the Sanhedrim. περὶ refers back to ἀδίκημα. In respect of this exclamation I must have offended, if they have found an ἀδίκημα in me! In this one exclamation must lie the crime discovered in me! A holy irony. — ὅτι instead of ἄν, attracted by φωνῆς. 6

Ver. 22. With the frank challenge to his accusers 10 Paul closes his speech. But Felix, who declares that he wished still to institute a further examination of the matter with the assistance of Lysias, decides for the present on an adjournment: ἀνεβάλλετο αἰτοῖς, ampliavit eos, both parties. He pronounced until further investigation the non liquet, 11 and for the time being adjourned the settlement of the accusation. 12 — ἄκριβεστέρον εἴδος τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ] The only correct interpretation is: because he knew more exactly what referred to Christianity. 13 As Felix had been procurator for more than six years, and as Christianity was diffused everywhere in Judæa, even in Caesarea itself, it was natural that he should have an ἄκριβεστέρον knowledge of the circumstances of that religion than was given to him in the present discussion; therefore he considered it the most fitting course to leave the matter still in suspense. In doing so he prudently satisfied, on the one hand, his regard for the favour of the Jews 14 by not giving Paul his liberty; while, on the other hand, he satisfied his better intelligence about

---

1 Hermann, ad Philoctet. 16.
4 As certainly those absent can make no statement, comp. Baernslein, Partik. p. 136 f.
5 Ewald. Comp. ver. 15.
8 Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 117 (E. T. 287).
9 vv. 20, 21.
10 Cic. Cherm. 28, Brasian. formul.
11 See on the judicial term ἀναβάλλεσθαι (Dem. 1042 ult.), Weitzstein, and Kypke, II. p. 128 f.
12 Ver. 14.
13 Comp. ver. 27.
Christianity, by which, notwithstanding his badness in other respects, he felt himself precluded from pleasing the Jews and condemning the apostle. This connection, which in essentials the Vulgate, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Wolf, and others have expressed, has been often mistaken. Beza and Grotius, followed by Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, and Ewald, regard ἀκριβότερον . . . ὅδω as part of the speech of Felix: "Ubi exactius didicerò, quid sit de hac secta, et ubi Lysias venerit, causam illam terminabo." But so late a bringing in of the εἰπὼν is entirely without precedent in the N. T. Michaelis and Morus resolve εἰδὼς by quamquam; notwithstanding his better knowledge of Christianity, Felix did not release Paul. But this resolution is the less suggested by the relation of the particle to the verb, as afterwards, ver. 23, the specially mild treatment of the apostle is expressly stated. According to de Wette, the sense is: "As he needed no further hearing of the accused, and it was only necessary now to hear the tribune." But the reference to the tribune is only to be regarded as a welcome pretext and evasion: an actual hearing of Lysias would have been reported in the sequel of the history. Lastly, Kuinoel erroneously renders: when he had inquired more exactly, which εἰδὼς does not mean. — τὰ καθ ὑμᾶς] your matters, not: your misdeeds, as if it were τὰ καθ ὑμᾶς.

Ver. 23. Διακραζ.] belongs, like εἰπὼν, to ἀνεβάλητο; and, yet τί has preponderant testimony against it, having given orders. — τὴν εἰκάσεων αἰτίων κ.τ.λ. that he should be kept in custody and should have relaxation. He was to have rest, to be spared all annoyance. Usually ἀνεσίων is understood of release from chairs, custody libera, ψυχαγή δὲ σε σωματίων; but without indication of this special reference in the text, and against ver. 27. From τῷ ἐκατοντάρχῳ it is rather to be inferred that the present custody was the usual custodia militaris, in which, however, Paul was to be treated with mildness and to be kept without other molestation. — καὶ μεγίστα καλλεν] the construction is active: and that he, the centurion, should hinder no one. — τῶν idiom aitou] is not to be understood of the Jewish servants of the procurator, but of those belonging to the apostle. They were his friends and disciples, among whom were perhaps also relatives. They were allowed to be at hand and serviceable for the satisfaction of his wants.

Ver. 24. Παραγαγ.] denotes the coming along of Felix and Drusilla to the prison, where they wished to hear Paul. Grotius thinks that it refers to the fetching of Drusilla as his wife, which took place at this time. But this must have been more precisely indicated, and is also not chronologically
suitable, as the marriage of Felix with Drusilla occurred much earlier. On the beautiful Drusilla, the third wife of Felix, the daughter of Agrippa I. and sister of Agrippa II., who was at first betrothed to Antiochus Epiphanes, the prince of Commagene, but afterwards, because the latter would not allow himself to be circumcised, was married to Azizus, king of Emesa, and lastly was, with the help of the sorcerer Simon, estranged from her husband and married by Felix, whose first wife, according to Tac. Hist. v. 9, the granddaughter of Antony and Cleopatra, is said to have been also called Drusilla. — μετεπέμψις τ. Π. certainly at the desire of his Jewish wife, whose curiosity was interested about so well-known a preacher of Christ.

Vv. 25, 26. What a sacredly bold fidelity to his calling! Before one, who practised all manner of unrighteousness and incontinence—the victim of his lust sat beside him!—“cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus,” Paul, his defenceless prisoner, discoursed on righteousness, continence, and the impending last judgment. Such is the majesty of the apostolic spirit in its ἀριστείας. The extraordinary phenomenon strikes even the heart of Felix; he trembles (c). But his ruling worldliness quickly suppresses the disturbing promptings of his conscience; with the address of a man of the world, the conference is broken off; Paul is sent back to his prison; and Felix—remains reprobate enough to expect from such a man, and in spite of the Lex Julia de repetundis, a bribe, and for this purpose in fact subsequently to hold several conversations with him. — το νῦν ἐλεον] for the present. — καὶ πρὸς μεταλ.] tempus opportunum nactus. Here consequently Paul had spoken ἀκριβῶς. — A comma only is to be placed after μεταλ. σε, as ἐλπίζων, ver. 26, does not stand for the finite verb, but is a further definition to ἀσκηρίης. Also before διὰ, wherefore, a comma only is to be placed. — χρήματα] Certainly Felix had not remained in ignorance how the love of the Christians had their money in readiness for Paul. “Sic thesaurum evangelii omisit infelix Felix,” Bengal.

Ver. 27. Διεταίς δὲ πληρωθ.] namely, from the commencement of the imprisonment at Caesarea.—On the time of the accession of Festus, 61; see Intro. §4. — χάρα (see the critical remarks) καταθήκας, to lay down, deposit, thanks for himself, i.e. to earn for himself thanks, to establish claims to their gratitude. An old classical expression. Grotius aptly says: “Est locutio bene Graeca

1 58 or 54. See Wieseler, p. 80.
3 Joseph. Ant. xx. 7. 1.
4 Suetonius, i.e., calls him “prince regnum maritum.” We know only the two.
6 Tac. Ann. xii. 54.
7 1 Cor. ii. 4.
8 See Kypke, II. p. 194; Bornemann and Rosenmüller, Repert. II. p. 283.
9 2 Tim. iv. 2.
10 What Wieseler has further urged in favour of the year 60 in his most recent learned investigation (Beitr. a. Würd. d. Evang. p. 332 ff.) does not remove the chief objection that, according to Josephus, Poppaea, about the time (κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν) that Festus succeeded, was no longer the mistress, but the wife of Nero. Especially when the discourse is of an empress, it would be least of all to be lightly passed over; on the contrary, it is to be presumed that the expression is meant, and is to be understood, strictly.
11 xxv. 9.
12 Herod. vi. 41. See Kräger on Thuc. i. 23. 1.
CHAP. XXIV.—NOTES.

... quales locutiones non paucas habet Lucas, ubi non alios inducit loquentes, sed ipse loquitur, et quidem de rebus ad religionem non pertinentalibus." The form χάρια, only here and in Jude 4 in the N. T., is also found in classical poets and prose writers, although less common than χάριν. — δεδεμένον] According to what was remarked on ver. 23, Paul had not hitherto been released from chains; and therefore we have not to suppose that Felix on his departure changed the captivity of the apostle, which was previously free from chains,¹ into the custodia militaris allowable even in the case of Roman citizens, in which the prisoner was bound by a chain to the soldier who kept him. This period of two years in the life of the apostle, we may add, remains to us, as far as the Book of Acts goes, so completely unknown, that we are not in a position² to maintain that no letters of his from that interval could be in existence. — Of Porcius Festus, the better successor of Felix, little is known except his energetic measures against the sicarii.³ He died in the following year, and was succeeded by Albinus, whose knavery was yet surpassed by that of his successor, Gessius Florus.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(A4) Tertullus began to accuse. V. 2.

Lysias, the chief captain, had sent Paul under a strong military escort to Cesarea to appear before the Roman governor Felix. Thus Paul returned to that city in a very different style from that in which he left it, a short time before. Then he was attended by a little caravan of humble disciples, now in the midst of a Roman body-guard, with all the pomp of martial display. Then, however, as a preacher bound, but only in spirit, to go to Jerusalem; now, as a prisoner bound in chains, destined to a long imprisonment. The officer in charge took Paul at once to the governor, and delivered the letter which had been intrusted to him by Lysias. Felix read the letter, inquired to what province the prisoner belonged, and intimated his intention of trying the case when his accusers arrived.

The Jews, probably because ignorant of Roman law, engaged the services of a Roman barrister of eminent ability, persuasive eloquence, and probably of great reputation, to make the charges against the apostle. From the outline given of his speech, he was evidently a practised pleader, and a voluble, plausible orator. Augustin says: "Eloquence is the gift of God, but the eloquence of a bad man is like poison in a golden cup." He commences with a fulsome and flattering compliment to Felix, which he certainly little deserved, since, though he suppressed some bands of brigands with much vigor and decision, he kept a number of sicarii in his employment, and inflamed the dissatisfaction and fanned a spirit of sedition among the Jews. He was both covetous and cruel, and was one of the worst governors ever placed over Judea. He is reported to have been more criminal than the very robbers whom he put to

¹ But see on ver. 23.
² With Ewald and Otto.
³ See Joseph. Ant. xx. 8. 9 f. to xx. 9. 1,
NOTES.

death, "ipse tamen his omnibus erat nocentior." Next Tertullus apologizes for intruding even for a brief space upon the time and attention of the governor, and proceeds to make his charges against Paul, which were threefold: First, he accuses him of sedition; as being a pest in the community, a disturber of the peace, and one who excited factions among the Jews. The next count in the indictment was heresy; as being a ringleader in the sect whom he contemptuously calls the Nazarenes—a term of reproach, here first used, which has been often applied to the followers of Christ. Jews and Mohammedans both still use it. This charge had at least the merit of truth, as Paul was unquestionably a standard-bearer among those thus stigmatized. The last accusation was, sacrilege; as going about to profane the temple—a serious charge, but utterly unfounded. Having thus made an orderly and formal indictment against the apostle of treason against Rome, schism against Moses, and profanity against the gods, the clever and crafty advocate insinuates that the Sanhedrim would have judged Paul rightly had Lysias not interposed, and further gets the elders to assent to all he had stated. The governor intimated to Paul that he might now reply to the charges laid against him. "Non ignoravit Paulus artem rhetorum movere laudando." He first states that he could proceed with his defence more cheerfully and hopefully because, for so long a period, his judge had been cognizant of affairs in Judea. He replies to each of the charges and refutes them in succession. He had not caused any disturbance of the public peace, or raised any opposition to the Roman law; he had only been a few days in the country, and he challenged any one to prove that he had said or done anything contrary to the law; he had excited no tumult in the temple, in the synagogues, or in the city. As to the charge of schism, he frankly avowed that after the way they called the sect of the Nazarenes he worshipped the God of his fathers, the God of the Jews. As Lange expresses it, "By these words Paul maintains that, along with his Christian faith, he was a true Jew; for Christianity is the fulfilment and truth of Judaism."

As to the charge of polluting the temple, it was utterly baseless, as after an absence of years he had gone thither, had purified himself, for the purpose of presenting offerings, and had been guilty of no act of impropriety whatever; and he closed by challenging any member of the Sanhedrim present to say whether, when on trial before that council, any such accusation had been laid against him, and stated further that the only disturbance arose among themselves concerning the doctrine of the resurrection, which the majority of them believed in, as he did. The reply of the apostle was conclusive and triumphant, and he ought to have been acquitted at once, but Felix reminded him to jail for further examination.

(p4o) According to our law, etc. V. 6.

On the genuineness of this passage Alford encloses it in brackets and writes: "The phenomena are common enough in the Acts of unaccountable insertions. But in this place it is the omission which is unaccountable, for no similarity of ending, no doctrinal reason can have led to it." Hackett says: "The passage is of doubtful authority." "It is urged for the words that their insertion answers no apparent object, and that they may have been dropped accidentally." Phelp's remarks: "The word may have been either the interpolation of a
scribe, or a later addition of the writer.” Gloag observes: “The genuineness of the entire passage has been called in question. The external evidence is decidedly against its reception. On the other hand the internal evidence is rather in favor of the words. Without them the speech of Tertullus is apparently defective, and awkward in point of construction.” Wordsworth considers the passage genuine and Jacobson says: “The clause is recognized by the Syriac and the Vulgate, and the report of the speech is exceedingly brief and meagre without it.”

(σ) Felix trembled. V. 26.

Felix by vile means had seduced the wife of Azizas, the daughter of Herod Agrippa, from her allegiance to her husband, and had married her. Probably at her request, as she could scarcely be entirely ignorant of the events connected with the disciples and their persecutions, Felix sent for Paul, to hear from him concerning his beliefs; and right nobly did the dauntless apostle discharge his duty. Paul had been often summoned before Felix. Now Felix is arraigned before Paul. And as the prisoner reasoned before the governor and his princess, both of them notoriously and consciously guilty, the cruel, rapacious, and blood-stained ruler was profoundly stirred and agitated. Looking back on his stained past, and constrained for a moment to peer into the future certain retribution, he trembled. And well he might, for testimony the most irrefragable from both Jewish and Pagan sources show “how greedy, how savage, how treacherous, how unjust, how steeped with the blood of private and public massacre” he had been during his government of Samaria and Palestine. Tacitus says that in “the practice of all kinds of lust, crime, and cruelty, he exercised the power of a king, with the temper of a slave.” He trembled, but he trifled with his awakened conscience and said, “Go.” Better far that a man’s conscience should never be awakened at all, than that it should be awoke with its reproofs, and be disobeyed. Dr. Taylor deduces the following lessons from the incident: The twofold power in conscience to sustain and condemn, as illustrated by Paul and Felix; the danger of stifling conviction; the hypocrisy of procrastination, the fettering influence of sin.

“To-morrow and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
To the last syllable of recorded time,
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death.”
CHAPTER XXV.

VER. 2. ὁ ἄρχερεις] οἱ ἄρχερεῖς is decidedly attested. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The singular arose from xxiv. 1. — Ver. 4. εἰς Ἰακώβ.] so Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to preponderating testimony. Eliz. Scholz have ἐν Ἰακώβῃ. An interpretation. — Ver. 5. τοῦτο] A B C E Ν, min. Arm. Vulg. Lucifer, have ἄτοπον. So Lachm. and Born. But how easily, with the indefiniteness of the expression εἰ τι ἐστὶν ἐν κ. τ. λ., was ἄτοπον suggested as a gloss, perhaps from a recollection of Luke xxiii. 41! This then supplanted the superfluous τοῦτο. Other codd. have τοῦτο ἄτοπον. And ἄτοπον is found variously inserted. — Ver. 6. οὐ πλείους ἕκτῳ ἢ δέκα] so Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. Scholz, Born. But Eliz. has πλείους ἢ δέκα, in opposition to A B C Ν, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. As the oldest codd., in which the numbers are written as words, likewise all the oldest vs. (of which, however, several omit οὐ, and several οὐ πλείους), have ἕκτῳ, it is very probable that in later witnesses the number written by the numeral sign η was absorbed by the following δ. Finally, the omission of οὐ was suggested by ἐν τάξει, ver. 4, as it was thought that διατήρησα δῇ . . . δέκα must be taken as a contrast to ἐν τάξει (he promised to depart speedily, yet he tarried, etc.). — Ver. 7. αἰτίωματα] Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. read αἰτίωματα, which is so decidedly attested that, notwithstanding that this form does not occur elsewhere, it must be adopted. — φέροντες κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read καταφέροντες, following A B C Ν, lo. 40, Vulg. Lucifer. The Receptra is one interpretation of this; another is τέκτων τῷ Π. in E. — Ver. 11. γῷ] A B C E Ν, min. Copt. Slav. Chrys. Theophyl. 2, have οὕ, which Griesb. has approved, and Lachm. Tisch. Born. have adopted. Rightly; εἰ μὲν οὖν ἄδικῷ seemed entirely at variance with the preceding οὐδὲν ὑδίκησα. — Ver. 15. δίκη] A B Ν, min. Bas. have καταδίκην. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Born. An interpretation. — Ver. 16. After ἀνθρωπον Eliz. Scholz have εἰς ἀπώλειαν. It is wanting in preponderating witnesses, and is an addition of the nature of a gloss. — Ver. 18. ἐπιθέρουν] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐφερον, according to decisive testimony. — After ἐν π. εἰγώ Α C* have πονηρῶν (so Lachm.), and B E Κ** πονηρῶν (so Born.). Two different exegetical additions. — Ver. 20. τοῦτο] has decisive attestation. But Eliz. Scholz have τοῦτον, which (not to be taken with Grotius and others as the neuter) was occasioned by the preceding ὁ Παύλος and the following εἰ βούλοιτο. — Ver. 21. ἀναπέμψω is to be adopted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to preponderating testimony, instead of πέμψῃ. The reference of the compound was overlooked. — Ver. 22. ἐφι, and afterwards ἄ δῇ, are deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to A B Ν; and rightly. They were added by way of completion. — Ver. 25. καταλαβόμενος] Lachm. and Born. read καταλαβόμενη, following A B C E Ν ** lo. 41. Vulg. Copt. Syr., which witnesses also omit καὶ before αὐτοῦ. A logical emendation. — Ver. 26. σχῆ, τί γράψαι] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read σχὶ, τί γράψω according to A B C, min. The Receptra is a mechanical repetition from the preceding.
Ver. 1. Naturally it was the interest of Festus, both in his official and personal capacity, after he had entered upon his province as procurator of Judea, i.e. after having arrived in it, soon to acquaint himself more fully with the famous sacred capital of the nation which he now governed.—ἐπιβαίνειν, with the dativ.1 — τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ; 2 for the procurators were also called ἐπαρχοί.3

Vv. 2, 3. Ἐνεφάνεσαν κ.τ.λ.] See on xxiv. 1. — οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς] see the critical remarks, as in xxii. 30; consequently not merely the acting high priest,4 who at that time was Iahmæl, son of Phabi, and successor of Ananias.5 — καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων] thus not merely the ἰερεύνητεροι, xxiv. 1. The opposition now came forward in a larger spiritual and secular representation of the nation against the enemy of the national religion. It is true that most of these πρῶτοι were without doubt Sanhedrists, and therefore also Festus names them directly a portion ἰερεύνητεροι; 6 but this does not justify the assertion of Grotius, that Luke here uses πρῶτοι as equivalent to ἰερεύνη. So also de Wette and Ewald. Ver. 5 is opposed to this view. — αἰτοῦμεν χάριν κ.τ.λ.] desiring for themselves favour against him.7 — τῷ κ.τ.λ.] The design of παρεκάλεσαι, ait. — ἐνέδραν ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ.] an accompanying definition to παρεκάλεσαι . . . Ἴεροναλήμ, giving a significant explanation of the peculiar nature of this proceeding: inasmuch as they thereby formed a snare, in order to put him to death, through assassins, by the way.

Ver. 4. For the reasons of the decision, see ver. 16. — By τηρείσας . . . ἐκπρετεσθασα, the reply of refusal: "Paul remains at Caesarea," is expressed indirectly indeed, but with imperative decidedness. Observe in this case the τηρείσας emphatically prefixed in contrast to μεταπέμψῃ, ver. 3. — εἰς Κατάρα.] In Caesarea, whither he was brought in custody.8 — Notice the contrast between the Jewish baseness and the strict order of the Roman government.

Ver. 5. The decidedly attested order of the words is: οἱ οὖν ἐν ἤμιν φησιν δὸνατοί.9 οἱ δονατοὶ ἐν ὑμ. are: the holders of power among you, i.e. those who are invested with the requisite official power, for making a public complaint in the name of the Jewish nation. Thus the usual literal meaning of δονατος is to be retained, and it is neither to be explained, with Erasmus, as idonei; nor, with Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Homberg: quibus commodum est; nor, with Bengel: those who are strong for the journey; nor, with Er. Schmid and Wolf: quibus in promptu sunt accusandi capita. Certainly if οἱ πρῶτοι, ver. 2, were the same as οἱ ἰερεύνητεροι, then οἱ δονατοὶ ἐν ὑμῖν would be unsuitable, as those persons in power were just the Sanhedrists; wherefore οἱ πρῶτοι must include also other prominent persons. — ἀνυγκαζόμενοι having gone down with me.10 — εἰ τι ἰστιν] namely, an object of accusation.

1 See Thuc. vii. 70. 5; Dio. L. l. 19; Dod. xvi. 66; Plin. N. Hist. iii. 19.
2 xxiii. 34.
3 See Krebe in loc.
4 As in xxiv. 1.
5 See Joseph. Antiq. xx. 8. 8, 11.
6 Ver. 15.
7 Com. ver. 15.
8 xix. 32. xxi. 13.
9 Lachmann, Thleseer, Bornemann. See on similar intervening insertions of φης, Köhler, ad Xer. Mem. iii. 5. 13; Bornemann, ad loc.; Stahlf. ad Plat. Rep. p. 473 D.
10 Comp. Cestalio, de Dei, and others.
11 Thuc. vi. 30. 2; Dod. xii. 30; Wisd. x. 13; Lobeck, ad Pitym. p. 396.
Vv. 6, 7. *Διαπρύπας . . . δέκα* includes the whole brief stay of Festus at that time among the Jews at Jerusalem (in aίτοις), not merely the time that had elapsed since the rejection of that proposal. — *περιέσρησαν*] stood round Paul, as is evident from the preceding παραγ. δὲ αίτοι. Grotius and Kuinoel incorrectly hold that it is to be referred to τὸ βῆμα. — *πολλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.* as in John xx. 30. — *αιτώματα* [see the critical remarks], instead of *αιτῶμα*, accusations, is not elsewhere preserved. — *καταφέροντες* (see the critical remarks), *they brought against him.*

Ver. 8. They were not in a condition to prove them, *seeing that he stated for his vindication, that, etc.* — *οὕτω κ.τ.λ.* These were consequently the three principal points to which the *πολλὰ καὶ βαρόνα αἰτώματα* of the Jews referred, to which they now added the political accusation, as formerly against Jesus.

Ver. 9. *Χάριν καταθεσαί] see on xxiv. 27. — θέλεις . . . i π' εμού*; Grotius correctly renders: *visne a Synedrio judicari me praebente?* For that Festus meant a κρίνοθαι by the Sanhedrim, is evident of itself from εἰς Ἱεροσ. ἀνάβ. and εἰς. — *ἐν τῷ εμοί] orem me.* Bengel aptly observes: hoc Festus speciose addit.—Paul must be asked the question, θέλεις, because he had already been delivered over to the higher Roman authority, and accordingly as a Roman citizen could not be compelled again to renounce the Roman tribunal.—If Festus had previously *without ceremony refused the request of the Jews, which was at variance with the course of Roman law, he now shows, on the other hand, after they had conformed to the ordinary mode of procedure, that he was quite willing to please them. Certainly he could not doubt beforehand that his θέλεις would be answered in the negative by Paul; yet by his question he made the Jews sensible at least that the frustration of their wish did not proceed from any indisposition on his part.

Ver. 10. Paul gives a frank and firm refusal to that request, both positively—*ἐπὶ τοῦ βῆμ. Καίσ. κ.τ.λ.*—and negatively—*Ἰουδαίος εἰπέω κ.τ.λ., to the Jews I have committed no offence.—ἐπὶ τ. βῆμ. Καίσαρον* for "*quae acta gentes sunt a procuratore Caesaris, sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Caesare ipse gesta sint.*" — *κάλλιον* namely, than appears to follow from your question. Paul makes his judge feel that he ought not to have proposed that θέλεις κ.τ.λ. to him at all, as it could not but conflict with his own better conviction.

Ver. 11. From his preceding declaration that he must be judged before the imperial tribunal, and not by Jews, Paul now reasons* that he accordingly by no means refuses to die, if, namely, he is in the wrong; but in the opposite case, etc. In other words: "Accordingly, I submit myself to the penalty of the Roman law, if I am guilty; but, if," etc. And, in order to be sure of the protection of Roman law, amidst the inclination of

---

1 Comp. ver. 18.  
2 Yet Eust. p. 1452, 21, has aίτωμας instead  
3 Gen. xxxvii. 2; Deut. xxii. 14.  
4 On ἀσκολογούσθαι with ἐν (more frequently with ἐν), comp. Xen. Oec. xii. 22.  
5 Comp. xxi. 38, xxiv. 5 f.  
6 Ver. 4.  
7 Uplan L. I. D. de offic. procuratoris.  
8 oβρ, as the correct reading instead of γάρ, see the critical remarks.
Festus to please the Jews, he immediately adds the appeal to the Emperor (n°). — *ei ... ódúw* If I am at fault.¹ The idea of the word presupposes the having done wrong,² therefore the added καὶ ἄδειον διά. πέπρ. contains a more precise definition of ἄδειον, and that according to the degree. — oii παρατείναμεν κ. τ. ła.] non deprecor.³ — το ἀποδάνειν ἵνα ἐσφάλμαι, notat artificius.⁴ — *ei de oidiēn ἵνα ἄν] but *if there exists nothing of that, of which they, etc. ἄν* is by attraction for τοίην ἄ.⁵ — διόντα] namely, according to the possibility conditioned by the subsisting legal relations. — αὐτὸς χαρίσαςαί] to surrender me to them out of complaisance.⁶ — Καίσαρα ἐπικαλ.] I appeal to the Emperor.⁷ Certainly the revelation, xxi. 11, contributed to Paul’s embracing this privilege of his citizenship.⁸ " *Non vitas suae, quam ecclesiae consultus,*" Augustine accordingly says, Ep. 2.

Ver. 12. The conference of Festus with the council acting as his advisers, as may be inferred from the answer afterwards given, referred to the question whether the ἐπίκλησις of the Emperor was to be granted without more ado. For in cases of peculiar danger, or of manifest groundlessness of the appeal, it might be refused.⁹ The consiliarii¹⁰ of the provincial rulers were called also πάρεδροι, assessores.¹¹ — After ἐπιτείλ., the elsewhere usual note of interrogation, which simply spoils the solemnity and force of the answer, is already condemned by Grotius. — Baumgarten thinks that, from the appeal to Caesar, which in his view will not have been pernicious to Paul, and from xxi. 24, it may be inferred that the Acts of the Apostles is decidedly favourable to the supposition of a liberation of Paul from the Roman imprisonment. Too rash a conclusion. Neither the appeal nor xxi. 24 points beyond Rome. To Rome he wished to go (appeal), and was to go, xxi. 24.

Ver. 13. This Marcus Agrippa was the well-meaning, but too weak, Ηρόδ Άγριππα II., son of the elder Agrippa, grandson of Aristobulus, and the great-grandson of Herod I. Soon after the death of his father¹² he received from Claudia, at whose court he was brought up,¹³ the principality of Chalcis, and instead of this, four years afterwards,¹⁴ from the same emperor, the former tetrarchy of Philip and Lysanias, along with the title of king;¹⁵ and at a later period, from Nero, a further considerable increase of territory. He did not die till the third year of Trajan, being the last-reigning prince of the Herodian house.¹⁶ — Ἐπίτειλος, also Βερονίας and Βερο-
nice,¹ was his sister, formerly the wife of her uncle Herod the prince of Chalcis, after whose death she lived with her brother,—probably in an incestuous relation,—a state of matters which was only for a short time interrupted by a second marriage, soon again dissolved, with the Cilician king Polemon.² At a later period still she became mistress of the Emperors Vespasian and Titus.³ — ἀσπασθενον] It was quite in keeping with the relation of a Roman vassal, that he should welcome the new procurator soon after his accession to office.

Ver. 14. The following conversation between Festus and Agrippa most naturally appears not as a communication by an ear-witness,⁴ but as drawn up by Luke himself as a free composition; for he had the materials for the purpose in his accurate information, received from Paul, as to the occurrence set forth in ver. 7 ff. — ἀνέκθετο] he see forth, enarravit, Gal. ii. 2. His design in this was⁵ to learn the opinion of the king; for Agrippa, as an Idumean, as belonging himself to Judaism,⁶ and especially as chief overseer of the temple and of the election of high priest,⁷ was accurately acquainted with the state of Jewish affairs.

Vv. 15, 16. Αιτούμενον κ.τ.λ.] asking for punishment against him. That δίκη⁸ is so to be taken, according to its very frequent use by the classical writers,⁹ is shown by ver. 16.¹⁰ — πρὶν ἦ] refers to the conception of condemnation contained in χαριτέσθαι. As to the principle of Roman law here expressed, see Grotius.¹¹ On the optative with πρὶν after a negative clause, when the matter is reported “ut in cogitatione posita,” see Klotz, ad Devar. p. 726.

Vv. 17–20. After they had therefore come together here,¹² I made no delay, etc.¹³ — Ver. 18. περὶ οὗ] belongs to σταθήσεσθαι.¹⁴ — αἰτίαν ἐφερον (see the critical remarks): they brought no accusation. The classical expression would be ait. ἐκήρυξεν.¹⁵ — ὅν, instead of ἔκατον δάν, ὅπερ ὅσον ἐγὼ.] In the case of a man already so long imprisoned, and assailed with such ardent hostility, Festus very naturally supposed that there existed some peculiar capital crimes, chiefly, perhaps, of a political nature. It is true that political charges were also brought forward,¹⁶ but “hinc iterum conjicere licet, imo aperte cognoscere, adeo futilis fuisse calumnias, ut in judicii rationem venire non debuerint, perinde ac si quis convicium temere jactet,” Calvin, — Ver. 19. περὶ τῆς ὁικείας ἰδιαίτεραμ.] concerning their own religion. Festus prudently uses this ex media, leaving it to Agrippa to take the word in a

¹ I.e. equivalent to ὑπερεῖν. Sturt, Dial. Macr. p. 81.
² Joseph. Antt. xx. 7. 3.
³ Joseph. Antt. xx. 7. 5.
⁴ See Gerlich, l.c.
⁵ Riehm, Kuinoel.
⁶ See ver. 36 f.
⁷ Comp. xxxii. 27; also Schoettig, Hor. p. 451.
⁸ Joseph. Antt. xx. 1. 3.
⁹ Comp. 2 Thees. i. 9; Jude 7.
¹¹ Comp. the passages with ait. sic. in Wetstein.
¹² In loc., and on xvi. 37. Likewise as to the Greek law, see Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 160.
¹³ To Caesarea, just as in ver. 29.
¹⁴ See examples of ἄναφθηντος ὑπεύθεν (comp. ἀναβαλλοντας, xxiv. 28) in Wetstein.
¹⁵ Comp. ver. 7.
¹⁶ Herod. i. 36; Thuc. vi. 76; Plat. Legg. lx. p. 556 E; and often in the orators, or ἐδέχετο Dem. 275. 4.
¹⁷ Ver. 8.
good sense, but reserving withal his own view, which was certainly the
Roman one of the *Judaica superstition*. — *ζην* that he lives, namely, risen and
not again dead. Moreover, the words καὶ περὶ τινος Ἰησοῦ . . . *ζην* bear
quite the impress of the indifference and insignificance which Festus
attached to this very point, inasmuch as, in regard to the τεθνηκότος, he
does not even condescend to designate the *mode* of death, and, as regards the
*ζην*, sees in it an empty pretense.—Ver. 20. ἀποροθένην] but I, uncer-
tain on my part. Quite in accordance with the circumstances of the case—
for before the king Festus might not lay himself open to any imputation
of partiality—Luke makes the procurator keep silence over the real motive
of his proposal, ver. 9. — *εἰς τὴν περὶ τοῦτον ἐπιτρ. regarding the investigation
to be held on account of these to me so strange matters.* Instead of *εἰς τὴν
κ.τ.λ.*, Luke might have written only τὴν κ.τ.λ., or τοις κ.τ.λ.*

Ver. 21. After, however, Paul had appealed to be kept in ward 4 for the
cognizance 5 of Augustus, etc. — *τηρηθήναι* is not equivalent to *εἰς τὸ τερηθ..*,
but it is the contents of the expressed appeal, namely, the legal demand
which it contained. After this appeal had been in law validly made, no
further proceedings might be taken by the authorities at their own instance
against the appellant. 10 — *αὐτῶν* is not to be written αὐτῶν, as there is no
reflexive emphasis. — *Σεβαστός* Venerandus, the Lat. Augustus, the well-
known title of the emperors since the time of Octavianus. 11 — *τῶν οὖ ἀνα-
πέτυχον* (see the critical remarks 12) is direct address. 13

Ver. 22. The narrative of Festus has excited the Jewish interest of the
king, so that he also, on his part (κ. αὐτῶς), wishes to hear the prisoner. —
*ἐξουλέγησα* quite like our: *I wished*, namely, if it admitted of being done. 14
Calvin erroneously infers from the imperfect that Agrippa had previously
cherished a wish to hear Paul, but had hitherto refrained from expressing
it, in order not to appear as if he had come for any other reason than to
salute Festus. — *αἰρον ἀκοίην . . . αἰτεύος* The wish of the king is very

Ver. 23. Φαντασία, show, pomp, παραπομπή. 14 — τὸ ἀκορήθην 17 is the audiences-
chamber appointed for the present occasion. That it was, as is assumed,
just the usual judgment-hall, is at least not conveyed in the words. —
σῶν τε τοῖς κ.τ.λ.] τὸ is placed after σῶν, not after χλαδρχ., because the σῶν

---

1 Quinctil. iii. 8. Comp. on xvii. 22.
2 ἔστησεν, comp. xxiv. 9. [vi. 16. 2.
3 Ἐγέρσασθαι, in the judicial sense, as in Pol.
4 Comp. Soph. Trac. 1283.
5 As A H actually read. Heind. ad Plat. Orig. p. 409 C.
6 Stahl. ad Plat. Rep. p. 558 D.
7 Ver. 4.
8 Judicial decision, Wld. iii. 18, and often in the classical writers.
9 Grotius, Wolf, Heinrichs, and others.
10 See Wetstein on ver. 11.
11 See generally, Fincke, de appellatioth. Consessum honorif. et adulator. seqv. ad Hadrian., Region. 1887. αὐτὸς γεννημένος ἄρχῃ σεβασμω καὶ τοῖς ἑῳεῖν, Philo, Leg. ad Ca-
12 Tum p. 1012. Vell. Paterc. ii. 91; Dio Cass. iii. 16; Herodian, ii. 10. 19, ii. 13. 7; Strabo, vii. p. 221.
13 On ἀπειράθησας to send up, of the trans-
port of prisoners to Rome, comp. Polyb. i. 7.
14 οὐκ ἔστησα, comp. on xxiii. 12.
15 Germ.: *ίδιᾳ* wolle.
16 Comp. Rom. ix. 8; Gal. iv. 80. See Wi-
17 Tum p. 205 f. (E. T. 250).
18 1 Macc. ix. 37, ambltio (Nep. x. 2. 5). See Polyb. xv. 25. 5, xvi. 21. 1, xxiii. 13. 6; Dlog.
19 L. iv. 53; Jacobs, ad Del. epigr. p. 158; and Wetstein.
20 Plat. Moral. p. 45 F, 297 D. Cat. 22.
is again mentally supplied before ἀνάρασιν. By τοῖς χιλιάρχοις, there were ἱσεν cohorts, and therefore five tribunes in Caesarea—and by ἀνάρασιν . . . πάλιν are meant the principal military and the prominent civil personages of the city. Instead of τοῖς καὶ ἑξαχτύν ὁτα, a classical writer would say τοῖς ἑξαχτύνοις or ἑξαχτυτάτοις.  

Vv. 24, 25. Θεωρεῖν] Indicative. — παν το πλήθος] appears to conflict with vv. 2 and 15, and is at all events an exaggeration. But how natural is it to suppose that the persons there named were accompanied by an impetuous crowd! Hence also εἰποβοῦντες. On ἐντυχὼν μοι, they have approached me, in a hostile spirit towards him.  

On ἐνθάδε, comp. xxv. 17. — οἴοι αἰνοῦ ὅταν τοῦτο] and, on the other hand, this person himself, ἱσενque ipse ille. 

Vv. 26, 27. 'Ασφαλῆς τι] something trustworthy, whereby the emperor, ὁ κύριος, Dominus, the appellation declined by Augustus and Tiberius, but accepted by their successors, may inform himself certainly concerning the state of matters. Such a fixing of the real aitia had not been possible for the procurator, who had to draw up the literae dimissoriae, so long as the proceedings were constantly disturbed and confused by intentional fabrications of the Jews.—ἀναράσις.] A preliminary examination, "judicis edocendi causa." — In σχῶτο τι γράφει (see the critical remarks) γράφει is the future: what I am to write. — ἄλογον] unreasonable, absurd.  

Without εἰναι. — τοῖς καὶ αἰνοῦ aitia. This was just the ασφαλῆς, which was still wanting to the procurator. Without having made himself clear to the contents of the charges brought against Paul, he would have been obliged frankly to report to the emperor that he was in ignorance of them. Olshausen, however, is hasty in holding that, with the placing of the apostle before Agrippa the prediction of the Lord was now for the first time fulfilled. We know far too little of the previous history of the other apostles to take this ground. Perhaps the elder James and Peter had already stood before Herod.  

But Paul stood here for the first time before a king, who, however, is by no means to be considered as the representative of the power of the heathen world, as Baumgarten supposes, as Agrippa was himself a Jew, ruled over the Jews, was by Paul addressed as a Jew, and was, in fact, even regarded as representative of the Jews.

---

1 See Schoemann, ad Iose. p. 395 f.; Stallb. ad Plat. Ort. p. 43 B.  
2 On the periphrastic καθέ, see Winer, 536 (R. T. 563).  
3 Comp. 1 Mac. viii. 22, x. 61; 2 Mac. iv. 96.  
4 Matt. x. 18; Mark xii. 9.  
5 See also Heind. ad Plat. Phaedr. p. 277 R.; Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 141.  
6 See on Phil. i. 23.  
7 Thuc. vi. 85, 1, Plat. Gorg. p. 519 B, Apol. p. 18 C.  
9 See on ver. 14.  
10 xxvi. 8, 27.  
11 See Note 8.
NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(v4) I appeal to Caesar. V. 11.

For two years the mercenary and unprincipled Felix kept Paul in prison at Cesareae. It has been supposed by some that during this period, Luke, having free access to Paul, wrote his gospel, and perhaps a part of the Acts under his direction. On account of a formal impeachment by the Jews, Felix was recalled to Rome to answer their accusations, and Festus, a man of a very different character, was appointed as his successor. He seemed to have been an upright and honorable man, who entered upon the duties of his office with energy, activity, and decision. Owing to the excited state of mind among the Jews at the time, and their embittered feelings against Paul, his case was at once brought before Festus. The new governor without delay visited Jerusalem, the ancient capital of the province, with a view to become acquainted with the characteristics of the people whom he had been appointed to govern.

When there, the chief men among the Jews came to him, and asked, as a special favor, that he would give judgment against Paul at once, or order him to be sent to Jerusalem for trial. This was done with the sinister design of assassinating him while on the way. The answer of Festus was dignified and worthy of the office he held: "Let his accusers come to Cesareae, and he shall be tried there." As soon as Festus returned Paul is brought again before the court. The Jews passionately and clamorously reiterate their former charges of treason, heresy, and sacrilege, which the apostle meets with a calm and emphatic denial. With the view of putting an end to a scene so disorderly and offensive to his sense of Roman decorum, Festus asks Paul whether he was willing to transfer the question from Roman back to Jewish jurisdiction. Paul's reply is prompt and decided, and reveals the dauntless and heroic spirit of the man. "I am either guilty or not; if guilty, I fear not the sentence of death from the tribunal at which I now stand; but if I am innocent, as a Roman citizen, no man can deliver me into the hands of the Jews; I appeal to Caesar." The right of appeal from a subordinate court to the emperor was one of the privileges of citizenship; and no unnecessary impediment could be interposed against such appeal. Festus therefore, having consulted his counsellors, granted the appeal and said, "Unto Caesar thou shalt go"—"Cæsarem appellasti; ad Cæsarem ibis." So Paul was again remanded to prison until arrangements could be made to forward him to Rome. Particular importance was attached to the right of appeal from the judgments of provincial magistrates. The magic power of this one word appello is described as similar to that of the talismanic phrase, Cives Romanus sum. Indeed the two things coincided. (Alexander.)

(v4) Unto my lord. V. 26.

'O κυριο-—dominus—lord. Gloag says: "In the use of this title we have an instance of the extreme accuracy of the historian of the Acts." This title was declined by the first two emperors, Augustus and Tiberias. Caligula accepted it, but it was not a recognized title of any emperor before Domitian. Of
Augustus, Tertullian writes: "Augustus imperii formator ne dominum quidem dici se volebat"—Augustus, the founder of the empire, did not wish any one to call him lord. And Suetonius writes: "Dominum se appellari, ne a liberis quidem, aut nepotibus, vel serio vel joco, passus est"—He suffered not himself to be addressed as lord, even by his own children or grandchildren, whether in jest or earnest.

Antoninus Pius was the first who put this title on his coins. Polycarp, who was a contemporary of some of the apostles, and who suffered martyrdom at an advanced age, refused to utter it.
CHAPTER XXVI.

VER. 1. ἔπει] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read peri, upon decisive evidence. — Ver. 3. After δέσως Elz. Scholz have sou, which is deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to A B E K, min. Aeth. Syr. p. Arm. Vulg. A supplementary addition. — Ver. 6, εἰς] Elz. Scholz have πρὸς. εἰς has A B E K, min. in its favour; is recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born.; πρὸς is explanatory, in accordance with xiii. 32. — After παρ. A B C E K, min. Chrys. Theophyl. and many vss. have ἡμῖν. Adopted by Griesb. Scholz. Lachm., and in view of the considerable preponderance of testimony, rightly. The unnecessary pronoun was easily passed over. — Ver. 7. The critically established order of the words is: ἔγκαλον μαίν ὑπὸ 'Iovaiou (not ὑπὸ τῶν 'Iov., as Elz. has) Ἰασολέω. So Lachm. Born. Tisch. ἱγοςίας, which Elz. and Scholz have after βασιλεῖς, is an addition opposed to greatly preponderant testimony. — Ver. 10. φυλακαίς] decisive witnesses have εἰν φυλ.; so Griesb. Scholz. Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 12, εἰν εἰς καί] καί is wanting in A B C E J K, min. and several vss. Deleted by Lachm. and Born.; and on that preponderating testimony with the more right, as the frequent καί after the relative was easily added mechanically. — τῆς παρά τῶν] Lachm. and Born. have merely τῶν, according to A. E J, min. vss. (B Ν omit only παρά). But τῆς might be just as easily left out after the syllable τῆς, as παρά might be overlooked as superfluous. If only τῶν stood originally, there was no reason why it should be completed from ver. 10. Therefore the Recepta is to be retained. — Ver. 14. λαλοῦσαν πρός με κ. λέγονταν] Lachm. and Born. read λέγονταν πρός με, following A B C J K, min. vss., to which also E, min., having φωνῆς λεγοντός πρός με, are to be added. But the comparison of ix. 4, xxii. 7, occasioned the abbreviation. — Ver. 15. ὁ δὲ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ὁ δὲ Κύριος, according to very considerable testimony. The Recepta is from ix. 5 (see the critical remarks thereon). — Ver. 16. εἴδες] B C* (?) 137, Arm. Syr. p. Armbr. Aug. have εἶδες με. More precise definition, although defended by Buttman in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 360. — Ver. 17. Instead of τῇ, Elz. Scholz have νῦν, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 20. After πρῶτον Lachm. Born. Tisch. have τε as in A B Ν. Inserted for closer connection with καί Ιερος. Comp. the following τε . . . καί. — εἰς πάσαν] εἰς is wanting in A B K, and is deleted by Lachm., but is indispensable, and might be easily enough passed over after the syllable ois. — Ver. 21. The article is wanting before 'Iovaiou in B G Ν*, which Buttman approves: it was easily overlooked on account of the similarity of the following syllable, but would hardly be added, comp. vv. 2, 3, 7. — Ver. 22. παρά] ἀπό has the stronger attestation (Lachm. Tisch. Born.). — μαρτυρούμενος] A B G H Ν, min. Chrys. Theophyl. have μαρτυρούμενος. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. A correction. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 25. ὁ δὲ] Lachm. and Born. read ὁ δὲ Παῦλος, which, indeed, has important attestation, but has the suspicion of having arisen from the very usual practice of writing the name on the margin. — Ver. 28. ἵππα] is to be deleted, with Lachm.

Vv. 1–3. Ἐπιτρέπεται σοι] it is, herewith, permitted to thee to speak for thyself, i.e. to defend thyself. — ἵκτεινα τὴν χειρα] after stretching forth his hand, is not equivalent to the κατακείσαι τῇ χειρᾷ, xii. 17, xiii. 16, in opposition to Er. Schmid and Hammond, because this latter had for its object the στάγνον of the hearers; but it conveys a trait descriptive of the solemnity of this moment: Paul comes forward in the attitude of an orator, with all the ingenuousness and candour of a good conscience, although the chain hung on his hands. — Comp. in contrast to the simple gesture of Paul, the artificially rhetorical one in Apuleius: "Porrigit dextram et ad instar oratorum conformat articulum, duobusque infinis conclusis digitis ceteros eminentes porrigit." According to Lange’s fancy, it is an intimation that "he stretched out his hand at length for once to an intelligent judge." — How true and dignified is also here the conciliatory exordium, with which Paul commences his speech! — ἵπτε Ἰουδαίων] by Jews, generally, not: by the Jews, comp. xxv. 10. In regard to Jewish accusations, Paul esteemed himself fortunate that he was to defend himself before Agrippa, as the latter was best informed about Jewish customs and controversies. — Ver. 3. μάλιστα γνώσετι δύνα μ] as thou art most, more than all other authorities, cognisant.

The speech, continuing by a participial construction, is joined on in an abnormal case, as if an accusative expression had been previously used. The view of Bornemann is very harsh, as ὅλος ἄνω entirely closes the previous construction, and commences a new sentence of the speech: that Paul has put the accusative, because he had it in view to continue subsequently with αὐτῷ . . . ὑποίσαι μου, but omitted to do so on account of πάνω . . . ἡγημάτων. — κατά Ἰουδ. among Jews throughout.

Vv. 4, 5. Μᾶν οὖν] introduces, in connection with the preceding exordium, the commencement now of the defence itself. — βιωσίν] manner of life. Not preserved in Greek writers. — τὴν ἀν’ ἀρχῆς . . . Ἱεροσ.] a significant exegesis of τὴν ἐκ νεότητος, for the establishment of the following ἴσοι κ.τ.λ. — προγινόμενοις . . . Φαρισαίοις] my manner of life . . . know all Jews, since they knew me from the outset, since the first time of my be-

1 Expressing the meaning: thou dosest not to make me a Christian. Nevertheless Lachmann, Proc. p. x considers the reading of A as correct. [7. 16.
3 xii. 17.
4 Ver. 29.
5 Metamorph. ii. p. 54.
6 Comp. xxiv. 10.
8 See Winer, p. 574 (E. T. 499).
9 See Bäumlein, Partik. p. 181.
10 Ecclus. Prag. i, Symm. Ps. xxxviii. 6,
coming known—namely, that I, according to the strictest sect of our religion (θρησκείας), have lived as Pharisee. This Ἰουδαίος, calling that ἀριστ. αἰρεσίν by its name, stands with great emphasis at the close. Notice generally the intentional definiteness with which Paul here describes all the circumstances of the case, to which belongs also the emphatic repetition of τίν. — In προ-γνώσει, προ, before, contains the same conception, which is afterwards still more definitely denoted by ἄνωθεν. They knew Paul earlier than merely since the present encounter, and that indeed ἄνωθεν, from the beginning, which therefore, as it refers to the knowing and not to Κρας, may not be explained: from my ancestors. — ην θελωσε παρειπείν] if they do not conceal or deny, but are willing to testify it. "No leaf at the same, quia persentiose-ebant, in conversione Pauli, etiam respectu vitae ante actae, efficacissimum esse argumentum pro veritate fidei Christianae," Bengel.

Vv. 6, 7. As I was known from of old by every one as a disciple of the strictest orthodoxy, so it is also now far from being anything heterodox, on account of which I stand accused (ἰσπαρμενείς),—it is the universal, ardently-cherished, national hope, directed to the promise issued by God to our fathers. — εἰς ἡμῖν] on account of hope toward the promise, etc. That Paul means the hope of the Messianic kingdom to be erected, the hope of the whole eternal εἰπρονομια, not merely the special hope of the resurrection of the dead, the following more precise description proves, in which the universal and unanimous solicitude of the nation is depicted. He had preached of this hope, that the risen Jesus would realize it, and this was the reason of his persecution. — εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν] issued to our fathers. On the order of the words, the participle after the substantive, see Küchler. — εἰς ήν refers to the ἐπαγγελία. — τῷ ὀδηγοῦν ἡμῶν] our twelve-tribe-stock, a theocratically honourable designation of the nation as a whole. The word is also found in the Protevangel, Jacob, 1: τῷ ὀδηγοῦσατο τοῦ Ἰσαακ. To understand the expression historically, it need only be remarked, that even after the exile the collective body of the people actually consisted of the twelve tribes; in which view the circumstance, that ten tribes did not return from the exile, did not alter anything in the objective relation, and could not destroy the consciousness, deeply interwoven and vividly bound up by history and prophecy with the whole national character, that every Jew, wherever he was, belonged to the great unity of the ὀδηγοῦν,—to say nothing of the fact that all the members of the ten tribes did not go into exile, and of the 500 did not jointly and severally remain in exile. The question, therefore, as to the later fate of the ten tribes does not belong to this place. — ἐν ἑνεκείναις τ. τ. Λ.] with constancy attending to the
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1 xxii. 9.
2 See Bornemann in loc.
3 Luke i. 3.
4 Bessar.
5 Comp. xxiii. 19 f.
6 Heb. ix. 15.
7 Grotius.
8 Comp. xiii. 32 f.
9 See also xxviii. 20.
10 Med. Anab. v. 3. 4.
11 Comp. Jas. 1. 4.
12 See Thilo in loc., p. 105 f.; Clem. 1 Cor. 63, comp. chap. 31, p. 75.
13 Quite analogous in διεφθαρεῖν. Herod. v. 65; comp. τετραθάλ. In the same place.
14 See especially Baumgarten.
worship of God, as well by the *τερπ., sacrificial juge,* as by prayer and every kind of adoration. Comp. on Luke ii. 37, where also, in order at once to give prominence to the earnestness of the constant worship, νίκτα precedes. — καταναγχαί] to arrive, as if at a goal, which is the contents of the promise. The conception λαμβάνειν τίν επαγγέλ. is analogous. The realization of the Messianic promise is also here represented as attaching itself to the pious preparation of the nation. — ἵπτον Ἰοναίων] by Jesus! placed at the end, brings into emphatic prominence the contrast. The absurdity and wickedness of being impeached by Jesus concerning the hope of the Messianic kingdom were to be made thoroughly palpable.

Ver. 8. The circumstance that Paul made the resurrection of Jesus the foundation of his preaching of the Messianic kingdom, had specially provoked the hatred of the Jews. This resurrection they would not recognize, and therefore he continues—in his impassioned address breaking away from what had gone before, and in the person of the Jewish king addressing the Jews themselves as if present (παρ' ἐμίν)—with the bold inquiry: Why is it esteemed as incredible with you? etc. Beza and others, also de Wette and Lange, place after τί a note of interrogation: How? Is it incredible? etc. But it tells decisively against this view that the mere τί is not so used; τί γάρ, τί οὖν, or τί οὖν would be employed. — ei ὁ Θεός νεκρ. ἦτοι ἕν God, as He has done in the instance of Jesus, raises the dead. ei is neither equivalent to δέ, nor is it the problematic whether, the more especially as the matter under discussion is not that of doubt or uncertainty on the part of the Jews, but that of their definite unbelief, which is absurd.

Vv. 9, 10. In consequence of this unbelief (μὲν οὖν), I myself was once a decided opponent of the name of Jesus.—εἴδησα ἐπανρ. ἑαυτ. ipsi videbar. See examples in Wetstein. The view of Erasmus, Calovius, de Dieu, and Vater, who connect ἐπανρ. with δειν, is to be rejected; for δειν with the dative, although not without example in classical writers, is foreign to the N. T. ἐπανρ. has the emphasis of his own personal opinion: I had the self-delusion, that I ought to exert myself. “Tanta vis errantis conscientiae,” Bengel. — πράσος τὸ ὄνομα] in reference to the name, namely, in order to suppress the confession and invocation of it. Observe how Paul uses ἰς συν τοῦ Ναζ.ν. according to his standpoint as Saul.—δ] which πολλὰ ἔναντι πράζαι I also actually did. This is then more particularly set forth by καὶ (and indeed) πολλούς κ.τ.λ. Mark the difference between πράσοσων and ποιεῖν. — τῶν ἢ γινώσκω] spoken from the Christian standpoint of the apostle, with grief. The ἢγώ also has painful emphasis — ἀναμ. τε αἰτ., καθήγεται ψήφου] and when they were put to death, when people were on the point of executing them, I have given vote thereto, calculation adjecti, i.e. I have as-

1 See Ewald, Alterth. p. 171.
2 Comp. on Phil. iii. 7.
3 ii. 23; Gal. iii. 14; Heb. ix. 15, x1. 12.
4 Comp. vili. 30 f.
5 xxv. 19.
6 Comp. Vulgate, Erasmus, and others.
7 Luther, Beza, Grotius, and others.
8 De Wette and others.
9 Xen. Mem. Ill. 3. 10, Anab. Ill. 4. 26, Oecoms. vili. 30; see Kühner, § 551, note 5; Schoenm. 10 Comp. Gal. ii. 10. [ad lx. p. 880.]
11 See on John ili. 30.
sented, συνενδόκησα, xxi. 20. The plural ἀναρχ. αὐτ. is not, with Grotius, Kuinoel, and others, to be referred merely to Stephen, but also to other unknown martyrs, who met their death in the persecution which began with the killing of Stephen. Elsner and Kypke make the genitives dependent on κατηγορεία, and in that case take κατα- in a hostile reference. Harsh, and without precedent in linguistic usage; ἀναρχ. αὐτ. is the genitive absolute, and κατηγορεία is conceived with a local reference, according to the original conception of the ψήφος, the voting-stone, which the voter deposes in the urn. Classical authors make use of the simple φέρων, φήμων, also of διάφερειν, or ἐπιφέρ. or ἀναφέρ. or εἰκόφρ. But to καταφέρειν in our passage corresponds the classical τίθειναι ψήφον.

Vv. 11-13. Κατὰ πᾶσας τ. συναγ. throughout all the συναγωγαί in Jerusalem, going from one to another and searching out the Christians in all. — τιμωρῶν αὐτοῖς] taking vengeance on them, dragging them to punishment. The middle is more usual. — βλασφημίων] namely, τὸν Ἰησοῦν, which is obvious of itself, as the object of the specific reverence of Christians. Whether and how far this ἴδαγμα. βλασφ. was actually successful, cannot be determined. — εἷς καὶ εἰς τάς ἐξω πόλεις] till even unto the extraneous cities, outside of Palestine. By this remark the following narrative has the way significantly prepared for it. — εἰς ὅλις] in which affairs of persecution. — μετ᾽ ἐξωστρ. κ. ἐνπρ.] with power and plenary authority. "Paulus erat commissarius," Bengel. — ἡμέρας ἠμέρας] Αὔ αποστ. μεσημβρίας, genitive of the definition of time. On the non-classical Greek expression μέσα ἡμέρα, see Lobeck. — κατὰ τὴν δόμον] along the way. — ὑπὲρ τ. λαμπρ. τ. ἡλίου] surpassing the brightness of the sun.

Vv. 14, 15. See on ix. 4 ff.; comp. xxi. 7 f. — τῇ Ἐξοφ. διαλ.] It was natural that the exalted Christ should make no other language than the native tongue of the person to be converted the medium of his verbal revelation. Moreover, these words confirm the probability that Paul now spoke not, as at xxi. 40, in Hebrew, but in Greek. — σκληρὸν αὐτοῖς κέντρα λακτίζων hard for thee, to kick against goads! i.e. it is for thee a difficult undertaking, surpassing thy strength, and not to be accomplished by thee, that thou, as my persecutor, shouldest contend against my will. 'Ἡ δὲ τροπή ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν τῶν γὰρ οἱ ἀτακτοὶ κατὰ τὴν γεωργίαν κεντριζόμενοι ύπὸ ἀροῦντος, λακτίζων τὸ κέντρον καὶ μᾶλλον πληγίταιναι."

Vv. 16-18. 'Ἀλλά! "Prostravit Christus Paulum, ut eum humiliaret; nunc eum erigit ac jubet bono esse animo," Calvin. — εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ] εἰς τοῦτο
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1 Comp. viii. 1, ix. 1.
2 Comp. κατάφησιν. [quently.
4 Plat. Thm. p. 81 D; Eur. Or. 784; Dem.
5 362. 6, and frequently.
6 Comp. xxil. 19.
7 Soph. O. E. 107, 140; Polyb. ii. 56. 15.
8 Comp. xxii. 5, and Westein in loc.
9 Jas. ii. 7; comp. Pln. Ep. x. 97; Sucer,
10 Thep. i. p. 607.
11 Comp. xxiv. 18.
12 Polyb. iii. 15. 7; 3 Macc. xii. 14.
13 Bernhardy, p. 146.
15 xxv. 8, vili. 36.
16 See Winer, p. 576 (E. T. 508).
17 Compare Gamelie's saying, v. 29.
19 Aesch. Agam. 1540 (1894): πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε. See other examples from Greek and
20 Roman writers in Grotius and Westein; also
21 Blomfield, ad Aesch. Prom. 381; Eimal. ad
points emphatically to what follows, προχείρισσαι κ.τ.λ., and γάρ assigns the reason for what precedes, ἀνάστηθι κ.τ.λ.—προχείρ.] in order to appoint thee. 1 He was, indeed, the αἱκὸν ἵκλογῆς, ix. 15. — ὃν τε ὀφθήσομαι σοι] ὃν is to be resolved into τούτων δὲ; but ὀφθήσομαι is not, with Luther, Bengel, and others, including Bornemann, to be taken as causative, videre faciam, but purely passive, I shall be seen. The δὲ contained in ὃν is equivalent to δι' ὃν, on account of which. 2 Consequently: and of those things, on account of which I shall appear to thee, tibi videtur. 3 — εἰς ἐρωτημένος σε] is an accompanying definition to ὀφθήσομαι σοι: rescuing thee, as thy deliverer, from the people, i.e. καὶ ἐξοχὴν, the Jewish nation, and from the Gentiles, from their hostile power. 4 Calvin appropriately says: "Hic armatur contra omnes metus, qui eum maneant, et simul praeparatur ad crucis tolerantiam." — εἰς οὗ] is not, with Calvin, Grotius, and others, to be referred merely to τῶν ἐθνῶν, but, with Beza, Bengel, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, de Wette, to τὸν λαὸν κ. τ. ἐθνῶν together, which is required by the significant bearing of vv. 19, 20. — ἀποστέλλω] not future, but strictly present. — ἀνοίξαι σφαιραί αὐτῶν] contains the aim of the mission. And this opening of their eyes, i.e. the susceptibility for the knowledge of divine truth, 5 which was to be brought to them by the preaching of the gospel, 6 was to have the design: τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι, that they may turn themselves; on account of ver. 20, less admissible is the rendering of Beza and Bengel: ut convertas, ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς, from darkness to light, i.e. from a condition, in which they are destitute of saving truth, and involved in ignorance and sin, to the opposite element, καὶ (ἀπὸ) τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ κ.τ.λ. The two more precise definitions of ἐπιστρέψαι apply to both, to the Jews and Gentiles; but the latter has respect in its predominant reference to the Gentiles, who are ἄθετοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, 7 under the power of Satan, the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, Eph. ii. 2. — τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτῶν ἄφεσιν . . . εἰς ἑαυτὸν] This now contains the aim of τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι κ.τ.λ., and so the ultimate aim of ἀνοίξαι σφαιραί αὐτῶν.— κλήρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγαμοῖς.] See on xx. 22. — πίστις τῇ εἰς ἑαυτὸν] belongs to λαβεῖν. Faith on Christ, as the subjective condition (causa apprehendens) of the forgiveness of sins and the attainment of the Messianic salvation, is with great emphasis placed at the close; the form also of the expression has weight.

Vv. 19, 20. ὦθεν] Hence, 8 namely, because such a glorious ministry has been promised to me. — ὄντι εἰγνώμην] i.e. non praestitit me. 9 — Observe the address to the king, as at ver. 13 in the narrative of the emergence of the Christophany, so here immediately after its close; in both places, for the purpose of specially exciting the royal interest. — τῇ ὑπάρχῃ ὑπαστοίρι] the heavenly vision, because it came ὑπάρχων τῇ χρόν. τ.'Ἰουδ.]
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1 See on iii. 20, xxii. 14.
3 Comp. Winer, p. 266 (E. T. 329), who, however, without reason, contradicts himself, p. 185 (E. T. 178).
4 On ἵκλογ., comp. vii. 10, xii. 11, xxiii. 27; Gal. i. 4, LXX. and Apocr.; Dem. 256. 2, al.)
5 The opposite: xxviii. 27; Rom. xil. 8.
6 Ver. 20.
7 Eph. ii. 12.
8 Ver. 19 proves the resistibility of the influences of grace.
9 Matt. xiv. 7.
10 See Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 7. 4.
11 Ver. 12.
The statement is threefold: I preached, (1) to them in Damascus; (2) to the city Jerusalem, Ἰερουσαλήμ, simple dative, no longer dependent on ἐν, and unto all the land of Judaea; 1 (3) to the Gentiles. 2 Thus Paul indicates his whole ministry from his conversion till now. 3 Consequently there is here no contradiction with Gal. i. 22. 4 It was also the interest of the apostle, persecuted by the Jews, to put his working for the Jews into the foreground. The shift to which Hofmann, l.c., resorts, that the apostle does not at all say that he has preached in all Judaea—he certainly does say so—but only that his preaching had wound forth thither, is the less required, as he here sumptarily comprehends his whole working. — πράσονας] accusative. 5 — Paul certainly gives the contents of his preaching in a form reminding us of the preaching of the Baptist; 6 but he thus speaks, because he stands before an assembly before which he had to express himself in the mode most readily understood by it, and after a type universally known and venerated, for the better disclosure of the injustice done to him (ἐνκα τούτων, ver. 21!) ; to set forth here the μυστήριον of his gospel, with which he filled up this form, would have been quite out of place. Without reason, Zeller and Baur 7 find here a denial of the doctrine of justification by faith alone; an opinion which ought to have been precluded by the very πίστες τῆς εἰς ἑμέ, ver. 18, which leaves no doubt as to what was in the mind of the apostle the specific qualification for μετανοεῖν . . . πράσονας.

Vv. 21, 22. 'Ενκα τούτων. 7 because I have preached this μετανοεῖν and ἐντρέψεων among Jews and Gentiles. — διαχειρ.] Beza correctly explains: "manibus suis interficere." 8 — ἐπικοινωνίας ὑπὸ . . . θεοῦ] This ὑπὸ infers from the preceding ἐν εἰς. διαχειρ. that the ἑστηκα ἀχρὶ τῆς ἡμέρ. ταύτης is effected through help of God, without which no deliverance from such extreme danger to life could come. Observe withal the triumphant ἑστηκα, I stand, keep my ground! — μαρτυροῦμενος μικρὸ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ,] as one witnessed to by small and great, i.e. who has a good testimony from young and old. 9 Accordingly, μαρτυροῦμενος is to be taken quite regularly as passive, and that in its very current sense; 10 while μικρός and μεγάλῳ are the datives usual with the passive construction. 11 The usual rendering, following the Vulgate: witnessing to small and great, 12 i.e. "instituens omnis generis homines," 13 arbitrarily assumes a deviation from linguistic usage, as μαρτυρεῖσθαι is always used passively, on which account, in 1 Thess. ii. 12, the reading

1 See in Luke viii. 34, and frequently ; see on ix. 28, xviii. 11.
2 The πρῶτον belongs only to τοῖς ἐν Δαμασκῷ, not also to Ἰερουσαλήμ. (Hofmann, N. T. i. p. 119), as between Damascus and Jerusalem, in the consciousness of the apostle (Gal. i. 13), there lay an interval of three years.
3 See ver. 21.
4 Zeller.
5 See Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. i. 2. 1; Kühner, ad Mem. i. 1. 9; Bretschneider, ad Oecum. i. 4.
7 See also his neutest. Theol. p. 333.
8 See on v. 30. Comp. xxi. 30, 31.
9 vill. 10.
10 As in vi. 3, x. 23 al.
11 See on Matt. v. 21, instead of which ἔστω is used in x. 22, xvi. 3, xxii. 13.
12 Erasmus, Castello, Calvin, Bengel, and others take μαρτυροῦμενος. τοῖς . . . θεοῦ in the sense of rank: to persons of low and of high degree. This is historically unsuitable to the correct view of μαρτυροῦμενος, as Paul was despised and persecuted by the great of this world. The wisdom, which he preached, was not at all theirs, 1 Cor. ii. 6 ff.
13 Kuinoel.
Paul's Reply to Festus.

μαρτυρητος is necessarily to be defended.¹ See Rinck,² who, however, as also de Wette, Baumgarten, Ewald, declares for the reading μαρτυρημ. ; this, although strongly attested (see the critical remarks), is an old, hasty emendation, which was regarded as necessary to suit the dative. But in what a significant contrast to that deadly hatred of his enemies appears the statement:¹ "By help of God I stand till this day, well attested by small and great"! The following words then give the reason of this μαρτυριον: because I set forth nothing else than what (ὁ = τοιοῦτον ὁ) the prophets, etc. — μεταλλων] On the attraction, see Lobeck;⁴ and on the expression τὰ μεταλλον γίνεσθαι, Jacobes.*

Ver. 23 is to be separated simply by a comma from the preceding: What the prophets and Moses have spoken concerning the future, whether,—whether, namely—the Messiah is exposed to suffering, etc. — Paul expresses himself in problematic form (εἰ), because it was just the point of debate among the Jews whether a suffering Messiah was to be believed in,⁶ as in fact such an one constantly proved an offence unto them." "Res erat liquida; Judaei in quaestionem vocarant," Bengel. Paul in his preaching has said nothing else than what Moses and the prophets have spoken as the future state of the case on this point; he has propounded nothing new, nothing of his own invention, concerning it. πεποιθης, passibilis,⁸ not, however, in the metaphysical sense of susceptibility of suffering, but of the divine destination to suffering: subjected to suffering.⁹ The opposite ἀπαθης in classic writers since the time of Herodotus.¹⁰ — The other point of the predictions of Moses and the prophets, vividly introduced without a connecting particle, in respect of which Paul had just as little deviated from their utterances, is: whether the Messiah as the first from the resurrection of the dead, as the first for ever risen, as πρωτοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν,¹¹ will proclaim light¹² to the Jewish people and to the Gentiles. The chief stress of this sentence lies on πρωτος ἐκ ἀνασ. νεκρῶν; for, if this was, in accordance with the O. T., appropriated to the Messiah as characteristic, thereby the σκάνδαλον of the cross of Christ was removed. After His resurrection Jesus proclaimed light to all the Gentiles by his self-communication in the Holy Spirit,¹³ whose organs and mediate agents the apostles and their associates were.¹⁴

Ver. 24. While he was thus speaking in his defence, Festus said with a loud voice,¹⁵ Thou art mad, Paul! ταύτα is to be referred to the whole defence,¹⁶ now interrupted by Festus—observe the present participle—but in which certainly the words spoken last (οὐδὲν ἐκτός κ.τ.λ.) were most unpalatable.

¹ See Lünemann in loc.
² Lübker, crit. p. 91.
³ Ver. 81.
⁴ Ad Aj. 1000; Buttman, neut. Gt. p. 261 (R. T. 305).
⁵ Ad Philos. p. 650.
⁶ John xli. 84.
⁷ 1 Cor. I. 23; Gal. v. 11.
⁸ Vulgata.
⁹ Plut. Alex. 16: ὑπὸ θυρίων καὶ καθηκότων

¹¹ Col. I. 18; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22.
¹² As in ver. 18.
¹³ See on Eph. II. 17.
¹⁴ Comp. on Col. I. 12.
¹⁵ μετ. τῇ φωνῇ, see on xiv. 10.
¹⁶ As to ἀπολαογ. τι, see on Luke xii. 11.
to the cold-hearted statesman, and at length raised his impatience to the point of breaking out aloud. His profane mind remained unaffected by the holy inspiration of the strange speaker, and took his utterances as the whims of a mind perverted by much study from the equilibrium of a sound understanding. His ματημαί was indignant earnestness; with all the more earnestness and bitterness he expressed the idea of eccentricity by this hyperbolical ματημαίνον, the more he now saw his hope of being enlightened as to the true state of matters grievously disappointed.¹ That solicitude of the procurator,² which naturally governed his tone of mind, was much too anxious and serious for a jest, such as Olshausen takes it to be. Nor does μεγάλη τή φωνή suit this, on which Chrysostom already correctly remarks: οὕτω ἐν κ. ὀργής ἡ φωνή. The explanation, thou art an enthusiastic is nothing but a mistaken softening of the expression.³ However the furor propheti-
ous may be nourished by plunging into πολλά γράμματα, the ματημαί in this sense is far less suited to the indignation of the annoyed Roman; and that Paul regarded himself as declared by him to be a madman, is evident from ver. 25 (ἀλήθειας κ. σωφροσ.). — tā πολλά σε γράμματα] multas litteras,⁴ the much knowledge, learning, with which thou busiest thyself.⁵ Not: the many books, which thou readest,⁶ for, if so, we cannot see why the most naturally occurring word, βιβλία or βιβλοί, should not have been used. — The separation of πολλά from γράμμα by the interposition of σε puts the emphasis on πολλά. Bengel correctly adds: Videbat Festus, naturam non agere in Paulo; gratiam non vidit.⁷

Ver. 25. Ὅ δέ] μετὰ ἐπικεφαλής ἀποκριθήμενος, Chrysostom.— ἀλήθειας κ. σωφροσ. βήματα] words, to which truth and intelligence, sound discretion, belong. ἀλήθεια may doubtless accompany enthusiastic utterance, but it is a characteristic opposed to madness. For passages in the classics where σωφροσύνη is opposed to ματημαί, see Eslner and Raphel.⁷ — ἀποφθέγγοναι] "aptum verbum," Bengel. See on ii. 4.

Ver. 26. In proof (γάρ) that he spoke truly, and in his sound mind, Paul appeals to the knowledge of the king, in quō plus erat spei, Calvin.— peri τούτων and τί τούτων refer to what Paul had last said concerning the Messiah, which had overpowered the patience of Felix and drawn from him the ματημαί.⁸ τούτο is the same, but viewed together as an historical unity. ἐπιστάμαι with peri is not found elsewhere in the N. T., but often in Greek writers. — oiv] like nili, in no respect.⁹ Taken as accusative of object, it would be inappropriate, on account of τί;¹⁰ while, on the other hand, B has not τί.—Observe also the correlates ἐπιστάμαι and λανθάνειν placed at the beginning. — oiv ... ἐν γαμνί] A litotes: not in a corner (ἐν κρυπτῷ), but publicly in the sacred capital of the nation.¹¹

¹ Comp. Soph. O. R. 1800: τίς εὔ, δετέλμαν, προεδρήσαμαί
² xxv. 26.
³ So Kuhn (in Wolf), Majus (Obs. IV. p. 11 et.), Loesner, Schleusner, Dindorf.
⁴ Vulgate.
⁵ See on John vil. 13.
⁶ Heinrichs, Kulnoel, Hildebrand.
⁷ Plat. Procr. p. 233 B: δει αὐτοι σωφροσύνην ἠγούμενον εἶναι τέλειόν λέγειν, ἐνεργείᾳ ματημαί.
⁸ Comp. also Luke vili. 25; 2 Cor. v. 12.
⁹ Comp. on ταύτα, ver. 24.
¹⁰ Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. vi. 6. 12.
¹¹ Hence A B Μ Ζ min. omit it (so Lachmann and Bornemann).
¹² See examples in Wetstein.
Ver. 27. Instead of adding to the "for this was not done in a corner" as a second reason, "and the prophets in whom the king believes have foretold it," in the increased vehemence of his impassioned discourse, Paul turns to the king with the question: Believeth thou the prophets? and immediately himself answers the question with confidence: I know that thou believest! Thus with fervent earnestness he suddenly withdraws the sacred subject from merely objective contemplation, and brings it as a matter of conscience home to the king's consciousness of faith. Paul could reasonably say without flattery, οἶδα, ἢτι πιστεύεις, since Agrippa, educated as a Jew, could not have belief in the truth of the prophecies otherwise than as a heritage of his national training, although it had in his case remained simply theory, and therefore the words of the apostle did not touch his heart, but glanced off on his polished and good-natured levity.

Ver. 28. The king is of course well-meaning enough not to take amiss the burning words, but also, as a luxurious man of the world, sufficiently estranged from what is holy instantly to banish the transiently-felt impression with haughtily contemptuous mockery. The conduct of Pilate in John xviii. 38 is similar to this and to ver. 32. — ἐν ἀληθείᾳ is to be taken as neuter, and without supplement, namely: With little (ἐν, instrumental) thou persuadedst me to become a Christian! This sarcasm is meant to say: "Thus summarily, thus briefly, manu, you will not manage to win me over to Christianity." Appropriately, in substance, Oecumenius: ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τοῦτο ἔστι δὲ ἀληθείᾳ Ἰμανουὴλ, ἐν βασίλει ἀληθείᾳ, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἀδιασκέπασθαι, χωρὶς πάλιν πάνω καὶ συνεχῶς διαλέξεις. Most expositors either adopt the meaning sometimes with and sometimes without the supplement of χρόνῳ: in a short time; or: prope modum, parum abest quin. So also Ewald, who calls to his aid the τῷ of value, for a little, i.e. almost. But in opposition to the view which takes it temporally, may be decisively urged the reading μεγάλῳ, to be adopted instead of παλαιῷ in ver. 29 (see the critical remarks), an expression which proves that Paul apprehended ἐν ἀληθείᾳ in a quantitative sense; and there is no reason in the context for the idea, to which Calvin is inclined, following Chrysostom, that Paul took the word in one sense and the king in another. The same reason decides against the explanation prope modum, which also is not linguistically to be justified, for there must have been used either ἀληθεία, or ἀληθεία ἢτι or παρ' ἀληθείᾳ. — Lastly, that the words of the king are to be taken ironically, and not, with Heinrichs and many other expositors, as an earnest confession, is evident even from the very improbability in itself of such a confession in view of the luxurious levity of the king, as well as from the name Ἐρασίων, which, of Gentile origin, carries with it in the mouth of

---

1 Comp. Dissen, ad Dem de oor. pp. 186.
2 As in Eph. iii. 3 (see in loc.).
3 Calvin, Wetstein, Kuhnoel, Olshausen, Neander, de Wette, Lange.
4 Find. Pyth. vill. 131; Plat. Apol. p. 23 B; and see the passages in Raphel, Polyb.; comp. the analogous δι' ἀληθείας, Thuc. i. 77. 4, ii. 85. 2, iii. 43. 3; Schaefer, ad. Bos. Eth. pp. 101, 553; and see on Eph. iii. 3.
5 Chrysostom, Valla, Luther, Castello, Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Calovius, and others, to which also the modica ex parte of Erasmus comes in the end.
7 Bernhardy, p. 268.
8 See on xi. 26.
a Jew the accessory idea of heterodoxy and the stain of contempt. Schneckenburger also would have the expression to be earnestly meant, but in favour of the apologetic design imputed to the Book of Acts (v).

Ver. 29. In the full consciousness of his apostolic dignity, Paul now upholds the cause of the despised Χριστιανοὺς γενεσθαι as that which he would entreat from God for the king and all his present hearers, and which was thus more glorious than all the glory of the world. — εἰς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ] I would indeed, in case of the state of the matter admitting it, pray to God.² Ἐξεσθαι; with the dative, to pray to any one, only here in the N. T., but very frequently in classical writers. — In what follows σῆμερον belongs to τ. ἄκολουθός μου, not to γενέσθαι,² as is to be inferred from ἐν μεγάλῳ. — καὶ ἐν δύναμι καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ σὺ μόνον εἰ κ.τ.λ.] that as well by little as by great,—whether in the case of one, little,⁴ and in the case of another, much,⁵ may be employed as a means for the purpose,—not merely thou, but also all . . . were such also as I am, Christians. On κάγω, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 7.⁷ — παρεκτὸς τῶν διεσιωμ. τοῦτων] The chains which had bound him in prison, and were again to bind him,⁸ chaining him, namely, after the manner of the custodia militaris to the soldiers who watched him, he bore now hanging down freely on his arm.⁹ The παρεκτὸς κ.τ.λ., although to the apostle his chains were an honour,¹⁰ is "suavissima εἰπετραπεία et exceptio,"¹¹ in the spirit of love.

Vv. 30–32. Perhaps this bold, grand utterance of the singular man had made an impression on the king's heart, the concealment of which might have occasioned embarrassment to him, had he listened any longer: Agrippa arose and thereby brought the discussion at once to a close. With him arose, in the order of rank, first the procurator, then Bernice, then all who sat there with them (οἱ συγκαθημένοι αὐτοῖς). After they had retired from the audience chamber (ἀναχώρησαντες), they communicated to each other their unanimous opinion, which certainly amounted, only to the superficial political negative: this man, certainly by the most regarded as a harmless enthusiast, practises nothing which merits death or bonds. But Agrippa delivered specially to Festus his opinion to this effect: this man might, already, have been set at liberty,¹² if he had not appealed unto Caesar, by which the sending him to Rome was rendered irreversible.¹³—πράσσει] practises.

---

² 1 Pet. iv. 16.
²² See on this use of the optative with ἄν, Fritzsche, Consect. I. p. 34 f.; Bernhardy, p. 410; Krüger, § 54, 3, 6.
²³ Chrysostom.
²⁴ See on ver. 28.
²⁵ κάνον κ. πόνος ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, Oecumenius, reading ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.
⁶ The interpreters who take ἐν δυναμίᾳ as brevi tempore (see on ver. 28) here translate (according to the reading ἐκκλησίᾳ): "be it for short or for long" (de Wette). Those who take ἐν δυναμίᾳ as propemodum, translate: "non propemodum tantum, sed plane" (Grotius). With our view of ἐν δυναμίᾳ, the reading ἐν κυκλῳ makes no difference of meaning from ἐν μεγάλῳ. Ewald, likewise following the reading ἐν μεγάλῳ, takes ἐν also here consistently in the sense of value: by little and by much, that is, by all wise, etc.
⁷ Baumlein, Partik. p. 158.
⁸ Comp. on xxiv. 23, 27, xxviii. 30.
⁹ Comp. Justin. xiv. 4, 1.
¹⁰ Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1; Phil. 1. Comp. Phil. ii. 17 f.
¹¹ Bengel.
¹² Not "dismittit poterat," Vulg. Luther, and others. See in opposition to this, and on the expression without ἄν, Buttmann, neut. Gr. pp. 187, 195 (E. T. 216, 228). Comp. also Nägeli, on the ἤθελον, p. 450, ed. 3.
¹³ See Grotius.
Grotius rightly remarks: "agit de vitae instituto:" hence in the present. —The "recognition of the innocence of the apostle in all judicatures" is intelligible enough from the truth of his character, and from the power of his appearance and address; and, in particular, the closing utterance of Agrippa finds its ground so vividly and with such internal truth in the course of the proceedings, that the imputation of a set purpose on the author's part can only appear as a frivolously dogmatic opinion, proceeding from personal prepossessions tending in a particular direction. The apostle might at any rate be credited, even in his situation at that time, with an ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος κ. ὑπόκμενος, 1 Cor. ii. 4.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(44) Almost thou persuadest me. V. 28.

While Festus was in a state of perplexity in respect to Paul, a distinguished visitor came to congratulate him on his accession to his exalted position. This was Agrippa, the great grandson of Herod the Great, and at that time King of Chalcis. Subsequently his kingdom was greatly enlarged. He was the brother of the infamous Drusilla, who lived with Felix, and of the equally infamous Bernice, who lived with himself, and who accompanied him at this time to the city which their great-grandfather had built, and where he miserably perished. During their visit Festus took occasion to refer to the perplexing case of the prisoner Paul; he informed Agrippa of the madness which seemed to inspire the Jewish people at the mere mention of the name of Paul, and of the futile results of the trial just concluded. He stated further that the questions at issue pertained to their own religious or superstitious observances, and to one Jesus, who had been crucified by them, but whom Paul affirmed to be alive, and further that the prisoner had declined to be tried again by the Sanhedrim and had appealed to the emperor.

On hearing this recital Agrippa expressed a wish to hear the man. So Festus, willing to gratify his princely guests, ordered the auditorium in the palace to be prepared, and invited the officers of the army and the chief men of the city to attend; and as the Herods were vain and fond of show, he arranged a gorgeous procession, so that Agrippa and Bernice came in royal state, "she, doubtless, blazing with all her jewels, and he in his purple robes, and both with the golden circlets of royalty around their foreheads." Into the presence of this vain, weak king and his radiantly beautiful but notoriously profligate companion, and the vast, brilliant assemblage Paul, shackled and pale from long imprisonment, is brought.

Festus opened the proceedings, which were in no sense a trial, as the appeal to Cesar arrested all further legal proceedings, with stating the reasons for calling such an assembly, and by making some complimentary allusions to Agrippa, stating also clearly that he found the prisoner had done "nothing worthy of death."

1 Comp. John iii. 20; Rom. i. 33 et.; John vii. 51.
3 "In order that, with the Gentile testimonies, xxv. 18, 25, a Jewish one might not be wanting," Zeller.
The king intimated that Paul might now make his address. The apostle, undaunted by the pompous inanities of reflected power around him, with calm dignity and perfect self-possession makes his own defence against the charge of heresy, and specially offers a powerful plea for the truth of Christianity. He expressed himself as pleased to have the privilege of speaking in the presence of one who, from his training, was a competent judge of the questions at stake. He asked for a patient hearing, and once more narrated the familiar story of his wonderful conversion from the bigoted, fiery, persecuting spirit he had formerly manifested against Christ and his followers, to a firm belief that the Messianic hopes of his people had been actually realized in Jesus of Nazareth, who had risen from the dead. He showed that he was no heretical schismatic, but had kept the law of Moses, and firmly believed that the promise given to the Jews of a Messiah was now fulfilled; that the very thing for which he was accused was the great hope of the Jewish nation; that the cause he now espoused he once hated, and conscientiously and violently persecuted with a zeal and bitterness more intense than their own; that this change in his convictions and the commission he received to preach Jesus and the resurrection were divine; and that his work was in strict accordance with the prophets of the Old Testament.

Festus, struck by the earnest enthusiasm of the eloquent prisoner, interrupts him with the excited exclamation, “Paul, thou art mad; these writings have turned your brain!” Paul with perfect calmness and exquisite courtesy replies, “I am not mad, most noble Festus; what I have said is the sober, well-attested truth, as the king himself can witness, for these marked events did not take place in a corner.” Then turning to the king he asked, “Believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest.” Agrippa, unwilling to be led into a discussion of this kind, replied with good-natured contempt, a scarcely suppressed smile, and courtly wit, perhaps with derisive irony, “You will soon be making me a Christian!” Paul, casting his eye over the splendid and numerous audience, gave a most earnest and sincere reply to the bantering jest of the king. Raising his manacled hand, he said: “I would have wished God, both in little and in much, not only thee, but also all those hearing me to-day, to become such as I also am, except these bonds.”

“No more he feels upon his high-raised arm
The ponderous chain, than does the playful child
The bracelet, formed of many a flowery link;
Headless of self, forgetful that his life
Is now to be defended by his words,
He only thinks of doing good to them
That seek his life.”

After a brief consultation with each other Festus and Agrippa agreed that Paul might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed to Caesar; but now, to Caesar he must go.

The answer of Agrippa to Paul has been variously rendered as the language of sincere conviction, bitter irony, or courtly jest. Some render the phrase:\n\n\textit{ἐν ἐκακίᾳ, almost}; others, with Meyer, render the clause, with few words, or lightly; some render: in a little time, which may be taken either in earnest or in jest; others render: in a small measure, or somewhat. As to the spirit of the reply, the general opinion of recent critics concurs with Meyer, that the words were ut-
tered in irony or jest. Alford, Eadie, Lange, Abbott, Plumptre, Schaff, Bloomfield, Hackett, and Taylor substantially agree with Meyer; on the other hand, Calvin, Bengel, Stier, Alexander, Jacobus, Barnes, and Thomas, with some variations, agree in regarding the language as sincere. The Revised Version is decidedly in favor of Meyer's view, "With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian."
CHAPTER XXVII.

Vuln. 2. μέλλοντι] So A B Σ, min. and most vss. Approved by Mill., Bengel, and Grieseb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The usual μέλλοντες is an alteration in accordance with the preceding εἰπόντες. — τούς] Lachm. reads εἰς τούς, following A B Σ Σ min. Other oodd. have εἰς. Different supplementary additions. — Ver. 3, πορευθέντα] Lachm. reads πορευθέντα, following A B Σ min. A hasty correction on account of εἰπότες. — Ver. 12, κακελθέν] Lachm. and Scholz read ἐκείθεν, following A B G Σ min. vss. Chrys. But the want of a reference of the καί in what goes before easily occasioned the omission. — Ver. 19, ἐβρίσαν] Approved by Grieseb., adopted by Lachm. and Born., after A B C Σ, min. Vulg. The Recepta is ἐβρίσαμεν. As this might just as easily be inserted on account of αὐτόχρησες, as ἐβρίσαν on account of ἐποιήτω, the preponderance of witnesses has alone to decide, and that in favour of ἐβρίσαν. — Ver. 23. The order ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ (Lachm. Tisch. Born., also Scholz) is decidedly attested. Ἀγγελος is to be placed, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., only after λατρεύω (A B C Σ, min.) and ἐγώ is to be adopted (with Lachm. and Born.,) after εἰμι, on the evidence of A C Σ, min. vss.; it might very easily be suppressed before φ. — Ver. 27. ἐγένετο] A, 10466, Vulg. have ἐπέγενετο. So Tisch.; and rightly, as the very unusual compound (only again in xxviii. 13) was easily neglected by the transcribers. — According to preponderating attestation, καρά (instead of εἰς) is to be read in ver. 29 with Lachm. Tisch. Born.; comp. vv. 17, 26, 41. — ἐπιτέωμα] Elz. has ἐπιτέωμα, against decisive testimony. Alteration to suit the following ψέγοντο. — Ver. 33. προσλαβόμενα] Lachm. reads προσλαβανόμενο, merely in accordance with A, 40. But the part. pres. is to be viewed as an alteration to suit προσδοκώντες. — Ver. 34. μεταλαβεῖν] Elz. has προσλαβεῖν against preponderent testimony. From ver. 33. — προσείρατι] Grieseb. Lachm. Scholz. Tisch. Born. read ἀπολεῖρα, which indeed has weighty attestation in its favour, but against it the strong suspicion that it was borrowed from Luke xxi. 18. This tells likewise against the Recepta τε, instead of which ἀπό is to be read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. It is less likely that προσείρατι should have been taken from the LXX. 1 Kings i. 52; 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11. — Ver. 39. ἑβουλεύσαντο] Lachm. and Born. read ἑβουλεύσαντο after B C Σ, min. But on account of the preceding imperfecta, the imperfect here also was easily brought in; and hence is to be explained the reading (explanatory gloss) ἑβουλεύσαντο in A, min. — Ver. 41. τῶν κυμάτων] has in its favour C G Η Μ** and all min. Chrys. and most vss., and is wanting only in A B Σ. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. There is, however,—especially as with τῆς βασίς a definition, although not necessary, is probable,—amidst such strong attestation less a suspicion of its being a supplementary addition, than a probability that the transcribers confounded this τῶν with the τῶν of ver. 42 and thus overlooked τῶν κυμάτων. Besides, it would have more naturally suggested itself to a glossator to write on the margin τῆς βασίς, than τῶν κυμάτων, which does not again occur in the whole narrative of this voyage. — Ver. 42. Elz. has διαφόροι. But Grieseb. Lachm.
Tisch. read διαφύγει, which is attested, indeed, by A B C δί, min., but has arisen from the usual custom of the N. T. in such combinations to put not the optative, but the subjunctive. — On the variations in the proper names in this chapter, see the exegetical remarks.

Ver. 1. Τῶν ἀποκλειν ἡμᾶς contains the aim of the ἐκρίθη. "But when, by Festus, decision was made, to the end that we should sail away." The nature of the "becoming resolved" (κρινοματικὰ) implies that the object—the contents of the resolution—may be conceived as embraced under the form of its aim. The modes of expression: κελεύου ἡμᾶς, εἰσείν ἡμᾶς, βῆλειν ἡμᾶς, and the like, are similar; comp. ver. 42, βοηθή ἐγενησό, ἡμᾶς. Luke speaks as a fellow-traveller. — παρεδώκειστοι] namely, the persons who were entrusted with the execution of the ἐκρίθη. ἐκτροχῖς is purposely chosen, not ἄλλοις, to intimate that they were prisoners of another sort, not also Christians under arrest. ἐκτροχῖς in xv. 35, xvii. 34, also is to be similarly taken in the sense of another of two classes, in opposition to de Wette. — σπείρως Σεβαστ.] cohortis Augustae, perhaps: the illustrious, the imperial, cohort. Σεβαστ. is an adjective. Probably, for historical demonstration is not possible, it was that one of the five cohorts stationed at Caesarea, which was regarded as body-guard of the emperor, and was accordingly employed, as here, on special services affecting the emperor. We have no right, considering the diversity of the names used by Luke, to hold it as identical with the σπείρα Ἰταλικῆ, x. 1, so Ewald. Weisler finds here the cohort Augustanorum, imperial body-cohort, at Rome, consisting of Roman equites, of the so-called evocati, whose captain, Julius, he supposes, has been at this very time on business at Caesarea, and had taken the prisoners with him on his return. In this way the centurion would not have been under the command of Festus at all, and would have only been incidentally called into requisition, which is hardly compatible with the regulated departmental arrangements of Rome in the provinces; nor is there in the text itself, any more than in the σπείρα Ἰταλικῆ, x. 1, the least intimation that we are to think of a cohort and a centurion, who did not belong at all to the military force of Caesarea. Schwarz, with whom Kuinoel agrees, conceived that it was a cohort consisting of Sebastenes, from Sebastae, the capital of Samaria, as in fact Sebastene soldiers are actually named by Josephus among the Roman military force in Judea. But the calling a cohort by the name of a city, the cohort of Sebastae, is entirely without ex-

---

1 Comp. on chap. xxvii. the excellent treatise of James Smith, The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, London 1848, ed. 2, 1856; Vömel, Progr., Frankf. 1850; in respect of the language, Köstermann, Vindiciæ Luc. VII. — In Baumgarten there is much allegorizing and play of fancy; he considers the apostle as the true Jonah, and the ship's crew as a representative of the whole heathen world. — Hackett treats chap. xxvii. with special care, having made use of many accounts of travels and notes of navigation.

3 See also Luke iv. 10.

4 Comp. Luke xxiii. 33; Tittmann, Synon. N. T. p. 155 f.; and see on Gal. i. 7.

5 Comp. λυμήν Σεβαστ. In Joseph. Antt. xvii. 5. 1: the imperial harbour (in Caesarea).


8 De cohortis Ital. et Aug., Altorf, 1730.

9 Antt. xx. 6. 3, Bell. ii. 12. 5.
ample; we should necessarily expect Σεβαστήνων, or an adjective of locality, such as Σεβαστής, after the analogy of 'Ιταλής, x. 1. — Nothing further is known of the centurion Κιλίκ. Tacitus mentions a Κιλίκιος as centurion of the Praetorians; but how extremely common was the name!

Ver. 2. 'Επιβάντων, with dative, see on xxv. 1. — πλοῖων 'Αδραμ.] a ship which belonged to Αδραμυττίου, had its home there, the master of which resided there. 'Αδραμυττίου, or 'Αδραμυττίους, was a seaport of Μυσία, and is not to be confounded with Αδρυμυττίου on the north coast of Africa, because amidst all the variations in the codd. ( Αλαμυττίων, Αδραμυττίων, Αδραμυττίων, Αδραμυττίων) the v in the middle syllable is decidedly preponderant. — μελλόντος πλοίων κ.τ.λ.] The ship, certainly a merchant-ship, was thus about to start on its homeward voyage. The prisoners were by this opportunity to be brought to the Asiatic coast, and sent thence by the opportunity of another vessel to Italy. — τοῖς κατὰ τ. 'Ασίαν τόποις] to navigate the places situated along Asia, on the Asiatic coast. — 'Αρπατάρχου] Thus he also had from Asia come again to Paul; Trophimus already joined him at Jerusalem. But whether Aristarchus accompanied Paul as a fellow-prisoner does not follow with certainty from Col. iv. 10.

Ver. 3. Εἰς Σιδώνα unto Sidon, into the seaport. — χρῆσαι τοῖς to have intercourse, fellowship, with any one. The fact that the centurion treated Paul so kindly may be sufficiently explained from the peculiar interest, which a character so lofty and pure could not but awaken in humane and unprejudiced minds. It may be also that the procurator had specially enjoined a gentle treatment. — παρενέθησα is to be analysed as accusative with infinitive. — παρενέθησα] Without doubt Paul had told the centurion that he had friends, namely, Christian brethren, in Sidon. Still the centurion would not leave him without military escort, as indeed his duty required this.

Vv. 4, 5. 'Υπενελάσα τ. Κιλίκον] We sailed under Cyprus, so that we remained near the shore, elevated above the level of the sea, because the (shifting) winds were contrary, and therefore made a withdrawal to a distance from the northern shore not advisable. — κατὰ τ. Κιλίκα.] along. Just so ver. 7,—κατὰ Σαλάμινα; comp. ver. 2. — Μέρη] or, as Lachmann, following B, reads, Μύρα — it is neuter, yet the feminine form was also used—was a seaport of Lycia, only twenty stadia from the coast. The
readings Δαστάρνη or Δασταρνή, and Σμίτρνα, are explained from want of acquaintance with that name of a town.

Vv. 6, 7. Whether the Alexandrian ship was freighted with grain, which at least is not to be proved from ver. 88, or with other goods, cannot be determined; as also whether it was by wind and weather, or affairs of trade, that it was constrained not to sail directly from Alexandria to Italy, but first to run into the Lycian port. — πλοῦτον. It was already on its voyage from Alexandria to Italy. — ἵνα ἢμαίς ἔμμεθναι, put us on board, a vox nautica (6). See examples in Palairet and Wolf. — Ver. 7. But when we had made slow way for a considerable number of days, and had come with difficulty toward Cnidus, into its neighbourhood, thus in the offing, having passed along by Rhodes, so that the wind did not allow of us to land at Cnidus, we sailed under Crete, near Salmone. The wind thus came from the north, so that the vessel was drawn away from Cnidus and downward towards Crete. — προσέκινετο;] finds a definite reference in the immediately preceding κατά τὴν Κνίδουν, and hence the view of Grotius, following the Peshito, that rectum tenere cursum should be supplied, is to be rejected. — Cnidus was a city of Caria on the peninsula of Cnida, celebrated for the worship of Aphrodite and for the victory of Cimon over Pisander. — The promontory Σαλμόνι, on the east coast of Crete, is called in Strabo, Σαλμόνι, and in Dionys. Σαλμωνί.

Ver. 8. Παράλλευσα] corresponds entirely to the Latin legere, oram, to sail along the coast. This keeping to the coast was only with difficulty (μάλιστα) successful. — αὐτήν refers to τ. Κρήτην. — Nothing is known from antiquity of the anchorage Καλοί λιμένες — Fair Havens (6). — The name is perhaps, on account of ver. 12 (ἀνενθέτων κ.τ.λ.), to be considered as euphemistic. The view that the place is identical with the town called by Stephanus Byzantinus Καλή ἀκτή, is improbable, because the Fair Havens here was not a town, as may be inferred from the appended remark: ἢ ἤγερε θνείτε Λασ. — ἢν] not ἄτι. The preterite belongs to the graphic description. They saw the neighbouring city. — The town Λασάλις also is entirely unknown; hence the many variations, Λασίτα, Thalassa. The evidence in support of these other forms is not strong enough to displace the Recepta, seeing that it is also supported by B ἡ, which has Λασάλις. Beza conjectured 'Ελαίνα; but such a conjecture, especially in the case of Crete with its hundred cities, was uncalled for.

1 A M. Copt. Vulg. Fathers.
2 Sin. Boda.
3 Baumgarten, II. p. 873 f., collects the nautical expression of this chapter, adducing, however, much that belongs to the general language.
4 See Forbiger, Geogr. II. p. 231.
5 x. p. 727.
6 Perieg. 110.
7 Diod. Sic. xiii. 8, xlv. 55.
8 It is certainly the bay still called Lisanas κατ' Ποκοκέα, Mory. II. p. 381. Comp. Smith, p. 88, ed. 2. See, moreover, on the above localities generally, Hoeck, Kreta, I. p. 439 ff.
9 Comp. Krüger, and Kühner, Ad Xen. Anab. i. 4. 9; Breitzenb. ad Xen. Hær. ii. 4.
10 Yet see on ruins with this name, Smith, p. 288.
11 B. min.; so Tischendorf.
12 A, 40, 96, Syr. p. on the margin; so Grotius, Lachmann, Ewald.
13 Vulgate, Aethiopic.
14 Codd. Lat., et al.
15 G. H.
Ver. 9. Ἰκανοῦ δὲ ἥρ. διαγ.] namely, since the beginning of our voyage.
—πλοῦς] See on this late form, instead of πλοῦς, Lobbeck.¹ — διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸ νηστείαν ἢς παρελ.] because also, even, the fasting was already past.⁸ The νηστεία, κατ' ἐξοχήν, is the fasting of the great day of atonement, which occurred on the 10th of Tisri.⁹ It was thus already after the autumnal equinox, when navigation, which now became dangerous (ἐπισφαλ.), was usually closed. — παρέχει δὲ Ἡ.] He had experience enough for such a counsel.⁶

Vv. 10, 11. θεωρῶ] when I view the tumult of the sea. — δὴ . . . μέλλων ἑσσθαι] A mixing of two constructions, of which the former is neglected as the speech flows onward.⁴ — μετὰ ὑβριστὶ with presumption. Paul warns them that the continuance of the voyage will not take place without temerity. Accordingly μετὰ ὑβρ. contains the subjective, and (μετὰ) πολλῆς ζημίας ὧν μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ. the objective, detriment with which the voyage would be attended. The expositors—Ewald, however, takes the correct view—understand μετὰ ὑβρ. of the injuria or sancta tempestatis. But as the definition tempestatis has no place in the text, the view remains a very arbitrary one, and has no corresponding precedent even in poets.⁷ The whole utterance is, moreover, the natural expression of just fear, in which case Paul could say ἲμυὸν without mistrusting the communication which he received in xxiii. 11; for by πολλῆς the ζημία τῶν ψυχῶν is affirmed, not of all, but only of a great portion of the persons on board. He only received at a later period the higher revelation, by which this fear was removed from him.⁹ He speaks here in a way inclusive of others (ἵμυον), on account of their joint interest in the situation. A special "entering into the fellowship of the Gentiles"¹⁰ is as little indicated as is the assumption that he did not preach out of grief over the Jews. The present time and situation were not at all suitable for preaching: — ἐπειθέτο μᾶλλον τοῖς ἐμπείρων ἐχονσι μᾶλλον πρὸς τὸ πλεῖον, ἡ ἐπιβάτης ἐπείροι ναυτικής, Oecumenius. So the opposite view of the steersman and captain of the ship, νάυκληρος, prevailed with the centurion. By reason of the inconvenience of the haven for wintering, the majority of those on board came to the resolution, etc., ver. 12.

Ver. 12. Ἀνειθάντος] not well situated, Hesychius and Suidas, elsewhere not found; the later Greeks have διοικητός. They ought, according to the counsel of Paul, to have chosen the least of two evils. — πρὸς παρα*-χειμασίαν for passing the winter.¹⁰ — κακεῖθεν also from thence. As they had not hitherto lain to with a view to pass the winter, the resolution come to by the majority was to the effect of sailing onward from thence also.¹¹

² According to Bleek and de Wette, this Jewish definition of time, as well as that contained in Ξ. 6, betrays a Jewish-Christian author. But the definitions of the Jewish calendar were generally, and very naturally, adopted in the apostolic church. Comp. Schnepkenburger, p. 18.
³ Lev. xvi. 29 ff., xxiii. 26 ff.
⁴ See Wetstein.
⁵ 2 Cor. xi. 35.
⁶ See Heind. ad Plat. Phaed. p. 63 C; Winet, p. 318 (E. T. 436); Raphel, Polyb. in loc. Comp. on xix. 27, xxii. 23 f.
⁷ Comp. Pind. Pyth. i. 78: μενειδοτοίν τίβρειν τίβρειν, Ἀνδρ. i. 22, 58: δεῖναις διάλεγμα τίβρειν.
⁸ See vv. 23, 24.
⁹ Baumgarten.
¹⁰ Diod. Sic. xix. 63, and more frequently in Polybius. Comp. xxviii. 11.
¹¹ On ἰδέατο σουλήν, comp. Judg. xix. 30; Ps. xiii. 8.
FROM MYRA TO CRETE.

εἰπὼς δύναντοι ἦν, in order to try, whether perhaps they would be able. — The haven Φοινίξ is called in Ptolemy, iii. 17, Φοινίκης, and the adjacent town Φοίνιξ. Stephanus Byzantinus, on the other hand, remarks: Φοινίκης πάλις Κρήτης. Perhaps the two names were used in common of the haven and the city. Whether the haven was the modern Lutro, is uncertain. — βλέπειν] quite like spectare, of the direction of the geographical position. — Διψ is the Africus, the south-west wind, and Χώρος the Caunurus, the north-west. The haven formed such a curve, that one shore stretched toward the north-west and the other toward the south-west (1).

Ver. 18. But when gentler south winds had set in. — this was the motive of the following δοκάνες. As, namely, Fair Havens, where they were, and also Φοινίξ farther to the west, whither they wished to go, lay on the south coast of the island, the south wind was favourable for carrying out their resolution, because it kept them near to the coast and did not allow them to drift down into the southern sea. — κεκρατηκών] to have become masters of their purpose, that is, to be able safely to accomplish it. Examples in Raphel, Polyb. — ἀραντες] namely, the anchor, which is understood of itself in nautical language: they weighed anchor. — ἀσον παρέλγει.] they sailed closer, than could previously, ver. 8, be done, along the coast of Crete. ἀσον, nearer, the comparative of ἄχως, is not only found in poetry from the time of Homer, but also in prose. — The Vulgate, which Erasmus follows, has: cum sustulissent de Asson, so that thus ΛΣΥΝ is connected with ἀραντες and regarded as the name of a city of Crete; — hence also Elz., Mill, Scholz have 'Asson, as a proper name. But as this translation is at variance with the words as they stand, Luther, Castalio, Calovius, and several older expositors have taken ἀσον as the accusative of direction: cum sustulissent Assum. But, even if the little town had really been situated on the coast, which does not agree with Plin. l.c., the expression would have been extremely harsh, as ἀραντες does not express the notion of direction; and not only so, but also the mere accusative of direction without a preposition is only poetical, and is foreign to the N. T.

Ver. 14. Ἐβάλε] intransitive: fell upon, threw itself against it; often in the classical writers after Homer. — καὶ αὐτῆς] refers to the nearest antecedent Κρήτην, not to προβίος. — ἀνεμος τυφώνικος] The adjective is formed from τυφών, a whirlwind, and is found also in Eustathius. — Εὐροκλίδων] the broad-surfing, from εὔρος, breadth, and κλίδω. It is usually explained: Eurus fluctus excitans, from Εὔρος, the south-east wind, and κλίδων. But this compound would rather yield an appellation unsuitable for a wind: south-east wave, fluctus euro excitatus. Εὐρωκλίδων, from εὔρος,
a Jew the accessory idea of heterodoxy and the stain of contempt. Schneckenburger also would have the expression to be earnestly meant, but in favour of the apologetic design imputed to the Book of Acts (ψ").

Ver. 29. In the full consciousness of his apostolic dignity, Paul now upholds the cause of the despised Χριστιανοίν γενέσθαι as that which he would entreat from God for the king and all his present hearers, and which was thus more glorious than all the glory of the world. — εἰκεῖαν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ | I would indeed, in case of the state of the matter admitting it, pray to God. Ἐνεσθαί; with the dative, to pray to any one, only here in the N. T., but very frequently in classical writers. — In what follows σήμερον belongs to τ. ἄκοινον μ., not to γενέσθαι, as is to be inferred from ἐν μεγάλῳ. — καὶ ἐν δίληγω καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ οὐ μόνον σὲ κ.τ.λ.] that as well by little as by great,—whether in the case of one, little, and in the case of another, much, may be employed as a means for the purpose, — not merely thou, but also all . . . were such also as I am, Christians. On καγώ, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 7. — παρεκτὸς τῶν δεσμῶν τοῦτων] The chains which had bound him in prison, and were again to bind him, chaining him, namely, after the manner of the custodiers of the soldiers who watched him, he bore now hanging down freely on his arm. The παρεκτὸς κ. τ. λ., although to the apostle his chains were an honour, is “suavissima ἐπίθεσει et exceptio,” in the spirit of love.

Vv. 30—32. Perhaps this bold, grand utterance of the singular man had made an impression on the king's heart, the concealment of which might have occasioned embarrassment to him, had he listened any longer: Agrippa arose and thereby brought the discussion at once to a close. With him arose, in the order of rank, first the procurator, then Bernice, then all who sat there with them (οι συγκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς). After they had retired from the audience chamber (ἀναχωρήσαντες), they communicated to each other their unanimous opinion, which certainly amounted only to the superficial political negative: this man, certainly by the most regarded as a harmless enthusiast, practises nothing which merits death or bonds. But Agrippa delivered specially to Festus his opinion to this effect: this man might, already, have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar, by which the sending him to Rome was rendered irreversible. — πράσσει practises.

---

1 1 Pet. iv. 16.  
2 See on this use of the optative with ἐν, Fritzsche, Conject. I. p. 34 f.; Bernhardy, p. 410; Krüger, § 54, 3. 6.  
3 Chrysostom.  
4 See on ver. 28.  
5 κόσος κ. νόμος ἐν τῷ διδασκαλία, Oecumenius, reading ἐν καλλίᾳ.  
6 The interpreters who take ἐν διλήγω as brevi tempore (see on ver. 28) here translate (according to the reading καλλίᾳ): “be it for short or for long” (de Wette). Those who take ἐν διλήγω as propemodum, translate: “non propemodum tantum, sed plane” (Grothius). With our view of ἐν διλήγω, the reading ἐν καλλίᾳ makes no difference of meaning from ἐν μεγάλῳ. Ewald, likewise following the reading ἐν μεγάλῳ, takes ἐν here consistently in the sense of value: by little and by much, that is, by all I wish, etc.  
7 Baeumlein, Partik. p. 158.  
8 Comp. on xxiv. 23, 27, xxviii. 30.  
9 Comp. Justin. xiv. 4, 1.  
10 Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1; Phil. 1, Comp. Phili. ii. 17 f.  
11 Bengel.  
13 See Grothius.
Grotius rightly remarks: "agit de vitae instituto:"

hence in the present. 1 —The "recognition of the innocence of the apostle in all judicatures" is intelligible enough from the truth of his character, and from the power of his appearance and address; and, in particular, the closing utterance of Agrippa finds its ground so vividly and with such internal truth in the course of the proceedings, that the imputation of a set purpose on the author's part 8 can only appear as a frivolously dogmatic opinion, proceeding from personal prepossessions tending in a particular direction. The apostle might at any rate be credited, even in his situation at that time, with an ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος κ. ὀνόματος, 1 Cor. ii. 4.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(4) Almost thou persuadest me. V. 28.

While Festus was in a state of perplexity in respect to Paul, a distinguished visitor came to congratulate him on his accession to his exalted position. This was Agrippa, the great grandson of Herod the Great, and at that time King of Chalcis. Subsequently his kingdom was greatly enlarged. He was the brother of the infamous Drusilla, who lived with Felix, and of the equally infamous Bernice, who lived with himself, and who accompanied him at this time to the city which their great-grandfather had built, and where he miserably perished. During their visit Festus took occasion to refer to the perplexing case of the prisoner Paul; he informed Agrippa of the madness which seemed to inspire the Jewish people at the mere mention of the name of Paul, and of the futile results of the trial just concluded. He stated further that the questions at issue pertained to their own religious or superstitious observances, and to one Jesus, who had been crucified by them, but whom Paul affirmed to be alive, and further that the prisoner had declined to be tried again by the Sanhedrim and had appealed to the emperor.

On hearing this recital Agrippa expressed a wish to hear the man. So Festus, willing to gratify his princely guests, ordered the auditorium in the palace to be prepared, and invited the officers of the army and the chief men of the city to attend; and as the Herods were vain and fond of show, he arranged a gorgeous procession, so that Agrippa and Bernice came in royal state, "she, doubtless, blazing with all her jewels, and he in his purple robes, and both with the golden circlets of royalty around their foreheads." Into the presence of this vain, weak king and his radiantly beautiful but notoriously profligate companion, and the vast, brilliant assemblage Paul, shackled and pale from long imprisonment, is brought.

Festus opened the proceedings, which were in no sense a trial, as the appeal to Caesar arrested all further legal proceedings, with stating the reasons for calling such an assembly, and by making some complimentary allusions to Agrippa, stating also clearly that he found the prisoner had done "nothing worthy of death."

1 Comp. John iii. 20; Rom. i. 23 al.; John vii. 51.

8 "In order that, with the Gentile testimonies, xxv. 18, 25, a Jewish one might not be wanting," Zeller.
The king intimated that Paul might now make his address. The apostle, undaunted by the pompous inanities of reflected power around him, with calm dignity and perfect self-possession makes his own defence against the charge of heresy, and specially offers a powerful plea for the truth of Christianity. He expressed himself as pleased to have the privilege of speaking in the presence of one who, from his training, was a competent judge of the questions at stake. He asked for a patient hearing, and once more narrated the familiar story of his wonderful conversion from the bigoted, fiery, persecuting spirit he had formerly manifested against Christ and his followers, to a firm belief that the Messianic hopes of his people had been actually realized in Jesus of Nazareth, who had risen from the dead. He showed that he was no heretical schismatic, but had kept the law of Moses, and firmly believed that the promise given to the Jews of a Messiah was now fulfilled; that the very thing for which he was accused was the great hope of the Jewish nation; that the cause he now espoused he once hated, and conscientiously and violently persecuted with a zeal and bitterness more intense than their own; that this change in his convictions and the commission he received to preach Jesus and the resurrection were divine; and that his work was in strict accordance with the prophets of the Old Testament.

Festus, struck by the earnest enthusiasm of the eloquent prisoner, interrupts him with the excited exclamation, "Paul, thou art mad; these writings have turned your brain!" Paul with perfect calmness and exquisite courtesy replies, "I am not mad, most noble Festus; what I have said is the sober, well-attested truth, as the king himself can witness, for these marked events did not take place in a corner." Then turning to the king he asked, "Believeth thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." Agrippa, unwilling to be led into a discussion of this kind, replied with good-natured contempt, a scarcely suppressed smile, and courteously, perhaps with derisive irony, "You will soon be making me a Christian!" Paul, casting his eye over the splendid and numerous audience, gave a most earnest and sincere reply to the bantering jest of the king. Raising his manacled hand, he said: "I would have wished God, both in little and in much, not only thee, but also all those hearing me to-day, to become such as I also am, except these bonds."

"No more he feels upon his high-raised arm  
The ponderous chain, than does the playful child  
The bracelet, formed of many a flowery link;  
Headless of self, forgetful that his life  
Is now to be defended by his words,  
He only thinks of doing good to them  
That seek his life." (Graham.)

After a brief consultation with each other Festus and Agrippa agreed that Paul might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed to Caesar; but now, to Caesar he must go.

The answer of Agrippa to Paul has been variously rendered as the language of sincere conviction, bitter irony, or courtly jest. Some render the phrase ἐν μιᾷ τῶν μικρῶν, almost; others, with Meyer, render the clause, with few words, or lightly; some render: in a little time, which may be taken either in earnest or in jest; others render: in a small measure, or somewhat. As to the spirit of the reply, the general opinion of recent critics concurs with Meyer, that the words were ut-
tered in irony or jest. Alford, Eadie, Lange, Abbott, Plumptre, Schaff, Bloomfield, Hackett, and Taylor substantially agree with Meyer; on the other hand, Calvin, Bengel, Stier, Alexander, Jacobus, Barnes, and Thomas, with some variations, agree in regarding the language as sincere. The Revised Version is decidedly in favor of Meyer's view, "With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian."
CHAPTER XXVII.

VER. 2. μέλλοντι] So A B * min. and most vsa. Approved by Mill., Bengel, and Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The usual μέλλοντες is an alteration in accordance with the preceding ἐπιβάντες. — τούς] Lachm. reads εἰς τούς, following A B * min. Other odd. have ἐν. Different supplementary additions. — VER. 3, παρευθείνα] Lachm. reads παρευθείν, following A B * min. A hasty correction on account of εἰπτρεψ. — VER. 12, κακεῖδεν] Lachm. and Scholz read εἰκείθεν, following A B G * min. vsa. Chrys. But the want of a reference of the καί in what goes before easily occasioned the omission. — VER. 19, ἔρμιφα] Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Born., after A B C * min. Vulg. The Recepta is ἔρμιφαμεν. As this might just as easily be inserted on account of αἰσθείρες, as ἔδραμαν on account of ἐποιόντο, the preponderance of witnesses has alone to decide, and that in favour of ἔδραμαν. — VER. 23. The order τὰυτῇ τῇ νυκτί (Lachm. Tisch. Born., also Scholz) is decidedly attested. Ἄγγελος is to be placed, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., only after λατρεύω (A B C * min.) and ἔγω is to be adopted (with Lachm. and Born.) after εἰμι, on the evidence of A C * min. vsa.; it might very easily be suppressed before ὑπερ. — VER. 27. εἰγένετο] A, lo468, Vulg. have ἐπεγένετο. So Tisch.; and rightly, as the very unusual compound (only again in xxviii. 13) was easily neglected by the transcribers. — According to preponderating attestation, κατά (instead of εἰς) is to be read in ver. 29 with Lachm. Tisch. Born.; comp. vv. 17, 26, 41. — ἐκπέσωμεν] Elz. has ἐκπέσωμεν, against decisive testimony. Alteration to suit the following τῆς ὁμον. — VER. 33, προσαλαβόμενα] Lachm. reads προσαλαβόμενοι, merely in accordance with A, 40. But the part. pres. is to be viewed as an alteration to suit προσδοκώντες. — VER. 34, μεταλαβεῖν] Elz. has προσλαβεῖν against preponderant testimony. From ver. 33. — πεσεῖται] Griesb. Lachm. Scholz. Tisch. Born. read ἀπολείται, which indeed has weighty attestation in its favour, but against it the strong suspicion that it was borrowed from Luke xxii. 18. This tells likewise against the Recepta ἐκ, instead of which ἀπό is to be read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. It is less likely that πεσεῖται should have been taken from the LXX. 1 Kings i. 52; 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11. — VER. 39, ἐβουλέσαντο] Lachm. and Born. read ἐβουλεύοντο after B C * min. But on account of the preceding imperfects, the imperfect here also was easily brought in; and hence is to be explained the reading (explanatory gloss) ἐβουλεύοντο in A, min. — VER. 41, τῶν κυμάτων] has in its favour G H * and all min. Chrys. and most vsa., and is wanting only in A B * min. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. There is, however,—especially as with τῆς βασίς a definition, although not necessary, is probable,—amidst such strong attestation less a suspicion of its being a supplementary addition, than a probability that the transcribers confounded this τῶν with the τῶν of ver. 42 and thus overlooked τῶν κυμάτων. Besides, it would have more naturally suggested itself to a glossator to write on the margin τῆς βασίς, than τ. κυμάτων, which does not again occur in the whole narrative of this voyage. — VER. 42. Elz. has διαφύγει. But Griesb. Lachm.
Tisch. read διαψάφη, which is attested, indeed, by A B C k, min., but has arisen from the usual custom of the N. T. in such combinations to put not the optative, but the subjunctive. — On the variations in the proper names in this chapter, see the exegetical remarks.

Ver. 1. Τοῦ ἀποπλείν ἡμᾶς] contains the aim of the εἰρήνη. **"But when, by Festus, decision was made, to the end that we should sail away."** The nature of the "becoming resolved" (κρινονθαι) implies that the object—the contents of the resolution—may be conceived as embraced under the form of its aim. The modes of expression: κελέων ἵνα, εἰπεῖν ἵνα, θέλειν ἵνα, and the like, are similar; comp. ver. 42, βοῦλη ἐγένετο, ἵνα. — ἡμᾶς] Luke speaks as a fellow-traveller. — παρεδόον] namely, the persons who were entrusted with the execution of the εἰρήνη. — ἔτροπος is purposely chosen, not ἄλλος, to intimate that they were prisoners of another sort, not also Christians under arrest. — ἔτροπος in xv. 35, xvii. 34, also is to be similarly taken in the sense of another of two classes, in opposition to de Wette. — σειράς Σεβαστ.] cohorts Augustae, perhaps: the illustrious, the imperial, cohort. Σεβαστ, is an adjective. Probably, for historical demonstration is not possible, it was that one of the five cohorts stationed at Caesarea, which was regarded as body-guard of the emperor, and was accordingly employed, as here, on special services affecting the emperor. We have no right, considering the diversity of the names used by Luke, to hold it as identical with the σειρά Ἰταλική, x. 1, so Ewald. Weiseler finds here the cohors Augustanorum, imperial body-cohort, at Rome, consisting of Roman equites, of the so-called enocati, whose captain, Julius, he supposes, has been at this very time on business at Caesarea, and had taken the prisoners with him on his return. In this way the centurion would not have been under the command of Festus at all, and would have only been incidentally called into requisition, which is hardly compatible with the regulated departmental arrangements of Rome in the provinces; nor is there in the text itself, any more than in the σειρά Ἰταλική, x. 1, the least intimation that we are to think of a cohort and a centurion, who did not belong at all to the military force of Caesarea. Schwarz, with whom Kuinoel agrees, conceived that it was a cohort consisting of Sebastenes, from Sebastae, the capital of Samaria, as in fact Sebastene soldiers are actually named by Josephus among the Roman military force in Judea. But the calling a cohort by the name of a city, the cohort of Sebastae, is entirely without ex-

---

1 Comp. on chap. xxvii. the excellent treatise of James Smith, The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, London 1848, ed. 2, 1856; Vömel, Ἐν γλώσσα, Frankf. 1859; in respect of the language, Köstlermann, Vindeliciæ Luc. VII. — In Baumgarten there is much allegorizing and play of fancy; he considers the apostle as the true Jonah, and the ship's crew as a representative of the whole heathen world. — Hackett treats chap. xxvii. with special care, having made use of many accounts of travels and notes of navigation.

2 See also Luke iv. 10.

3 Comp. Luke xxii. 23; Tittmann, Synon. N. T. p. 156 f.; and see on Gal. i. 7.

4 Comp. οἱ Σεβαστ. in Joseph. Antt. xvii. 5: 1: the imperial harbour (in Caesarea).


6 Tac. Ann. xiv. 15; Sueton. Nero. 35; Dio, lxi. 30, lxxxii. 8.

7 De cohorts Ital. et Aug., Altorff, 1730.

8 Antt. xx. 6, 2, Bell. ii. 12, 5.
ample; we should necessarily expect Σεβαστηνών, or an adjective of locality, such as Σεβαστηνηψ, after the analogy of Ἰταλική, x. 1. — Nothing further is known of the centurion Julius. Tacitus mentions a Julius Priscus as centurion of the Praetorians; but how extremely common was the name!

Ver. 2. Εὐσφάντεις [with dative, see on xxv. 1.—πλοῖον 'Αδραμ. a ship which belonged to Ἀδραμύττιον, had its home there, the master of which resided there. 'Αδραμύττιον, or 'Αδραμύττιου, was a seaport of Mysia, and is not to be confounded with Ἀδραμύττιον on the north coast of Africa, because amidst all the variations in the coed. (‘Ἀδραμύττιον, ‘Ἀδραμούττιον, ‘Ατραμύττιον, ‘Ατραμούττιον) the ν in the middle syllable is decidedly preponderant. —μέλλοντε πλεῖν κ.τ.λ.] The ship, certainly a merchant-ship, was thus about to start on its homeward voyage. The prisoners were by this opportunity to be brought to the Asiatic coast, and sent thence by the opportunity of another vessel to Italy.—τοὺς κατὰ τ. Ἀσίαν τότον ο ἀνακατοπτέον to navigate the places situated along Asia, on the Asiatic coast.—Ἀριστάρχον] Thus he also had from Asia come again to Paul; Trophimus already joined him at Jerusalem. But whether Aristarchus accompanied Paul as a fellow-prisoner does not follow with certainty from Col. iv. 10.

Ver. 3. Εἰς Σιδώνα] unto Sidon, into the seaport. The fact that the centurion treated Paul so kindly may be sufficiently explained from the peculiar interest, which a character so lofty and pure could not but awaken in humane and unprejudiced minds. It may be also that the procurator had specially enjoined a gentle treatment. —πορευθῆναι is to be analysed as accusative with infinitive. —πρὸς τ. φίλους] Without doubt Paul had told the centurion that he had friends, namely, Christian brethren, in Sidon. Still the centurion would not leave him without military escort, as indeed his duty required this.

Vv. 4, 5. Ὑπελειποντες τ. Κύπρον] We sailed under Cyprus, so that we remained near the shore, elevated above the level of the sea, because the (shifting) winds were contrary, and therefore made a withdrawal to a distance from the northern shore not advisable.—κατὰ τ. Κλίξ.] along. Just so ver. 7,—κατὰ Σαλμώνη; comp. ver. 2.—Μύρα] or, as Lachmann, following B, reads, Μύρα— it is neuter, yet the feminine form was also used— was a seaport of Lycia, only twenty stadia from the coast. The
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1 Joseph, Bed. ii. 19. 5: "Ἰλαν ἱστόνειν καλον-μένην Σεβαστηνών."
2 Hist. ii. 92, iv. 11.
3 For several other modes of writing the name, see Steph. Byz. s.α.; Poppo, ad Thuc. I. 2, p. 441 f.
4 Grotius, Drusius, Richard Simon.
5 See xex. 8.
6 On the accusative, see Winer, p. 210 (E. T. 280); Thuc. vi. 63. 2: μάλλην τά τι ἐνέκλειν τῆς Ἑλλάδος. Pausan. i. 35.
7 See xix. 23, xx. 4; Col. iv. 10; Phillem. 94.
8 xx. 4.
9 See on xxi. 39.
10 Ewald.
11 See loc.
12 Comp. xxi. 3, xxvi. 12.
14 See on xxvi. 30, and Lobeck, ad Soph. Af. 1006.
15 ix. 19.
16 Comp. Grotinus, "cum milite."
17 See Steph. Byz. α.α.
readings Ἀστρα or Ἀστρὰν, and Σμύρνα, are explained from want of acquaintance with that name of a town.

Vv. 6, 7. Whether the Alexandrian ship was freighted with grain, which at least is not to be proved from ver. 38, or with other goods, cannot be determined; as also whether it was by wind and weather, or affairs of trade, that it was constrained not to sail directly from Alexandria to Italy, but first to run into the Lycian port. — πλέων] It was already on its voyage from Alexandria to Italy. — ἐνθισθενεις] he embarked us, put us on board, a vox nautica (α'). See examples in Palairot and Wolf. — Ver. 7. But when we had made slow way for a considerable number of days, and had come with difficulty toward Cnidus, into its neighbourhood, thaus in the offing, having passed along by Rhodes, so that the wind did not allow us to land at Cnidus, we sailed under Crete, near Salmine. The wind thus came from the north, so that the vessel was drawn away from Cnidus and downward towards Crete. — προσέσων] finds a definite reference in the immediately preceding κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, and hence the view of Grotius, following the Peshito, that rectum tenere cursum should be supplied, is to be rejected. Cnidus was a city of Caria on the peninsula of Cnidia, celebrated for the worship of Aphrodite and for the victory of Cimon over Pisander. — The promontory Σαλιόν, on the east coast of Crete, is called in Strabo, Σαλιόνων, and in Dionys. Σαλιόνις.

Ver. 8. Παραλγεσθα] corresponds entirely to the Latin legere,oram,to sail along the coast. This keeping to the coast was only with difficulty (μόλις) successful. — αὐτὴν refers to τ. Κρήτην. — Nothing is known from antiquity of the anchorage Καλαί λιμάνες—Fair Havens (μ'). — The name is perhaps, on account of ver. 13 (ἀνειθέντο κ. τ. λ.), to be considered as euphemistic. The view that the place is identical with the town called by Stephanus Byzantinus Καλὴ ἀκτή, is improbable, because the Fair Havens here was not a town, as may be inferred from the appended remark: ὡς ἐγγὺς ἐν πόλις Δασο. — ἐν] not ἄξι. The preterite belongs to the graphic description. They saw the neighbouring city. The town Λασαί also is entirely unknown; hence the many variations, Λασαὶ, Λάσασα, Λάσασα, Thessala. The evidence in support of these other forms is not strong enough to displace the Recepta, seeing that it is also supported by B μ*, which has Λασαία. Beza conjectured Ελαία; but such a conjecture, especially in the case of Crete with its hundred cities, was uncalled for.

1 A R. Copt. Vulg. Fathera.
2 S↓. Beda.
3 Baumgarten, II. p. 372 f., collects the nautical expression of this chapter, adducing, however, much that belongs to the general language.
4 See Forbliger, Geogr. II. p. 231.
5 x. p. 737.
6 Perieg. 110.
7 Diod. Sic. xiii. 3, xlv. 55.
8 It is certainly the bay still called Lamos
10 Yet see on ruins with this name, Smith, p. 302.
11 B. min.; so Tischendorf.
12 A, 40, 96, Syr. p. on the margin; so Grotius, Lachmann, Ewald.
13 Vulgate, Aethiopic.
14 Codd. Lat., et al.
15 G. H.
16 Phln. N. E. IV. 12.
Ver. 9. 'Ικανον δὲ χρ. διαγ.] namely, since the beginning of our voyage. — πλούς] See on this late form, instead of πλούς, Lobeck. — διὰ τοῦ καὶ τ. νυστειαν ἡν παρελ.] because also, even, the fasting was already past. The νυστεια, κατ’ ἐξοχήν, is the fasting of the great day of atonement, which occurred on the 10th of Tisri. It was thus already after the autumnal equinox, when navigation, which now became dangerous (ἐπορφαλ.), was usually closed. — ἀραφήνει ὁ Π.] He had experience enough for such a counsel.

Vv. 10, 11. θεωρῶ] when I view the tumult of the sea. — δὲ ... μέλλειν ἔσοβαι.] A mixing of two constructions, of which the former is neglected as the speech flows onward. — μετὰ ὑβρεῖς] with presumption. Paul warns them that the continuance of the voyage will not take place without temerity. Accordingly μετὰ ὑβρ. contains the subjective, and (μετά) πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον κ.τ.λ. the objective, detriment with which the voyage would be attended. The expositors—Ewald, however, takes the correct view—understand μετά ὑβρ. of the injuria or sœvità tempestatis. But as the definition tempestatis has no place in the text, the view remains a very arbitrary one, and has no corresponding precedent even in poets. The whole utterance is, moreover, the natural expression of just fear, in which case Paul could say ἡμῶν without mistrusting the communication which he received in xxiii. 11; for by πολλῆς the ζημία τῶν ψυχῶν is affirmed, not of all, but only of a great portion of the persons on board. He only received at a later period the higher revelation, by which this fear was removed from him. He speaks here in a way inclusive of others (ἡμῶν), on account of their joint interest in the situation. A special "entering into the fellowship of the Gentiles" is as little indicated as is the assumption that he did not preach out of grief over the Jews. The present time and situation were not at all suitable for preaching: — ἵππειθέτο μᾶλλον] τοις ἐκπείρας ἔχονσι μᾶλλον πρὸς τὸ πλεῖο, ἢ ἵππειθά ἀπειρο ναυτικῆς, Oecumenius. So the opposite view of the steersman and captain of the ship, ναυκληρος, prevailed with the centurion. By reason of the inconvenience of the haven for wintering, the majority of those on board came to the resolution, etc., ver. 13.

Ver. 12. ἄνευθέτον] not well situated, Hesychius and Suidas, elsewhere not found; the later Greeks have δόσθετος. They ought, according to the counsel of Paul, to have chosen the least of two evils. — πρὸς παρα-κεκυμαιν] for passing the winter. — κάκειαν] also from thence. As they had not hitherto lain to with a view to pass the winter, the resolution come to by the majority was to the effect of sailing onward from thence also.

---

2 According to Bleek and de Wette, this Jewish definition of time, as well as that contained in xx. 6, betrays a Jewish-Christian author. But the definitions of the Jewish calendar were generally, and very naturally, adopted in the apostolic church. Comp. Schnakenburger, p. 18.
3 Lev. xvi. 29 ff., xxiii. 96 ff.
4 See Wetstein.
5 2 Cor. xi. 36.
6 See Heind. ad Plat. Phaed. p. 63 C; Winer, p. 318 (E. T. 465); Raphel, Polyb. in loc. Comp. on xix. 27, xxiii. 23 f.
7 Comp. Pind. Pyth. l. 73: ἵππειθέτον ὑβριν ἰδὼν, Anthol. iii. 82, 58: δεισάνα φελάττες ὑβριν.
8 See vv. 23, 24.
9 Baumgarten.
10 Diod. Sic. xix. 66, and more frequently in Polybius. Comp. xxviii. 11.
11 On ἤθετο βουλή, comp. Judg. xix. 30; Ps. xii. 8.
FROM MYRA TO CRETE.

1 εἰναῖς δύναιναι] i.e. in order to try, whether perhaps they would be able. — The haven Φοίνιξ is called in Ptolem. iii. 17, Φοινικάς, and the adjacent town Φοίνιξ. Stephanus Byzantinus, on the other hand, remarks: Φοινικάς πόλις Кρήτης. Perhaps the two names were used in common of the haven and the city. Whether the haven was the modern Λυτρο, is uncertain. — βλέπειν] quite like spectare, of the direction of the geographical position. — Δίφ is the Αφίνις, the south-west wind, and Χώρος the Καυρίς, the north-west. The haven formed such a curve, that one shore stretched toward the north-west and the other toward the south-west.

Ver. 18. But when gentler south winds had set in — this was the motive of the following δόξαντες. As, namely, Fair Havens, where they were, and also Φοίνιξ farther to the west, whither they wished to go, lay on the south coast of the island, the south wind was favourable for carrying out their resolution, because it kept them near to the coast and did not allow them to drift down into the southern sea. — κεκρατηκέναι] to have become masters of their purpose, that is, to be able safely to accomplish it. Examples in Raphel, Polyb. — δραντες] namely, the anchor, which is understood of itself in nautical language: they weighed anchor. — άσσων παρελκώ. τ. Κρήτ. — they sailed closer, than could previously, ver. 8, be done, along the coast of Crete. άσσων, nearer, the comparative of αχρί, is not only found in poetry from the time of Homer, but also in prose. The Vulgate, which Erasmus follows, has: cum sustulissent de Asson, so that thus ΑΣΣΩΝ is connected with δραντες and regarded as the name of a city of Crete; — hence also Elz., Mill, Scholz have 'Ασσών, as a proper name. But as this translation is at variance with the words as they stand, Luther, Castalio, Calovius, and several older expositors have taken 'Ασσών as the accusative of direction: cum sustulissent Ασσώμ. But, even if the little town had really been situated on the coast, which does not agree with Plin. l.c., the expression would have been extremely harsh, as δραντες does not express the notion of direction; and not only so, but also the mere accusative of direction without a preposition is only poetical, and is foreign to the N. T.

Ver. 14. Εβαλε] intransitive: fell upon, threw itself against it; often in the classical writers after Homer. — κατ' αὐτής] refers to the nearest antecedent Кρήτης, not to προβία. — δυναμός τυφώνικός] The adjective is formed from τυφών, a whirlwind, and is found also in Eustathius. — Ευρυκλίδων] the broad-surfing, from ευρός, breadth, and κλίδω. It is usually explained: Ευρισκέται excitans, from ευρός, the south-east wind, and κλίδων. But this compound would rather yield an appellation unsuitable for a wind: south-east wave, fluctus euro excitatus. Ευρυκλίδων. from ευρός,
according to the analogy of εἰρυκρείων, εἰρυμέλων, εἰρυβίνης, etc., would certainly be more suitable to the explanation broad-surfing; but on this very account the reading Εἰρυκλῖδων in B** 40, 133, is not to be approved with Griesbach, but to be considered as a correction. Lachmann and Borsienmann, followed by Ewald, Smith, and Hackett, have Εἰρακίλων, according to A χ (Vulg. Cassiod.: Euroaquilo), which also Olshausen, after Erasmus, Grotius, Mill, Bengel, and others, approves; the best defence of this reading is by Bentley, in Wolf, Cur. This would be the east-north-east wind; the compound formed, as in εἰρώνοτος, ἐυραυστήρ, εὐρωαφίκης. But the words of the text lead us to expect a special actual name (καλοῦμ) of this particular whirlwind, not merely a designation of its direction. It is difficult also to comprehend why such an easily explicable name of a wind as Euroaquilo, εἰρακίλων, should have been converted into the difficult and enigmatic Εἰρυκλῖδων. Far more naturally would the converse take place, and the Εἰρυκλῖδων, not being understood, would be displaced by the similar Εἰρακίλων formed according to the well-known analogy of Εἰρώνοτος κ.τ.λ.; so that the latter form appears a product of old emendatory conjecture. Besides, Εἰρακίλων, if it were not formed by a later hand from the original Εἰρυκλῖδων, would be an improbable mixture of Greek and Latin, and we do not see why the name should not have had some such form as Εἰροβοριας; ἀκίλων = aquilo, is nowhere found (a). Ver. 15. Εὐαρπαστ.] but when the ship was hurried along with the whirlwind.—On αὐτοφναλείου, to look in the face, then to withstand.—ἐπιδόντες may either, with the Vulgate, data nave flatibus ferembar, Luther, Elsner, and many others, be referred to τὸ πλοῖον, or be taken in a reflexive sense: we gave ourselves up and were driven. The former is simpler, because τὸ πλοῖον precedes. Ver. 16. Κλαίδη, or according to Ptol. iii. 7 Κλαίδος, or according to Mela ii. 7 and Plin. iv. 20 Gaudoς, according to Suidas Καῦδα, was the name of the modern Gózso to the south of Crete. From the different forms of the name given by the ancients must be explained the variations in the odd, and vse., among which Καῦδα is attested by B χ** Syr. Aeth. Vulg., adopted by Lachmann, and approved by Ewald. We cannot determine how Luke originally wrote the name; still, as most among the ancients have transmitted it without λ, the λ, which has in its favour A G H χ* vse. and the Greek Fathers, has probably been deleted by subsequent, though in itself correct, emendation.—τῆς σκάφης they could scarcely become masters of the boat, belonging to the ship, which swam attached to it, when they wished to hoist it up, that it might not be torn away by the storm. Ver. 17. And after they had drawn this up, they applied means of protection, undergirding the ship. This undergirding took place, in order to diminish
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* Gez. ii. 23. 10.
* Raphel, Wolf, Bengel, Kypke.
* Comp. Lobeck, ad Aj. 250.
* Vv. 17. 30.
* Polyb. xcvii. 3. 3.
the risk of foundering, by means of broad ropes, which, drawn under the ship and tightened above, held its two sides more firmly together. By βοθειας is to be understood all kinds of helpful apparatus which they had in store for emergencies, as ropes, chains, beams, clamps, and the like. The referring it to the help rendered by the passengers, which was a matter of course amidst the common danger, makes the statement empty and unnecessary. — ἑβοθειας τε κ.τ.λ. and fearing to strike on the nearest Syris. It is entirely arbitrary to understand τὴν Σύρτιν, without linguistic precedent, in the wider sense of a sandbank, and not of the African Syrtis. Of the two Syrtes, the Greater and the Lesser, the former was the nearest. As the ship was driven from the south coast of Crete along past the island of Clauda, and thus ran before the north-east wind, they might well, amidst the peril of their situation, be driven to the fear lest, by continuing their course with full sail, they might reach the Greater Syrtis; and how utterly destructive that would have been! — ἐκπίπτειν, of ships and shipwrecked persons, which are cast, out of the deep, navigable water, on banks, rocks, islands, shoals, or on the land, is very common from Homer onward.— τὸ οἰκίον] the gear, the tackle, is the general expression for all the apparatus of the ship. The context shows what definite tackle is here meant by specifying the aim of the measure, which was to prevent the ship from being cast upon the Syrtis, and that by withdrawing it as far as practicable from the force of the storm driving them towards the Syrtis. This was done by their lowering the sails, striking sail, and accordingly choosing rather to abandon the ship without sails to the wind, and to allow it to be driven (ὁμος ἔφερενο), with or without stretched sails to be cast quickly, and without further prospect of rescue, on the Syrtis. Already at a very early date τὸ οἰκίον was justly explained of the sails, and Chrysostom even read τὰ ἱστα. According to Smith, the lowering of the rigging is meant, by which the driving of the ship in a straight direction was avoided. But this presupposes too exact an acquaintance with their position in the storm, considering the imperfection of navigation in those times; and both the following description, especially ver. 20, and the measure adopted in ver. 29, lead us to assume that they had already relinquished the use of the sails. But the less likely it is that in the very exact delineation the account of the striking of the sails, which had not hitherto taken place, in opposition to Kypke and Kuinoel, should have been omitted, and the more definitely the collective meaning is applied in τὸ οἰκίον, the more objectionable.

1 ὑποβώματα, tormenta.
2 Yet it is doubtful whether the procedure was not such, that the ropes ran in a horizontal manner right round the ship (Boeckh, Stablb. ad Plat. l.c.). But see Smith. Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 416 C: οἷον τὰ ὑποβώματα τῶν τρόμου, σφυρί ὁμοίως δεῖξις τῷ ψυχρῷ; Athen. v. 87; and see generally Boeckh, Urkunden 50 d. Beweisen des Althischen Staaten, p. 135 ff.; Smith (The Ships of the Ancients), p. 174 ff.; Hackett, p. 406 ff.
3 See Wetstein.
4 Grotius, Heinsius, and others.
5 Στᾶ, ἡμᾶς, ἣμα, στῆς.
6 See Herod. iii. 25 f., lv. 173; Sallust. Jug. 73 f.; Strabo, xvii. 824 f.
7 Locella, ad Xen. Epid. p. 289; Stablb. ad Plat. Phil. p. 13 D.
appears the view of Grotius, Heinsius, Kuinoel, and Olshausen (after the Peshito), that Ὁ σκείως is the mast. Still more arbitrary, and, on account of ἵππος, entirely mistaken is the rendering of Kypke: "demissentes
ancoram," and that of Castalio and Vataplus: "demissa scapha;" see, on the other hand, ver. 30.

Vv. 18, 19. Ἐξεβολὴν ἐποιοῦσα] they made a casting out, i.e. they threw overboard the cargo.¹ For the lightening of the vessel in distress, in order to make it go less deep and to keep it from grounding, they got rid in the first instance of what could, in the circumstances, be most fitly dispensed with, namely, the cargo; but on the day after they laid hands even on the σκεῖα τοῦ πλοίου, i.e. the ship's apparatus,—the utensils belonging to the ship, as furniture, beds, cooking vessels, and the like. The same collective idea, but expressed in the plural, occurs in Jonah i. 5. Others² understand the baggage of the passengers, but this is at variance with τοῦ πλοίου; instead of it we should expect ἡμῶν, especially as αὐτόχειπερ precedes. Following the Vulgate, Erasmus, Grotius, and many others, including Olshausen and Ewald, understand the arma navis, that is, ropes, beams, and the like belonging to the equipment of the ship. But the tackling is elsewhere called ῥα ὅπλα, or ῥα σκεῖα, from σκεῖος, and just amidst the danger this was most indispensable of all.—αὐτόχειπερ] with our own hands,³ gives to the description a sad vividness, and does not present a contrast to the conduct of Jonah, who lay asleep,⁴ as Baumgarten in his morbid quest of types imagines.

Ver. 20. Μὴρὲ δὲ ἡλίου κ.τ.λ.] For descriptions of storms from Greek and Roman writers, which further embellish this trait, see Grotius and Wetstein.—ἐπικυριοῦσα] spoken of the incessantly assailing storm.⁵ —λαμπῶν] ceterum in reference to time, i.e. henceforth.⁶ —ἡμᾶς] not ἡμῖν, which would not have been suitable to Paul,⁷ nor yet probably to his Christian companions.

Vv. 21, 22. The perplexity had now risen in the ship to despair. But, as the situation was further aggravated by the fact that there prevailed in a high degree (πυλής) that abstinence from food which anguish and despair naturally bring with them, Paul came forward in the midst of those on board (ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν), in the first instance with gentle censure, and afterwards with confident encouragement and promise. — On ἀνίσια, jejunatio, comp. Herod. iii. 52; Eur. Suppl. 1105; Arist. Eth. x. 9; Joseph. Antt. xii. 7. 1.¹₀ —τότε] then, in this state of matters, as in xxviii. 1.¹¹ —σταθεὶς κ.τ.λ.] has

¹ Had the ship been loaded with ballast, and this been thrown out (Laurent), we should have expected a more precise designation (ἐποιοῦσα). The σκεῖα, too, would not have been included in the category of things thrown out at once on the following day, but after the ballast would have come, in the first instance, the cargo. The ship was without doubt a merchant- vessel, and doubtless had no ballast at all. Otherwise they certainly would have commenced with throwing the latter out, but would not thereupon have at once passed to the σκεῖα. Dem. 286. 17; Aesch. Soph. 782; Arist.-Eth. iii. 1; Pollux. i. 98; LXX. Jonah i. 5.
² Diod. Sic. xiv. 79.
³ Wetstein, Kypke, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel.
⁴ Hermann, ad Soph. Ant. 1160.
⁵ Jonah i. 5.
⁶ Virg. Aen. i. 88 ff., iii. 195 ff.; Ach. Tat. iii. 2. p. 284, al.
⁷ See Alberti, Obs. 279; Wolf, Cur.
⁸ See Vigerus, p. 22, and Hermann thereon, p. 706; Kühner, ad Anab. ii. 2. 5.
⁹ xxviii. 11.
¹₀ Volg.
¹¹ See also in the classics after participles, Xen. Cyr. i. 5. 6; Dem. 286. 6, 80. 18.
here, as in xvii. 22, ii. 14, something solemn.—αἰτῶν not ἵμαν; for the censure as well as also primarily the encouragement was intended to apply to the sailors. —τὸς µὲν it was necessary indeed. This µὲν does not stand in relation to the following καί, but the contrast—possibly: but it has not been done—is suppressed.¹ Bengel well remarks: "καὶ modestiam habet." —κεφαλής κ.τ.λ.] and to have spared us this insolence³ and the loss suffered. ταῦτα points to the whole present position of danger in which the ἁβρασις, wherewith the warnings of the apostle were despised and the voyage ventured, presented itself in a way to be keenly felt as such. κεφαλῆς, of that gain, which is made by omission or avoidance.³ The evil in question is conceived as the object, the non-occurrence of which goes to the benefit of the person acting, as the negative object of gain. Analogous to this is the Latin lucrificare, see Grotius.⁴ —ἀποβολὴ γὰρ ψυχῆς κ.τ.λ.] for there shall be no loss of a soul from the midst of you, except loss of the ship, i.e. no loss of life, but only the loss of the ship. An inaccuracy of expression, which continues with πλῆν, as if before there had simply been used the words ἀποβολὴ γὰρ ψυχής. —To what Paul had said in ver. 10, his present announcement stands related as a correction. He has now by special revelation learned the contrary of what he had then feared, as respected the apprehended loss of life.

Vv. 23-35. Ἀγγελος] an angel (κ'). But naturally those hearers who were Gentiles, and not particularly acquainted with Judaism, understood this as well as τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. according to their Gentile conception, of a messenger of the gods, and of one of the gods.—οὐ εἰς ἐγώ, ὦ καὶ λατρεῖο] to whom I belong, as His property, and whom I also, in accordance with this belonging, serve.⁵ Paul thus characterizes himself as intimate with God, and therewith assures the credibility of his announcement, in which τοῦ Θεοῦ with great emphasis precedes the ἀγγέλος κ.τ.λ. (see the critical remarks). On ἐγώ (see the critical remarks), in which is expressed a holy sense of his personal standing, Bornemann correctly remarks: "Pronomen Paulum minime dedecet coram gentilibus verba facientem." —κεχάρισται σωι ὁ Θεός] God has granted to thee, i.e. He has saved them, according to His counsel, for thy sake.¹ —Here, too,² the appearance, which is to be regarded as a work of God, is not a vision in a dream. The testimony and the consciousness of the apostle, who was scarce likely to have slumbered and dreamed on that night, are decisive against this view, and particularly against the naturalizing explanation of Eichhorn,³ Zeller, and Hausrath. De Wette takes objection to the mode of expression κεχάρισται κ.τ.λ., and is inclined to trace it to the high veneration of the reporter; but this is unfair, as Paul had simply to utter what he had heard. And he had heard, that for his sake the saving of all was determined. Bengel well remarks:

¹ See Kühner, § 733, note. p. 480; Baemel. Introd. p. 158. Comp. on xxviii. 23.
² See on ver. 10.
³ See examples in Bengel, and Kypke, II. p. 189 f.
⁴ On the form κεφαλής, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 740 f.
⁵ See Winer, p. 567 [E. T. T. 790].
⁶ Comp. Rom. i. 9.
⁷ See on iii. 14.
⁸ Comp. on xvi. 10.
⁹ Bibl. III. p. 497, 1084.
"Non erat tam periculo so alioqui tempore periculum, ne videretur P., quae necessario dicebat, gloriae dicere." — o

Ver. 26. But—dé, leading over to the mode of the promised deliverance—we must be cast on some island. This assurance, made to Paul probably through the appearance just narrated, is verified ver. 41 ff. But it is lightly, and without reason assigned, conjectured by Zeller that vv. 21—26 contain a catonicium post eventum on the part of the author.

Vv. 27—29. But after the commencement of the fourteenth night, namely, after the departure from Fair Havens, while we were driven up and down in the Adriatic sea, about midnight, the sailors despaired, etc. The article was not required before the ordinal number, as a special demonstrative stress is not contemplated, but only the simple statement of time. On νυὲ ἐνέχυντο (see the critical remarks), the night set in. — ὁ Ἀδριατικός here and frequently, not in the narrower sense of the Golfo di Venetia, but in the wider sense of the sea between Italy and Greece, extending southward as far as, and inclusive of, Sicily. — τὸ προδάγχευεν that it approaches to them. The opposite is ἀναχωρεῖ, recedere. See Smith and the passages in Kuinoel. The conjecture of the sailors (ἐνέχυντο) had doubtless its foundation in the noise of the surf, such as is usual in the vicinity of land. — On βολίζειν, to cast the sounding lead, and on ὅργυν, a measure of length of six feet, like our fathom. — ἀναδρομῆσαντες] note the active: having made a short interval, i.e. having removed the ship a little way farther. — ἐκκεντρίσαντες] With this decrease of depth the danger increased of their falling on reefs, such as are frequent in the vicinity of small islands. — τίνα παρείρι. For the different expressions for casting anchor, see Poll. l. 108 (L').

Ver. 30. While they were lying here at anchor longing for daylight, ηὔχοντο ἡμᾶς γενέσαν, ver. 29, the sailors, in order with the proximity of land to substitute certainty for uncertainty, make the treacherous attempt to escape to land in the boat, which they had already let down under the pretense of wishing to cast anchor from the prow of the ship, and thus to leave the vessel together with the rest of those on board to their fate. Certainly the captain of the vessel, whose interest was too much bound up with the preservation of the ship, was not implicated in this plot of his servants; but how easily are the bonds of fidelity and duty relaxed in

1 ἵππον, see on ver. 17.
2 Comp. vv. 18, 19.
3 διαφερ., see the passages in Wetstein and Kypke, II. p. 141, and Philo, de migr. Abr. p. 410 E.
4 Poppo, ad Thuc. ii. 70, 5.
5 Amelie on Hom. Od. xiv. 341.
6 Comp. Herod. vili. 70; Thuc. iv. 25; Polyb. i. 11, 15, ii. 25, 5.
7 Filn. iii. 16, 30.
8 Comp. Scherzer, statistisch, commercielle Ergebnisse, p. 51: "During the European winter a sailing vessel may be often forced to lose fourteen days or more by a persistent south-east wind in the Adriatic Gulf." See Forbiger, Geogr. ii. p. 16 ff. "Hadrice arbiter notus." Horat, Od. 1. 8, 15.
10 Smith.
11 βολίς, in Herodotus κατανεραγμα. See the passages from Kustathius in Wetstein.
12 Concerning the accent, Götting, p. 188.
15 κατὰ τραχεῖα τόνωσι.
16 Comp. Cass. Bell. cix. i. 26: "Naves quaternis ancoris destinabat, ne fluctibus movensentur."
FEARS AND HOPES.

vulgar minds when placed in circumstances of perilous uncertainty, if at the expense of these bonds a safe deliverance may be obtained! — προφάσει ως ... μελλόντων] The genitive is absolute, subordinate to the preceding χαλασ., and προφάσει 1 is adverbial, 2 as in classical writers the accusative προφασιν more commonly occurs. 3 Hence: on pretence as though they would, etc. — ἥκτεν] extender. 4 They affected and pretended that by means of the boat they were desirous to reach out anchors 5 from the prow, from which these anchors hung, 6 into the sea, in order that the vessel might be secured not only behind, 7 but also before. Incorrectly Laurent renders: "to cast out the anchors farther into the sea." Against this, it is decisively urged that ἄγκτρας is anarthrous, and that ἐκ πρόφασις stands in contrast to ἐκ πρίμυνς, ver. 29.

Vv. 31, 32. Paul applied not first to the captain of the vessel, but at once to the soldiers, because they could take immediately vigorous measures, as the danger of the moment required; and the energetic and decided word of the apostle availed. — οὖτω ... ὕπειρα] Correlates. Paul, however, does not say ἕμεις, but appeals to the direct personal interest of those addressed. — συνθήκαν οὖ δύνασθε] spoken in the consciousness of the divine counsel, in so far as the latter must have the fulfilment of duty by the sailors as the human means of its realization (κατ'). — ἵππεος ἐκ] to fall out. We are to think on the boat let down into the sea, 8 yet hanging with its fastened end to the ship—when the soldiers cut the ropes asunder.

Ver. 33. But now, when he had overcome this danger, it was the care of the prudent rescuer, before anything further, to see those on board strengthened for the new work of the new day by food. But until it should become day,—so long, therefore, as the darkness of the night up to the first break of dawn did not allow any ascertaining of their position or further work,— in this interval he exhorted all, etc. — τεσσαρεῖς σήμ. ἢμεραν κ.τ.λ.] waiting, for deliverance, the fourteenth day to-day, since the departure from Fair Havens, yet continue without food. ἀντίοι holds with ἄνωθεν, the place of a participle. 9 — μηδὲν προσλαβ. 10 since ye have taken to you (adhæro) nothing, no food. This emphatically strengthens the ἀντίοι. That, however, the two terms are not to be understood of complete abstinence from food, but relatively, is self-evident; Paul expresses the "insolitam cibi abstinentiam" 11 earnestly and forcibly. 12

Ver. 34. Πρὸς τῆς ἵμερ. αὐτ.] on the side of your deliverance, e salute vestra, i.e. corresponding, conducing to your deliverance. 13 Observe the emphatic ἵμερας; your benefit I have in view. — οίδενός γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] assigns the reason

---

1 Comp. Luke xx. 47; Thuc. v. 53. 1, vi
2 Bernhardy, p. 190. [76. 1]
3 Dorr, ad Charid. p. 219; Krüger on Thuc. iii. 111. 1, on ἵμ., comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 18, and see Xen. Anab. i. 2. 1
4 Vulg.
5 "Vane eo usque prolatum," Grotius.
6 Pind. Pytl. iv. 342, x. 90.
7 Ver. 29.
8 Ver. 30.
9 See the passages in Winer, p. 386 [E. T. 437]; Krüger on Thuc. i. 34. 2, and Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 6. 2.
10 Calvin.
11 Comp. παλλᾶς, ver. 21.
12 Comp. Thuc. iii. 59. 1, v. 105. 3; Plut. Corg. p. 450 C; Arr. An. vii. 10. 5. See on this use of προς with the genitive (only found here in the N. T.), Bernhardy, p. 364; Winer, p. 350 [E. T. 297 τ.].
for the previous πρὸς τ. ἵματερ. σωτηρίας. For your deliverance, I say, for, etc. In this case their own exertions and the bodily strengthening necessary for this purpose are conceived as conditioning the issue. — On the proverbial expression itself, which denotes their being kept utterly exempt from harm, comp. Luke xxi. 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11; 1 Kings i. 52.

Vv. 35, 36. Like the father of a family among those at table, not, as Olshausen and Ewald suppose, notwithstanding that most of the persons were heathens, regarding the meal as a Christian love-feast, Paul now, by way of formal and pious commencement of the meal, uttered the thanksgiving-prayer—for the disposition towards, and relative understanding of, which even the Gentiles present were in this situation susceptible—over the bread, broke it, and commenced to eat (ἅπαξ ἐσθίειν). And all of them, encouraged by his word and example, on their part followed. — προσελέβας τροφῆς] parted of food. It is otherwise in ver. 33, with accusative.

Ver. 37. And what a large meal was thus brought about! — The number 276 may surprise us on account of its largeness; but, apart from the fact that we have no knowledge of the size and manner of the Alexandrian ship, ver. 6, it must, considering the exactness of the entire narrative, be assumed as correct; and for the omission of διακόσια the single evidence of B, which has ὡς, is too weak.

Ver. 38. Now, seeing that for some time, and in quite a brief period must the fate of those on board be decided, further victuals were unnecessary—now they ventured on the last means of lightening the ship, which, with the decreasing depth, was urgently required for the purpose of driving it on to the land, and cast the provisions overboard, which, considering the multitude of men and the previous ἅρπα, was certainly still a considerable weight. Chrysostom aptly remarks: οίτω λατρεύον τὸ πῶς ἐκρυφαν ἐν τὸν Παύλου ὡς καὶ τὸν σίτου ἐκβάλειν. Σιτίος may denote either corn, or also, as here and often with Greek writers, provisions particularly prepared from corn, meal, bread, etc. Others have explained it as the corn with which, namely, the ship had been freighted. But against this it may be urged, first, that this freighting is not indicated; secondly, that καρπθήδες corresponds to the throwing out of the provisions, and not of the freight; and thirdly, that the throwing out of the freight had already taken place, as this indeed was most natural, because the freight was the heaviest.

Ver. 39. Τὴν γην ὅπι ἐπετυλωσκ.] i.e. when it became day, they recognised not what land it was; the land lying before them (τὴν γην) was one unknown to them. — κάλπον δὲ τῶν κατενόουν ἐξουσία αἰγολῶν] Thus Luke writes quite faithfully and simply, I might say naively, what presented itself to the scrutinizing gaze of those on board: but they perceived a bay which had a beach. A bay and a beach belonging to it—so much they saw at the unknown land, and this sufficed for the resolution to land there, where it was

---

1 Comp. Luke xxiv. 59. [vi. 11. 2 Matt. xiv. 19, xv. 36; Mark viii. 6; John 3 Comp. Herod. viii. 90. 4 See Bornemann in loc. 5 Ver. 38. 6 Erasmus, Luther, Beza, et al., including Baumgarten, Smith, Hackett. 7 Ver. 18.
possible. Observe that *aịγαλός* is a flat coast, thus suitable for landing, in distinction from the high and rugged ἀκτή. Hence it is not even necessary, and is less simple, to connect, with Winer, *εἰς δὲ τὸ κατάλαβον* as modal definition of *αἰγαλ*. closely with the latter: "a shore of such a nature, that," etc. — *εἰς δὲ* applies to *αἰγαλ*. See ver. 40. For examples of *εἰς ὀδεῖν*, used of the thrusting a ship from the open sea on to the land, navem *ejicere*, *expellere*, see Wetstein. On St. Paul's Bay, see the description and chart of Smith.

Ver. 40. A vivid description of the stirring activity now put forth in making every effort to reach the shore. 1. They cut the four anchors round about (περιελόντες), and let them fall into the sea, in order neither to lose time nor to burden the ship with their weight. 2. At the same time they loosened the bands, with which they fastened the rudders to the ship in order to secure them while the ship lay at anchor from the violence of the waves, for the purpose of now using them in moving on. 3. They spread the top-sail before the wind, and thus took their course (κατείχον) for the beach (*εἰς τὸν αἰγαλόν*). — *εἶναί* is to be referred to the *ἀγκυράς*, which they let go by cutting, so that they fell into the sea. Arbitrarily, following the Vulgate (committebant se), Luther, Beza, Grotius take it as "*εἶναί τὸ πλοῖον ἴνα εἰς τὴν βάλασσαν*." — That τῶν πηδαλίων is not to be taken for the singular, but that larger ships had *two* rudders, managed by one steersman. — *ὁ ἀρτέμων* not elsewhere occurring in Greek writers as part of a ship, is most probably explained of the *top-gallant-sail* placed high on the mast. *Labeo* points to this view: "Malum navis esse partem, artemone autem non esse, Labeo ait," in which words he objects to the confounding of the artemon with the mast: the mast constituted an integral part of the ship, but the artemon did not, because it was fastened to the mast. Luther's translation: "mast," is therefore certainly incorrect. Grotius, Heumann, Rosenmüller, and others, including Smith, explain it of "the small sail at the prow of the ship." In this they assume that the mast had already been lowered; but this is entirely arbitrary, as Luke, although he relates every particular so expressly, has never mentioned this. Besides, we cannot see why this sail should not have been called by its technical name *δόλων*. Hadrianus, Junius, Alberti, Wolf, and de Wette understand the *mizzen-sails* at the stern, which indeed bears that name in the present day, but for this *ἐπίδραμος*, is well known to be the old technical name. — τῆς πτερόνος ἃν ἀφῄνε, has raised itself quite to the position of a substantive. The *datives* indicates the reference; they hoisted up the

1 Matt. xiii. 2; and see Nägelsbach on the *Naut.*, p. 354, ed. 8.
4 See Smith, p. 9, also Scheffer, *De milii. nav.* lii. 5; Boëckh, *Urkunden*, p. 126.
5 See especially Scheffer, *De milii. nav.* lii. 5; Forcellini, *Theo.* i. p. 301.
6 In Jabolen. *Dig.* lib. i. tit. 16, leg. 343.
7 Segelbaum.
8 Comp. on ver. 17.
9 Polyb. xvi. 15. 9; Diod. xx. 61; Pollux, i. 91; Liv. xxxvi. 4, xxxviii. 30; Isidor. *Orig.* xix. 3; Procop. *Bell.* *Vandal.* i. 17.
11 Pollux i. 91.
sail for the breeze, so that the wind now swelled it from behind. For examples of ἵππεις, for hoisting up and thereby expanding the sail, and for κατερχεῖν to steer towards, see Kypke, II. p. 144.

Ver. 41. But when they had struck upon a promontory,1—it is altogether arbitrary to abandon the literal import of διδάλασσος, forming two seas, or having the sea on both sides, bimaris,2 and to understand by τόπος ἰδιαλ. a sandbank or a reef, situated after the manner of an island before the entrance of the bay. This view is supposed to be necessary on account of ver. 43 f., and it is asked: "quorum enim isti in mare se proiercet, si in ipsum litus navis impegerat prora?" But the promontory, as is very frequently the case, jutted out with its point under the surface of the water, and was covered to so great an extent by the sea, that the ship stranding on the point was yet separated from the projecting dry part of the isthmus by a considerable surface of water; hence those stranded could only reach the dry land by swimming. Even in Dio Chrys. v. p. 83, by which the signification of reef is sought to be made good, because there τραχύς κ. διδάλασσα κ. ταυία (sandbanks) are placed together, διδάλ. is not to be taken otherwise than τόπος διδάλ. here. — ἵππειαν] ἵππελλειν may be either transitive: to thrust the ship on, to cause it to strand,3 or intransitive: to strand, to be wrecked.4 As τὴν ναῦν is here added, which in the intransitive view would be the accusative of more precise definition, but quite superfluous, the transitive view is that suggested by the text: they thrust the ship upon, they made it strand. Lachmann and Tischendorf, following A B* C, have ἵππειαν, from ἵππελλω, to push to the land, naves appellere. But neither does this meaning suit, as here it is the ship going to wreck that is spoken of; nor can proof be adduced from the aorist form ἵππειλα.5—ἵππειαν] having fixed itself. On ἵππελλειν, used also by the Greeks in an intransitive sense, comp. Prov. iv. 4.—ἡ δὲ πρόμα ἐλβετο κ.τ.λ. for the promontory had naturally the deeper water above it the farther it ran seawards, so that the stern was shattered by the power of the waves. This shipwreck was at least the fourth7 which Paul suffered.

Vv. 43-44. Now, when the loss of the ship was just as certain, as with the proximity of the land the escape of those prisoners who could swim was easily possible, the soldiers were of a mind to kill them; but the centurion was too much attached to Paul to permit it.8 Not sharing in the apprehension of his soldiers, he commanded that all in the ship who knew how to swim should swim to land, and then the rest, to whom in this way assistance was ready on shore, were to follow partly on planks and partly on broken pieces of the ship. — βολη ἵγκειτο, ἵκα] there took place a project, in the design, that, etc.; comp. on ver. 1, and see Nægelsb. on the Iliad, p.

1 As to ἵππεις, comp. on Luke x. 30.  
2 See the passages in Wotaieln.  
3 Calvisius: compare Kuinoel.  
4 Herod. vi. 16, vii. 189; Thuc. iv. 93. 5.  
5 So Thuc. viii. 108. 3; Polyb. 1. 20. 15, 1v. 41. 2, and see Loesner, p. 940.  
6 Hom. Od. ix. 138, 148, viii. 114: ἱππελείς, see Bornemann. In Polyb. iv. 81. 2, ἱππελλον- 
τες has been introduced by copyists’ mistake  
7 2 Cor. xi. 25.  
8 In this remark, ver 43, Zeller conjectures  
very arbitrarily a later addition to the original 
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very arbitrarily a later addition to the original narrative, which was designed to illustrate the influence of the apostle upon the Roman.
ALL ON BOARD SAVED.

62, ed. 3, who on such modes of expression appropriately remarks that the "will is conceived as a striving will." — ἀπορρίπτειν, to cast down, intransitive, in the sense of so projectere. 1 — καὶ τῶν λαοῖς] δικό εἰς εἰς τὴν γῆν. — ἐπὶ σανίσαι on planks, which were at hand in the ship. — ἐπὶ τῶν ἄπο τοῦ πλοιοῦ] on something from the ship, on pieces which had partly broken loose from it by the stranding, so forming wreck (φαναγοῦν, έρείσιον), and were partly torn off by the people themselves for that purpose. ἐπὶ denotes both times the local being upon, and the change between datives and genitives is to be regarded as merely accidental. 2 — In the history of this final rescue, Baumgarten, II. p. 420, has carried to an extreme the arbitrariness of allegorico-spiritual fiction.

REMARK 1.—The extraordinarily exact minuteness and vividness in the narrative of this whole voyage justifies the hypothesis that Luke, immediately after its close, during the winter spent in Malta, wrote down this interesting description in the main from fresh recollection, and possibly following notes which he had made for himself even during the voyage — perhaps set down in his diary, and at a later period transferred from it to his history.

REMARK 2.—The transition from the first person — in which he narrates as a companion sharing the voyage and its fortunes — into the third is not to be considered as an accident or an inconsistency, but is founded on the nature of the contents, according to which the sailors specially come into prominence as subject. See vv. 13, 17, 18, and 19, 21, 29, 38–41.

REMARK 3. If the assumption of the school of Baur as to the set purpose animating the author of the Acts were correct, this narrative of the voyage, with all its collateral circumstances in such detail, would be a meaningless ballast of the book. But it justifies itself in the purely historical destination of the work, and confirms that destination.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(o) And he put us therein. V. 6.

In no ancient literature have we, in so small a compass, such a minute description of a voyage and shipwreck as is contained in this chapter of the Acts, and the account abounds in nautical phrases and words. To account for the great minuteness of detail with which the voyage is described it has been supposed that Luke kept a diary during the voyage and used it in his history. The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, by James Smith, Esq., of Jordan Hill, a work of European reputation, gives a full explanation and illustration of the entire voyage. "Mr. Smith has applied his nautical knowledge to the elucidation of this chapter, and by so doing has furnished us with a new and independent argument in favor of the authenticity of the Acts."

Hackett is also particularly full and minute on this and the following chapter. The Greek words ἐνεζώβασεν ἡπάς eis autó, rendered put us therein, in a nauti-

1 See Schaefer, ad Bov Ed. p. 127.
2 See Bernhardy, p. 200 f.; Kühner, § 634, ad Xen. Mem. 1. 1. 20.
cal phrase, and means put us on board of it. Hackett remarks: "It will be observed that Luke employs such terms with great frequency, and with singular precision. He uses, for example, not less than thirteen different verbs which agree in this, that they mark in some way the progression of the ship, but which differ, inasmuch as they indicate its distance from the land, rate of movement, direction of the wind, or some such circumstance. With the exception of three of them, they are all nautical expressions." Doubtless the writer learned the use of such terms from the sailors themselves.

(xi) Fair Havens. V. 8.

On this harbor Alford writes: "The situation of this anchorage was ascertained by Pococke from the fact of the name still remaining." "In searching after Lehena farther to the west, I found out a place which I thought to be of greater consequence because mentioned in Holy Scripture and also honored by the presence of St. Paul, that is the Fair Havens, near unto the city of Lasea; for there is a small bay about two leagues to the east of Mataha, which is now called by the Greeks good, or fair, havens." Mr. Smith in quoting this passage adds: "The most conclusive evidence that this is the Fair Havens of Scripture is that its position is precisely that where a ship, circumstanced as St. Paul's was, must have put in."

Hackett observes: "This harbor consists of an open roadstead, or rather two roadsteads contiguous to each other, which may account for the plural designation. It is adapted also by its situation to afford the shelter in north-west winds, which the anchorage mentioned by Luke afforded to Paul's vessel. Nautical authorities assure us that this place is the farthest point to which an ancient ship could have attained with north-westerly winds, because here the land turns suddenly to the north." Gloag says that Rev. G. Brown identified the exact situation of Lasea, in the year 1856. He ascertained that the natives of Crete gave the name of Lasea to some ruins on the coast about five miles east of Fair Havens. Two white pillars and other remains still mark the spot.

(xii) Toward the north-west and south-west. V. 12.

On this phrase which he renders, looking down the south-west and north-west winds, i.e., in the direction of these winds, viz., north-east and south-east, Alford writes: "For λίχ and χωρος are not quarters of the compass, but winds; and ξαυα, used with a wind, denotes the direction of its blowing—down the wind." This interpretation, which I was long ago persuaded was the right one, I find now confirmed by the opinion of Mr. Smith. Hackett in a note says: "As this question has excited some interest, it may be well to mention how it is viewed in works published since 1850. Humphrey (1854) says that Mr. Smith's passages are not quite conclusive as to βλέπωνε κατα Αιδα. He supposes Phoenix to be the modern Phinika which opens to the west, and thus adopts the common explanation of the phrase. Alford (1852), agrees with Smith. And he adds to his note on verse 12, this statement: "See Professor Hackett's note, impugning the above view and interpretation. I cannot observe on it, as it has only come to hand as these sheets are being printed, but it does not alter
my opinion."—Am. Ed.] Howeson would admit an instance of this usage in
Josephus, but says the other alleged proofs are untenable or ambiguous. He
mediates between the two opinions by suggesting that the point of view
(βλέποντας) is from the sea and not the land, so that κατὰ Δίβα would have its
usual meaning, and yet the harbor open toward the east like Lutro. Words-
worth has a copious note on this question. He reviews the arguments on both
sides, and sums up with the result that we should not abandon the ancient in-
terpretation, or at all events should suspend our decision till we have more
complete topographical details for forming it. Gloag says: "There is a differ-
ence of opinion regarding the exact situation of the ancient Phenix. Lutro,
Sphakia, and Franco Castello, places on the south coast of Crete, to the west
of Cape Matala, have each been fixed upon. Most modern commentators are
now agreed that the modern part of Lutro is meant."

He adds that Spratt informs us that a wide bay, a little to the west of it, is
still known by the name of Phenix, and says: "Most probably it is this bay
to the west which is meant, as the haven of Lutro is open to the east, and
therefore does not suit the description of it given by Luke, as looking toward
the south-west and north-west, whereas the bay of Phoinice does, being open to
the west." In a note he adds further: "This view, that Phoinix is not Lutro,
but the adjoining bay to the west, is also adopted by Humphrey and by Bishop
Wordsworth."

(☞) Euroclydon. V. 14.

Gloag remarks on this word: "Alford thinks that it is a corruption by the
Greek sailors of εὐρακτίων, as the last part of that word was not Greek, but Latin.
The addition ὁ καλοίμενος denotes that it was a popular name given to the wind
by the sailors, just as a similar wind in the Mediterranean is now known to
our seamen by the name of the Levanter." Hackett thinks the name of the
wind denotes the point from which it came, and should probably be written εὐρακτίων, Euroquilo, as in the Vulgate, a north-east wind, and says the in-
ternal evidence favors that form of the word. In this opinion Alexander, Jacob-
son, Jacobus, and Plumptre substantially concur. The Revised Version gives the
name Euroquilo, which Abbots and Taylor also approves. In popular language
it was a north-easterly gale. Schaff says: "We here naturally think of the
beautiful stanza of the Greek hymn of Anatolius containing the word Euro-
lydon.

"'Ridge of the mountain wave, lower thy crest !
Wall of Euroclydon, be thou at rest !
Sorrow can never be, darkness must fly,
Where saith the Light of light, Peace ! It is I!""

(☞) The angel of God. V. 23.

The literal rendering is, as in the Revised Version, an angel of the God,
whose I am. The ministry of angels is frequently referred to in the Acts.
This form of expression is natural in addressing idolaters, to whom the idea
of an angel was familiar, as a messenger from the gods, but who had no idea of
the one living and true God. This vision was to Paul a source of strength and
presence of mind, which he was able in some degree to impress on others.
Stier says: "How beautiful is the quiet certainty of the apostle amid the dangers of the raging sea. I am God's is the loftiest and inmost confidence of piety; I serve him is the consequent appeal to the vitality of his worship." Houson characterizes this statement of the apostle as "one of the noblest utterances that ever came from the lips of man, and made more remarkable by the circumstances under which the words were uttered."

(14) They cast four anchors out of the stern. V. 29.

Some suppose that the four anchors here mentioned was a four-flanked anchor; but large vessels often carried several anchors. Atheneus mentions a ship that had eight iron anchors, and the quotation from Cesar by Meyer refers to ships made fast by four anchors. In general the ancients, like the moderns, anchored from the bow. The reason why anchors in the present instance were cast from the stern was that in that way the progress of the ship would at once be stopped without swinging round. "In the battles of the Nile and of Copenhagen, Nelson had his ships anchored from the stern, and the fact derives peculiar interest from the statement that he had been reading Acts xxvii. on the morning of the engagement." (Plumptre.)

Having cast out the anchors they wished for day. These words vividly portray the straw of hope and fear which made them almost cry: "And if our fate be death, give light and let us die."

(w') Except these abide, ye cannot be saved. V. 31.

Notwithstanding the divine assurance to Paul, means were necessary, and these were ordained as well as the end. Paul's vigilance and the seamen's skill and labor were required to effect the divine purpose. Stier says: "We see, therefore, that God's promises are conditional; in this case, the use of ordinary means and a faithful perseverance in duty to the very last were both requisite."

Calvin on this verse writes: "Paul doth not dispute, in this place, precisely of the power of God, that he may separate the same from his will and from means; and surely God doth not, therefore, commend his (strength or) power (virtudem suam) to the faithful, that they may give themselves to sluggishness and carelessness, contaminating means or rashly cast away themselves when there is some certain way of escape. And yet for all this it doth not follow that the hand of God is tied to means or helps, but when God appointeth this or that means to bring anything to pass, he holdeth all men's senses that they may not pass the bounds which he hath appointed."

Dr. Chalmers, in a sermon on Acts xxvii. 22 and 31, says: "There is no inconsistency between these verses. God says in one of them, by the mouth of Paul, that these men were certainly to be saved, and Paul says in the other of these verses that unless the centurion and others were to do so and so, they should not be saved. In one of the verses, it is made to be the certain and unfailing appointment of God. In the other it is made to depend on the centurion. There is no difficulty in all this, if you would just consider that God, who made the end certain, made the means certain also. It is true that the end was certain to happen, and it is as true that the end would not happen without the means, but God secured the happening of both, and so gives sure-
ness and consistency to the passage before us." He also says, "There must be a sad deal of evasion and of unfair handling with particular passages to get free of the evidence which we find for the doctrine of predestination in the Bible. And independently of Scripture altogether, the denial of this doctrine brings a number of monstrous conceptions along with it. It supposes God to make a world, and not to reserve in his own hand the management of its concerns. Though it should concede to him an absolute sovereignty over all matter, it deposes him from his sovereignty over the region of created minds, that far more dignified and interesting portion of his works. The greatest events of the history of the universe are those which are brought about by the agency of willing and intelligent beings, and the enemies of the doctrine invest every one of these beings with some sovereign and independent principle of freedom, in virtue of which it may be asserted of this whole class of events, that they happened, not because they were ordained of God, but because the creatures of God, by their own uncontrolled power, brought them into existence. At this rate, even He to whom we give the attribute of omniscience is not able to say at this moment what shall be the fortune or the fate of any individual, and the whole train of future history is left to the wildness of accident. All this carries along with it so complete a dethronement of God, it is bringing his creation under the dominion of so many nameless and indeterminable contingencies, it is taking the world and the current of its history so entirely out of the hands of him who formed it, it is withal so opposite to what obtains in every other field of observation, when instead of the lawlessness of chance, we shall find that the more we attend the more we perceive of a certain necessary and established order, that from these and other considerations which might be stated the doctrine in question, in addition to the testimonies which we find for it in the Bible, is at this moment receiving a very general support from the speculations of infidel as well as Christian philosophers."
CHAPTER XXVIII.

VER. 1. ἐπέγνωσαν] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐπέγνωσεν, according to A B C I, min. and most vss. Rightly; the third person was introduced with a retrospective view to xxvii. 39, through the connection with the concluding words of xxvii. 44. — VER. 2. ἀνάφαντες] Lachm. Born. read ἀφαντες, according to A B C I, min. But AN was liable to omission even in itself, and especially through the preceding N. — VER. 3. εἰ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read διο, which is decidedly attested, and therefore to be adopted. — ἄειεῖ θεῶσα] So Tisch. Born. Scholz, according to A G H, min. Chrys. Theophyl. But Elz. and Lachm. have ἄειεῖ θεῶσα. The double compound was the more easily neglected as it was not elsewhere known from the N. T. — VER. 5. ἀποτινάξας] ἀποτινάξας, although adopted by Scholz and Tisch., is not sufficiently attested by A G H, min. — VER. 10. τὴν χρείαν] Lachm. Tisch. Born. have τὰς χρείας, according to A B J I, min. A gloss on τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν, after xx. 34. — VER. 14. ἐκ αὐτοῦ] Lachm. and Born., following A B J I, min., read ἐκ αὐτοῦ, which was introduced as explanatory. — VER. 16. ὥς ἐκάστονταρχεῖς . . . στρατοπεδάρχη] is wanting (so that the passage continues: ἔπετρεπε τῷ Πη.) in A B I, loth 40, Chrys. and most vss. Condemned by Mill, Bengel, and other, suspected by Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Defended especially by Born. in Rosenm. Repert. II. p. 301 f. The words, attested by G H and most min. Ar. p. Slav. Theophyl. Occ., have certainly the suspicion of being an expansion. Yet in opposition to their rejection we may urge, first, that there are no variations in detail, as is the general rule with interpolations; secondly, that the writer of a gloss, instead of τῷ στρατοπεδ., would probably have written the more readily occurring πλῆρον; and thirdly, that in transcribing one might very easily pass from ἔκαστον ἈΡΧΩΣ directly to στρατοπεδάρξΗ, which corruption would then produce the form of Lachmann’s text. — VER. 17. αὐτῶν] Elz. has τῶν Παῦλων, against A B I, min. Chrys. and several vss. The name came in, because in ver. 17 a separate new act of the history commences; therefore also Chrys. has once, and indeed at the beginning of a homily, τ. Παῦλ. — VER. 19. κατηγορήσας] A B I, min. have κατηγορεῖν, which Lachm. Tisch. and Born. have adopted. Rightly: κατηγορήσας is a mechanical alteration, in conformity with ἐπικαλέσσαθα. — VER. 23. ἤκον] A B I, min. have ἤλθαι. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. The extremely common word has been involuntarily substituted for the classical imperfect ἤκο, not elsewhere occurring in the N. T. — τὰ περὶ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. have only περὶ, following A B I, min. vss. Comp. on viii. 12, xix. 8. — VER. 25. ἡμῶν] A B I, min. vss. Fathers have ὅμων, which Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. The Recepta is justly supported by Born. The tone and contents of the speech, conveying censure and rejection, involuntarily suggested the second person to the transcribers. Comp. vii. 51 f. — VER. 27. ἰασίμαι] A B G H I, min. Theophyl. have ἰάσμαι, recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Tisch. Rightly; see on John xii. 40. — VER. 28. τὸ σωτήρ.] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read τοῦτο τὸ σωτήρ., according to A B I, min. Chrys. and several vss. The
omission of τοῦτο, which has no express reference in the text, is quite in keeping with the inattention of transcribers. — Ver. 29 is entirely wanting in A B E Ρ, lo13, 40, 68, Lect. 1, Syr. Erp. Copt. Vulg. ms. In the Syr. p. it is marked as suspected by an asterisk. Condemned by Mill and others, deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Very suspicious as an interpolated conclusion of the whole transaction (according to ver. 25). Yet it is saved from complete rejection by the fact, that here also in detail there are only found very immaterial variations. — Ver. 30. After ἑυμείνε δὲ, instead of which there is to be read, with Tisch., according to B Ρ, lo13, ἑνεχείνεν δέ, Elz. has ὁ Παῦλος, against witnesses of very considerable importance. See on ver. 17.

V. 1. 'Τότε] then, after our rescue, we recognised; looks back to xxvii. 39. — That by Μέλιτα is to be understood the well-known Μάλτα (M*), and not — as some of the older commentators5 would infer partly from εἰ τῷ Ἀδριάτικος, xxvii. 27, partly from βάρβαροι, ver. 2, and partly from the observed fact, which, though true in the present day, cannot at all be made good for those times, that there are no venomous serpents in Malta—the island now called Μελίτα in the Adriatic Gulf, not far from the Illyrian coast, 6 is proved as well by the previous long tossing about of the ship, which was hardly possible with a continued storm in the Adriatic Gulf, as more especially by the direction of the further voyage. 4 The local tradition, also, in Malta, is in favour of it. 6 In the Act. Petri et Pauli 1, the island is called Γανδουέλτη.

Ver. 2. Βάρβαροι] from a Roman point of view, because they were neither Greeks nor Romans, but of Punic descent, and therefore spoke a mixed dialect, neither Greek nor Latin. It was not till the second Punic war that Malta came under the dominion of the Romans. 5 — ὁ τού τινος] See on xix. 11. — προσελήφθαν] they took us to themselves. 7 — διὰ τούτου ὁ ἐφεστ.] on account of the rain which had set in. 8 — τὴν ἰχθυοτιμήν] thus to be accentuated, although in opposition to a preponderance of σοῦς, 9 not σοῦς.

Ver. 3. 'Ἀνά τοῦ θεοῦ.] (see the critical remarks) on account of the heat. 8 The reading ἰκ had to be rendered: from out of the heat.— δυσεξίλλοισα]. 11 It denotes that the viper came out from the brushwood in which it was, and through the layer of the same which was above it. 12 — καθήψει τῆς χείρος αὐτοῦ it seized on his hand. 13 The reading καθήψατο, recommended by Griesbach, following C, min. Chrysostom, al., appears to be an emendation. That this καθήψατο took place by means of a bite, Luke himself makes suffi-

1 Diod. Sic. v. 12; Strabo, vi. 2, p. 277; Cic. Pont. viii. 46; Ovid. Fast. iii. 567 f.; Fortilla est Malta, sterile vicina Cyrrus, Insula quam Libyc verberat unda fremit.
2 Following Constantin. Porph. d. admin. imper. p. 36 (see in Wolf, and in Winer, Realw.).
3 Apoll. Rhod. Arg. v. 17. 279.
4 vv. 11, 12.
6 On the late form δύρην, instead of δύρα, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 331; see Winer, p. 348 (E. T. 465); Hermann, ad Arist. Nub. 384.
8 See Bornemann, and Kähler, ad Xen. Anab. vi. 4. 35. [ad Af. 700.]
9 Comp. Arr. Epict. iii. 10. 20; Lobeck,
ciently evident in ver. 4 by κρεμάμενον . . . εκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ; but it follows decidedly, and without rashly leaping to a conclusion, from the judgment, from the expectation, and from the subsequent ἔλεγον δέων αὐτ. εἰσα of the Melitenses, vv. 4, 6, in all which it is necessarily presupposed that they, the near bystanders, had actually seen the bite of the serpent. From this at the same time it follows just as certainly, that the animal must have been definitely known to the islanders as a poisonous viper. Hence we must reject the view of Bochart: 1 "illigavit se etc., nempe ut . . . mordet, sed eam cohíbuit Deus, sicut, leones illos, Dan. vi. 22," and of Kuinoel: 2 "erat autem vipera ista aut non venenata, etsi Melitenses eam pro venenata habuerint, aut si erat, insinuavit quidem se Pauli manui, non vero momordit." The latter, also hinted at by Ewald, follows least of all from ἐπαθέν οὐδὲν κακόν, ver. 5, by which the very absence of result, brought about by special divine help, is placed in contrast with the poisonous bite. Nevertheless, Lange 3 supposes that the reptile may have hung encircling his hand without biting, and Lekebusch, p. 382, that Luke had in view the alternative contained in Kuinoel’s explanation. Indeed, according to Hausrath, the judgment in ver. 5 is only ascribed to the islanders by Luke. They were, as he thinks, aware that there were no poisonous serpents with them, and that thus the bite was not dangerous.

Vv. 4, 5. Ἐκ τῆς χειρ. αὐτ.] from his hand, so that it hung fastened with its mouth in the wound. 4.—πάντως φονεύς ἰστιν κ.τ.λ.] he is at all events a murderer, etc. From the fact that the stranger, though he had escaped from shipwreck, yet had now received this deadly bite, the people inferred that it was the work of Δίκη, who was now carrying out her sentence, and requiting like with like, killing with killing. Perhaps it had been already told to them that Paul was a prisoner; in that case their inference was the more natural. The opinion of Elsner, to which Wolf, Kuinoel, and Lange accede, that the people might have deduced their inference from the locality of the supposed bite, according to the idea that punishment overtakes the member with which a crime is committed, 5 is to be rejected for the very reason, that in fact from a bite on the hand any other crime committed by the hand might quite as well be inferred. — ἐπαθέν] not sinit, 6 but sivit; they regard the bite as so certainly fatal.—On the goddess Δίκη, the avenger of crime, 7 Justitia, the daughter of Zeus, 8 and ξυνέργος or πάρεργος. 9 How the islanders named the goddess to whom Luke gives the Greek name Δίκη, or whether perhaps they had received the Greek Δίκη among their divinities, is not to be decided. — On the active ἀποτιμώσασιν, to shake off, comp. Luke ix. 5 ; Lam. ii. 7.

Ver. 6. But when they waited long, not expectant, and saw, etc. On ἀποτιμωσι of abnormal corporeal changes, see examples in Wetstein and Kypke. Not

1 Hieroc. ii. 3, p. 369.
2 Comp. Heurichs.
3 Apost. Zeitatt. II. p. 344 f.
4 Comp. Kühner, § 639 c.
5 Spanheim, ad Callim in Cer. 64.
6 Vulgate, Luther, and others.
8 Hesiod. Theog. 902.
9 Soph. Oed. Col. 1834; Arrian. iv. 9. See Mitechelich, ad Hor. Od. iii. 2. 32; Ellendt, Lee Soph. I. p. 483; Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 345.
even the expected swelling (πυμπρ.) occurred. — εἰς αὐτὸν γνώμην."

took place on him. — μεταβάλλωσθαι] to turn themselves round, to change, often used even
by classical writers to express change of view or opinion, without, however, supplying τὴν γνώμην."

The good-natured people, running immediately into extremes with the inferiority of their rational training,
think that he is a god appearing in human form, because they could not reconcile the complete want of result from the poisonous bite of the viper, well known to them in its effects, with the knowledge which they had derived from experience of the constitution of an ordinary human body.

Σπερμοί τὸς δαπέρ καὶ τῶν δχλων τῶν ἐν Λυκαιων."

Bengel well remarks "‘aut latro iniquus aut Deus . . . ; datur tertium; homo Dei.’ The people themselves do not say (ὅτι) that they meant a definite, particular god." Zeller finds in ver. 6 simply an unhistorical addition "in the miraculous style of our chap. xiv.," which character belongs still more decidedly to the cures in vv. 8 and 9.

Vv. 7–10. The otherwise unknown Publius, the πρῶτος τῆς νήσου, is to be considered as the chief magistrate of the island. But this is not so much to be proved from the inscription, discovered in Malta, quoted by Grotius and Bochart, Geogr. ii. 1. 26—. . . ΠΡΟΥΛΗΝ. ΠΕΥΣ. ΡΩΜ. ΠΡΩΤΟΣ. ΜΕΙΤΑΙΓΝ. . . — as it may, both in that inscription and in this passage, be justly inferred from the nature of the case itself; for certainly the Roman governor, that is, the legate of the praetor of Sicily, to which praetorship Malta belonged, had the first rank on the small island. — ἀνατες, ἡμᾶς] Ver. 10 proves that this ἡμᾶς applies not to the whole ship’s company, but to Paul, Luke, and Aristarchus. Certainly the wonderful course of things in connection with the bite of the viper had directed the interest of the humane man to Paul. And Paul repaid his kindness by the restoration of his sick father. — Ver. 8. πυρετοῖς] The plural denotes the varying fever fits. Observe how accurately Luke as a technical eye-witness designates the disease. — δυσνερπιο] dysentery. Yet the later neuter form δυσνερπιο is so strongly attested that it has been rightly adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Bornemann. — Vv. 9, 10. ὑθεραμενώτου] namely, by Paul, ver. 8." The conjecture, based on the following ἡμᾶς, ver. 10, that Luke as a physician was not unconcerned in these cures, is not only against the analogy of ver. 8, but altogether against the spirit and tendency of the narrative, and indeed of the book. — πολλαὶς τιμαῖς ἔτημ.
They honoured us with many marks of honour; and when we set sail, were on the point of sailing, they placed on the ship what was necessary, provisions, and perhaps also money and other requisites for the journey. Many expositors render τιμαίς εἰτὶμ., muneribus ornarunt; but in that case, as in Ecclus. xxxviii. 1, the context must undoubtedly have suggested this special showing of honour, by rewards. Even in the well-known honoris habendus medico the general honoris is not to be exclusively restricted to the honorarium. In 1 Tim. v. 17 also τιμάς is quite generally honoris. While the very command of Christ, Matt. x. 8, is antagonistic to the explanation praemium ornarunt in our passage, the context is also against it, which represents the actual aid as a proof of gratitude different from that quite general πολλαῖς τιμαῖς εἰτὶμ. ἡμᾶς, both in point of substance and in point of time.—Tradition makes Publius afterwards bishop of Malta.

Ver. 11. Παρασήμων Διοσκοροῦ παρασ. is not an adjective, marked with the Dioscuri, as the adjective παράσημος has always a derogatory reference, e.g. falsely stamped, stigmatised, ill-famed, etc., but a substantive, so that the dative is connected with ἀνήχθημα· we put to sea... with a sign, which was the Dioscuri. An image of the Dioscuri was, namely, the ship's device, i.e. the παράσημον, the insignia of the ship. This name was given to the image of a divinity, of an animal, or of any other selected object, which was to be found either painted or sculptured on the prow.—For such a παράσημον the image of the Dioscuri was very suitably chosen, as Castor and Pollux were honoured as the ἀρωγοναίραι and generally as protectors in dangers. On the forms under which they were represented, see Müller. On the modes of writing Διοσκορόω and Διοσκοράω, see Lobeck. —The mention of the ship's sign belongs to the special accuracy of the recollection of an eye-witness. According to Baumgarten, Luke designs to intimate “that in this vessel there did not prevail that former presumptuous security, but confidence in a superhuman protection and assistance.” So much the more arbitrarily invented, as we know not what παράσημον the wrecked ship had. Luke has noticed the sign in the case of the one, and not in the other. It is conceivable enough, even without assuming any set purpose, that after the surmounted disaster his attention was the more alive to such a special feature in the ship in which they now embarked.

Vv. 12–14. The voyage proceeded in quite a regular course from Malta to Syracuse, and from that to Rhegium, now Reggio, in the Sicilian Straits.
and then through the Etruscan Sea to Puteoli, now Pizzuolo, near Naples.

— ἐπιτευμοῦντον ἑτοῖμον] when thereupon south wind, which favoured the voyage, had arisen. — The force of ἐπί is, in all places where ἐπίγεινεθαυ occurs of wind, not to be overlooked. — διεσπαρόν] as persons, who were on the second day, i.e. on the second day. — ἀδέλφοι] Thus Christianity was already at that time in Puteoli, whether coming thither from Rome, or perhaps from Alexandria? — Ver. 14. παρεκληθομεν ἐπί αὐτοῖς ἑπιμειν] we were invited to remain with them. — ἐπί αὐτοῖς] beside them. — Rinck, as also Ewald, prefers the reading ἑπιμειναντις, and takes παρεκλ. ἐπί αὐτοῖς together: we were refreshed in them; but the participle is much too weakly attested, and without doubt has only come into the text through this view of παρεκλ. — καὶ οὖν εἰς τ. Ῥώμ. ἔλθω.] and thus, after we had first tarried seven days at Puteoli, we came to Rome. ἐπιμεινα is neither here, in opposition to Beza, Grotius, de Dieu, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and many others, nor elsewhere in the N. T. ἐπί, not even in John vi. 17, where the imperfect is to be observed; but Luke narrates the arrival at Rome, and then in ver. 15 inserts by way of episode something special, which stood in close connection with this arrival; hence he again joins on ver. 16 by ἐπί δὲ ἐλθομεν εἰς τ. Ῥ. to ver. 14. Observe at the same time that in ver. 14 εἰς τ. Ῥώμ., as the final aim of the voyage, but in ver. 16 ἐλθομεν, has the emphasis. — Moreover, the concession of a seven days’ stay, so near to the end of the journey, testifies how much Paul possessed the love and confidence of the centurion. The Book of Acts, however, gives us no information at all how Christianity was planted in the Italian cities and in Rome.

Ver. 15. Οἱ ἀδέλφοι] Considering the largeness which we must assume the church at Rome to have attained, according to Rom. xvi. 3 ff., probably a numerous representation of it is to be conceived as present. — ἔμνι] appropriating dative of the pronoun. — ἄχρις Ἀππίων φ. κ. Τρίῳ ταβάς.] καὶ: and, respectively. Luke narrates from the standpoint of the travellers. These came first to Forum Appii, a village on the Via Appia, 43 miles from Rome, and then to Treæ-tabernæe, Three-booths, an inn ten miles nearer to Rome; in both places they were received by the brethren, who thus went to meet them in two detachments. As they had tarried seven days at Puteoli, the Roman Christians might have obtained information timeously enough in order to come so far to meet them with the speed of love and reverence. — εἰς χαρ. τ. Θεῷ ἢ δικέθη δίκαιος] How natural was it that Paul, to whom Rome, this εἰπομεθα τῆς οἰκομήνης] had for so long been in view as a longed-for goal of his labours, should now, at the sight of the brethren, who had thus from Rome carried their love forth to meet him, glow with gratitude to God, and in this elevated feeling receive confidence as to the devel-

called round about (Lange, comp. Smith). Luke does not express himself with chartographic accuracy.

1 As in Thuc. iv. 30. 1, et al.
2 Herod. vi. 108. Comp. on John xi. 50; Phil. iii. 5.
3 Comp. Xen. Anab. viil. 2. 1; ἐπιγεινεθαυ ἑπί ἑπιμεινεθαυ ἐπί.
opment of his fate and as to his new sphere of work! According to Baumbrecht, it is true, he saw at the same time in the Roman church, not founded by any apostle, "the identity and continuity" of the Pentecostal church—of all which the text contains not a hint, as, indeed, such a fancy as to the founding of the church is by no means justified by the circumstances of the case being unknown to us.

Ver. 16. The two praefecti praetorio, commanders of the imperial bodyguard, had the duty of providing for the custody of accused persons handed over from the provinces to the Emperor. That there was at that time only one praefect, namely Burrus, who died before the beginning of March 62, and after whose death there were again two, does not follow from the singular τὸ στρατὸν, in opposition to Anger, Wieseler, and others. It is to be taken as: "to the praefectus praetorio concerned," namely, who then had this duty of receiving, and to whose dwelling, therefore, the centurion repaired with a view to deliver over the prisoners. This does not suppose, as Wieseler objects, that the praefect received them in person; he had his subalterns. — καθ' ἑαυτὸν for himself, apart from the other prisoners. This special favour is explained partly from the report of Festus, which certainly pointed to no crime, and partly from the influence of the centurion who respected Paul, and would specially commend him as having saved the lives of all on board. — σὺν τῷ . . . στρατióν] This was a praetorian, to whom Paul, after the manner of the custodia militaria, was bound by the arm with a chain.

Ver. 17. On the interview which now follows with the Jews it is to be observed: (1) that Paul even now remains faithful to his principle of trying his apostolic ministry in the first instance among the Jews, and thereby even as a prisoner complying with the divine order of the way of salvation: Ιουναίῳ τῷ πρóτον καὶ Ἑλλήνω, Rom. i. 16, and with the impulse of his own love to his people, Rom. ix. 1 ff., which the painful experiences of the past had not weakened. (2) He does this after three days, during which time he had without doubt devoted himself, first of all, to the Roman Christians. (3) The fact that he commences his interview with the Jews by a self-justification is—considering the suspicion with which he, as a prisoner, must have been regarded by them—natural and accordant with duty, and does not presuppose any ulterior design, such as: to prevent a prejudicial influence of the Jews on his trial. (4) The historical character of these dis-

3 Comp. ὁ ἐπιστ. xiv. 18.
4 See vv. 23, 30.
5 xxv. 25, xxvi. 81.
7 Ver. 30. See on xxiv. 27.
8 That Luke gives no further information concerning the Roman church cannot surprise us (in opposition to Zeller, p. 873), as the theme of his book was the ministry of the apostles. A disagreement between Paul and the Roman church (Schneckenburger, p. 129) is not at all to be thought of; the church was not Judaizing, but Pauline. According to Zeller, the author has desired to make Paul appear as the proper founder of that church. But this is erroneous on account even of ver. 15, where, it is true, Zeller understands only isolated believers from Rome, who are assumed therefore not to presuppose any church there, as referred to. See, on the contrary, Ewald, Jahrb. IX. p. 66 f.
cussions with the Jews has unjustly been denied, and they have been wrongly referred to the apologetic design of the author. ¹ See the details below at the passages appealed to.—μετὰ ἣμερ. τρεῖς] in which he might sufficiently occupy himself at the outset with the Roman Christians who came to him, as doubtless, in opposition to Zeller, he did in conformity with his long-cherished desire to see them.² —τῶν ὄντως τῶν Ἰουδ. πρῶτων] the existing³ chiefs of the Jews ⁴ i.e. the Jewish leaders at that time in Rome. —οὐδὲν εἰςνίκειν κ.τ.λ.] although I have done nothing, etc. This Paul could say, as he had laboured only to conduct the nation to the salvation appointed for it, and only to bring the Mosaic institutions to their Messianic πλήρωσις. His antagonism to the law was directed against justification by the law. This, and not the abolition of the law in itself, was his radical contrast to the Jewish standpoint, in opposition to Zeller.⁵ —τῶν Ἰουδαίων] refers to the procurator in Caesarea, who represented the Romans ruling over Palestine.

Vv. 18, 19. This observation of the apostle, disclosing his presence at Rome thus brought about as a position of necessity, completes⁶ the narrative of xxv. 9. After his vindication⁷ we are to conceive, namely, that Festus expresses his willingness to release him; this the Jews oppose,⁸ and now Festus proposes that Paul should allow himself to be judged in Jerusalem,⁹ whereupon the latter appeals to Caesar.¹⁰ —σὺς ὡς τοῦ ἐθνοῦς . . . κατηγορεῖν] thus purely on the defensive, and not in unpatriotic hostility. —ἐναντιον and the present infinitive (see the critical remarks) refer to what Paul has to do now in Rome.

Ver. 20. Therefore, because I am here only as a constrained appellant, and entirely free from any hostile effort, I have invited you, to see you and to speak with you. Heinrichs, Kuinoel; Schott take it otherwise: "vos rogavi, ut me viseretis et mecum colloqueremini." But the supplying of me and mecum is arbitrary, seeing that, in fact, ὑμᾶς and ὑμῖν are naturally suggested by the directly preceding ὑμᾶς; besides, it is far more in keeping with courtesy for Paul to say that he desired to see and speak with them, than that he had requested them to see and speak with him. —ἐνεκὼ γὰρ τῆς ἑλπίδος κ.τ.λ.] now contains the more special reason, in a national point of view so highly important, for the arrangement of this interview. —The ἱλπίς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ is to be taken entirely, as in xxvi. 6, of the Messianic national hope. —On περίκεμα with accusative comp. Heb. v. 2.¹¹

Ver. 21. This answer of the Jews makes it probable that Paul in his discourse had definitely suggested that they might perhaps have received written or oral insinuations concerning him from Judaea.—It appears almost incredible that neither took place, but we have to weigh the follow-

¹ Baur, Zeller. ² Rom. i. 11 f. ³ Comp. Rom. xiii. 1. ⁴ Comp. Luke xix. 47; Acts xiii. 50, xxv. 9. ⁵ Comp. on xxiv. 14. ⁶ Comp. xxv. 25. ⁷ xxv. 8 ⁸ xxviii. 19. ⁹ xxv. 9. ¹⁰ xxv. 11. ¹¹ Kypke, Obs. II. p. 147; Jacobs, ad Athol. IX. p. 75; on τὰ ἄλλα τετείχα, comp. xxvi. 59.
ing considerations:—(1) Before the appeal the Jews had no ground inducing them to make communications regarding him to the Roman Jews in particular, because they could not conjecture that Paul, then a prisoner in Caesarea, and whom they hoped to destroy presently, would ever come into contact with their brethren in the distant West. (2) After the appeal it was hardly possible for the Jews to forward accounts to Rome before his arrival there. For the transportation of the apostle, which followed at any rate soon after the entering of the appeal, occurred so late in autumn, and so shortly before the closing of the navigation, that there is extreme improbability in the supposition of another vessel having an earlier opportunity of reaching Italy than Paul himself, whose vessel in spring, after the opening of the navigation, had to sail only the short distance between Malta and Puteoli, and that, too, with a favourable wind. (3) There remains, therefore, only the possible case; that during Paul’s two years’ imprisonment at Caesarea evil reports concerning him might have come to the Roman Jews in some accidental way, not officially, by means of private letters or Jewish travellers. Indeed—considering the lively intercourse between Judæa and Rome, and the great noise which the labours of the apostle had made for many years, as well as the strong opposition which he had excited among the Jews—it can by no means be supposed that these labours and this opposition should have continued unknown to the Roman Jews. But the πῶτοι of the Roman Jews here proceed with reserve under dread of possible eventualities, and prudently fall back upon the official standpoint; and so they affirm—what, taken in all the strictness of the literal sense, might certainly be no untruth—that they on their part (ἡμεῖς) had neither received letters concerning him, nor oral notification or statement of anything evil concerning him. The more impartial they thus appear and maintain a politic spirit of frankness, the more openly, they at the same time hope, will Paul express his mind and disclose his purposes. Zeller therefore too rashly seizes on the seeming contradiction to truth in ver. 21, as warranting the inference that the non-historical character of the narrative is evident. The explanation also to which Olshausen has recourse appears erroneous: that by the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius, the connections, which the Jews of Jerusalem had with them, were broken off; that only very slowly and secretly the Roman Jews returned in the first years of Nero; and that therefore those who were in Palestine were not properly informed of this situation of matters in Rome,

1 xxv. 13, xxvii. 1.
2 xxvii. 9.
3 xxviii. 13.
4 It has indeed been thought that the Jews in their plot against the life of the apostle, might have had a motive for not allowing their exasperation against him to become notorious, least of all at Rome (see Lange, apostol. Zeit. I. p. 100). But ever granting this arbitrarily assumed calculation on their part, the hostile disposition in Judæa was much too general (xxi. 21) to admit of control over the spread of the hostile report to a distance.
5 id., "in sermone quotidiano."
6 Ver. 22.
7 Comp. Holtzmann, Judench. u. Christenth. p. 785, who suggests that the author wished to evade touching on the wide opposition between Paul and Jewish Christianity. But merely to evade this point, he would have needed only to suppress vv. 21, 22, instead of putting such a surprising expression into the mouth of the Jews.
and accordingly made no notification concerning Paul to that quarter. Even a priori, such a strange ignorance of the Jews as to the fortunes of their very numerous countrymen in the capital of the world is very improbable; and, from a historical point of view, that expulsion of the Roman Jews had occurred so many years before, and the edict of banishment was at all events only of such temporary force that the renewed toleration of the Jews, permitted either expressly or tacitly, is to be placed even under the reign of Claudius.

Ver. 22. Αξιωτερ δὲ] But we judge—so as, in such lack of information from other quarters, to be better instructed concerning the circumstances in which thou art placed—it right—as a claim which, as matters stand, is no more than right and proper—to learn from thee—παρὰ σοῦ has emphasis—etc. — ἐ φρονεῖς i.e. what principles and views thou pursuuest. — περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἰρέσ. ταύτης, for of this party certainly. ταύτης has its reference in the more precise expressions, with which Paul must be presumed to have accompanied his ἔνεκεν γὰρ τῆς ἐλπίδος τ. Ἰσραήλ. In the μὲν without δὲ the tacit contrast is to be mentally supplied: “Although thou thyself art unknown to us.” The γὰρ grounds the οἰκεῖοι κ.τ.λ. on the apparently impartial interest of obtaining more particular information. At first view, it must appear strange that these Jewish πρῶτοι in Rome betray so little acquaintance, or none at all, with the great Christian church at Rome, which consisted, at any rate in part, of Jewish Christians. This difficulty is not solved by the arbitrary assumption that, after the return of the Jews expelled by Claudius, the Jews and Christians kept aloof from each other and thus gradually lost acquaintance with one another; nor yet by the circumstances of such a great city as Rome, amidst which the existence of the Christian community might well have escaped the knowledge of the rich worldly Jews,—which, considering the relationship of Judaism and Christianity, would a priori be very improbable. It is rather to be explained, like the expression in ver. 21, from a cautious sort of official reserve in their demeanour, not exactly hypocritical or intimidated by the Claudian measures, but in which withal the Jewish contempt for Christianity generally is apparent. The representation here given, according to which those Jews simply avoid any sort of expression compromising them, is by no means to be used, with Baur and Zeller, against the historical truth of the occurrence. Its historical character, on the contrary, gains support from the Epistle to the Romans itself, which shows no trace that in Rome Christianity had been in conflict with the Jews; and therefore de Wette is wrong in his remark that, if Luke had only added καὶ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν το πανταχοῦ, there would have been no ground of offence (κ).
Ver. 28. Eic τὴν γειών] to the lodging, i.e. the dwelling which, after his arrival at Rome¹ he was allowed to occupy with a friendly host.² At a later period he obtained a hired house of his own.³ Whether the γειών was the house of Aquila,⁴ cannot be determined. — πλείονοι a greater number than were with him on the former occasion. — πείθων κ.τ.λ.] and persuading them of what concerns Jesus. πείθων is neither to be taken as docens with Kuinoel,⁵ nor de consilio with Grotius. Paul really did on his part, subjectively, the πείθειν, persuaders; that this did not produce its objective effect in all his hearers, does not alter the significance of the word.⁶ — ἀκόλουθος κ.τ.λ.] starting from it, linking his πείθειν to its utterances.⁷ — The opinion of Böttger,⁸ that Paul was liberated between vers. 22 and 23 is refuted by ver. 30, compared with ver. 16, as well as by Phil. i. 13 ff., since the Philippian Epistle was not written in Caesarea, as Böttger judges.⁹

Vv. 26-27. Ἀπελήλθοντο] they departed,¹⁰ they withdrew. The imperfect is graphic. — εἰπών τοῖς Ἰ. πῆμα ἐν] after that Paul, immediately before their departure, had made one utterance. ἐν: one dictum, instead of any further discourse: it makes palpable the importance of this concluding saying. Then follows this πῆμα ἐν in the oratio directa (with br) as far as ver 28. — καλῶν] because completely justified as appropriate by the latest result before them.¹¹ — τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον] “Quod Spiritum sanctum loquentem inducit potius quam prophetam, ad fidem oraculi valet.”¹²—πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν] to our fathers;¹³ for the divine command imparted to Isaiah, πορεύθηκεν κ.τ.λ., was as such made known to the fathers. — Isa. vi. 9, 10, almost exactly according to the LXX., has its Messianic fulfilment in the obdurancy of the Jews against the gospel,¹⁴—a fulfilment which Paul here announces to the obdurate, so that he recognises himself as the subject addressed by πορεύθηκεν. With hearing, auribus, ye shall hear, and certainly not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and certainly not perceive. For the heart, the spiritual vitality, of this people had become fat—obdurate and sluggish, see on Matt. l.c.—and with their ears they have become dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed, in order that they may not perceive with the eyes, or hear with the ears, or understand with the heart, or turn themselves, to me, and I, i.e. God, should heal them, of their spiritual malady, by forgiveness and sanctification.¹⁵—εἰπόν (Eliz. εἰπτ) is oxytonon.¹⁶

¹ Ver. 16.
² Phil. vii. 49.
³ Ver. 30.
⁴ Olshausen.
⁵ Comp. on xix. 8.
⁶ Comp. on vii. 26; Rom. ii. 4.
⁷ Comp. on xvii. 2.
⁸ Beitr. ii. p. 33 ff.
⁹ See also Wieseler, p. 411 ff.
¹⁰ Polyb. ii. 54. 12, v. 98. 6, and frequently.
¹¹ Not taken, see ver. 22.
¹² Comp. Matt. xii. 5.
¹³ Calvin; 2 Pet. i. 31.
¹⁴ By ἡμῶν Paul as little includes himself (thinking possibly of his conversion) in the hardening, as with ἡμῶν in 1 Cor. x. 1 (in opposition to Baumgarten). It is the simple expression of Israelitish fellowship. Comp. Rom. iv. 1.
¹⁵ Matt. xiii. 14 f.; John xii. 40.
¹⁶ See on Matt. l.c.
¹⁷ On the expression, comp. Dem. 797. 8: ἐπιστάσαι μὴ δρᾶσαι καὶ ἀκούσατε μὴ ἀκούσασθε, Aesch. Prom. 448: κλίνοντες σὺν ἡμῖν, Jacob; Del. epigr. vil. i. 4 f.; Soph. o. R. 571: τούτα δὲ τὰ ἄτα τὸν τῷ κοῦν τῷ ἐμοὶ τὸν οὐκ.
¹⁸ See Goettling, Lehre vom Apostel p. 58; Winer, p. 50 (E. T. 58); Bornemann in loc.
Vv. 28, 29. "Ων because ye are so obdurate and irrecoverable. — δὲ τοῖς ἑνεκεὶ κ.τ.λ.] that by my arrival at Rome this (ῥόῤῥο, see the critical remarks) salvation of God, i.e. the Messianic salvation bestowed by God, which is meant in this prophecy, has been sent, not to you Jews, but to the Gentiles.1 — αὐταίριοι they on their part quite otherwise than you. — καὶ ἄκοσιον οὐκ] namely the announcement of salvation, which conception is implied in ἀπεστάλη as its mode.9 καί, etiam: non solum missa est is salus, sed etiam audient, give ear. Bengel appropriately observes: "Protectionem ad gentes declaraverat Judaeis contumacibus Antiochiae xiii. 46; Corinthii xviii. 6, nunc tertium Romae; adaeque in Asia, Graecia, Italia." — Ver. 30. ἐν ἱδίῳ μισθῷ.] i.e. in a dwelling belonging to himself by way of hire. This he had obtained after the first days when he had lodged in the ξενία, ver. 28; but he was in it as a prisoner, as follows from ver 16, from καὶ ἀπεστάλη κ.τ.λ., and from ἀκολούθως, ver. 31, nemina prohibente, although he was a prisoner.4 To procure the means of hiring the dwelling must have been an easy matter for the love of the brethren, and support came also from a distance.6 — πάντοτε] Christians, Jews, Gentiles; not merely the latter, as Baumgarten arbitrarily limits the word, while with equal arbitrariness he finds in ver. 31 a pointing to the final form of the church, in which the converted Israel will form the visible historical centre around which the Gentile nations gather, and then the Parousia will set in. This modern view of Judaistic eschatology has no support even in Rom. xi. 27 ff. (f).

Ver. 31. Solemn close of the whole book, which is not to be regarded as incomplete.4 The Gospel also concludes with a sonorous participial ending, but less full and solemn. — κηρύσσων κ.τ.λ.] thus his word was not bound in his bonds.7 — ἀκολούθως]4 "Victoria verbi dei. Paulus Romae, apex evangelii, actorum finis," Bengel (q).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(xv) Melita. V. 1.

When the passengers and crew of the ill-fated, stranded vessel had all safely landed, they discovered they were on an island named Melita, or Malta, as it is now called. There can be no doubt that this was the island where the apostle and his companions spent the winter months. It has been objected that there are now no poisonous reptiles on the island, or brushwood of any kind, but both may have abounded at that time, when the island was less populous, and not fully cultivated. The people were not barbarous in any other sense than in using a different language, the Punic. Even at present the Maltese have a peculiar dialect, a mixture of Arabic and Italian. The inhabitants kindly welcomed the shipwrecked travellers, and, as they were shivering from

2 x. 35, xiii. 25.
3 Comp. Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 24.
4 Comp. Phil. i. 7.
5 Phil. iv. 10 ff.
6 See Introduct. § 3.
7 2 Tim. ii. 9.
8 Plat. Cret. p. 415 D; Herodian. 1. 12. 15.
the wet and the cold, they built for them a fire. Paul, as he did when on board, gave his personal aid, and gathered some brushwood or sticks, whence came out a viper which bit him. All attempts to show that either the serpent did not bite Paul’s hand, or if it did, it was not venomous, are justly characterized by Aford as “the disingenuous shifts of rationalists and semi-rationalists.” The natives seeing this, with some innate ideas of a righteous retribution, at once imagined he was a murderer, whom divine vengeance thus overtook. They expected that he would have fallen down suddenly dead. Sudden collapse and death ensue often from the bite of serpents. Shakespeare speaks as a true naturalist of the asp-bitten Cleopatra:

“Trembling she stood and on the sudden dropped.”

Plumptre, in illustration, quotes the following stanza translated from Lucan:

“Nasidius tolling in the Marsian fields
The burning Prestes bit—a fiery flush
Lit up his face and set the skin a stretch,
And all its comely grace had passed away.”

No unpleasant results, however, following in the case of Paul, they changed their minds and said he was a god. Here the apostle during his stay performed many miraculous cures, which called forth the gratitude and gifts of the people. Doubtless also Paul lost no opportunity of preaching the great Healer, in whose name he performed such wonderful cures. About the month of February, A.D. 61, Paul and his companions started again for Rome, in a corn ship, whose sign was Castor and Pollux, twin sons of Jupiter and Leda, regarded as the tutelar deities, θεοὶ αὐτῆς, of sailors, and described by Horace as fratres Helene Lucida sidera. The constellation Gemini, the Twins, is named from them. The ancients identified them with the phosphoric lights, sometimes seen on the masts of ships, which promise a fair wind and a prosperous voyage, and which are now called the fires of St. Elmo. Touching at Syracuse and at Rhegium, they came, after a prosperous sail of 180 miles, to Puteoli, which lies on the northern part of the Bay of Naples, and is described as one of the loveliest spots on earth. Here the apostle spent a whole week with brethren.

(ο*) This sect . . . spoken against. V. 22.

The apostle received a most affectionate welcome from the brethren in Rome. Some of them having gone as far as Appia Forum and the Three Booths, distant from Rome respectively about forty and thirty miles, to greet him. His sensitive spirit deeply felt this kindness, and he was greatly cheered by it. At last his long-cherished desire to visit Rome is realized. But in a way he had never dreamed of. He had not imagined that “when he went to the City of the Seven Hills he should enter it as a prisoner chained to a soldier of the Augustan cohort.” Yet in his visit to the metropolis of the world, trying, and seemingly hopeless as the circumstances were, Paul accomplished all that he had earnestly desired. For, as he writes from his prison, all that happened to him proved favorable for the furtherance of the gospel. He had not the same opportunities which he found at Athens or at Ephesus. No great hall or hippodrome or even synagogue was open for his ministrations. He was not even at liberty to go
from house to house, to the Forum, or the market-place, but he diligently used such opportunities as were within his power, and was eminently successful among the Gentiles, specially with the soldiers who guarded him, and even with those of the royal household. Shortly after his arrival, he sent for the chief men among the Jews, rulers of the synagogue, and heads of Jewish families, and, fearing they might have heard some reports injurious to him, he fully explained the cause of his coming among them as a prisoner. A time being appointed, many came to hear his account of the gospel of the Crucified, and a whole day was spent in the discussion. It must have been a striking and most impressive scene, such an audience in such a place, listening to a preacher in chains—the man and his theme alike wonderful. He spoke of a King whose kingdom was grander, more extensive, and more enduring than the Empire of the Cæsars. A fire was kindled in Rome that day which rapidly spread throughout the empire. The sect then so bitterly spoken against and so ably vindicated by Paul, exists still, and is winning its way to the conquest of the world for Christ. In his conferences with the Jews, the apostle exhibited the satisfactory and conclusive evidences of the truth of the gospel, unfolded the ample provision which it makes for all the deepest wants of the human heart, and illustrated the happy influence it exerts on all human relations and interests. He expounded and testified and persuaded them concerning Jesus. The majority did not favorably receive his message, but some were convinced and embraced Christianity.

(r') Two whole years in his own hired house. V. 30.

All this time Paul was a prisoner of state, and all his expenses were, doubtless, cheerfully defrayed by friends in Rome and elsewhere. During the day he was chained to a soldier, and, in the night, guarded by two or more. From notices in the epistles written during this imprisonment we learn that several Christian friends, some of whom were very dear to him, were with Paul—Luke, Timothy and Mark, Epaphras, Aristarchus and Tychicus. His chief employment was preaching the gospel. Many a soldier who for six hours was chained to the arm of the apostle had occasion to bless God that such a privilege had been his, and not a few of them, doubtless, became true soldiers of the cross and spread the good tidings through the army, and, as a consequence, more or less over the land. Many of the brethren also “waxing confident by his bonds, were much more bold to speak the word without fear.”

From the salutation and allusions contained in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, critics are generally agreed that they were written during these two years’ imprisonment. There is a simple grandeur in the concluding sentence of this history which is very impressive. “The mention of the kingdom had been a matter of odium in the eyes of Pilate.” Now Rome bears its being publicly stated. “The victory of the Word of God. Paul at Rome forms the (apex) climax, or crowning point, of the gospel preaching, and the end of the Acts which Luke otherwise might have easily brought on to the death of Paul. He began at Jerusalem, he ends at Rome.” (Bengel.)

A great many reasons have been imagined why Luke concludes his narrative without giving any account of the end of Paul. Conjecture is as various as it is
vain. Some suppose that Luke intended to write a third treatise, but was prevented by his death; others that the narrative was carried up to the time that Luke wrote. Plumptre with others suggests that the subsequent events were already known to Theophilus, who was an Italian convert; but the most probable opinion is that Luke had accomplished the purpose he had in view in writing. The Acts give an account of the rise of the gospel at Jerusalem, and closes with its reception at Rome. The writer's work was done; hence, “with an emphatic and artistically formed sentence, he concludes his history.”

(qt) Paul's second imprisonment.

However slight may be the grounds of direct testimony it has generally been believed in all ages, that about the beginning of the year A.D. 64, St. Paul was tried, acquitted, and liberated, and that after some years of liberty and labor, he was a second time brought a prisoner to Rome, and there suffered martyrdom. The arguments in favor of a second imprisonment are drawn from two sources: the ancient traditions of the church, and allusions contained in the pastoral epistles. The unanimity of the ancient church on this point is very remarkable, yet it is by no means conclusive; though such authorities as Clement, Tertullian, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Jerome are quoted. The evidence to be gathered from the pastoral epistles is clearly in favor of a second imprisonment. All who maintain the genuineness of these epistles are constrained to adopt this view, or to resort to some more improbable suppositions to explain the statements they contain. On the genuineness of the pastoral epistles see Excursus IX. to Farrar's Life of Paul, which concludes with the following sentence: "Pauline in much of their phraseology, Pauline in their fundamental doctrines, Pauline in their dignity and holiness of tone, Pauline alike in their tenderness and severity, Pauline in the digressions, the constructions, and the personality of their style, we may accept two of them with an absolute conviction of their authenticity, and the third—the first Epistle to Timothy, which is more open to doubt than the others—with at least a strong belief that in reading it we are reading the words of the greatest of the apostles.” For a reply to Davidson in his Introduction to the New Testament, in which he presents every argument against the Pauline authorship of these epistles and the credibility of Luke as a historian, and also to the suppositions of Renan, see Westcott and Leathes and Hovseon’s Appendix I. For the argument drawn from the historical circumstances, the reference to certain heresies, and the advanced organization of the church alluded to and implied in the pastoral epistles, I refer to Morrison and to Taylor, who strongly advocates the certainty of a second imprisonment, and says: "So without regard to tradition, and solely on the ground of the evidence which may be distilled from the pastoral epistles themselves, I have adopted the view that shortly after the time at which Luke’s narrative in the Acts concludes, Paul was set at liberty by Nero; and that, after an interval of four or five years’ duration he was again carried to Rome as a prisoner and put to death.” Plumptre, in an excursus appended to his Acts, says: "If we accept the pastoral epistles as genuine, we are led partly by their style, partly by the difficulty of fitting them into any earlier period of St. Paul’s life, partly by the traces they present of a later stage of development, both of truth and error, to assign them to a date subsequent to the two years of the imprisonment of chap. xxiii. 30."
NOTES.

The life of the great apostle, in the interval between the two imprisonments, is involved in uncertainty. He probably visited Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, Crete, and Spain. Jerome informs us that Paul was beheaded in the fourteenth year of Nero, A.D. 68, the same year in which Peter was crucified—Paul’s right of citizenship exempted him from that form of martyrdom. “Thus, in all probability, died the most illustrious of all Christian missionaries, the prince of the apostles, the noblest of the noble army of martyrs.” Many ideal portraits have been drawn of this gifted, many-sided, wonderful, heroic, Christlike man. One writes:

“Courteous he was and grave; so meek in mien
It seemed untrue, or told a purpose weak;
Yet in the mood, he could with spinness speak,
Or with stern force, or show of feelings keen,
Marking deep craft, methought, or hidden pride:
Then came a voice—St. Paul is at thy side.”

Another writes:

“The third who journeyed with them, weak and worn,
Blear-eyed, dim-visioned, bent and bowed with pain,
We looked upon with wonder.”

“So they came;
So entered he our town; but ere the sun
Had lit the eastern clouds, a fever’s chill
Fell on him; parched thirst and darting throbs
Of keenest anguish racked those weary limbs;
His brow seemed circled with a crown of pain;
And oft, pale, breathless, as if life had fled,
He looked like one in ecstasy, who sees
What others see not; to whose ears a voice,
Which others hear not, floats from sea or sky.
And broken sounds would murmur from his lips,
Of glory wondrous, sounds inefable.
The cry of Abba, Father, and the notes
Of some strange chant of other lands.
So stricken, prostrate, pale, the traveller lay,
So stript of all the comeliness of form,
Men might have spurned and loathed him passing on
To lead their brighter life—and yet we stayed;
We spurned him not, nor loathed; through all the shroud
Of poverty and sickness we could see
The hero-soul, the presence as of One
Whom then we knew not. When the pain was sharp,
And furrowed brows betrayed the strife within,
Then was he gentlest. Even to our slaves
He spoke as brothers, winning all their hearts
By that un wonted kindness.”

“God buries his workmen, but carries on their work.” The emperors are dead. The Roman Empire has passed away. The City of the Seven Hills is shorn of her power and glory. The brutal and infamous Nero is remembered only to be detested and execrated, but the martyred apostle lives in all the churches of Christendom to-day; and is revered by millions as the greatest of human teachers. The kingdom too which he sought to extend and establish, despite all opposition, is mightier now than when he proclaimed it. It is a kingdom which cannot be moved, for it is built upon a rock—on Christ Jesus, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, who shall yet return and claim it for his own.

On this subject Dean Housen has published a volume of lectures. The following extract is from an article by Professor Matthew B. Riddle:

"The study of the Book of the Acts suggests two very important points bearing on the historical accuracy of the Gospels. The most obvious one is, that if it is itself a true story,—even true in general,—the weapon used by the early preachers was fact,—fact about Jesus Christ, his life, death, resurrection, and ascension.

"Granting the exactness of the history we have, in its particular reference to the main events of our Lord’s life, what is equivalent to a fifth Gospel. There is, too, this added element, namely, a more specific explanation of the purpose and significance of these facts.

"Minute usages, topographical peculiarities, and kindred points, may be found in nearly every paragraph, and each and every such reference can be used as a test of accuracy. The test has been applied. Volume after volume has been written on the subject. Every journey has been retraced, every voyage has been re-made, for the express purpose of verifying the narrative. Sometimes it has been thought that the writer made a mistake, but in nearly every such instance renewed investigations, in a few cases new discoveries by travellers, have shown the accuracy of the record. It has fairly stood every test, and may well be regarded as the book of history (of all times) which has been proven most exact. Others may be as accurate; none have been proven more so. It will be fair to infer that such accuracy would have been impossible, had the book been written very long after the date at which its story ends, A.D. 63, thirty-three years after the death of Jesus Christ. This view is confirmed by the use which the writer makes of the pronoun ‘we.’ Is it probable that he took the trouble to be so careful in telling the truth about towns and temples, harbors and currents, and yet careless enough to suggest a falsehood about persons?

"It might be said that such a book could be constructed like a historical romance, after a lapse of fifty or a hundred years. But this is to the last degree improbable. Walter Scott and Thackeray have written the finest and most accurate historical romances, and Shakespeare has furnished the grandest historical dramas. But not one of these three geniuses has succeeded in constructing a piece of literature which stands the test as the Book of Acts has done. Their memory constantly fails them, and their want of accurate knowledge betrays itself repeatedly. Were the Book of Acts a romance, its author must have been a genius unequalled in literature. Of all the Christian centuries, the second century shows fewest men of genius; and yet we are asked to believe that some one in that age polished up the Gospels into their present shape, and concocted the most accurate of historical romances. It is far easier to believe that Luke is the author of the work.

"The ‘evidential value’ of the Book of Acts consists mainly in this: That it offers presumptive evidence of the strongest character in regard to the main facts of the gospel history, and in particular proves that the author of the third Gospel, being the author of this book also, is a writer of tested accuracy, who tells the exact truth about Jesus Christ. Knowing so well how to be accurate, if he is false in his story about Jesus Christ, he is wilfully and awfully false. One must be far gone in hatred of Christ and his cause not to shrink from this last position."
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