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INTRODUCTION.

The Author of the Book. Whoever wrote the Acts wrote also the Gospel which bears the name of St. Luke. We find writers far removed in standpoint from each other, e.g., H. Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 391, and Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 128, agreeing in this conviction, and appealing to the same work, Friedrich's *Das Lukas Evangelium und die Apostelgeschichte*, *Werke desselben Verfassers* (1890; see commentary), in support of it. In recent years the philologist Gercke seems to be almost the only convert to the opposite view who, with Sorof, regards the author of Acts as the reviser of the δεύτερος λόγος of Luke; but his efforts in promulgating his views cannot be said to have met with any success (see Zöckler, *u. s.; Theologische Rundschau*, pp. 50, 129: 1899; and Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 4, 1899).

Friedrich's pamphlet, which contains a useful summary of the whole evidence on the subject, much of which had been previously collected by Zeller and Lekebusch (although their readings, like those too of Friedrich, sometimes require careful testing), gives instances of language, style, and treatment of various subjects which place the identity of authorship beyond reasonable doubt (see instances noted in commentary). At the same time it would be misleading to say that recent critics have been unmindful of the linguistic differences which the two books present, although a candid examination shows that these differences are comparatively slight (cf. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 140; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 381, 1899). In earlier days Zeller had not lost sight of those peculiarities which are entirely linguistic, and he maintains that they are not of a nature to prove anything against the same origin of the two writings, *Acts*, vol. ii., p. 243, E.T.

Amongst recent writers, Blass, in his Index ii., *Acta Apostolorum*, marks fifty-six words as peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts; cf. also the list in Plummer's *St. Luke*, iii., liii. The instances of words and phrases characteristic of St. Luke's Gospel in Sir J. Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*, 1899, pp. 29-41, will enable any one to see at a glance by the references how far such words and phrases are also characteristic of, or peculiar to, Acts; see also in commentary.
Who is the early Christian writer thus able to give us not only such an account of the Life of our Lord that Renan could describe it as the most beautiful book in the world (Les Evangiles, p. 283), but also an account of the origines of the Christian Church which Jülicher regards as an ideal Church history, Einleitung, p. 270, and of which Blass could write "hunc libellum non modo inter omnes Novi T. optima compositione uti, sed etiam eam artem monstrare, quæ Graeco Romanove scriptore rerum non indigna sit"? One thing seems certain, that the writer, whoever he was, represents himself in four passages, xvi. 10-17, xx. 5-15, xxi. 1-18, xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16 inclusive, cf. also Acts xi. 28, Codex D (on which see below, and in loco), as a companion of St. Paul. If we examine the phraseology of these sections (ninety-seven verses in all), we find that it is in many respects common to that employed in the rest of the book (Klostermann, Vindiciae Lucane, p. 46 ff.; Nösgen, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 15, 16; Blass, Acta Apostolorum, p. 10; Vogel, Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil, p. 41; Hawkins, u. s., p. 149; Spitta, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 235, 257).¹

Those who deny this identity of authorship are not only obliged to face the difficulty of accounting for this similarity of style and language, but also to account for the introduction of the "We" sections at all. If the writer of the rest of the book had wished to palm himself off at a later period as a companion of St. Paul, he would scarcely have sought to accomplish this on the strength of the insertion of these sections alone, as they stand. It may be fairly urged that he would at least have adopted one of the unmistakable

¹ Sir J. Hawkins not only gives us, p. 151, seventeen words and phrases found only in the "We" sections and in the rest of Acts; twenty-seven words and phrases found in the "We" sections and Luke, with or without the rest of Acts also; thirty-seven words and phrases found in the "We" sections, and also used predominantly, though not exclusively, in the rest of Acts or Luke or either of them; but he remarks that out of the eighty-six Matthaean words and phrases, ten, or rather less than one eighth occur in the "We" sections; out of the thirty-seven Marcan words and phrases, six, or about one sixth; out of the 140 Lucan words and phrases, less than one third, p. 14, ff.: "Is it not utterly impossible," he asks, p. 150, "that the language of the original writer of the 'We' sections should have chanced to have so very many more correspondences with the language of the subsequent compiler than with that of Matthew or Mark?" The expressions peculiar to the "We" sections are for the most part fairly accounted for by the subject-matter, p. 153, e.g., εὐθυδρομέω, κατάγεσθαι, παραλέγομαι, πλόος, ὑποπλέω. Part iii., C, Section iv., of the same book should also be consulted where the identity of the third Synoptist with a friend and companion of St. Paul is further confirmed by the similarities between his Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles.
methods of which a Thucydides, a Polybius, a Josephus availed themselves to make their personal relation to the facts narrated known to their readers (Zahn, Einleitung, ii., pp. 387, 426, 435).

This unknown author of Acts, moreover, whoever he was, was a man of such literary skill that he was able to assimilate the "We" sections to the rest of his book, and to introduce cross references from them to other parts of his work, e.g., xxii. 8 and vi. 5; and yet, with all this, he is so deficient in literary taste as to allow the first person plural in the "We" sections to remain, a blunder avoidable by a stroke of his pen.

The German philologist, Vogel, who cannot be accused of speaking with a theological bias, states the common-sense view of the matter in pointing out that when an author of such literary skill as the author of Acts undoubtedly possessed passes without a break from the third to the first person in his narrative, every unprejudiced reader will explain it on the ground that the author thus wished modestly to intimate his own personal presence during certain events. This is the one natural explanation, and to this Vogel determines to adhere, until it is shown to be untenable; and he justly pours ridicule upon the notion that the author of Acts would have interwoven into a work written in such a delicate and finished style the travel-diary of some other person without altering the pronouns (Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil, pp. 12, 13).

If we are asked to believe that this first person plural was introduced from time to time merely for the purpose of giving an air of verisimilitude to the narrative (or in imitation of certain passages in Ezra and Nehemiah, or Tobit), why should we not find it in the account, e.g., of St. Peter's escape from prison, chap. xii., where Wendt maintains that the author probably had possession of a narrative full of details, derived probably from John Mark himself? There can be no doubt that the "We" sections are introduced for the definite purpose of marking the writer's presence with St. Paul; we cannot, e.g., conclude that there is any other reason for the circumstance that the "We" section of chap. xvi. breaks off at Philippi, and that the following "We" section, chap. xx., commences again at Philippi. But if this is so, how again could a later unknown writer have gained possession of a document of such high value as that comprising or embodying these "We" sections? A day-journal

1 See Weiss, Einleitung, p. 583, and Overbeck (De Wette, 4th edition), p. xlv., who both point out that the cases are not analogous, although, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld and Wendt have recently pressed them into service.
left behind by an intimate companion of St. Paul must have been preserved long enough for this unknown writer to have incorporated it, or at least some of it, into his own work, and it must then have vanished altogether out of sight, although one would have supposed that a treasure so valuable would have been preserved and guarded in some Christian circle with the greatest care.¹

But if we further ask who amongst the companions of St. Paul speaks to us in these "We" sections, the testimony of critics of various schools—of critics who draw a distinction between the authorship of the "We" sections and the rest of the book—may be quoted in favour of St. Luke as the author of the former, if not, as we believe, of the latter also. Thus Holtzmann, Einleitung⁸, pp. 394, 395, examines the question, and decides in favour of St. Luke as against the claims of Timothy, Silas, or Titus (so Overbeck (De Wette, 4th edit.), pp. 1., li.; Mangold, Einleitung (Bleek), p. 445; Spitta, u. s., p. 312). Acts xx. 5, 6 may be fairly quoted as decisive against Timothy, to say nothing of the impossibility that the author of Acts should assume the character of a person in the "We" sections, and by naming this same person elsewhere should thus distinguish him from himself (Overbeck). For Silas nothing can be said, and the advocacy of his claims is the most groundless of any of the three. He appears nowhere in the third missionary journey, an absence which would be fatally inconsistent with his presence in the "We" sections, and he is nowhere named in any of the letters of the First Imprisonment, whereas the narrator of xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16 would naturally be found amongst the companions of the Apostle during that period (of course, if xi. 27, 28 in β-text be taken into account, both Timothy and Silas are thereby excluded, Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 425). The same objection may be made to Titus, since there is no hint that he was with St. Paul at Rome (even if we allow that he may have been included in the ἤμείς at Antioch, xi. 27, and that, as he is not mentioned at all in Acts, the difficulties which are presented by the names of Timothy and Silas do not occur in his case). Moreover, the travel-journey of Silas would have commenced rather with xv. 1, as Holtzmann urges; nor is there any reason to suppose that Silas was at Philippi during the time required (Holtz-

¹ This, no doubt, presents less difficulty to advanced critics who find it apparently easy to credit that the Pastoral Epistles contain fragments of genuine letters of St. Paul, and that these letters having supplied the fragments to the Pastorals were themselves no longer cared for or regarded (McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 407, 408, and, on the other hand, Dr. Salmon, Introd., p. 408).
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But if the author of these sections is to be found amongst the intimate companions of St. Paul, and amongst those who were with him in Rome, no one fulfills the conditions better than St. Luke. Even Jülicher, who declines to decide positively which of the four companions, Silas, Timothy, Titus, Luke, was the author, considers that if it was St. Luke, we have in that fact the best explanation that his name remained attached to the Third Gospel and Acts alike, Einleitung, p. 269. The writer of Acts xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16 evidently accompanied St. Paul to Rome, and that St. Luke was with the Apostle at the time of his first captivity we learn on the authority of two Epistles which very few of the best critics would now care to dispute, Col. iv. 14, Phil. ver. 24.

But the writer of Acts has not felt the need of using the Epistles of St. Paul as sources for his work, although they were the most weighty documents for the history which he professes to describe. There are numbers of undesigned coincidences between the letters and the history, and Paley, in his Hora Paulinae, has done invaluable service in drawing attention to them. But still Acts is written independently of the Epistles, and it cannot be said that any one letter in particular is employed by the writer. Yet this would be inconceivable if the former work was composed 100-120 A.D., especially when we remember the knowledge of the Epistles displayed by the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas, by St. Ignatius or St. Polycarp (Harnack, Chron., i., 249). Moreover the writer, whoever he was, was beyond all doubt intensely interested in St. Paul, and it is strange that he should not have made use of his letters, when we remember the impression which they made upon those contemporary with the great Apostle, cf. 2 Cor. x. 10, 2 Pet. iii. 15 (Zahn, u. s., p. 412).

But this relation between Acts and the Pauline Epistles not only shows that the former was written before the close of the first century, but that the author stood sufficiently near to St. Paul to be able to write without enriching his knowledge by references to the Apostle's letters. This, however, becomes natural enough on the supposition that the writer was a Timothy, or a Titus, or a Luke. If, however, the two former are excluded, probabilities again point to Luke (Zahn). (For recent writers who deny the acquaintance of the author of Acts with St. Paul's Epistles we may refer to Wendt, Felten, McGiffert, Harnack, Zahn, Jülicher, Rackham.) And we thus come into line with early Church tradition which referred the third

But Luke, we have been recently reminded, was not an uncommon name, and many Christians may have borne it in the latter part of the first century (*McGiffert, Apostolic Age*, p. 435). But not only is the above tradition precise in its mention of Luke as a physician; the writings attributed to him bear upon the face of them indications of the hand of a medical man. No reference, however, to the possibility of this is made by Dr. McGiffert. He tells us, p. 239, that nowhere is the source used by the author of Acts marked by anything like the vividness, preciseness, and fulness of detail that characterise the "We" sections. The writer of these sections was not Silas or Timothy, but "the unknown author of the 'We' passages," p. 239. This unknown author was evidently the intimate companion of St. Paul, and of his other companions in Rome none is more likely to have written the personal notes of travel than Luke, who seems indeed to have been the nearest and dearest to the Apostle of all his friends (pp. 434, 435). The inference from all this, coupled with the tradition of

If there is one narrative of the N.T. which more than another contains internal proof of having been related by an eye-witness, it is the account of the voyage and shipwreck of St. Paul," *Salmon, Introd.*, p. 5, and this judgment based upon the valuable monograph of James Smith (himself a Fellow of the Royal Society) of Jordan Hill, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 4th edit., revised and corrected, 1886, has received fresh and remarkable confirmation, not only from English but from German and French sources of a technical and professional kind: *e.g.*, Dr. Breusing, Director of the Seefahrtschule in Bremen, published in 1886 his *Die Nautik der Alten* with a close examination verse by verse of the narrative in Acts xxvii., and he has been followed precisely on the same lines by J. Vars, Professor in the Lycée of Brest in his *L'Art Nautique dans l'antiquité*, 1887. Both writers make constant reference to Smith's work, although they often differ from him in technical details, and references to Breusing will be found in Blass and Wendt (1899). The latter writer also refers to a thoughtful article with a similar testimony to St. Luke's accuracy by Von Goerne in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 352, 1898, and allusions will be found to this, as to the above-mentioned works, in the commentary. Breusing's testimony is very striking, p. xiii.: "The most valuable nautical document of antiquity which has come down to us is the account of the voyage and shipwreck of the Apostle Paul. Every one can see at a glance that it could only have been composed by an eye-witness." The strangest exception perhaps to this almost universal recognition of the value of the narrative in Acts xxvii. (*cf.*, *e.g.*, the remarkable testimony in its favour by Weiszäcker, *Apostolic Age*, ii., p. 126 ff., E.T.) is Mommsen's attack upon it in *Sitzungsber. d. berl. Ak.*, 1895, p. 503; but, as Zahn justly remarks, Mommsen has not increased his reputation by alleging that "Luke speaks of the Adriatic Sea by Crete and of the barbarians of Malta"; see answers to these objections in Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 421, and also in commentary, Acts xxvii. 27, and xxviii. 2.
the Church, would seem to be quite plain, but Dr. McGiffert declines
to draw it, and falls back upon the belief that some other person
named Luke was the writer of the third Gospel and Acts, p. 433.
But if there had been such a person there would have been no need
for tradition to identify him with Luke the beloved physician, since
his own intrinsic merits as an author and historian would have
been amply sufficient to secure him an undying recognition.

Here comes in the value of the argument from the medical
language employed in the third Gospel and the Acts. The Church
in identifying the writer with St. Paul’s beloved friend was not
following some fanciful or unreliable tradition, but a tradition amply
supported by an examination of the language of the books in
question; language which not only witnesses to the truth of the
tradition, but also to the unity of Acts, since this medical phraseology
may be traced in every part, and not in the “We” sections alone.
The present Introduction, which must of necessity be brief, does
not allow of any lengthy examination of this important subject (to
which the writer hopes to return), but in a large number of passages
in the commentary notes are given with special reference to indi-
cations of medical phraseology. But one or two remarks may be
added here. In the first place, it is well to bear in mind that St.
Luke’s medical phraseology was fully recognised before Dr. Hobart’s
interesting and valuable book, The Medical Language of St. Luke,
1882 (cf., e.g., Dr. Belcher’s Our Lord’s Miracles of Healing, 1st
edit., with Preface by Archbishop Trench, 1871, 2nd edit., 1890).
The Gentleman’s Magazine, June, 1841, containing a short article of
some two and a half pages, pp. 585-587, is often referred to as a kind
of starting-point for this inquiry, but it should not be forgotten that
the great names of Wetstein and Bengel may be quoted as fully
recognising the hand of a medical writer; thus in commenting not
only on Luke xiv. 2, but also on Acts xxviii. 8, Wetstein makes the
same remark: “Lucas qui medicus fuerat morbos accuratius de-
scibere solet,” cf. Bengel on Acts iii. 7, “Proprie locutus est medicus
Lucas,” and Luke viii. 43, where the disputed reading does not
interfere with the force of the comment: “Lucas medicus ingenue
scribit”. Indeed it is not too much to say that the main position
taken up by Hobart has been abundantly recognised both in France
and Germany, and not always in quarters where such a recognition
might have been anticipated, cf., e.g., Renan, Saint Paul, p. 133,
12th edit.; J. Weiss, Evangelium des Lukas, 1892, with reference
to Dr. Hobart’s book, and with quotations from it, although with
the qualification that many of the instances require careful siftin,
p. 274 ff. More recently the German philologist Vogel, 1897, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, p. 17, draws attention to the fact that a large number of words peculiar to the Acts are found in Luke's contemporary, the physician Dioscorides of Anazarbus in Cilicia, not far from Antioch, and he speaks of the use of Dioscorides by the Evangelist as highly probable. But the fullest recognition of Dr. Hobart's work comes to us even more recently by Zahn: "Dr. Hobart has proved for every one for whom anything can be proved, that the author of the Lucan work (by which Zahn means both the third Gospel and Acts) is a Greek physician, acquainted with the technical terms of the medical art," *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 427, 435 (1899). The language is strong, and it may perhaps be fairly contended that some of the instances cited by Dr. Zahn may well have been subjected to the cross-examination instituted so carefully and fully by Dr. Plummer, *St. Luke*, pp. lii., lxiii.-lxvi., in his inquiry into the validity of Dr. Hobart's position. The evidence in favour of this position must be cumulative, but it depends not merely upon the occurrence of technical medical terms in St. Luke's writings, but also upon his tendency to employ medical language more frequently than the other Evangelists, upon the passages in his Gospel in which we come across medical terms which are wanting in the parallel passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark, upon the account which he gives of miracles of healing not only in comparison with the other Evangelists, but also of the miracles peculiar to his own narratives; upon the way in which he abstains from using words which medical writers abstain from so using, although employed in this sense elsewhere in the Gospels; upon the frequency with which he uses medical language and phraseology in a secondary sense. Illustrations of some of these characteristic peculiarities are noted in the commentary, and a passing reference (space allows this only) may be made to two others. Each of the Synoptists gives our Lord's comparison between the passage of a camel through the eye of a needle and the entrance of a rich man into the kingdom of heaven, St. Matt. xix. 24, St. Mark x. 25, St. Luke xviii. 25. St. Matthew and St. Mark have the same word for

---

1 Whatever strictures may be passed upon Dr. Hobart's book, it must not be forgotten that the following authorities amongst others are persuaded that the author's main thesis has been abundantly proved: Bishop Lightfoot, "Acts," B.D. i., p. 31; Dr. Salmon, *Introdn.* p. 129; Professor Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 205; Dr. Plummer, *St. Luke*, u. s. (cf. Sir J. Hawkins, *Hora Synoptica*, p. 154, 1899); and it is significant that Dr. B. Weiss in the 3rd edit. of his *Einleitung* refers to the book, and no longer speaks of the argument as mere "trifling".
needle ῥαφίδος: διὰ τρήματος ῥαφίδος, Matt., T.R.; but W.H. τρήματος in text, τρυμαλιάς in margin, διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιάς (τῆς) ῥαφίδος, Mark. But when we turn to St. Luke, he introduces at least one different word (if we adopt W.H. for St. Matt.), and a combination peculiar to himself, διὰ τρήματος βελόνης (W.H. and R.V.). It cannot be said that the words used by St. Luke occur in LXX, since neither of them is found there (although St. Mark’s τρυμαλιά occurs in LXX possibly six and at least three times). But both words used by St. Luke were in technical medical use, τρήμα being the great medical word for a perforation of any kind, βελόνη being the surgical needle; and not only so but the two words are found combined as here by Galen: διὰ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν βελόνην τρήματος and again τοῦ διατρήματος τῆς βελόνης (cf. Hobart, p. 60, J. Weiss, u. s., p. 567, Zahn, u. s., p. 436, and Nestle, Einführung in das G. N. T., p. 228).

Dr. Plummer points out that τρήμα is not peculiar to St. Luke (see W.H. above), but the combination is peculiar to St. Luke, and the force of this fact and of the combination of undoubted medical terms is not lessened by Grimm’s description of βελόνη as a more classical word than ῥαφίς.

Once again: St. Luke’s characteristic medical style shows itself in abstention as well as in employment. In three passages, e.g., μαλακία is used by St. Matthew to denote disease, but in medical language it is used as in its primary classical sense of delicacy, effeminacy, and St. Luke never uses it in St. Matthew’s sense, although he employs the cognate adjective μαλακός of “soft” raiment in vii. 25. But this non-usage of the noun by the medical Luke is all the more significant, since in the LXX it is found at least a dozen times to denote sickness and disease.

In St. Matt. iv. 24, viii. 6, both βασανίζειν and βάσανος are used of bodily sickness, but in medical writers the words are not employed in this sense, and St. Luke refrains from so employing them (Hobart, p. 63, and Zahn, u. s., p. 435). But here again significance is added to this non-usage by St. Luke when we remember that βάσανος is not only used of the torments after death in Wisd. iii. 1, 4 Macc. iii. 15, cf. Luke xvi. 23, 28, but also of the pain of bodily disease, 1 Macc. ix. 56.

The Aim of the Book. Not only the aim but the purpose and contents of the book are set forth, according to Lightfoot, in the Preface, chap. i. 1-8. The prophetic words of the Lord in ver. 8 implicitly involve a table of contents: “Ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost,” etc., ii. 1-13; “witnesses unto me” (1) “in Jerusalem,” ii. 14-viii. 1, and (2) “in all Judæa and Samaria,” viii. 2-xi. 18, (3) “and to the uttermost part of the earth,” xi. 19-xxviii.
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31 (on the latter expression see comment. in loco and reference to Psalms of Solomon, viii. 16). The writer closes with the event which his aim required, the preaching of the Gospel in Rome, the capital of the world, the metropolis of the human race, without hindrance; and the fulfilment of the third section mentioned above is thus given, not actually, but potentially, while an earnest is afforded of its ultimate accomplishment; Philippians, p. 3; B.D.², i., p. 26; cf. also Weiss, Einleitung, p. 562, Blass, Acta Apost., Proleg., p. 3: "At hic liber non est imperfectus, cum longi cursus evangelii Roma terminus sit". But starting from the distinction which Lightfoot himself thus draws between the potential and actual, is it not quite possible that there may thus be room for the τρίτος λόγος for which Lightfoot, it is true, saw no conceivable place, cf. Harnack, Chron., i., p. 248, but for the purpose of which Professor Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 380, and others, notably Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 380, have so strongly argued (see list of earlier advocates in Bleek-Mangold, Einleitung, p. 462, and note in comment. on xxviii. 31)? It is perhaps worth noting that Bengel, to whom we owe the oft-quoted words, Victoria verbi Dei, Paulus Romæ, apex evangelii, Actorum Finis, reminds us on the same page of the words of Estius: "Fortasse Lucas meditabatur tertium librum, in quo repeteret acta illius biennii; sicut, Act. i., quaedam exposuit tacita ultimo capite evangeli". Moreover, if we take Acts i. 8 as giving us in outline the programme of the book, it seems that its purpose would have been fulfilled not so much in the triumph of the Gospel, but in the bearing witness to Christ in Jerusalem, Samaria, and to the end of the earth: the Apostles were to be witnesses, i. 8; St. Paul was told that he was "to bear witness" in Rome, μαρτυρήσαι xxiii. 11, cf. xxviii. 23; the triumph would succeed the witness, and the keynote of victory is struck in the word ἀκολουθεῖ.

Nothing, it is true, is said in Acts of the beginnings of Christianity in Rome, or as to how the Church was first founded in that city; but when we consider the importance that St. Paul plainly attached to his seeing for himself the metropolis of the world, cf. xix. 21, and when his Epistle addressed to the Roman Church indicates how clearly he foresaw the importance which that Church would have for Gentile Christianity in the future, it is quite conceivable that the universalist Luke would draw his second treatise to a fitting close by showing that blindness in part had happened to Israel that the fulness of the Gentiles might come in. "We are not told," says Holtzmann, quoting Overbeck, "how the Gospel came to Rome, but how Paul came to Rome": but this objection, which
Overbeck considered the greatest against the view that the contents of Acts were summed up in chap. i. 8, is obviated by the above considerations; St. Paul was to bear witness in Rome as he had at Jerusalem, but the result of his final witness in Jerusalem, xxiii. 1 ff., resulted in a division among the Jews, and a similar result followed his first testimony in Rome. The Gospel had come to Rome already, but those who accepted it were only a sect everywhere spoken against; now its foremost representative gains it a hearing from the Gentiles, and that too without interruption or prohibition.

But this recognition of the importance of St. Paul's witness and work in Rome, and of their subsequent development, by no means excludes other purposes which may have been present to the mind of St. Luke. "No other N.T. writer," says Zahn, "mentions a Roman emperor by name," and he proceeds to point out the significance of this fact in connection with the whole design of St. Luke to show that Christianity was an historical religion; how the edicts of Augustus, Luke ii. 1, and of Claudius, Acts xviii. 2, had their influence on the new faith (cf. Luke iii. 1), how in comparison with the other Evangelists St. Luke constantly introduces the names of those who were connected indirectly as well as directly with political events (Einleitung, ii., p. 375, and cf. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 385, Friedrich, u. s., p. 53 ff.). Not only would notices of this kind impress a reader of the type of Theophilus with a sense of the certainty of those things in which he had been instructed, but they are also of importance in that they indicate that a writer, who thus took pains to gain accurate information with regard to events in the Roman world, would naturally be interested in tracing carefully the relations between the empire and the infant Church, and all the more so if it was important to show his readers that Christianity stood in no hostile relationship to the imperial government (cf. Zahn, u. s., p. 379).

But it is one thing to describe one of the objects of the book in this way, viz., as an attempt to reassure those who had been already instructed in the origines of the Christian Faith, and to emphasise its evident power and rectitude at the bar of the rulers of this world, and to maintain that all this was done with a political-apologetic aim, regardless of truthfulness to fact, and only concerned with representing Christianity in a favourable light before magistrates and kings. No doubt we are repeatedly told how St. Paul took shelter in an appeal to Roman law and Roman authority, and how much more justly and calmly the Roman authorities judged of his case than the fanatical and insensate Jews; "but," says Wendt with
admirable candour (Apostelgeschichte, p. 17), “there is no reason to doubt that this representation simply corresponded to historical truth” (see the whole paragraph in Wendt, 1899, and cf. Weiss, u. s., p. 569, as against Overbeck and Mangold, u. s., p. 427, following Schneckenburger and Zeller). Moreover, when we remember that the writer of Acts deliberately enters upon a field of history “where perhaps beyond all others there was room for mistake and blunder, the administration of the Roman Empire and its provinces,” nothing is more surprising than the way in which his accuracy is confirmed by every fresh and searching investigation.1

But if there is no reason to attribute a political tendency (see further below) to the writer, still less is there room for the attribution of a doctrinal tendency. The earlier representatives of this latter view of the book, Baur and Zeller, started with insisting upon the fundamental opposition which prevailed between the view of the relationship of St. Paul with the primitive Apostles as set forth in those Epistles which these critics accepted, and in the Acts: to St. Paul a Judaising tendency was ascribed in the latter which was not in harmony with his statements in his own writings, whilst, on the other hand, to St. Peter especially a liberal standpoint was ascribed, which was not to be expected in view of the utterances of St. Paul in his Epistles, a standpoint which would make Peter, not Paul, the originator of Gentile Christianity. On the whole the Acts represented an idealised and harmonising view of the relation of parties in the primitive Church, and its object as the work of a Pauline Christian was to reconcile the Jewish and Pauline parties. Schneckenburger had previously emphasised the supposed parallel in Acts between Peter and Paul (see further below), and had represented the book as written with the apologetic aim of defending Paul against the misrepresentation of the Judaizers; but it must always be remembered that Schneckenburger, although emphasising the apologetic tendency of St. Luke, never denied

1 Cf., e.g., the notes on xvii. 6, xxvii. 7, etc., the references to the invaluable and epoch-making works of Professor Ramsay, and Vogel, Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil, p. 28, 1897, on the remarkable degree of confidence with which military, political, and judicial terms are employed in Acts. Professor Schmiedel in his review of Professor Ramsay’s St. Paul describes it as the work on the whole not of the historian or archaeologist, but of the narrow apologist, Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1897, No. 23, and more recently, Professor H. Holtzmann, characterises Professor Ramsay’s description and illustration of the scene, Acts xvi. 25-34, as “humbug”! Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1899, No. 7; such remarks are ill calculated to promote candid and respectful criticism.
his historical truthfulness, whilst Baur fastened upon Schneckenburger's view, and further developed his own previous attack on the historical character of Acts (Zahn, u. s., p. 393, Lightfoot, B.D.², i., 41). But Baur's theory in its extreme form could not maintain its ground, and various modifications of it took place within his own school. Certainly, to take an illustration, it must always remain a strange fact that, if Acts was written with the conciliatory tendency alluded to, only one indirect mention in it is found, xxiv. 17, of the collection for the poor Saints at Jerusalem, which played so prominent a part in St. Paul's work and writings, and which was in itself such a palpable proof of the Apostle's love for his Jewish brethren.

The tendency view adopted by some of the writers succeeding Baur, e.g., Reuss, Keim, Weizsäcker, regards the author of Acts as not intentionally departing from the historical relations between the two parties, but as forming his judgment of the relations between them from the standpoint of his own time. One of the most recent attempts to represent the conciliatory tendency of Acts as an apology for the Christian religion before Gentiles, i.e., before a heathen public, against the charges of the Jews, and to show how Judaism, through Christianity, broke up into its world-wide mission, is that of J. Weiss, Über die Absicht und den literar. Charakter der A. G., 1897 (see further below); but whatever amount of correctness there may be in this view we may frankly adopt, without committing ourselves to the very precarious explanations and deductions of the writer; St. Luke's own prologue, and the dedication of his two writings to the Gentile Theophilus, are in themselves sufficient to lead us to expect that the design accentuated by J. Weiss would not be altogether absent from his mind in composing his history (see the remarks of Zahn, u. s., ii., p. 393).

But if there is no satisfaction in the more recent attempts to represent Acts as written mainly with a conciliatory "tendency," still less can satisfaction be found in the view, older in its origin, of a supposed parallelism between St. Peter and St. Paul, drawn out by a writer who wished in this way to reconcile the Petrine and Pauline parties in the Church, by placing the leaders of each in a position of equal authority. That there are points of similarity in the life and work of the two Apostles may be readily admitted, but these likenesses are of the most general kind, and only such as we might expect in cases where two men work in the same calling at the same period and under the same conditions, cf. to this effect Clemen, Die Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe, pp. 17, 18, and Feine, Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas, p. 214. The parallel can
only be extended to a few instances such as the healing of the lame man by Peter at Jerusalem, iii. 2, and by Paul at Lystra, xiv. 8, but there is no real ground for the institution of a parallel between the worship paid to Peter by Cornelius, x. 25, and by the inhabitants of Lystra to St. Paul, xiv. 11, or between the judgment inflicted on Ananias and Sapphira by Peter, v. 1, and on Elymas by St. Paul, xiii. 6. The position thus advocated by Clemen is taken up by B. Weiss, Einleitung, p. 540, 3rd edit., 1897, no less than by earlier writers like Lekebusch and Nösgen (cf. too Sanday, Bampton Lectures, p. 327, and Salmon, Introduction, p. 310). But whether we consider that the parallel was instituted to place Paul on an equality with Peter, or, as Van Manen has recently urged, Paulus I.: De handelingen der Apostelen, p. 126, 1890, that the writer wished to represent Peter in accordance with the delineation of Paul, there is one fact fatal to both points of view, viz., that if either of these purposes had been in the mind of the author of Acts, we cannot account for his omission of the crowning point to the parallel between the two Apostles, viz., their martyrdom in the same city, and in the same persecution. An already discredited theory can scarcely survive the ridicule of Dr. Blass, Proleg., p. 8, and of Dr. Salmon, u. s., pp. 310, 311: in all true history we may expect to find parallelisms, and these parallels exist in the lives of nations no less than of individuals. When we consider the various attempts which have been made to describe the aim of Acts, it is something to find that a critic who does not hesitate to regard the book as written to some extent with an idealising and harmonising purpose, should nevertheless be constrained to reckon it, on account of its many trustworthy traditions, as an historical work of invaluable worth, see Wendt, Apostelgeschichte, p. 33, 1899.

Sources. If St. Luke is acknowledged as the writer of Acts, we can understand the remark of Blass that in this case the question of sources for the greater part of the book need not be raised, Blass, Acta Apost., Proleg., p. 10; cf. Zahn, u. s., pp. 404, 412; Knabenbauer, Actus Apostolorum, p. 8, 1899. It is plain from the narrative that a man in St. Luke's position would be brought into contact with many persons from whom he could have obtained rich and varied information, and in many cases the details of his narrative point unmistakably to the origin of the information. A good example may be seen in chap. xii. (see commentary), in which the vivid and circumstantial details of St. Peter's escape from prison are best accounted for on the supposition that the narrative comes from John Mark: to the house of the mother of Mark St. Peter makes his
way, ver. 12, and not only does later history associate St. Mark with St. Peter, but also with St. Luke and St. Paul, inasmuch as he is with the latter in Rome, Col. iv. 10, Philem., ver. 24 (cf. 2 Tim. iv. 11), to say nothing of an earlier association, cf. Acts xiii. (Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 385; Blass, u. s., p. 11; Belser, Theologische Quartalschrift, p. 62, 1895); and even Wendt, p. 31 (1899), sees no other way of accounting for the contrast between the brief notice of the death of St. James, xii. 1, and the lengthy account of the liberation of St. Peter than the probability that the latter was derived from John Mark, whilst more exact information was wanting for the former.

But John Mark was not the only member of the Jerusalem Church from whom, or through whom, St. Luke could have obtained information as to the origin of the Christian community. Barnabas, the cousin of John Mark, was in a position to know accurately the same events, in some of which he had shared, iv. 36, and if St. Luke was a member of the Church at Antioch when Barnabas settled there (cf. note on xi. 28) he would have learnt from the lips of Barnabas the early history of the Jerusalem Church; and it would have been strange if amongst the men of Cyprus and Cyrene who fled from Judæa to Antioch, xi. 19, there had been none who were baptised at the first Christian Pentecost, cf. ii. 10, 41 (Zahn, u. s., p. 414).

For the same series of events St. Luke had access also to the information preserved by Mnason, a disciple ἀρχαίος, i.e., from the first Pentecost, cf. xi. 15, xxi. 16, from whom likewise he may have learnt the account given in ix. 31-43. In chap. xxi. we are also told how Luke was a guest for several days in the house of Philip the Evangelist, vv. 8-12, an intercourse which could have furnished him with the information narrated not only in viii. 4-40, but in vi. 1-viii. 3, x. 1-xi. 18. And from Jerusalem itself, no less than from Cæsarea, information might have been acquired, for Luke, xxi. 18, had intercourse not only with the elders but with no less a person than St. James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, and at an earlier period he must have shared at Philippi, xvi. 19 ff., the company of Silas, who is mentioned as one of the chief among the brethren of the mother city, xv. 22. In this connection we may note that St. Luke alone gives us two incidents connected with Herod Antipas, Luke xiii. 31-33, xiii. 6-12, 15, cf. Acts iv. 27, which are not narrated by the other Evangelists, but this intimate acquaintance of St. Luke with the court of Herod is in strict harmony with the notice of Manaen the foster-brother of Herod, Acts xiii. 1, cf. Luke viii. 3, a teacher of the Church at Antioch when St. Luke may
himself have been there, and from whom the Evangelist may at all
events have learnt much of the information about other members of
the Herodian family which comes to us from him only (Plumptre,
Zahn, Belser, Feine). It may no doubt be contended, with con-
siderable plausibility, that St. Luke must have had at his command
written documents as well, e.g., in his account of the speeches
of St. Peter and St. Stephen, and it is quite possible that he
might have obtained such documents from the Church at Jeru-
salem. One thing is quite certain, that these addresses like all
others throughout the book are in striking harmony with the
circumstances and crises to which they relate (see further below):
"quo intentius has orationes inspexeris," writes Blass, "eo plura
in eis reperies, quae cum sint temporibus personisque egregie
accommodata, ad rhetori
cam licentiam scriptoris referri se vetent" (Proleg., p. 11). But at the same time it requires no great
stretch of imagination to conclude with Zahn (ii., p. 412) that
such a man as Luke required no other sources of information
for the composition of Acts, or at least for a great portion of
that work, than his own recollections, partly of the narratives
of St. Paul, partly of the events in which he himself had shared,
cf. vi. 8-viii. 3, ix. 1-30, xiii.-xxviii. There is abundant proof
in St. Paul's Epistles that the Apostle must have constantly
referred to his earlier experiences in way of conversation, or in the
delivery of his discourses, cf. 2 Cor. i. 8-10, xi. 22, xii. 9, Gal. i. 11-
ii. 14, Phil. iii. 3-7, Rom. xv. 16-32, xvi. 7, and during periods of
enforced inactivity, while Luke was with him at Cæsarea, or during
the winter months at Malta, or later in Rome, nothing was more
natural, as Zahn urges, than that the great missionary should com-
municate to his beloved friend the records of his work and experience
in great heathen centres of commercial or intellectual life, like
Corinth, Ephesus, Athens. After his return from his travels, and
on many other occasions, Zahn points out that it was St. Paul's
habit to relate minutely καθ' έκαστον, Χxi. 19, what God had
wrought by him, xiv. 27, xv. 3, 12, 26, Gal. ii. 2, 7-9, and there is no
reason whatever to suppose that such recitals were withheld from
St. Luke. No doubt it may be urged that the style in the second
part of the book is less Hebraistic than in chaps. i.-xii., but this
may be fairly accounted for if we remember that St. Luke would
often obtain his information for the earlier events from Jewish
Christians, and on the soil of Palestine, and that he may have
purposely retained the Hebraistic colouring in his embodiment of
these narratives, cf. Plummer, St. Luke, p. xlix.; Zahn, u. s., ii.,
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pp. 414, 423; Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, p. 31, 1898. If it be maintained that the earlier chapters of Acts, i.-v., were incorporated from some earlier document, it is admitted that this was of Jewish-Christian origin, derived from the Jewish Church through an eye-witness (cf. B. Weiss, Einleitung, p. 549, 3rd edit.; Feine, u. s., p. 233). Thus in these chapters, e.g., the Sadducees appear as the chief opponents of the new faith, cf. note on iv. 1, and the members of the hierarchy are represented as in the main members of the same sect, a fact which strikes us as strange, but which is in strict accordance with the testimony of Josephus. A careful consideration of the speeches and of their appropriateness to their various occasions tends more and more surely to refute the notion that they are fictitious addresses, the work of a writer of the second century. The testimony of Dr. McGiffert may be cited as bearing witness to the primitive character of the reports of the speeches of St. Peter in the early chapters of Acts, and for the truthful manner in which they represent a very early type of Christian teaching (see comment., p. 119), and cf. also the remarks of Schmiedel, Enc. Bibl., i., 48, 1899.

At the delivery of St. Stephen's speech Paul himself was present, xxvi. 10, cf. vi. 12, and there is good reason for thinking that the speech made a deep impression upon him (see, e.g., Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 31), while the many Lucan expressions and turns of thought which it contains (cf. Zeller, Acts, ii., p. 313, E.T., and Overbeck, Apostelgeschichte, p. 93) are natural enough if the address comes to us through the medium of a translation (see commentary for the speech and its meaning).

For the second part of the book we perceive that St. Luke might have easily obtained accurate reports of the speeches even in cases where he was not present; e.g., the speech at the Pisidian Antioch, chap. xiii., gives us what we may well regard as a familiar example of St. Paul's teaching on many similar occasions (cf. also in commentary the striking resemblances recently noted by Professor Ramsay between this speech and the Galatian Epistle). The addresses at Lystra and at Athens delivered to heathen, so wonderfully adapted to the audience in each place, in the one instance appealing to a more popular and ruder, in the latter to a more learned and philosophic class of hearers ("ita sunt omnia et loco et

1 Dr. Dalman's sharp distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms should be noted, p. 16 ff., whilst he allows that the pure Hebraisms in the Gospels are almost exclusively peculiar to that of St. Luke, and that by these peculiarities of diction Acts is also marked, p. 29; see further in commentary.
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audientibus accommodata," says Blass); in both cases starting from truths which some of the Greek philosophers might themselves have pressed home, but in each case leading up to and insisting upon the need and necessity of repentance for wise and simple alike; were eminently characteristic of a man who became as a Jew to the Jews, as without law to those without law, as a Greek to the Greeks, and such discourses in the brief form in which they have reached us in Acts may well have expressed the actual teaching delivered by St. Paul in Lystra and in Athens (see for these speeches especially Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 146 ff., and for the speech at Athens, Curtius, "Paulus in Athen," Gesammelte Abhandlungen, ii., pp. 527-543, and references in commentary 1): "there is no reason," writes McGiffert, "for questioning the trustworthiness of the discourse at Athens as a whole . . . in fact such a discourse as that ascribed to Paul is exactly what we should expect from him under the circumstances" (u. s., p. 260).

The speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, xx. 18-35, is constantly marked by St. Paul's characteristic words and phrases, and its teaching is strikingly connected with that of the Ephesian Epistle (see notes in commentary, and cf. Page, Acts, p. xxxvi.; Lock, "Ephesians," Hastings' B.D.; Cook, Speaker's Commentary, p. 342, and also Lekebusch, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 336-339; Nösgen, u. s., p. 53; Felten, u. s., p. 33). No one has affirmed the historical truthfulness of this address more strongly than Spitta, and in this instance also we may again conclude with McGiffert, p. 339, that "we shall be safe in assuming that the account of Paul's meeting with the elder brethren of Ephesus, and the report of the words which he uttered are substantially accurate." We may well feel this security when we recall that St. Luke would be himself a hearer of St. Paul's pathetic farewell.

The three remaining speeches contain three δικαιογίαι of St. Paul, one before the Jews and the chiliarch in Jerusalem, xxii. 1-21, the second before Felix, xxiv. 10-21, and the third before Festus and Agrippa, xxvi. The first reaches us through the medium of a Greek translation, and it is noticeable that the speech in this form contains no Pauline words or expressions, although some words remind us of him, e.g., δικαιογία, δικαίωσεν, παρα-

1 Hilgenfeld blames Curtius because he has not explained the source of information for St. Paul's address, since the Apostle was at Athens alone, but Kna-benbauer writes, Actus Apostolorum, p. 308, "Probabilissime is cum aliis id plane superflium reputavit, quia Paulus post eam orationem neque memoriam neque loquelas amisit; unde ipse potuit narrare quid Athenis egerit."
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δέχομαι, ἐπικαλείσθαι and τὸ δόμα (Nösgen, Felten), while it contains several peculiar to St. Luke. But if the Evangelist was present at the delivery of the defence, he would have been able to reproduce the speech himself, or at least its substance, and we have an explanation of the fact just mentioned (see Salmon, Introd., pp. 317, 318; Page, Acts, p. xxxvi.; Alford, Proleg., pp. 13-15).

The vivid description, xxi. 30-40, and especially the local details, vv. 34, 35, point to the presence of an eye-witness, who was in possession of information which he could use with accuracy, and at the same time with discrimination, limiting himself to the requisites of his narrative (Bethge, Die Paulinischen Reden, p. 174). It is difficult to understand why Blass should say that although Luke may have heard the speech, it is doubtful if he understood it. In his Pref. to his Evangelium secundum Lucam, pp. xxi.-xxiii., he not only adopts Nestle's theory that an Aramaic document underlies the first part of Acts, i.-xii., but amongst the few Aramaisms from chap. xiii. onwards he notes especially, p. xxi., two from the chapter before us, xxii., viz., ver. 19, ἔμην φυλακίζων "periphrasis illa aramaica imperfecti futurique, quæ fit per participium et verbum ἔμην (έσομαι)," and ver. 14, φωνήν εἴ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, cf. i. 16, iii. 18, 21 for στόμα. We must also bear in mind the strictures of Dalman upon Blass in this connection: cf. Die Worte des Jesu, p. 28, 1898.

In the apology before Felix, xxiv. 10-21, we have traces of St. Paul's diction (see commentary, and cf. Nösgen, u. s., p. 54, Felten, u. s., p. 34), and although it would be rash to affirm that St. Luke was present at the delivery of this defence, yet, if he was with St. Paul during any of the time of the Apostle's imprisonment at Caesarea, it is surely not difficult to suppose that he would have received from the prisoner's own lips a summary of his ἀπολογία before Felix. The same remark might account for St. Luke's information as to the longer ἀπολογία before Agrippa, chap. xxvi., and it is specially noteworthy that in this speech, which may easily have been reproduced exactly as it was delivered, cf. Blass, Grammatik, p. 5, and Proleg., p. 13, we have Greek phrases and words of a more cultured and literary style, such as would be more suited to the most distinguished audience before which the Apostle had yet pleaded (see commentary). At the same time we may note that while the speech has many points of contact with St. Paul's peculiar language and favourite words, there are other expressions which may be described as Lucan, to which we may appeal as justifying the belief that if St. Luke was present at the hearing, he reproduced the speech not immediately, but after an interval, when it had passed through his
own mind, Bethge, Die Paulinischen Reden, pp. 259, 260. That the speeches in Acts bear the impress of St. Luke's own style and revising hand is freely admitted by conservative critics (cf. Lightfoot, B.D.², i., p. 36; Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 34; Salmon, Introd., p. 317), and we may thus unhesitatingly account for the combination in them of peculiar Pauline expressions with those which may be classed as Lucan or Lucan-Pauline. These linguistic phenomena by no means destroy the substantial accuracy of the report; rather they are exactly what we should expect to find. It is admitted on all sides that by comparing the language of St. Paul's speeches in Acts with the language of his Epistles a striking amount of similarity is evident. But if the writer of Acts was not acquainted with St. Paul's Epistles, we cannot account for this similarity of diction on the ground of literary dependence. If, however, the writer of Acts was a constant and frequent companion of St. Paul the explanation is easy enough, and we can readily believe that whilst in his report or revision of a speech words of the disciple might sometimes be found side by side with those of the master, yet the influence of the latter would nevertheless make itself felt in the disciple's thoughts and language (cf. Salmon, u. s., p. 315 ff., and Felten, u. s., p. 32). In many cases it is perfectly obvious that the account of the speeches in Acts is an abridged account—the longest of them would not take more than some five or six minutes in delivery—and therefore, as a matter of necessity, such an abridgment would bear upon it, in a sense, the impress of St. Luke's own style. Blass, Acta Apostolorum, p. 191, in speaking of St. Paul's address at Athens expresses the belief that it has come down to us "fideliter etsi brevissime: ita sunt omnia et loco et audientibus accommodata," and he adds a remark applicable to all the Apostle's speeches: "Tum quilibet qui paullo recentiore ætate orationes Pauli conflicturus esset, usurus erat Pauli epistolis; quarum in hac non magis quam in ceteris orationibus (c. 13, 20, 22, 24, 26) ullus usus compararet ".

It cannot be said that the recent and frequent attempts to multiply and differentiate sources in Acts, to assign them to various revisers or redactors, have met with any degree of real success. If Holtzmann and Wendt (see also a description of these attempts in Theologische Rundschau, Feb., March, April, 1899) contend that they have done so, and that with regard to the first few chapters of Acts some consensus of opinion has been gained, we may set against such contentions not only the opinion of Zahn, Einleitung, ii., pp. 414, 424, who maintains that none of these repeated attempts
has attained any measure of probability (so too Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 154, 2nd edit., and Knabenbauer, *Actus Apostolorum*, p. 9 ff., 1899), but also the opinion of Wendt, who, after a careful and on the whole sympathetic review, is obliged to confess that one must limit oneself in any attempt to discover the sources of the book to what is attainable and provable in the circumstances, and that the more complicated the hypothesis suggested, the more difficult it is to make it intelligible to others, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 17, 1899. In his own examination of the problem he limits himself to one great source, p. 30, and plainly declares that it does not seem to be possible to discover others, although he enumerates various passages in which old and trustworthy traditions were combined; but whether these were derived from written documents or from one and the same source he declines to say, and he is evidently inclined to admit that in many cases oral tradition may also have been at work. Thus whilst iv. 1-22, v. 17-42, are regarded as parallel pieces of information of what was in reality the same event, or whilst again the liberation of St. Peter in chap. xii. is a parallel to the release of the Apostle in chap. v. 18-20, the work of St. Philip and the death of St. James rest upon good and trustworthy tradition. The source to which Wendt attaches such importance includes the "We" sections, and the whole of the book from xiii. onwards, with the exception of xv. 1-33, the source continuing with ver. 35, whilst it can be traced further back to xi. 19, 27, and to viii. 1-4. But this large source is full of traces of revision and redaction, which mark not only the narratives but also the addresses. Its interest centred chiefly in the person of St. Paul and in his work, and it gave no history of the *origines* of the Church or of the missionary journeys of the other Apostles, although it introduced its account of St. Paul by tracing the foundation of the Church in Antioch from the mother Church in Jerusalem as a result of the death of St. Stephen and the subsequent persecution, and by showing how that same Church of Antioch became the starting-point for St. Paul's missionary labours.

This view of the sources adopted by Wendt contrasts favourably with some of the extraordinary and complicated theories which from time to time have been advocated in Germany, more especially during the last few years.

As early as 1845 Schleiermacher's published lectures referred the authorship of the "We" sections not to Luke but to Timothy, and some two years before this E. M. Mayerhoff had suggested that the same hypothesis might be extended to all parts of Acts, not
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however without the opposition of Bleek and Ulrich, the former of whom supported Schleiermacher. But Schleiermacher's view of the part played by Timothy had already met with the strong opposition of Schneckenburger, 1841, and Swanbeck, 1847, attacked it by means of his own more complicated and more hazardous attempt to solve the sources of Acts. According to Swanbeck, the book is made up of a biography of Peter, a source containing the death of Stephen, a biography of Barnabas, the memoirs of Silas including the "We" sections. But the theory gained no acceptance, and most critics will probably agree with Lekebusch (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 188) that Swanbeck in his attempt to avoid the misleading theory as to Timothy involved himself in a still greater error by his advocacy of Silas.

For the Tübingen school the question of sources occupied a less important place than the question of "tendency," and more weight was attached to the imaginative power of the author than to the possibility of his possession of any reliable tradition; and consequently for a time the attempts to discriminate and estimate various sources sank into abeyance. It was, however, supposed by some critics that in the first part of Acts either a pentateuch source or an Hellenistic history of Stephen had been worked up (Zeller, Overbeck), or that some old πράξεις Παύλου formed a foundation for the narrative. Hilgenfeld (see also below) maintained the probable existence of this latter document, and Holsten thought that he could discover traces of a Judaistic source in the speeches of the first part of the book. B. Weiss, as long ago as 1854, had referred the speeches of St. Peter to a written source, but the speeches were closely connected with the historical episodes, and so in his *Einleitung*, 2nd and 3rd editions, Weiss has attempted to trace throughout the whole first part of the book, i.e., from i. 15-xv., a Jewish-Christian source, whilst Feine, 1891, has maintained that the Jewish-Christian source already employed in the third Gospel was also the source of the history of the Jerusalem Church in Acts i.-xii., and he gives, *u. s.*, p. 236 ff., many verbal likenesses between this source in St. Luke’s Gospel and in the earlier portion of Acts. Feine’s handling of the whole question is much more conservative than that of the other attempts to which allusion will be made, especially as he regards St. Luke as the author of the third Gospel and the Acts, and claims a high historical value for the episodes and speeches in the source.

But the interest in the hypothesis of a source or sources chiefly centres around the second rather than the first part of Acts. For here the "We" sections are concerned, and when the view was
once started that these sections, although not the work of St. Luke, were the work of an eye-witness (since their vividness and circumstantiality could not otherwise be accounted for), and so derived from a source, the whole question of the authorship of this source was revived, and the claims of Timothy, Silas, Titus, again found advocates; and not only so, but the further question was debated as to how far this source extended. Was it limited to the "We" sections only? But the view which prevailed (and which still prevails, cf., e.g., Holtzmann, Einleitung ², p. 393, and see above) makes Luke the author of the "We" sections, although not of the whole book, which was referred to the close of the first, and even to the second century. This latter date (amongst the supporters of which may be included H. Holtzmann, Pfeiderer, Jülicher (100-105), Weizsäcker, to say nothing of earlier critics, or of those mentioned below) finds no support in the general character of the book, and it depends upon other very precarious arguments, e.g., the dependency of the author upon Josephus. But if it cannot be substantiated, it is in itself fatal to the partition theories put forward by Van Manen (125-150), Clemen (60-140), and Jüngst (110-125).

With Van Manen we mark one of the earliest of the many complicated attempts, to which reference has been already made, in proof of the use of sources throughout the whole of Acts. According to him, Acta Petri and Acta Pauli form the two sources, of which the final redactor, writing about the middle of the second century, availed himself. In the Acta Pauli, H. Pa., which fill the second half of the canonical book of Acts, with the exception of xv. 1-33 and some other passages due to the reviser (although some of the incidents of these Acta which refer to Barnabas, Stephen, Paul, find a place in the first half of the book), a Gentile Christian, the first redactor, writing at the end of the first, or beginning of the second century, has embodied the Lucan Travel-Document, probably written by Luke himself, consisting of the "We" sections and the bare recital of one of Paul's voyages from Jerusalem to Rome. This document is, however, much revised, and according to it the Apostle travels to Rome not as a prisoner, but as a free man. The final redactor, moreover, seems to have forgotten that such a document had ever existed, and to have depended upon the Epistles of St. Paul and the notices of Josephus. The second source, Acta Petri, H. Pe., chaps. i.-xii., is of very small historical value; it was composed later than the Acta Pauli, and aimed at placing Peter on a level with Paul. It is not perhaps to be wondered at that Van Manen himself seems to hesitate about the exact details of his

In the same year, 1890, Sorof published his *Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*. He too has his two written sources. Of the first the physician Luke was the author; this source runs through the book, and has for its purpose to represent the missionary spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome, making prominent the figure of Paul. But this source was revised by another disciple of Paul, Timothy, who as the son of a Jewish mother stood nearer than Luke to Jewish-Christian interests. Timothy, to magnify Peter, introduced much legendary matter relating to him in the first portion of St. Luke’s account, and also revised and corrected the record of St. Paul’s missionary activity on the strength of his authorship of the “We” sections and his own eye-witness. (It is no wonder that Heitmüller, *u. s.*, p. 85, again welcomes this theory with qualified praise, and considers the division of the parts of the book assigned to Luke and Timothy as improbable, if not impossible.) Another attempt in the succeeding year by Spitta gained much more notice than that of Sorof. He also has his two sources—A, an older source including the “We” sections, probably the work of Paul’s companion, Luke: a very valuable and erudite source containing the speeches of the book (see references in commentary); and B, a secondary source, unhistorical, depending on popular traditions, with a great tendency to introduce miraculous embellishments. B is the work of a Jewish Christian who writes with a desire to magnify Peter by miracles which equal those of the great Gentile Apostle. Spitta has further to suppose that these two sources, the one Pauline-Lucan and the other Jewish-Christian, were combined by a Catholic-Christian redactor R, with some additions of his own. Here again Heitmüller, p. 91, sees no hope of a satisfactory solution of the problem under investigation, and can only wonder at the manner in which two sources of a directly opposite tendency can be so simply interwoven by the redactor; the part played by the latter is altogether unsatisfactory, as he does little else than effect this combination of the two sources, with an occasional interpolation of his own. Spitta’s attempt was also sharply criticised by Jülicher, *Einleitung*, p. 270, and by Von Soden, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 26, 1892, and its value will be seen by references in the commentary.

The most complicated of all these recent attempts at the
reconstruction of Acts is that of Dr. C. Clemen. His three chief sources (with which he closely connects other shorter sources, e.g., a source for vi. 1-6) are named (1) Historia Hellenistarum, H.H., vi. 9, 10, vii. 1-36, 35-58b, 59b, 71, viii. 1b, xi. 19-21, 24a, 26: this source Clemen regards as very old and trustworthy; (2) Historia Petri, H.Pe., consisting chiefly of i.-v., and of some passages inserted in H.H., viz., vi. 7, 8, 11-15, vii. 37, 60, viii. 2, viii. 4-13, 18-24, the account of Simon Magus; viii. 26-40, the conversion of the Ethiopian; (3) Historia Pauli, H.Pa., xiii. 1-xxviii. 30, 31, a source which may have originated in a diary kept by Luke on a journey to Rome called (4) Itinerarium Pauli, I.Pa., containing the "We" sections, and combined with (3) by the first of the three redactors. The first redactor is simply R., and to him are attributed other additions besides the "We" sections to the Historia Pauli, although no "tendency" can be assigned to him, cf., e.g., xiv. 8-18, xvi. 28-34, xvii. 19-33, the Athenian discourse, etc. The two other redactors are much more pronounced: one, Redactor Judaicus, R.J., writing 93-117 A.D., compiled and revised the above sources, making many additions, e.g., the miracles at Lydda and Joppa, ix. 23-43, and for the most part the Cornelius history, x. 1-xi. 18; xvi. 1-3, xxi. 20b-26, etc.; and finally, the third redactor, Redactor Antijudaicus, R.A., writing probably in the time of Hadrian, with the object of counterbalancing the wrong tendencies of his predecessor; to him we owe, before all, ix. 1-31, Paul’s conversion, xii. 1-25, xv. 5-12, 19, 23-33, 41, and additions to the speech at Miletus, xx. 19b, 25-35, 38a. Other instances will be found in the commentary of the manner in which the additions of "these two antipodes," R.J. and R.A., are given precisely by Clemen, even to parts of verses, and it is no unfriendly critic (Heitmüller, u. s., p. 128) who points out that of the five journeys of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts no less than four are referred by Clemen to his redactors, which is fatal to the historical character of these visits: ix. 26, R.A.; xi. 30, R.A.; xv. 1-33, R.J. and R.A.; and xviii. 22b, R.; the last journey, xxi., is found in the source H.Pa., and this according to Clemen is a journey identical with Gal. ii. 1. There is indeed no occasion to look to a conservative critic like Zöckler for a sharp criticism of the ingenious but purely subjective theory of Clemen; the latter’s immediate successor in the same attempt to split up Acts into its component parts not only describes Clemen’s theory as over-ingenious, but speaks of the somewhat mechanical way in which his Redactor Judaicus brings Paul into the synagogue, only to allow the Apostle to be at once expelled therefrom by the
Redactor Antijudaicus, Jüngst, *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 9. Whether we view it from its critical or from its chronological standpoint, Clemen’s theory has not gained favour in England; for the former, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 11, and for the latter, Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xxxviii. But further, it cannot be said that Jüngst’s own theory is likely to find wider acceptance than that of his predecessor. To say nothing of the difficulties of the date which he proposes, and his advocacy of St. Luke’s dependence on Josephus, in which he is at one with Clemen (see further below), we find ourselves, as in dealing with Spitta’s theory, face to face with two sources, A and B. The Paulinist of the second half of Acts is A, and the simplest and most natural view, according to Jüngst himself, is to identify this A with the beloved physician Luke, Col. iv. 14, Philem. ver. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 11, who was with Paul during his imprisonment at Cæsarea and Rome; B represents the Petrine-Jewish Christian mainly of the first half, but whose hand may be seen in xiii. 40 f., xv. ver. 13 ἀπεκρίθη to ver. 19 κρίνω, and in ver. 20 ἐπιστείλαι to αἷμα τοῦ, whose name and date remain unknown, and whose narrative is full of miraculous events and legendary stories. Jüngst’s redactor has an important part to play, and whilst on the one hand he advocates the abrogation of the Mosaic law (Jüngst does not hesitate to attribute to him ver. 39, xiii.), on the other hand he allows Paul to circumcise Timothy, xvi. 2, to undertake a Nazarite vow, xxi. 20b-26, and to acknowledge himself a Pharisee, xxi. 6. The redactor’s aim was to represent Christianity as a *religio licita*, and he thus endeavours to bring it by a conciliatory process into close connection with the Jewish religion. It would be difficult to find in the range of criticism anything more purely arbitrary than Jüngst’s arrangement of his sections chronologically, see Table, p. 225, at the end of his book (and notes in commentary), and the instances given above are sufficient to show how he does not hesitate to split up a verse amongst his various sources: we cannot be surprised that Clemen retorted upon him the charge of overingeniousness with which Jüngst had greeted Clemen’s own subtle endeavours.

In the same year as Jüngst’s publication, the veteran Hilgenfeld explained his own views of the sources of Acts, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1895, 1896, following partly the lines upon which he had previously worked twenty years before in his *Einleitung*, but also taking into account either adversely or with different degrees of agreement, the theories since propounded. According to him the sources are three in number: (1) πράξεις Πέτρου,
A, a Jewish-Christian source, i. 15-v. 42, describing the origin and development of the mother-Church; from it were also derived ix. 31-42, xi. 2, Cod. D, a passage relating a missionary circuit, xii. 1-23; (2) πράξεις τῶν ἑπτά, a Jewish-Christian document hellenised, commencing with vi. 1, and continuing to viii. 40, including the choice of the Seven, and describing what was known of two of them, St. Stephen and St. Philip; (3) πράξεις Παύλου: this C source commences with (vii. 58, viii. 1, 3) ix., and includes nearly the whole of that chapter, xi. 27-29, and the greater portion of xiii.-xxviii., with the "We" sections. But it will be noticed that, according to Hilgenfeld, we owe this source C probably to one of the early Christians of Antioch (xi. 28 D), and that it affords us a trustworthy account, and partly that of an eye-witness, of the missionary work of St. Paul begun at Antioch and spread over the heathen world. Each of the three sources is revised and added to by the "author to Theophilus," who as a unionist-Pauline makes it his chief aim to represent the origin of the Gentile Church as essentially dependent upon the mother-Church of Jerusalem, and Paul as in full agreement with the primitive Apostles, and as acting after the precedent of St. Peter; thus to C is referred the whole episode of Cornelius and the account of the Church in Antioch, x. 1-xl. 18 (except xl. 2 β text), xi. 19-26, 30, xii. 24, 25. Hilgenfeld is not only often greatly dependent upon the Western text (see below and in commentary), but it will be seen that the reference of large sections to his "author to Theophilus" is often quite arbitrary (cf. notes in comment.).

One more well-known name follows that of Hilgenfeld—the name of J. Weiss. In 1893, Studien und Kritiken, Weiss had already to some extent given in his adhesion to Spitta's theory, and had treated Clemen's redactors R.J. and R.A., one of whom always follows the other to undo the effects of his working, with little ceremony; but in opposition to Spitta he sees in i.-v. only source B, a strong Jewish-Christian document, and in this respect he approaches more nearly to B. Weiss and Feine, although he does not attach equal weight to the historical value of the document in question. Unlike Spitta, he refers the speech of Stephen (upon which Spitta so strongly insists) not to A, but to B. In 1897 J. Weiss admits only A as the source for the second half of Acts, except in some passages in which he cannot refrain from introducing a redactor, Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der A. G., 1897, p. 38. The view taken by J. Weiss certainly has the merit of appearing less complicated than that of Jüngst and Clemen.
Heitmüller, u. s., pp. 94, 139, highly commends the service rendered by J. Weiss in insisting upon the fact that, even if it is derived from sources, the book of Acts forms a whole, written with a definite purpose and aim, and it is no doubt true that the more we recognise this, the more readily shall we recognise parts or sources which are inconsistent with a unity of aim, whether we derive them from oral or written traditions. But what kind of man must the final reviser have been in that he was entirely unaware of the discrepancies and difficulties which the sharp eyes of modern critics have discovered, and allowed them to remain instead of dismissing or explaining them with a few strokes of his pen? Or if he was so skilful as to be able to combine together sources often so unlike, how is it that he was notwithstanding so unskilful as to leave such patent and glaring discrepancies? And if the final revision took place in the second century, how is it that we have no colouring, not even in the speeches, of second-century ideas? (See especially Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 10.) In other respects it will be noticed that these theories, far from possessing even the recommendation of novelty, are nothing but a rehabilitation of the exploded "tendency" theories of Baur and Zeller, or of the discredited "parallelism" between Peter and Paul (see above); in numberless cases one critic flatly contradicts another in the details of his confident partition of sources into verses, or even portions of verses. At the same time hardly any of the writers in question seem able to separate themselves entirely from the traditional view that Luke, the companion of Paul, was more or less concerned in the composition of the book, which, as we believe, is so justly ascribed to him.

Before we pass from this question of sources, a few words must be said as to the alleged dependence of St. Luke upon Josephus. A century and a half ago points of contact between the two historians were collected by Ott and Krebs (see Wendt, u. s., p. 36, and Krenkel, Josephus und Lucas, p. 1). But only in comparatively recent times has the question been seriously discussed as to whether the author of the third Gospel and of Acts was dependent in a literary sense upon Josephus. At the outset it is well to bear in mind that both men were historians, writing at the same period, and often of necessity referring to the same events. A certain amount, therefore, of parallel description and even of similarity of diction might fairly be expected. But that the author of Acts often showed a know-

1 Amongst recent critics who have rejected the idea of St. Luke's dependence on Josephus may be mentioned Reuss, Schürer, Gloël, Harnack, Belser, Bousset, and in England, Salmon, Sanday, Plummer (in his review of the latter's St. Luke J. Weiss, however, now inclines to the opposite view).
ledge of independent tradition is admitted even by those who main-
tain the dependence in question; see, e.g., Krenkel, u. s., p. 207, 
Clemen, Die Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe, p. 68 (see further 
in commentary, v. 36, xii. 19, xxi. 38, and Zahn’s instances of this 
independent knowledge of events and persons, Einleitung, ii., p. 416).

But more extraordinary than the variations of certainty and 
uncertainty in these critics is the position taken up by Wendt in his 
latest edition (1899) of Meyer’s Commentary. In his former edition 
(1888) he maintained that the points of contact between Josephus 
and Luke were too general in their character to justify the notion 
of literary dependence, and that the author of Acts would naturally 
possess independent knowledge of contemporary events and person-
alisities, and he still admits this general similarity and the want of 
proof in many of the dependencies alleged by Krenkel in his lengthy 
examination of the question: e.g., the fact that both writers speak of 
Porcius Festus as the διάδοχος of Felix is no proof of literary 
dependence (Acts xxiv. 27, Jos., Ant., xx., 8, 9). But Wendt 
fastens on the one passage, v. 36, cf. Jos., Ant., xx., 5, 1, as proving 
a real dependence (see notes in commentary), and argues that if this 
is so, the same dependence may be naturally expected in other 
places. Thus, in what appears to be quite an arbitrary manner, he 
asserts that some notices in Acts are dependent upon Josephus, 
whilst some may be taken by the author of the book out of his own 
chief source, e.g., the account of the Egyptian, xxi. 38, and of the 
high priest Ananias, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1, etc. But having said all this, 
Wendt proceeds to point out that we must not measure too highly 
the influence of Josephus on Acts; even the passage v. 36, in 
which that influence is most marked, proves to us at the same time 
the nature of the influence in question: it did not consist in an 
exact familiarity with the words of Josephus, and in a careful 
employment of his material, but in a superficial reminiscence of an 
earlier reading of the Jewish historian; thus the deviations side by 
side with the likenesses are explained. But the most conservative 
critic might allow as much as this.

Wendt further admits that this dependence cannot extend to the 
later works of Josephus, c. Apion. and his Vita. This last work, 
which must have been written after the year 100 A.D. (see “Josephus” 
(Edersheim), Dict. of Chr. Biog., iii., p. 448), contains the expression, 
c. 29, θαυμάζω μία, ει διακρινω ἐστιν, οὐ παραποτώμαι, and Krenkel maintains 
that there is a clear trace of dependence upon this in the words 
used in Acts xxiv. 11 (pp. 255, 256, so Holtzmann and Steck). But 
in the first place the supposed dependency is not admitted by Wendt,
and not only may parallels be found to a similar use of the verb
παραιτούμαι in other Greek writers (Wetstein), but it is also notice-
able that in the same speech of St. Paul Krenkel discovers, xxv. ver.
9, what he calls "the most striking reference" to the language of
Josephus in the phrase χάριτα, χάριν κατατίθεσθαι τινι (cf. also xxiv.
27, Jos., B.f., vi., 3, and commentary, in loco). But the phrase
is distinctly classical, cf. Thuc., i., 33, 138, and if Josephus was
acquainted with Thucydides (see Kennedy, Sources of N.T. Greek,
1895.)

But what can we think of these supposed dependencies upon
a book of Josephus written in the early years of the second
century, when we read further that St. Paul's account of his
dream, xxiii. 11, is modelled upon the dream in Josephus,
Vita, 42? In the former passage we read σε δει και εις Ρώμην
μαρτυρήσαι, and in the latter δι καλ Ρωμαίος δει σε πολεμήσαι, in
each case the dream takes place in the night, and in each case
some one stood over the dreamer (ἐπιστάς) (see Bousset's review of
Krenkel, Theol. Literaturzeitung, p. 392, 1895, No. 15). The alleged
similarity between the introduction to the third Gospel and the
Acts, and the introduction to the Ant. of Josephus and to his
book, c. Apionem, is of the slightest when compared with the
likeness between the language of St. Luke in his preface to his
Gospel and the introduction of Dioscorides of Anazarbus to his
Materia Medica, cf. Bousset, u. s., Vogel, Zur Charakteristik des
Lukas, p. 17, and J. Weiss, Meyer's Commentary, Evangelium des
Lukas, p. 286; indeed much more might be said for an imitation by
St. Luke in his preface of the introduction to the history of Thucydides
(cf. Belser, u. s., pp. 642, 658, 659, etc.). It would have been
very advantageous if Krenkel in his long list of words common to
Josephus and Luke, p. 304 ff., had not only given us references in
classical writers to the use of the words which he adduces (e.g.,
the phrase πυρέτος συνέχεσθαι, Luke iv. 38, Ant., xiii., 15, 5, finds
frequent parallels in Plato and Thucydides), but also to the authors
whose books form the Apocrypha, and especially to 1 Macc. and 2
Macc. It is also noteworthy that no mention whatever is made of
Polybius (Zahn, u. s., p. 414). The whole list requires revision, and
it is preposterous to class amongst literary dependencies technical
terms like ἀνθύπατος, κολωνία, νεμικός, ναύκληρος, συκάριος, στρατάρχης,
tετραρχῆς, τετραρχῶν, or ordinary words which since Homer had been
common to all Greek literature, e.g., ἐκεῖνος, μοῖχος, πλοῦς, παροίχομαι,
παραπλέω. So far as language is concerned, what is more improbable,
as Zahn points out, than that the man who wrote Luke i. 1-4 should go to school and learn from Josephus? (Cf. C. Apion., i., 9; Ant., xx., 12.) But again what can we expect from an author who can find a parallel between Luke ii. 42 and Jos., Vita, 2? (See Gloél, Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes, p. 65.) The "We" sections equally with the other parts of the book contain many points of contact with Josephus, and Krenkel is somewhat puzzled to explain this, p. 281; but when we consider that Josephus has given us a long description of his own voyage to Rome, and of his shipwreck on the way, Vita, 3, it was only to be expected that similar nautical terms would be found in the two narratives, and some similarity of description, and the two accounts help to show us how easily and naturally two writers narrating the same experiences would express themselves in the same style and language.

But this question of the author's relation to Josephus is also important in its bearing upon the date of Acts. The Antiquities of Josephus are placed at 93, 94 A.D., and if it could be proved that traces of dependence on the Jewish historian may be found in the third Gospel, those who maintain that a considerable period of time elapsed between the writing of that book and of Acts would be obliged to place the latter work some few years later still. But here again we may see the uncertainty which prevails when conclusions are built upon such data. Wendt (p. 40) can find no sure traces of any acquaintance with Josephus in the third Gospel, and so he inclines to date Acts in the interval between 95 and 100 A.D. (although he admits the possibility of a later date still). But 95, 96 A.D. would place the book under Domitian, and the question arises as to whether it can be said with any certainty that Acts was composed at a time when the Christians had gone through such a period of persecution as marked the close of that emperor's reign. Harnack decides without hesitation in the negative, Chron., i., pp. 248-250, and whilst he gives 93 as the terminus ad quem, it is satisfactory to find that he holds that the book may have been composed between 80 and 93 A.D. The limit which he thus fixes Harnack regards as in approximate agreement with his other argument (see above) against the later date of Acts, vis., its non-use of St. Paul's Epistles, a fact which alone would prevent us from dating the book in the second century (p. 249). So far as date is concerned, Ramsay would seem to occupy to some extent the same position, at least approximately, for he maintains that the book could not possibly have been written as late as the reign of Trajan, when the Church had long suffered persecution from the State, or even by
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a writer who had passed through the reign of Domitian, *St. Paul*, p. 387, and he dates its publication in the year immediately following 81 A.D., *i.e.*, in the early years of Domitian. But whilst Harnack's language might be employed by one who even dated the book before the persecution of Nero, Ramsay maintains that there runs through the entire work a purpose which could hardly have been conceived before the State had begun to persecute on political grounds (p. 388). But when did this kind of persecution begin? The evidence for the origin of a definite State policy against the Christians points presumably to Nero, and not to Vespasian, *cf.* Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Government*, p. 80 (1890), Mommsen's letter, *Expositor*, July, 1893, Hort, *First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 3, Pullan, *Early Christianity*, p. 106 ff., 1898. Professor Ramsay speaks of the Flavian policy as declaring Christianity illegal and proscribing the Name, but the first of the three Flavian emperors was Vespasian, and there is no positive evidence to refer the adoption of a definite State policy against the new religion to him (*cf.* Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 256).

But if, from this point of view, there is nothing in the book itself to militate against an earlier date even than that mentioned by Ramsay and Harnack, are we justified in placing it, with Blass, before the fall of Jerusalem? Blass indeed would place it as early as 57-59 A.D., following St. Jerome, and the Gospel in 56, *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, p. lxxix., *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 33 ff. But however this may be, Blass has done invaluable service by pointing out that there is nothing in St. Luke's words, Luke xxi. 20 ff., which can give colour to the theory which regards them as a mere *vaticinium post eventum*, by showing that Daniel ix. 36 ff. already contained much which Luke is alleged to have added from his own knowledge of events already fulfilled, and by adding from modern history at least one remarkable prophecy and its fulfilment. Savonarola foretold as early as 1496 the capture of Rome, which happened in 1527, and he did this not merely in general terms but in detail; his words were realised to the letter when the sacred Churches of St. Peter and St. Paul became, as the prophet had foretold, stables for the conquerors' horses. The difficulties of foreseeing this capture of the Holy City at all by an army which would not have refrained from such an act of sacrilege is vividly depicted by Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 42 ff.1

1 *Cf.* *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, p. viii., where he adds: "Major utique Christus propheta quam Savonarola; hujus autem vaticinium longe difficiliorium fuit quam illius; nam hostis Romanus praevidi poterat, exercitus Lutheranus non poterat".
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But if on other grounds, e.g., on account of the prologue to St. Luke's Gospel (Harnack, u. s., p. 248, Sanday, B. L., p. 278, Page, Acts, p. xviii.), we are asked to place that book after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is further maintained by Harnack that some considerable interval must have elapsed after that event before Acts was written; for if it had been composed immediately after the destruction, the writer would have mentioned it as useful for his aim; and so the book must have been composed at a time, c. 80, when the overthrow of the Holy City no longer stood, as it were, in the foreground of events. But it may be doubted if this is a very convincing argument, for the Epistle of Barnabas, written, as Harnack holds, between the wide limits of 80 and 132 A.D., does refer to the destruction, and for the writer of this Epistle equally as for the writer of Acts the event would have been a fait accompli. It is doubtful whether, in fact, anything can be gained as to the fixture of date from this omission of any reference to the fate of the Holy City; if anything, the omission would point to the years before the destruction for the composition of the book, as Harnack himself allows, if we were not obliged, according to the same writer, by the date of the Gospel to place Acts also after the overthrow. Both in England and in Germany representative writers can be named in support of the earlier and of the later date, Dr. Salmon maintaining that Acts was written a little more than two years after St. Luke's arrival in Rome (cf. also Rackham, Journal of Theol. Studies, i., p. 77), whilst Dr. Sanday would apparently place Acts about 80 A.D., and the Gospel 75-80, B. L., p. 279, so too Dr. Plummer, St. Luke, p. xxxi., both being influenced to a great extent by the presumption that the Gospel followed the fall of Jerusalem. In this the English critics are in interesting agreement with Zahn in his recent volume, Einleitung, ii., pp. 433, 434, so far as date is concerned, in that he too regards 80 A.D. as the terminus ad quem for both Gospel and Acts, assigning them probably to 75 A.D., but unable to find a place for them before the fall of Jerusalem.¹

¹ Sir J. Hawkins in his valuable Hora Synoptica, p. 143, has recently drawn attention to the difference of vocabulary between the third Gospel and Acts, and whilst maintaining that it is quite insufficient to destroy the argument for the identity of authorship, he thinks that it points to a considerable lapse of time between the two works. But we are dealing with a versatile author acquainted apparently with many writers, Vogel, Zur Charakteristik des Lucas nach Sprache und Stil, pp. 15, 17, 38, and the differences in question cannot have weighed with Blass, inasmuch as he places the completion of Acts three years after the Gospel, and still less with Zahn, who still maintains that the two books were published
It would appear then that the date of Acts must be determined to a great extent by the date assigned to the third Gospel; and this apparently was the view of Bishop Lightfoot (cf. Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. xix., and Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 163, 2nd edit.), inasmuch as he leaves the question of the date of Acts undetermined, and refers for its solution to the date assigned to St. Luke's Gospel; although it should be noted that he does not attach any weight to the argument which finds in Luke xxii. 20-24 a proof that the Gospel was written after Jerusalem had fallen (cf. also Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., p. 30, and Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 40, for various dates).

As in the case of the Gospel, so in that of the Acts, it is impossible to say at what place it was written. The traditional view since the days of St. Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.*, 7, has favoured Rome (although elsewhere Jerome refers the writing of the Gospel to parts of Achaea and Boeotia, *Praef. to Comm. in Matt.*), cf. Schneckenburger, Lekebusch, Godet, Felten, Blass, amongst others (Wendt, 1899, although rejecting the traditional account of St. Jerome, adds that he knows of no decisive grounds against Rome, p. 40). Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 393, 429, in supporting the claims of Rome argues for the probability that St. Luke, like many medical men at the time, would be likely to find in Rome a good field for his professional work. Achaia, Macedonia, Asia Minor, Alexandria have all been mentioned, and Lightfoot also mentions Philippi. Pfleiderer has supported Ephesus on the ground that the writer manifests a special interest in that city, whilst Zöckler thinks that something may be said for Antioch in Syria, owing to St. Luke's traditional connection with the place, *Eus.*, H. E., iii., 4; Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.*, 7, cf. Acts xi. 28, D., if there was the slightest ground for supposing that Luke at the period when the book was written had any residence in the Syrian town. On the whole it seems best with Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 42; Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 40; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 337, 439, to leave the locality undetermined; see especially the latter as to the bearing on the question of the mention of insignificant places such as Tres Tabernæ, Appii Forum, in the

in the same year, 75. It is remarkable no doubt that *τε* is used so often in Acts in all parts of the book: nevertheless it occurs also in the third Gospel nine or ten times, but in St. Mark not at all, and in St. Matthew and St. John only three times in each; *μὲν οὖν*, although no doubt frequent in Acts, does not occur at all in St. Matthew and St. Mark, although it is found once in St. Luke, iii. 18 (twice in St. John); and *καὶ αὐτός*, although occurring very frequently in the third Gospel, is not dropped in Acts, although proportionately it is rarely found (eight times).
neighbourhood of Rome, and on the evident ignorance of Theophilus as to the localities of Palestine, and apparently also in some respects, and in comparison with the author, of Macedonia and Greece (cf. xvi. 12; xvii. 19, 21).

If we turn to external testimony in favour of the book we find it full and satisfactory (cf. Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, 2nd edit., p. 160, Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 26, and Gore on the points of contact between the earlier chapters and the Didache; see Church and the Ministry, p. 416). To Wendt in his latest edition, p. 41 (1899), we again owe much that is of value, both in what he allows, and in what he declines to recognise. One very important point calls for determination at the outset. The likeness between the language of Acts xiii. 22 and Clem. Rom., Cor., xviii., 1, in relation to Ps. lxxxviii. 20 (LXX) cannot, as both Clemen and Wendt admit, be accidental. Indeed Wendt is of opinion that it is no more probable that Clement depends upon Acts than Acts upon Clement, while at the same time he holds that a third alternative is possible, viz., that both writings may be dependent on some common third source. But there is no evidence forthcoming as to the existence of this common source, and Lightfoot rightly presses the significance of the threefold coincidence between the language of Acts and Clement, which cannot easily be explained away (u. s., p. 120).

In Acts we have three features introduced which are not found in the original of the Psalm, viz., the mention of the "witness," and the addition (a) of "a man after my heart," cf. 1 Sam. xiii. 14, and (b) of "the son of Jesse," but all these are also found in the passage in St. Clement. So again Wendt with many other critics would explain the words ἡδίον διδόντες ἡ λαμβάνοντες, Clem. Rom., Cor., ii., 1, cf. Acts xx. 35, not by dependence upon Acts, but by a common tradition of the words of the Lord. But Wendt admits, although very guardedly, the use of Acts in Polycarp, Phil., i., 2, cf. Acts ii. 34, Ignat., Ad Smyrn., 3, Acts x. 41, and he does not deny the connection between Ignat., Ad Magn., 5, and Acts i. 25, whilst he admits that in Justin Martyr the references become more clear and frequent (see, for a full and good estimate of the references to Ignatius and Polycarp, Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 26).

But it is most important to observe that Wendt fully recognises the influence of the Canonical Acts upon the Apocryphal Acts of the second century, although he points out that of this literature we only possess a small portion, and he expects great things from the recently discovered fragments of the Acta Pauli of the middle of

Space forbids us to enter into the many vexed questions which surround the chronology of Acts, but an attempt is made to discuss some of them in the pages of the commentary. A glance at the various tables given us in Meyer-Wendt (1888), p. 31, or in Farrar's *St. Paul*, ii., p. 624, is enough in itself to show us the number and complexity of the problems raised. But fresh interest has been aroused not only by Professor Ramsay, but by the recent return of Harnack and O. Holtzmann (cf. also McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 359; Blass, *Proleg.*, p. 22) to the earlier chronology of Eusebius (although O. Holtzmann does not mention him, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 128, 132), formerly advocated by Bengel. According to Eusebius the recall of Felix must be dated between October 55 and 56. Harnack places the entry of Festus upon office in the summer of 56, since Paul embarks for Rome some few months after the arrival of Festus in the autumn, *Chron.*, i., p. 237. The
Apostle would thus arrive in Rome in the spring of 57, and his release follows in 59. (O. Holtzmann from other data places the arrival of Festus in Palestine in the summer of 55, and both he and McGiffert place Paul's arrival in Rome in 56, and his imprisonment 56-58.)

This chronology has been severely criticised by Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 57 (1899), and it fails to commend itself to Ramsay, *Expositor*, March, 1897, as also more recently to Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 626. It has been objected to it, *inter alia*, that its supporters, or at all events Harnack and O. Holtzmann, place the conversion of Paul so soon after the death of our Lord that it is doubtful whether sufficient time is allowed for the events recorded in Acts i.-vi. (cf. xxvi. 10), although Holtzmann, p. 133, sees no difficulty in placing the conversion in 29, the date of the death of Jesus, as the events in Acts i.-viii. in his view follow quickly upon one another. (Ramsay thinks that the interval before Stephen's murder was short, but he allows two and a half or three years for the event after the great Pentecost; see notes in commentary for the difficulties connected with the martyrdom.) Harnack places the date of the conversion in 30, *i.e.*, according to him, either in the year following, or in the year of, the death of Jesus. On the other hand the chronology in question allows some considerable time for Paul's release from his first captivity (a release admitted by Harnack and Spitta, as earlier by Renan), and for his subsequent journeys east and west, if Mr. Turner, "Chronology," Hastings’ B.D., i., 420, is right in placing the death of both Peter and Paul in 64-65 (Harnack placing the death of St. Paul in 64 and of St. Peter in 67, Eusebius, however (so Blass), from whom Harnack here departs, placing the former event in 67 (68)). The received chronology, making 60, 61, the date for the arrival of Festus in Judæa, allows but little interval between the close of St. Paul's first imprisonment and his death, if his martyrdom was in 64. The difficulty is met by Mr. Turner, *u. s.*, p. 421, by assigning 58 (Ramsay 59) as the precise year for the accession of Festus to office, placing the close of the Acts, after the two years' captivity in Rome, early in 61, and so allowing an interval of three years between St. Paul's first and second imprisonment. Unfortunately it must be admitted that we cannot positively fix 58 as the year for the event in question, and this uncertainty sadly interferes with the adoption of any precise chronology for Acts, although on all sides the importance of the date of Festus' arrival is recognised—"the crucial date," Mr. Turner calls it; all depends upon ascertaining it, says Harnack (cf. also Wendt, *u. s.*, p. 56;
If we adopt Mr. Turner's date for Festus—a date intermediate between the earlier and later dates assigned above—and work back, we get 56 as the date for St. Paul's arrest in Jerusalem and imprisonment in Caesarea, 55 for his leaving Ephesus, 52 for the commencement of his third missionary journey (for he stayed at Ephesus considerably over two years; Lewin, Fasti Sacri, p. 310, says three), 50 for his reaching Corinth (late in the year), where he sojourned eighteen months, 49 for Council at Jerusalem and second missionary journey. But if we identify the Council at Jerusalem, Acts xv., with the second visit to Jerusalem according to Gal. ii. 1, but the third visit according to Acts, the question arises as to whether the notices in Gal. i. 18 and ii. 1 involve seventeen years as an interval between the Conversion and the Council (with Lightfoot, Harnack, Zahn), or whether the fourteen years, Gal. ii. 1, should be reckoned from the Conversion, i.e., eleven years from the first visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem, including the three in the fourteen (with Ramsay, Turner, McGiffert).

Against the former view Mr. Turner urges the objection that in this case the first visit to Jerusalem would be carried back to 35-36, whereas in all probability Aretas was not ethnarch of Damascus until 37 (2 Cor. xi. 32, Acts ix. 25, 26; see commentary), and he therefore includes the three years in the fourteen, and thus gets 35-36 for the conversion, and 38 (under Aretas) for the first visit. As Mr. Turner places the Crucifixion 29 A.D., his scheme is thus free from the objection referred to above as against Harnack and O. Holtzmann, since it allows some six or seven years for the events in the early chapters of Acts (see further on the whole question of chronology Mr. Turner's full and valuable article already mentioned; Zahn, u. s., ii.; Excursus, ii.; Professor Ramsay, "Pauline Chronology," Expositor, March, 1897; Professor Bacon (Yale), "Criticism of the New Chron. of Paul," Expositor, February, 1898; Wendt, u. s. (1899), p. 53 ff.; Biblical World, November, 1897; Mr. Vernon Bartlet's article on "Pauline Hist.

1 But Professor Ramsay, it must be remembered, identifies Gal. ii. with Acts xi. 30, xii. 25 (see notes in commentary), and an interval of fourteen years between St. Paul's conversion and the famine would be more probable than an interval of seventeen, which would throw the conversion back too early, and Dr. McGiffert identifies the accounts of both visits in Acts xi. and xv.—the former for famine relief and the latter for the settlement of the controversy with the Judaisers—with the visit mentioned in Gal. ii. 1, Apostolic Age, p. 208.
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and Chron.," Expositor, October, 1899, written too late for more than a brief mention here, as also Professor Bacon's more recent contribution, Expositor, November, 1899).

But although there are so many points of contact between secular history and the Acts, it seems that we must still be content with what Harnack describes as a relative rather than an absolute Chronology. We cannot say, e.g., that we can fix precisely the date of the famine, or the edict of Claudius, or the proconsulship of Gallio, or the reign of Aretas, to take the four events mentioned by Lightfoot, "Acts," B.D.² i., p. 4, as also by Harnack, Chron., i., p. 236, cf. Zahn, u. s., ii.; Excursus ii. But in this respect no blame attaches to St. Luke as an historian. His object was to connect the history of the rise and progress of the Christian Faith with the course of general imperial history around him, and if his chronological sense seems deficient to modern judgment, it was a deficiency in which he was by no means peculiar, but which he shared with his contemporaries and his age, cf. Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 18, 23, and Was Christ born at Bethlehem? pp. 204, 256.

STATE OF THE TEXT. It is not too much to say that during the last fifteen years chief interest has centred around the Western text and its relative importance (cf. Blass, Studien und Kritiken, p. 86 ff., 1894; Acta Apostolorum, 1895, and Acta Apostolorum, 1896, also Evangelium secundum Lucam, 1897, both edited secundum formam quae videtur Romanam; see also Dräseke, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 192 ff., 1894).¹

Codex D, its most important representative, contains an unusually large number of variations from the received text in Acts (see for the number Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, 2nd edit., p. 165; he reckons, e.g., some 410 additions or interpolations), and it is no wonder that attempts should have been made to account for this diversity. Bornemann's endeavour some half-century ago (1848) to represent D as the original text, and the omissions in the common text as due to the negligence or ignorance of copyists, found no acceptance, and whilst in one sense Blass may be said to have returned to the position of Bornemann, he has nevertheless found his predecessor's solution totally inadequate, Philology of the Gospels, p. 105. Joannes Clericus, Jean Leclerc, the Dutch philologist (born 1657), had already suggested that St. Luke had made two

¹ The main division of MSS. of Acts into three groups, with references to W. H. and Blass, is well given in Old Latin Biblical Texts, iv., pp. xvii., xviii. (H. J. White, Oxon., 1897).
editions of Acts, and is said by Semler to have published his opinion, although under an assumed name (Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 348; see also on the same page Zahn's interesting acknowledgment that he was himself in 1885-6 working on much the same lines as Blass). Meanwhile Tisch., W. H., B. Weiss have sought to establish the text of Acts essentially on the basis of НеABC, and it was left for Blass to startle the world of textual criticism by boldly claiming a fresh originality for Codex D. But this originality was not exclusive; St. Luke has given us two originals, first a rough copy β, R(omana), in Blass, and then a fair copy α, and А(ntiochena), for the use of Theophilus; the rough copy remained in Rome and became the foundation of the Western text, copies of it having reached Syria and Egypt in the second century, while the latter abridged by Luke reached Theophilus in Antioch (so Blass), and was thence propagated in the East.¹

But Codex D is by no means the sole witness, although a very weighty one, upon which Blass depends for his β text. He derives help from Codex E (Laudianus), from the minuscule 137 (M) in Milan, especially for the last chapters in which D is deficient, and in some passages also from Codex Ephraem, C; from the Philoxenian Syriac version with the marginal annotations of Thomas Harkel (unfortunately we have no Old Syriac text as for the Gospels), the Sahidic version, the Latin text in D, d, and E, e, the Fleury palimpsest (Samuel Berger, 1889), Flor. in Blass; the so-called "Gigas" Latin version in Stockholm (Belsheim, 1879), Gig. in Blass; the Codex Parisinus, 321 (S. Berger, 1895), Par. in Blass; a Latin version of the N.T., fifteenth century, in Wernigerode, Wernig., w., in Blass, and a Latin version of the thirteenth century, "in linguam provinciae Gallicae Romanæ factam," Prov. in Blass.²

In addition to these MSS. and versions Blass also appeals to the

¹ On the difference between the circulation of the two copies in the case of the third Gospel see Philology of the Gospels, p. 103. In England Bishop Lightfoot had previously conjectured that the Evangelist might himself have issued two separate editions of both Gospel and Acts, On a Fresh Revision of the N.T., p. 29. For similar instances of the issue of a double edition in classical and other literature see Drâsêke, u. s., p. 194; Zöckler, Greifswalder Studien, p. 132, and Blass, Proleg., p. 32.

² To these may be added fragments of an old Latin translation of Acts in the Anonymi de prophetis et prophetiis containing six passages, notably Acts xi. 27, 28, in agreement with Codex D, cf. Miscellanea Cassinense, 1897, and Harnack, Theol. Literaturzeitung, p. 171, No. 6, 1898; the Greek Codex Athous, derived according to Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 250, from an old and very valuable original, and taken into some account by Hilgenfeld, Acta Apostolorum, p. ix. (1899), and cf.
text employed by Irenæus, which contains many resemblances to D; to the text of St. Cyprian, which shows the same peculiarity; to the text of St. Augustine, especially in his treatises against the Manicheans, containing Acts i.-ii. 13, x. 13, 15, parts which are not found in the Fleury palimpsest: cf. also Tertullian, whose text, although it contains few quotations from Acts, resembles that of Irenæus (add to these the work De promissionibus et prædicationibus Dei, referred, but wrongly, to Prosper, Prom. in Blass; and the Contra Varimum of Vigilius, Vigil. in Blass: works not valued so highly by Hilgenfeld in his list of authorities for the Western text, Acta Apostolorum, p. xiii., 1899). By these aids Blass constructs his text, even for those portions where D is wanting, viz., from viii. 29, πρόσελθε to x. 14, ἔφαγον; from xxi. 2, ἐπιβάντες to ver. 10, ἀπὸ τῆς; xxi. 10, ἐν τέτακται to ver. 20, συνενδοκών, and from xxii. 29, οἱ μαλακτες to the end of the book, and his aim is to restore the Western text as it existed about the time of Cyprian, cf. Evangelium secundum Lucam, p. xxxi. The merit of his work in showing how widespread and interesting was the Western form of text is acknowledged even by those who do not accept his conclusions, see, e.g., Wendt, Apostelgeschichte (1899), p. 46, and Bousset, Theol. Rundschau, p. 413, 1898, although both object that Blass does not rightly estimate his different witnesses.

But Blass is able to refer in support of his use of some of the authorities mentioned to the important investigation of Dr. P. Corssen in his Der Cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum, 26 pp., 1892. This Latin text carries us back at least to the middle of the third century (and earlier still according to Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 53 ff., who thinks that the text might be called Tertullianic equally as well as Cyprianic; but see on the other hand Blass, Acta Apost., edit. m., p. xxxi.), as Corssen shows by comparing the readings of the Fleury palimpsest (sixth century) (1) with St. Cyprian’s quotations from Acts, (2) with similar quotations in the works of St. Augustine referred to above, De Actis cum Felice Manichaeo and Contra epistolam Manichaei, (3) with the quotations in the work mentioned above as that of Prosper (Harris, u. s., p. 53). Behind these various texts Corssen concludes that there was a common Latin primitive, i.e., the Cyprian text, as he calls it. Moreover, this Cyprian text is a Western witness superior in value.

Acts xv. 20, 29. Hilgenfeld also adds to the Latin versions, Codex Vindobonensis s. (probably sixth century), cf. xxviii. 20, and see Old Latin Biblical Texts, iv. (H. J. White, Oxon., 1897).
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even to the Greek of Codex Bezae, since it has in Corssen’s opinion an internal unity and sequence wanting in the latter, although it agrees in many peculiarities with the Greek of that Codex (Harris, u. s., p. 53; Salmon, Introd., p. 594). Corssen thus helps materially to prove the antiquity of the Western Latin.

But Dr. Blass further acknowledges that Corssen has done most valuable service in proving the composite nature of Codex D, and that in it we have not β in its purity, but in a state of frequent mixture and conflation with α. Whilst, however, Blass regards the β text as the older, Corssen regards α in that light, and β as revealing the character of a later revision (Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, pp. 433, 436, 446: 1896); in β he somewhat strangely maintains that we have the hand of a Montanist reviser at work (cf. Blass’s strictures, Evang. secundum Lucam, p. xxiv. ff.), a theory formerly adopted by Professor Harris, but afterwards abandoned by him.

But how far do the variations between the two forms of text justify the hypothesis of Blass that both may be referred to one author, β as the primary, α as the secondary text?

In the apparatus criticus of the following pages, in which the variations for the most part in the two texts are stated and examined, it cannot be claimed for a moment that any definite conclusion is reached, simply because the matter is one which may be said to call for suspension of judgment. Certainly there are many difficulties in the way of accepting the theory of Blass in its entirety. There are passages, e.g., of which it may be said that the more detailed form is the original, which was afterwards shortened, while it may be maintained often with equal force that the shortened form may well have been the original; there are passages where a local knowledge or an exact knowledge of circumstances is shown, e.g., xii. 10, xix. 9, xx. 15, xxi. 1, but such passages do not prove the priority of the β text, for if both α and β are referred to the same author, the same hand which omitted in a revision could also have added, although such instances may be cited for the originality of the β text in comparison with α (see notes in loco for each passage). To these may be added the famous addition in xi. 28 (see in loco), which Blass makes the starting-point for his inquiry, and to which Hilgenfeld, Zahn, Zöckler, Salmon, as against Harnack and B. Weiss, attach so much importance. There are again other passages in which it may be

1 Blass still maintains, as against Corssen, that the language of the additions, and generally in the variants of β, is Lucan, Philology of the Gospels, p. 113 ff., and Evangelium secundum Lucam, p. xxvii. ff.
maintained that if $\alpha$ is original we can understand the smoothness of $\beta$, but not \textit{vice versa}, and it must always be remembered that this love of paraphrase and simplification has been urged on high authority as a marked characteristic of the Western readings in general, cf. W. H., p. 122 ff., and B. Weiss, \textit{Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte}, pp. 52, 105: 1897. There are, moreover, other passages in which Blass seems to assimilate $\alpha$ and $\beta$, although the witnesses would differentiate them, cf. v. 28, 34, xv. 33, or in which there is a manifest blunder, not only in D but in other Western witnesses, which Blass corrects by $\alpha$, although such blunders really belong to the $\beta$ text, cf. v. 31, xiii. 48, xv. 15. There are cases in which D affords weighty support to readings otherwise testified to only by B, e.g., xix. 8, xxi. 25, or only by $\mathfrak{N}$, cf. ii. 20 (Wendt).

But a careful consideration of the whole of the instances justifies the attachment of far greater importance to the Western text than formerly (cf., e.g., Holtzmann's review of Blass's edit. min. of Acts, \textit{Theol. Literaturzeitung}, p. 350, 1897, No. 13), and goes some way to break down the former prejudice against Codex Bezae: not only is it allowed that one revising hand of the second century may be the main source of the most important readings, but that these readings may contain original elements, since they must be based upon a text which carries us back very near to the date of the composition of the book of Acts (Wendt, \textit{u.s.}, p. 52; Bousset, \textit{Theol. Rundschau}, p. 414, 1898). The same tendency to attach more importance to the Western text is observable in Professor Ramsay, for although he regards the most vivid additions of the Western text in Acts as for the most part nothing but a second-century commentary, and while he refuses to introduce xi. 27, 28, D, into his own text, yet he speaks of the high value of D in that it preserves with corruptions a second-century witness to the text, and he places the home of the revision on the line of intercourse between the Syrian Antioch and Ephesus, arguing from xi. 28 that the reviser was acquainted with Antioch (\textit{Church in the Roman Empire}, p. 151; \textit{St. Paul}, p. 27, and review of Professor Blass, \textit{Expositor}, 1895, and cf. Zöckler, \textit{Greifswalder Studien}, pp. 131, 140).

On the other hand the most thorough advocates of Dr. Blass's theory support his view of the priority and originality of $\beta$ by reference to three classes of passages: (1) those in which the later $\alpha$ has abbreviated the reading of $\beta$, cf. iii. 1, iv. 1, 3, 24, 32, vii. 29, ix. 5-8, x. 23, xi. 2, xiv. 1-20, xvi. 19, xvii. 12, 15, xxi. 39, xxii. 26; (2) those in which $\beta$ contains exact and specific notices of time which are wanting in $\alpha$, cf. xv. 30, xvi. 11, xvii. 19, xviii. 19, xix. 9,
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xx. 18, xxvii. 1, etc.; (3) those in which exact information appears to characterise the references of β to places, circumstances, persons, Cf., in addition to passages of this character already noticed under (1), xi. 28, xii. 1, 10, xvi. 35, xviii. 18, 27, xix. 14, xx. 15, xxi. 16, xxiv. 27, xxviii. 16, 19 (see for these passages Zöckler, Greifswalder Studien, p. 134 ff., and notes in apparatus criticus, and in opposition to the view of Zöckler Mr. Page's detailed list of passages in D, all of which he regards as bearing traces of being subsequent corrections of the text by a second-rate hand, Classical Review, p. 319, July, 1897, and Blass's reply, Philology of the Gospels, p. 123).1

If an examination of these passages, which vary considerably in value and importance, and the proofs of the existence of a second-century Latin text convince us that the readings in β are not to be hastily rejected as the glosses of a careless or blundering scribe, it cannot be said that we are in a position to account for the origin of the Western readings, or that a solution of the problem is yet attained. The hypothesis of Blass, tempting as it is, and simple as it is, wants verification, and the very simplicity which commends it to its supporters is often a sore stumbling-block to its acceptance, inasmuch as it does not seem to account for all the facts of the case. But at the present stage of the controversy it is of interest to note that the honoured name of Theodor Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 340, 1899, may be added to those who accept in the main Blass's position, amongst whom may be mentioned Nestle, Belser, Zöckler, Salmon.2

Zahn makes some reservations, e.g., with regard to xv. 29 (see in

1 In 1891 Professor Harris regarded the readings of Codex D (see Blass, edit. min., p. xx.) as the result of their adaptation to the Latin version of a bilingual MS. which carries us back to the middle of the second century, a view which he has somewhat modified in 1894, Four Lectures, etc., p. viii., although still maintaining a certain amount of Latinisation. Schmiedel, Enc. Bibl., i., 52, 1899, recently supports Harris, and maintains that the Greek of D rests partly on retranslation from the Latin. In his later book Dr. Harris examines the theory of Dr. Chase, that the peculiarities of Codex D are due to retranslation from an old Syriac version, pp. 14, 68, and maintains that whilst Dr. Chase's position is justified in so far that we possess evidence of an old Syriac text of Acts, yet his explanation of the Western variants as due to a Syriac glossator cannot be sustained, see also Zöckler, u. s., p. 131, and Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D.

2 Amongst the keenest attacks upon the theory may be noted that of B. Weiss in Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte, 1897; Page, Classical Review, July, 1897, and more recently, Harnack, see notes on xi. 28 and xv. 29; Schmiedel in Enc. Bibl., 50-56, 1899. Wendt's examination of the question, Apostelgeschichte (1899), pp. 43-53, should also be carefully considered, whilst Blass has replied to the strictures of Harnack and Zahn in Studien und Kritiken, i., 1900.
loco, and Harnack, Sitzungsberichte d. königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin, xi., 1899), whilst he lays stress upon xi. 28, and maintains the genuine Lucan character of the words used, e.g., ἀγαλλίαις, συστρέφειν.

Still more recently Hilgenfeld, Acta Apostolorum, 1899, has again, and more fully, expressed his conviction of the priority of the β text (although he differs from Blass and Zahn in not referring α and β to the same original author\(^1\)), and he has reconstructed it much on the same lines as Blass, and somewhat more boldly. References to the text adopted by Hilgenfeld will be frequently found in the apparatus criticus (as also to his annotations which deal largely with the criticisms of B. Weiss in his Codex D). In his Proleg. Hilgenfeld divides the authorities for the Western text as against ΝΑΒC into various groups: (1) Graeco-Latin MSS.: Codex D and E; (2) Latin versions: Flor., Gig., Par., Wernig., Prov., as Blass calls them, see above on p. 42; (3) Oriental versions: especially the marginal readings of Thomas Harkel in the Philoxenian Syriac; also the Sahidic version; (4) the Fathers: especially Irenæus, Cyprian, Tertullian (with reference to Corssen's pamphlet, see above); (5) some readings even in the four great MSS. ΝΑΒC. Hilgenfeld evidently attaches some weight (as Blass) to 137 (M), and to Codex Athous Lauroæ, p. ix. (see Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 250; and further, Studien und Kritiken, i., 1900).

For Literature bearing on Acts see the valuable lists in Headlam, “Acts,” Hastings’ B.D., pp. 34, 35, and Wendt, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 1-4, 1899. The present writer would venture to add to the former: (1) Commentaries: Felten, Apostelgeschichte, 1892; Knabenbauer, Actus Apostolorum (Paris, 1899), two learned and reverent works by Romanists, the latter dealing with the most recent phase of modern problems of text, chronology and sources; Wendt, Apostelgeschichte (Meyer-Wendt), 1899, with a full Introduction, pp. 1-60, discussing all recent problems, with constant reference in the text to Professor Ramsay’s writings, and altogether indispensable for the study of Acts; Matthias, Auslegung der Apostelgeschichte, 1897, a compendium useful in some respects, based chiefly upon Wendt’s earlier edition; Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, 2nd edit., 1894; to these constant reference is made. (2) Introductions: Zahn, Einleitung, ii.,

\(^1\)”Blassio debemus alterum Actorum app. textum non ortum ex jam fere recepto, sed hinc ab ipso Actorum app. auctore postea breviante et emendante in chartam puram scriptum esse minime demonstravit, lima ita potitus est, ut etiam genuina et necessaria non pausa sublata sint,” p. xiv.

¹ In the preparation of the textual criticism my best thanks are due to the kind and valuable help of the Rev. Harold Smith, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, sometime Lecturer in King's College, London.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ.

I. I. ΤΟΝ μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἔργατο ὦ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, 2. ἄχρι ἢς ἡμέρας.


2 Ν ΑΕ, Orig. and Blass in β, so also Weiss. Grammatik, p. 148).

CHAPTER I.—Ver. 1. τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον, a reference beyond all reasonable doubt to St. Luke's Gospel. Not merely the dedication of both writings to Theophilus, but their unity of language and style is regarded by critics of all schools as convincing proof of the identity of authorship of Acts and the third Gospel; see Introd. and Zöckler, Greiffswalder Studien, p. 128 (1895). The passage in Plato, Phaedo, p. 61, is valuable not only for the marked contrast between λόγος and μύθος, ποιεῖν μύθους ἀλλ' οὐ λόγους, but also for the use of ποιεῖν (Wendt). Amongst other instances of the phrase ποιεῖν λόγον cf. Galen, De Usu Part., ii., περὶ πρῶτων τῶν δακτύλων ἐποιησάμην τὸν Λόγον. St. Chrysostom sees in the phrase a proof of the unassuming character of the author: St. Luke does not say "The former Gospel which I preached." For the anomalous μὲν, "solitarium," without the following δέ, frequent in Luke, see Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 261, cf. Luke viii. 5, Acts iii. 21, xxviii. 22, etc., and several times in St. Paul. μὲν occurs thus six times in the Acts without ὅν—οὖν μὲν ὅν see ver. 6.—ὦ Θεόφιλε: the interjection used here simply in address, as common in Attic Greek, cf. xviii. 14, xxvii. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 11; without the epithet κράτιστος, as in Luke i. 3, and without ὦ, Θεόφ., alone would have seemed too bold, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 258. It has been suggested that the omission of the epithet κράτιστος, Luke i. 3, denotes that St. Luke's friendship had become less ceremonious, just as a similar change has been noted.
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Δεν είναι μόνον τοις αποστόλοις δια Πνεύματος Άγιου, ους ἔξελέξατο, ἀνελήφθη. 3. οὶς καὶ παρέστησεν ἐμφύτων ζωῆς μετὰ τὸ πάθειν

1 ἀνελήφθη Β and probably all cursive, but -ληφθη НΑΒ*CDΕ, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss (see Blass, Gram., pp. 24, 55). άρις...;... ἀνελήφθη. Duf. Vg. read "in die quos Apostolos legit per Spiritum Sanctum," omitting ἀνελήφθη altogether, and continuing with D, Lux., Syr. Harcl. mg., Sah. καὶ εκελεύσειν ερωτευόντων τὸ εὐαγγελίον (et præcepit prædicare evangelium). This reading of Aug. Blass adopts (so Corssen, Der Cyprianische Text der Acta Apost., p. 18, and Graefe, Stud. und Krit., p. 136 (1898)) and therefore refers the day mentioned to Luke vi. 12, the day of the choice of the Apostles. But Belser well points out that St. Luke's Gospel (quite apart from chaps. i. and ii.) does not begin with the choice of the Twelve, but with the public appearance of the Baptist and that of Jesus Himself, and with His public teaching. Nor is there anything said, as Blass himself admits, in St. Luke's account of the choice of the Twelve, vi. 12, as to any commission given to them at that time to preach the Gospel (although in his edition of St. Luke's Gospel Blass compares Mark iii. 14, but even then the expression used, ἀνελήφθη τὸ εὐαγγελίον, cannot be called Lucan, see Weiss on Codex D, p. 53). Further, D contains ἀνελήφθη, after ημερας, apparently to simplify the structure; there is no Greek authority for its omission, and it is contained in Codex Parisinus (which in many respects approaches so closely to D), where we find it at the end of the verse: assumptus est. Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 132 ff., contends for the reading which he had previously adopted in β, and sees in it the original draft of Luke who in a "has encumbered the clause in order to bring in the Ascension without leaving out the choice of the Apostles" (p. 136).

in the dedication of Shakespeare's two poems to the Earl of Southampton; cf. also Zahn, Einleitung, ii. 360. The way in which the epithet κράτιστος is employed elsewhere in the book in addressing Roman officials, xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25, has been thought to indicate that Theophilus held some high official post, or that he was at least of equestrian rank (Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 388, 389, and his inferences as to the date of Acts). Ramsay is of opinion that the name was given at baptism, and that it was used or known only among Christians, and he infers that this baptismal name is used in Acts because the book was probably written at a time when it was dangerous for a Roman of rank to be recognised as a Christian. But Theophilus was by no means uncommon as a Jewish name; cf. B. D. 4 i., p. 25, and also article "Theophilus," B. D. 1 (see also Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 19). The epithet κράτιστος was peculiarly appropriated to Romans holding high office, and actually became during the second century a technical title to denote equestrian rank; and from its use here Zahn maintains not only that Theophilus was a man of some social position, but that he was, when Luke wrote his gospel, not a member of the Christian Church, since there is no instance in the first two centuries of a Christian addressing his fellow-Christs in a title corresponding as it were to "your Excellency" (Einleitung in das N. T., ii., 360, 383). The instance of the address of the Epist. ad Diognetum, κράτιστος Διογνήτης, is alleged by Blass as an instance that the epithet is not always used in the technical sense mentioned; but to this Ramsay replies that if Diognetus was the friend and teacher of Marcus Aurelius, the emperor might well raise his teacher to equestrian rank; Septimius Severus raised his sons' tutor to the high dignity of the consulship. Ramsay discusses κράτιστος at length in Was Christ born at Bethlehem? (1898), pp. 65, 71, 72, as against Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 19. Blass fully recognises that Theophilus held a high position, and that the title in question would naturally occur in a book dedicated to a patron; but it must be borne in mind that Blass regards Theophilus as of Greek extraction, possibly a fellow-citizen with Luke of Antioch, whilst Ramsay sees in him a citizen of Rome and a resident in the imperial city. Theophylact asks why Luke should have cared to write to one man only and to value him so highly, and makes answer that it was because the Evangelist was a guardian of the words spoken by the Lord:

"It is not the will of my Father that one of these little ones should perish." There seems no great reason to doubt that Theophilus was a real personage, and the epithet κράτιστος, at all events in its
3-4.
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αὐτὸν, ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις, δι’ ἡμέρων τεσσαράκοντα ὑπανάμενος αὐτός, καὶ λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4. Καὶ συναλιζό-

technical significance, is hardly consistent with any other supposition (see Sanday, Inspiration, p. 319, note). The recent attempt to identify Theophilus with Seneca, referred to by Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 163, must be dismissed as equally groundless and fanciful as the former conjecture that he was no other than Philo.—κυρίως: the use of τεσσαράκοντα (mostly after a prep., as here) followed by an attracted relative may be classed amongst the mannerisms of St. Luke (Simcox, Writers of the N. T., p. 24, where other instances are given); see also Friedrich, Das Lucas-evangelium, pp. 1, 2.—ἐννεάδα: in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts the frequency of the attraction of the relative against generally characterises him amongst the N.T. writers, Friedrich, u. s., pp. 36 and 100.—ἐννεάδα: often regarded as simply pleonastic, but sometimes as emphatic, to intimate that the work which Jesus began on earth He continued in heaven, or that He began the work of the Gospel and committed its continuance to His followers; Zahn, u. s., p. 366 ff. In Winer's view to regard ἔρχεσθαι as pleonastic is a mere subterfuge to avoid a difficulty, and he renders the passage "what Jesus began both to do and to teach, and continued to do until," etc. (see also Grimm-Thayer, sub v.), treating it as an example of breviloquence (Winer-Moulton, lxvi., 1). On the whole it is perhaps best to consider the phrase ἔρχεσθαι as equivalent to fecit ab initio, although no doubt there is a sense in which, with every Christian for nineteen centuries, St. Luke would regard the whole earthly life of Jesus as a beginning, a prelude to the glory and mighty working to be revealed and perfected in the ascended Lord. The verb is of frequent use in St. Luke's writings (Friedrich, Zeller, Lekebusch), although in St. Mark's Gospel it is also constantly found. In the LXX it is often found like ἐννεάδα: the use of Elijah's translation to heaven in the LXX, 2 Kings ii. 9-11, also in Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 9 and 1 Macc. ii. 58, and perhaps of Enoch in Ecclesiasticus xlix. 14 (A. μετέτρεσθη). In addition to the present passage (cf. vv. 11, 12) it is also used in Mark xvi. 9 and 1 Tim. iii. 16 (where it probably forms part of an early Christian Hymn or confession of faith)
of our Lord's Ascension; cf. also Gospel of Peter, 19, in a doubtfully orthodox sense. It is to be noted that the word is here used absolutely, as of an event with which the Apostolic Church was already familiar. On the cognate noun ἀνάληψις, used only by St. Luke in N.T., and absolutely, with reference to the same event, in his Gospel, ix. 51, see Psalms of Solomon, iv. 20, ed. Ryle and James, p. 49. In the latter passage the word is apparently used for the first time in extant Greek literature, but its meaning is very different from its later technical use with reference to the Assumption of the Blessed; see instances, p. 49, ubi supra. St. Irenaeus, i., 10, 1, whilst using the noun of our Lord's Ascension, is careful to say τὴν ἐνσαρκόν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς ἀνάληψιν; see especially Swete, The Apostles' Creed, pp. 70-72, and below on verse 11.

Ver. 3. εἷς καὶ παρέστησεν, "he also showed himself," R.V., but margin "presented himself" (cf. ix. 41), praebuit se, Vulg. In ix. 41 monstravit, h. l. magis demonstravit (Blass). The verb is used thirteen times in Acts (once in a quotation, iv. 26), both transitively and intransitively. St. Luke in his Gospel uses it three times, and as in Acts both transitively and intransitively. In this he is alone amongst the Evangelists. In the Epistles it is found only in St. Paul, and for the most part in a transitive sense,—μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν, "after his passion," so in A. and R.V.; post passionem suum, Vulg.; "too sacred a word to be expunged from this the only place where it occurs in the Bible," Humphry, Commentary on R.V.; cf. iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 23.—ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίον — τεκμηρίου only here in N.T.—twice in Wisdom v. 11, xix. 13, and 3 Macc. iii. 24. The A.V. followed the Genevan Version by inserting the word "infallible" (although the latter still retained "tokens" instead of "proofs"). But R.V. simply "proofs" expresses the technical use of the word τεκμηρίου, convincing, certain evidence. Although in a familiar passage, Wisdom v. 11, τεκμηρίων and σημείων are used as practically synonymous, yet there is no doubt that they were technically distinguished, e.g., Arist., Rhet., i., 2, τῶν σημείων τὸ μὲν ἀναγκαῖον τεκμηρίον. This technical distinction, it may be observed, was strictly maintained by medical men, although St. Luke may have doubt have met the word elsewhere. Thus it is used by Josephus several times, as Krenkel mentions, but he does not mention that it is also used by Thucydides, ii., 39, to say nothing of other classical writers. Galen writes τὸ μὲν ἐκ τηρήσεως σημείον τὸ δὲ ἐξ ενδείξεως τεκμηρίον, and the context states that rhetoricians as well as physicians had examined the distinction; Hobart, Medical Language of St. Luke, p. 184. The word also occurs in the Proem of Dioscorides to his De Materia Medica, p. 3, which Vogel and Meyer-Weiss hold that Luke imitated in the Prologue to his Gospel (but see Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 384).—δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα. St. Chrysostom comments "οὐ γάρ εἶπε τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ἐφίστατο γαρ καὶ ἀφίστατο πάλιν." To this interpretation of the genitive with διὰ Blass refers, and endorses it, Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch, p. 129, following the Scholiast. The meaning, if this interpretation is adopted, would therefore be that our Lord did not remain with His disciples continuously (οὐ διηνεκῶς, Schol.) as before, but that He appeared to them from time to time; non perpetuo, sed per intervalla, Bengel. But cf. also Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 140. Men have seen in this period of forty days, mentioned only by St. Luke in N.T., what we may reverently call a symbolical fitness. But in a certain sense the remark of Blass seems justified: Parum ad rem est quod idem (numerus)
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Ιωάννης ἔβαπτίσετε δύο, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτίζω ὑμῶν ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ὅν ἐμπεύματα ταύτας ἐγὼ. Ιωάννης μεν ἐβαπτίσε τοὺς καθότι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτίσθησεσθε εν Πνεύματι Αγίῳ, ως μετὰ πωλλάς ταύτας ἡμέρας. 6. Οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες

οὐσιν αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰωάννης: in D almost throughout Ἰωάννης, see W.H., Notes on Orthography, p. 166, on authority of B and D. Nestle (Expository Times, Nov., 1897, p. 93) points out that in D ὁν prevails in Matt., Mk., John (ὁν 66, ὁν 7), while in Luke and Acts the reverse is the case (ὁν 3, ὁν 48); but see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 57.

Ἀπό τῆς ἡμέρας D, Sah. insert ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας. Wlass sees in the addition an intimate knowledge of the facts (see also Belser); cf. ii. 1, but cf. on the other hand Weiss on Codex D, p. 54.

alias quoque occurrit. The parallels in the histories of Moses and Elijah to which Holtzmann and Spitta refer are really no parallels at all, and if it be true to say that there was nothing in contemporary Jewish ideas to suggest our Lord's Resurrection as it is represented as taking place, it is equally true to maintain that there was nothing to suggest the after sojourn of the forty days on earth as it is represented as taking place; see Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., 624—οὐτανάνειν: if we could call this a frequentative verb with some scholars, it would in itself give the meaning "appearing from time to time," but it is rather a late Hellenistic present, formed from some parts of ὁμοί; Wlass, Grammatik des N. G., pp. 57, 181. But it certainly does not mean that our Lord's appearances were merely visionary. The verb is found only here in N.T., but also in LXX xi Kings vii. 8 and in Tobit xii. 19 (not in S.). In these two passages the word cannot fairly be pressed into the service of visionary appearances. In xi Kings the reference is to the staves of the ark which were so long that the ends were seen from the holy place before the oracle, but they were not seen from without, i.e., from the porch or vestibule. In Tobit it is not the appearance of the angel which is represented as visionary, quite the contrary; but his eating and drinking are represented as being only in appearance. But even if the word could be pressed into the meaning suggested, St. Luke's view of our Lord's appearances must be judged not by one expression but by his whole conception, cf. Luke xxiv. 39-43 and Acts x. 41. That he could distinguish between visions and realities we cannot doubt; see note below on xii. 12.—τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θ.: "speaking the things concerning," R.V., not "speaking of the things," A.V., but speaking the very things, whether truths to be believed, or commands to be obeyed (Humphry, Commentary on R.V.). On St. Luke's fondness for τὰ περὶ τῶν in his writings see Friedrich, Das Lucansvangelium, pp. 10 and 89 (so also Zeller and Lekebusch). The exact phrase is only found in Acts, where it occurs twice (in T.R. three times); cf. xix. 8 (viii. 12), and see also xx. 25 and xxviii. (23), 31. The expression ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θ., instead of τῶν οὐρανῶν of the Hebrew Evangelist St. Matthew, is characteristic of St. Luke's writings, although it is found frequently in St. Mark and once in St. John. In St. Luke's Gospel it occurs more than thirty times, and six times in Acts (only four times in St. Matt.). Possibly the phrase was used by St. Luke as one more easily understood by Gentile readers, but the two terms ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θ. and τῶν οὐρανῶν were practically synonymous in the Gospels and in Judaism in the time of our Lord (Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 171; E. T. and Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (second edit.), p. 67; Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, i., 287; and Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, p. 76 ff.). Dr. Stanton, Jewish and Christian Messiah, p. 226, draws attention to the important fact that the preaching of the original Apostles after the Ascension is not described as that of the preaching of the kingdom of God, but that the phrase is only used of the preaching of St. Paul, and of St. Philip the associate of St. Stephen. But in view of the fact that the original Apostles heard during the Forty Days from their Master's lips τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, we cannot doubt that in deed and in word they would proclaim that kingdom. On the question as to whether they conceived of the kingdom as present, or future, or both, see Wendt, Teaching of Jesus, i., 400, E. T., and Witness of the Epistles (Longmans), p. 309 ff, and on the conception of the kingdom of God in the Theology of A. Ritschl and his school see Orr, Ritschlian Theology, p. 258 ff. For the relation of the Church and the Kingdom see also Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, pp. 28, 36 ff., "Church," Hastings, B.D., p. 425; Hort, Ecclesia, p. 5 ff.
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Ι.

επηρώτων αὐτῶν λέγοντες, Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Ἰσραήλ; 7. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, ὅθεν ὅρων

Ver. 4. συναλίζομεν: a strong array of modern commentators renders "eating with them," following the Vulgate con-vescens illis (so both A. and R.V. in margin, and Wycl. and Rhem.). It is thus rendered by Overbeck (as against De Wette), Wendt, Holtzmann, Felten, Weiss, Matthias, Knabenbauer, and Blass, who adopts the reading ὦς συναλίζ., and regards the particle as showing that the recapitulation is continued of the events already mentioned in Luke xxiv. 42 ff. It is evidently taken in the same sense by Spitta, Feine, Jüngst. If we so translate it, we must derive it from ἄλς (salt), so Schol. κοινωνών ἄλων, τραπέζης, in the sense given to the expression by Chrys., Theophyl., Ecum. In Ps. cxxi. 4 LXX., to which Wendt refers, μὴ συν-διασα (although the reading is somewhat doubtful—the word is used by Symmachus, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19) is also rendered συνα-λίθος (Alius) as an equivalent of the Hebrew סלアジア, μὴ σינתיבאא, Symmachus. Blass gives no classical references, but points out that the word undoubtedly exists in the sense referred to in Clem. Hom., xiii., 4 (but see Grimm-Thayer, sub v.). Hilgenfeld (Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 74 (1894)) contends that the use of the word in the psalm quoted and in the passage from the Clementines refers not to the use of salt at an ordinary meal, but rather to the sacrificial and symbolic use of salt in the Old and New Testaments. Thus in the passage from the Clementines refers not to the use of salt at an ordinary meal, but rather to the sacrificial and symbolic use of salt in the Old and New Testaments. Thus in the passage from the Clementines refers to the use of salt at an ordinary meal, but rather to the sacrificial and symbolic use of salt in the Old and New Testaments. Clem. Hom., xiii., 4, πότε αὐτοῖς συναλ-ίσθε, πότε means "after the Baptism"; cf. also Ignatius, ad Magnes., x., ἄλλος ἤτο σὺν αὐτῷ, "be ye salted in him." Wendt takes the word quite generally as meaning that the sharing in a common meal with His disciples, as on the evening of the Resurrection, was the habitual practice of the Lord during the Forty Days; cf. Acts x. 41 and Luke xxiv. 38 ff. Feine similarly holds that the word presupposes some such incidents as those mentioned in Luke xxiv., and that Luke had derived his information from a source which described the final instructions to the disciples as given at a common meal. On the other hand it must be borne in mind that in classical Greek, as in Herodotus and Xenophon (Wetstein) (as also in Josephus, B. J., iii., 9, 4), συναλίζω = to assemble, cf. Hesychius, συναλίζων = συναλίζομεν, συναλίζομεν, συναλίζομεν, and it is possible that the preceding present participles in the immediate context may help to account for the use of the same participle instead of the aorist συναλίζομεν. The verb is then derived from σῦν and ἄλς (ἄ), meaning lit., close, crowded together. Mr. Rendall (Acts of the Apostles, p. 32) would derive it from ἀλή (ἄ), a common term for a popular assembly amongst Ionian and Dorian Greeks, and he supposes that the verb here implies a general gathering of believers not limited to the Twelve; but the context apparently points back to Luke xxiv. 49 to a command which was certainly given only to the Twelve.—παρηγγείλειν, "he charged them," R.V., which not only distinguishes it from other verbs rendered "to command," but also gives the emphatic meaning which St. Luke often attaches to the word. It is characteristic of his writings, occurring four times in his Gospel and ten or eleven times in Acts, and it is very frequent in St. Paul's Epistles (Friedrich, Lekebusch).—ἱεροσολύμων: a neuter plural (but cf. Matt. ii. 3 and Grimm sub v.). St. Luke most frequently uses the Jewish form ἱεροσολύμα—twenty-seven times in his Gospel, about forty in Acts—as against the use of ἱεροσολύμα four times in his Gospel and over twenty in Acts (Friedrich, Lekebusch). Blass retains the aspirate for the Greek form but not for the Jewish, cf. in loco and Grammatik des N. G., pp. 17, 31, but it is very doubtful whether either should have the aspirate; W.H., ii., 313; Plummer's St. Luke, p. 64; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93. Grimm points out that the Hebrew form is used in the N.T.: "ubi in ipso nomine tanquam sancta vis quaedam reponitur ut, Gal. i., 25; ita in compellationibus, Matt. xxii. 37, Luke xiii. 34;" see further sub v. ἱεροσολύμα.—μὴ χωρίζ.: it was fitting that they should not depart from Jerusalem, not only that the new law as the old should go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, Isa. ii. 3 (Felten), but that the Apostles' testimony should be delivered not to men unacquainted with the facts, but to the inhabitants of the city where Jesus had been crucified and buried. Εἰ δὲ εὐθύς ἐχωρίσθησαν ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ τούτων οὐδὲν ἐπηκολούθησαν, ἐγωοστομα ἡ ἀναστασις ὑπήρξεν, Ecumenius, in loco; see also Theophyl. —περιμένειν: not else-
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7. Η επαγγέλση, όπου ο Πατήρ έθετο εν τούτη ιδία εξουσία,

8. Αλλά λήφθησθε δύναμιν, επελθόντος του Άγιου Πνεύματος ἡμῶν.

where in N.T. (but see x. 24, D), but used
in classical Greek of awaiting a thing's
happening (Dem.). The passage in LXX
in which it occurs is suggestive: την
σωτηρίαν περιμένων κυρίου, Gen. xlix.
8. αλλά λήφθησθε δύναμιν, επελθόντος του Άγιου Πνεύματος εφ' ὑμᾶς,

where in N.T. (but see x. 24, D), but used
in classical Greek of awaiting a thing's
happening (Dem.). The passage in LXX
in which it occurs is suggestive: την
σωτηρίαν περιμένων κυρίου, Gen. xlix.
την επαγγελίαν : Bengel notes the
distinction between υπισχόμεναι and
επαγγέλλομαι, the former being used of
promises in response to petitions, the
latter of voluntary offers (Ammonius) :
"quæ verbi Graeci proprietas, ubi de
divinis promissionibus agitur, ex φοιτητά
observanda est ". Ιt is therefore remark-
able that in the Gospels the word επαγ-
γελία is never used in this technical sense
of the divine promise made by God until
Luke xxiv. 49, where it is used of the
promise of the Holy Spirit, as here. But
in Acts and in St. Paul's Epistles and in
the Hebrews the word is frequent, and
always of the promises made by God
(except Acts xxiii. 2). See Sanday and
Headlam on Romans i. 2, and Lightfoot
on Gal. iii. 14, and Psalms of Solomon,
xxii., 8 (cf. vii., 9, and xvii., 6), ed. Ryle and
James, p. 106. "The promise of the
Father," cf. Luke xxiv. 49, is fulfilled in
the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and
although no doubt earlier promises of
the gift of the Spirit may be included, cf.
Luke xii. 11, as also the promise of the
Spirit's outpouring in Messianic times
(cf. Joel ii. 28, Isaiah xlix. 3, Ezek. xxxvi.
26), yet the phraseology may be fairly
said to present an undesigned coinci-
dence with the more recent language of
the Lord to the Twelve. John xiv. 16, xv.
26, xvi. 14. On the many points of con-
nection between the opening verses of
Acts and the closing verses of St. Luke's
Gospel see below,

Ver. 5. ἐν πνεύματι: the omission of
ἐν before θεάς and its insertion before
πνεύματι, may be meant to draw a distinc-
tion between the baptism with water and
the baptism in the Spirit (R.V. margin "in ").
But in Matt. iii. 11 we have the prepo-
sition ἐν in both parts of the verse; cf.
John i. 31. On ἐν with the instrumental
dative see Blass, Grammatik des N. G.,
p. 114, and Grotius, in loco; cf. the
Hebrew בּ,—οι μετά πολλάς ταύτας
ἡμέρας: not after many, i.e., after few.
This use of τοῦ with an adjective or adverb
13, Acts xvii. 14, in which places οὐ
τολίς = δύναμις as here; cf. οὐ μετρώμενος,
xvii. 27; οὐκ εἰσήκοντος, Acts xx. 39: οὐχ
ὁ τυχών, Acts xix. 11, xxviii. 2, cf. Haw-
kins, Hora Syn., p. 153. No doubt
μετ' οὐ would be more correct, but the
negative is found both before and after
the preposition, so in Luke xv. 13; cf.
Josephus, Ant., i., 12, and xiii., 7, 1,
for similar changes of allocation in the
same words. ταύτα closely connects
the days referred to with the current
day; cf. also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 221.
οι μετά πολλάς, φησίν ίνα μὴ εἰς ἄθυμιαν
ιμπέρατων ἡράτωτος, οὐκ εἰς τείχος, οὐκ
eἰς τείχηρορόσην εἰς ἄθυμιαν, Theo-
physlact, in loco.

Ver. 6. οἱ μεν ουν: the combination
μεν ουν is very frequent in Acts in all
parts, occurring no less than twenty-
seven times; cf. Luke iii. 18. Like the
simple μεν it is sometimes used without
δέ in the apodosis. Ηere, if δέ is omitted
in ver. 7 after εἰπεν, there is still a con-
trast between the question of the Αποστόλων
and the answer of Jesus. See especially
Rendall, Acts of the Αποστόλων, Appendix
on μεν ουν, p. 16o ft.; cf. Weiss in loco.
—συνελθόντες: the question has often
been raised as to whether this word and
μεν ουν refer back to ver. 4, or whether
a later meeting of the disciples is here
introduced. For the former Hilgenfeld
contends (as against Weiss) and sees
no reference to any fresh meeting: the
disciples referred to in the αυτοίςοf ver.
4 and the υμεῖςοf ver. 5 had already come
together. According to Holtzmann there
is a reference in the words to a common
meal of the Lord with Ηis disciples already
mentioned in ver. 4, and after this final
meal the question of ver. 6 is asked to the
way to Bethany (Luke xxiv. 50). The
words οἱ μεν οὐν συνελθότες are referred by
Feltén to the final meeting which formed
the conclusion of the constant intercourse
of ver. 3, a meeting thus specially empha-
sised, although in reality only one out of
many, and the question which follows in
ver. 6 was asked, as Feltén also supposes
καὶ ἑσθῆ ὑμᾶς μάρτυρες ἐν τῇ ἱερουσαλημ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ καὶ Ἀμαρείᾳ καὶ ἑως ἐγχάλου τῆς γῆς. 9. Καὶ τώτῳ εἰπὼν,

(see too Rendall on vv. 7 and 8), on the way to Bethany. But there is no need to suppose that this was the case (as Jüngst so far correctly objects against Holtzmann), and whilst we may take ἐντὸς as referring to the final meeting before the Ascension, we may place that meeting not in Jerusalem but on the Mount of Olives. Blass sees in the word ἐντὸς an assembly of all the Apostles, cf. ver. 13 and 1 Cor. xv. 7, and adds: "Aliunde supplendus locus ubi hoc factum, ver. 12, Luke xxiv. 50"—ἐπιρρέων: imperfect, denoting that the act of questioning is always imperfect until an answer is given (Blass, cf. iii. 3), and here perhaps indicating that the same question was put by one inquirer after another (see on the force of the tense, as noted here and elsewhere by Blass, Hermathena, xxi., pp. 228, 229).—εἰ: this use of εἰ in direct questions is frequent in Luke, Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 254; cf. vii. 1, xix. 2 (in Vulgate si); it is adopted in the LXX, and a parallel may also be found in the interrogative יי in Hebrew (so Blass and Viteau).—ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ: such a promise as that made in ver. 5, the fulfilment of which, according to Joel ii. 28, would mark the salvation of Messianic times, might lead the disciples to ask about the restoration of the kingdom to Israel which the same prophet had foretold, to be realised by the annihilation of the enemies of God and victory and happiness for the good. As in the days of old the yoke of Pharaoh had been broken and Israel redeemed from captivity, so would the Messiah accomplish the final redemption, cf. Luke xxiv. 21, and set up again, after the destruction of the world-powers, the kingdom in Jerusalem; Weber, ᾿Ιουδαϊκή Θεολογία, pp. 360, 361 (1897). No doubt the thoughts of the disciples still moved within the narrow circle of Jewish national hopes: "totidem in hac interrogatione sunt errores quot verba," writes Calvin. But still we must remember that with these thoughts of the redemption of Israel there mingled higher thoughts of the need of repentance and righteousness for the Messianic kingdom (Psalms of Solomon, xvii., xvii.; ed. Ryle and James, p. lvii.), and that the disciples may well have shared, even if imperfectly, in the hopes of a Zacharias or a Simeon. Dr. Edersheim notes "with what wonderful sobriety" the disciples put this question to our Lord (ubi supra, i., p. 79); at the same time the question before us is plainly too primitive in character to have been invented by a later generation (McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 41).—ἀποκαθίσταταις ἡμῖν ἡ κράτος: a form of ἀποκαθιστάμεθα which is found in classical Greek and is used of the restoration of dominion as here in 1 Macc. xv. 3; see also below on iii. 21 and Malachi LXX iv. 5. On the form of the verb see W. H., ii., 162, and on its force see further Dalman, ᾿Ιερουσαλημ, p. 199. "Dost thou at this time restore... ?" R.V.; the present tense marking their expectation that the kingdom, as they conceived it, would immediately appear—an expectation enhanced by the promise of the previous verse, in which they saw the foretaste of the Messianic kingdom.

Ver. 7. χρόνους ἢ καιρός: Blass regards the two as synonymous, and no doubt it is difficult always to maintain a distinction. But here χρόνους may well be taken to mean space of time as such, the duration of the Church's history, and καιροῦς the critical periods in that history: ὁ μὲν καιρός δήλοι ποιότητα χρόνου, χρόνος δὲ ποσότητα (Ammianus). A good instance of the distinction may be found in LXX Neh. x. 34: εἰς καιρόν ἀνὴρ χρόνων, "at times appointed"; cf. i Thes. v. 1. So here Weiss renders: "zu kennen Zeiten und geeignete Zeitpunkte". In modern Greek, whilst καιρός means weather, χρόνος means year, so that "in both words the kernel of meaning has remained unaltered; this in the case of καιρός is changeableness, of χρόνων duration" (Curtius, Etym., p. 110 sq.); cf. also Trench, N. T. Synonyms, ii., p. 27 ff.; Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 153; and Grimm-Thayer, sub v. καιρός.

—ἐξουσία, authority, R.V.—either as delegated or unrestrained, the liberty of doing as one pleases (ἐξεστί); δύναμις, power, natural ability, inherent power, residing in a thing by virtue of its nature, or, which a person or thing exerts or puts forth—so δύναμις is ascribed to Christ, now in one sense, now in another, so also
9—10.

**ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ**

1 For T. R. καὶ ταῦτα . . . τοπ. αὐτην D, Sah., Aug., with var. καὶ ταῦτα εἰσήκουσα του τοπ. νεφελη αὐτου ἀπ' των ὀφθαλμων αὐτων. Chase explains from Syriac, but και αὐτην κ.τ.λ. may be an assimilation to Matt. ix. 15. Omission of βλεπ. αὐτου and εἰς των ὀφθαλ. in Western texts curious; may to some extent support Blass's view or may have been intentional omissions. Weiss regards the whole in D as secondary; Hilgenfeld follows D.

Ver. 8. ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες, "my witnesses," R.V., reading μου instead of μοι, not only witnesses to the facts of their Lord's life, cf. i. 22, x. 39, but also His witnesses, His by a direct personal relationship; Luke xxiv. 48 simply speaks of the fact to the testimony.—ἐν τε ἱεροσόλυμα κ. τ. λ.: St. Luke on other occasions, as here, distinguishes Jerusalem as a distinct separate from all the rest of Judaea (cf. Luke x. 17, Acts x. 39), a proof of intimate acquaintance with the Rabbinical phraseology of the time, according to Eder- scheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, pp. 17, 73.

In this verse, see Introduction, the keynote is struck of the contents of the whole book, and the great divisions of the Acts are marked, see, e.g., Blass, p. 12 in *Prologue to Acts*—Jerusalem, i.—vii.; Judaea, ix., 32; xii., 19; Samaria, viii.; and if it appears somewhat strained to see in St. Paul's preaching in Rome a witness to "the utmost parts of the earth," it is noteworthy that in *Psalms of Solomon*, viii., 16, we read of Pompey that he came ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς, i.e., Rome—the same phrase as in Acts i. 8. This verse affords a good illustration of the subjective element which characterises the partition theories of Spitta, Jüngst, Clemen and others. Spitta would omit the whole verse from his sources A and B, and considers it as an interpolation by the author of Acts; but, as Hilgenfeld points out, the verse is entirely in its place, and it forms the best answer to the "particularism" of the disciples, from which their question in ver. 6 shows that they were not yet free. Feine would omit the words ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς because nothing in the conduct of the early Church, as it is described to us in the Jewish-Christian source, Acts i.—xiii., points to any knowledge of such a commission from the Risen Christ. Jüngst disagrees with both Spitta and Feine, and thinks that the hand of the redactor is visible in prominence given to the little Samaria.

Ver. 9. ἀπήρθη: the word in ver. 2 is different, and ἀπήρθη seems not merely to denote our Lord's first leaving the ground (as Weiss, Overbeck), but also to be more in accordance with the calm and grandeur of the event than ἐσεσθέ; this latter word would rather denote a taking away by violence.—και νεφελη υπέλαβε: the cloud is here, as elsewhere, the symbol of the divine glory, and it was also as St. Chrysostom called it: το ὑπεράνω εἰς βασιλείαν; cf. Ps. civ. 3. In 1 Tim. iii. 16 we read that our Lord was received up εν δόξῃ, "in glory," R.V.

Ver. 10. ἀτενίζοντες ήσαν: this periphrasis of ἠν or ἠσαν with a present or perfect participle is very frequently found in St. Luke's writings (Friedrich, pp. 12 and 89, and compare the list in Simcox, u. s., pp. 130-134). The verb is peculiar to St. Luke and St. Paul, and is found ten times in Acts, twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and twice in 2 Cor.; it denotes a fixed, steadfast, protracted gaze: "and while they were looking steadfastly into heaven as he went," R.V., thus expressing more clearly the longing gaze of the disciples watching the Lord as He was going (πορευομένου αὐτοῦ, the present participle denoting that the cloud was still visible for a considerable time), as if carrying their eyes and hearts with Him to heaven: "Ipse enim est amor noster; ubi autem amor, ibi est oculus et cor" (Corn. à Lapide). The word is also found in LXX 1 Esdr. vi. 28 and 3 Macc. ii. 26 (cf. Aquila, Job vii. 8), and also in Josephus, B. Ἰ., v., 12, 3, and Polybius. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 38, 39, gives a most valuable account of the use of the word in St. Luke, and concludes that the action implied by it is quite inconsistent with weakness of vision, and that the theory which makes Paul a permanent sufferer in the eyes, as if he could not distinctly see the persons near him, is hopelessly at variance with St. Luke; cf. too the meaning of the word as used by St. Paul himself in 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13, where not weak but strong sight is implied in the word. The verb thus common in St. Luke is frequently employed by medical writers...
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

Ι. πορευομένου αυτοῦ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν ἕν έσθητι λευκή. II. οἱ καὶ εἶπον, Ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, τί ἐστήκατε εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν; οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναλήφθης αὐτὸν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, οὗτος δὲ ἔφυγεν, ἐν τρόπῳ εὐθασάμως αὐτὸν πορευομένου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν.

1 παρειστήκεισαν: W.H. read παρειστήκεισαν; but see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 100.

2 εσθήτη λευκή: CDE Syr. Harcl., Aeth., Orig.-int., Chrys., so Hilgenfeld; but in R.V. εσθήσεσ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, οὗτος δὲ εὐθασάμως αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν.

to denote a peculiar fixed look (Zahn); so in Luke xxii. 56, where it is used for the servant-maid's earnest gaze at St. Peter, a gaze not mentioned at all by St. Matthew, and expressed by a different word in St. Mark xiv. 67; Hobart, Medical Language of St. Luke, p. 76. In LXX, as above, it is employed in a secondary sense, but by Aquila, u. s., in its primary meaning of gazing, beholding.

-και ιδού: και at the commencement of the apodosis is explained as Hebraistic, but instances are not wanting in classical Greek; cf. Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 257, and see also Simcox, ubi supra, p. 160 ff. For the formula και ιδού cf. the Hebrew יָדַע, and on St. Luke's employment of it in sudden interpositions, see Hort, Ecclesia, p. 179. The use of καί (which in the most Hebraic books of the N.T. is employed much more extensively than in classical Greek) is most frequent in Luke, who also uses more frequently than other writers the formula και ιδού to introduce an apodosis; cf. Friedrich, ubi supra, p. 33. -παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῦ: in the appearance of angels which St. Luke often narrates there is a striking similarity between the phraseology of his Gospel and the Acts; cf. with the present passage Acts x. 30, xii. 7, and Luke xxiv. 4, II. 9. The description in the angels' disappearances is not so similar, cf. Acts x. 7 and Luke ii. 15, but it must be remembered that there is only one other passage in which the departure of the angels is mentioned, Rev. xvi. 2; Friedrich, ubi supra, pp. 45, 52, and Zeller, Acts ii., p. 224 (E. T.). For the verb cf. Luke i. 19, xix. 24, Acts xxiii. 2, 4, and especially xxviii. 23. -ἐν ἐσθήτῃ λευκῇ: in L.V. in the plural, see critical notes and also Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 90.

Ver. 11. Ἄνδρες Γαλ.: the ἄνδρες in similar expressions is often indicative of respect as in classical Greek, but as addressed by angels to men it may denote the earnestness of the address (Nosgen). St. Chrysostom saw in the salutation a wish to gain the confidence of the disciples: "Else, why needed they to be told of their country who knew it well enough?" Calvin also rejects the notion that the angels meant to blame the slowness and dulness of apprehension of Galileans. At the same time the word Γαλ. seems to remind us that things which are despised (John vii. 52) hath God chosen. Ex Galilaea nunquam vel certe raro fuerat propheta; at omnes Apostoli (Bengel); see also below. -ουτος ὁ Ιησοῦς: if the mention of their northern home had reminded the disciples of their early choice by Christ and of all that He had been to them, the personal name Jesus would assure them that their master would still be a human Friend and divine Saviour; ἡis θεός: qui habebit us et semper Jesus, id est, Salvator (Corn. à Lap.).

-πορευόμενον: on the frequency of the verb in St. Luke as compared with other N.T. writers, often used to give effect and vividness to the scene, both Friedrich and Zeller remark; St. Peter uses the same word of our Lord's Ascension, I Peter iii. 22. As at the Birth of Christ, so too at His Ascension the angels' message was received obediently and joyfully, for only thus can we explain Luke xxiv. 52.

Ver. 12. τότε: frequent in Acts and in St. Luke's Gospel, but most frequent in St. Matthew; on its use see Grimm-Thayer, and Blass, Gramm. des N. G., p. 270. -παρειστήκεισαν: a word characteristic of Luke both in his Gospel and in Acts, occurring in the former over twenty times, in the latter ten or eleven times. Only in three places elsewhere, not at all in the Gospels, but see Mark xiv. 40 (Moulton and Geden, sub v.); Friedrich, ubi supra, p. 8. On the Ascension see additional note at end of chapter. -τοῖς καὶ ἔξω ἑλώνοις: ubi captus fuit et vincitus fuerat. Wetstein. Although
13. Και ότε εισήλθον, ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερώον οὗ ἦσαν καταμένοντες, δὲ τὸ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Φίλιππος


St. Matthew and St. Mark both speak of the Mount of Olives they do not say τοῦ καλ. (neither is the formula found in John viii. 1). It is therefore probable that St. Luke speaks as he does as one who was a stranger to Jerusalem, or, as writing to one who was so. Blass, ubi supra, pp. 32, 84, contends that Ἐλαιώνος ought to give place to Ἐλαιών, which he also reads in Luke xix. 29, xxii. 37 (W. H. 'Ἐλαιών, and in Luke xix. 37, xxii. 39, τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, in each case as genitive of Ἐλαιών), the former word being found only here and in Josephus, Ant., vii., 9, 2. But it is found in all the MSS. in this passage, although falsa D. cum cat., says Blass. Blass would thus get rid of the difficulty of regarding Ἐλαιών as if used in Luke xix. 29, xxii. 37 as an indeclinable noun, whilst here he would exchange its genitive for Ἐλαιών. Deissmann, however, is not inclined to set aside the consensus of authorities for Ἐλαιών, and he regards Ἐλαιών in the two passages above as a lax use of the nominative case. As the genitive of Ἐλαιών it would correspond to the Latin Olietum (so Vulgate), an olive-orchard; cf. ἀμπέλος and ἀμπελών in Ν.Τ., the termination ὕν in derivative nouns indicating a place set with trees of the kind designated by the primitive. For instances cf. Grimm-Thayer, sub Ἐλαιών, but see on the other hand Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 36 ff. With regard to the parallel between our verse and Josephus, Ant., vii., 9, 2, it is evident that even if St. Luke had read Josephus he was not dependent upon him, for he says here τοῦ καλ. just as in his Gospel he had written τὸ καλ., probably giving one or more popular names by which the place was known; Gloël, Galaterbrief, p. 65 (see also on the word W. H., ii., Appendix, p. 165; Plummer, St. Luke, p. 445; and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93). — σαββάτου έχουν δίδον, not ἦνεχον: the distance is represented as something which the mountain has, Meyer-Wendt; cf. Luke xxiv. 13. There is no real discrepancy between this and the statement of St. Luke's Gospel that our Lord led His disciples ὅς πρὸς Βηθανίαν, xxiv. 50, a village which was more than double a sabbath day's journey, fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem. But if the words in St. Luke, l. c., mean "over against Bethany," ὃς πρὸς (so Feine, Eine vorkanonische Übersetzung des Lucas, p. 79, and Nösgen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 80; see also Rendall, Acts, p. 171—Blass omits ὃς and reads only τῶν πρὸς and remarks quæ vera πρὸς est eis; cf. also Belser, Theologische Quartalschrift, i., 79 (1895)), the difficulty is surmounted, for St. Luke does not fix the exact spot of the Ascension, and he elsewhere uses the Mount of Olives. Luke xxii. 37, as the equivalent of the Bethany of Matthew (xxii. 17) and Mark (xi. 1). Nor is it likely that our Lord would lead His disciples into a village for the event of His Ascension. It should be remembered that Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., says that "the Ascension was from the place where that tract of the Mount of Olives ceased to be called Bethphage and began to be called Bethany." The recent attempt of Rud. Hoffmann to refer the Ascension to a "Galilee" in the Mount of Olives rests upon a tradition which cannot be regarded as reliable (see Galilaea auf dem Oelberg, Leipzig, 1896), although he can quote Resch as in agreement with him, p. 14. On Hoffmann's pamphlet see also Expositor (5th series), p. 119 (1897), and Theologisches Literaturblatt, No. 27 (1897). This mention of the distance is quite characteristic of St. Luke; it may also have been introduced here for the benefit of his Gentile readers; Page, Acts, in loco, and cf. Ramsay's remarks, Was Christ born at Bethlehem? pp. 55, 56.

Ver. 13. τὸ ὑπερώον: "the upper chamber," R.V., as of some well-known place, but there is no positive evidence to identify it with the room of the Last Supper, although here and in Mark xiv. 15, as also in Luke xxii. 12, the Vulgate has conaculum. Amongst recent writers Hilgenfeld and Feine see in this definite mention of a room well known to the readers a reference to
και Θωμᾶς, Βαρθολομαίος καὶ Ματθαίος, ἵνα οὖν Ἰησοῦς, καὶ Ιούδας Ἰακώβου. 14. οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν

1 Ματθαίος ΑΒpegawai, Ματθαίος ΝΒpegawai, So Tisch., W.H., Weiss; see Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 60, 61. For Ἰακώβους, ΝΒpegawai, Σιμών ο Ζηλωτής, καὶ Ιούδας Ἰακώβου. 14. οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν

2 καὶ τῇ δεήσει C, Chrys. Omitted by ΝΑΒpegawai, DE 61, and others, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilgenfeld. συν γυναιξιν, D adds καὶ τεκνοις, so Hilgenfeld, but rejected by Blass ("male D"), for which see criticism of Weiss, Codex D, p. 54; probably occasioned by mention of the women, cf. xxii. 5. συν γυναιξιν, D adds καὶ τεκνοις, so Hilgenfeld, but rejected by Blass ("male D"), for which see criticism of Weiss, Codex D, p. 54; probably occasioned by mention of the women, cf. xxii. 5.

the author's first book, Luke xxii. 11, 12. But the word used in St. Mark and in St. Luke's Gospel is different from that in the passage before us—ἀνάγαιον, but here ὑπέρωον. If we identify the former with the κατάλυμα, Luke xxii. 11, it would denote rather the guest-chamber used for meals than the upper room or loft set apart for retirement or prayer, although sometimes used for supper or for assemblies (ὑπέρωον). Both words are found in classical Greek, but only the latter in the LXX, where it is frequent. In the N.T. it is used by St. Luke alone, and only in Acts. Holtzmann, following Lightfoot and Schöttgen, considers that an upper room in the Temple is meant, but this would be scarcely probable under the circumstances, and a meeting in a private house, ii. 46, iv. 23, v. 42, is far more likely. δὲ τῇ π.: in a series of nouns embraced under one category only the first may have the article, Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 154-157. In comparing this list of the Apostles with that given by the Synoptists we notice that whilst St. Peter stands at the head in the four lists, those three are placed in the first group who out of the whole band are prominent in the Acts as also in the Gospels, viz., Peter, John, and James; all the Synoptists, however, place St. James as the elder brother before St. John. In St. Luke's first list, as in St. Matthew's list, the brothers Peter and Andrew stand first, followed by another pair of brothers James and John; but in Acts Andrew gives place, as we might expect, to the three Apostles who had been admitted to the closest intimacy with Jesus during His earthly life, and St. John as St. Peter's constant companion in the Gospel narrative makes a pair with him. The list in Acts agrees with that given by St. Luke in his Gospel in two particulars (see Friedrich, ubi supra, p. 50, and so too Zeller): (1) Simon the Zealot is called not ὁ Καυνοῖος, as in Matthew and Mark, but ὁ Ζηλωτής, cf. Luke vi. 15; (2) instead of Thaddaeus (or Lebbaeus) we have "Judas of James," cf. Luke vi. 16—Ἰουδας Ἰακώβου, "the son of James," R.V. (so too above Ἰακώβους Αλφαίου, "James the son of Alpheus"), placing the words "or, brother, see Jude i.," in the margin, so too in Luke vi. 16. The rendering of the words as Jude the brother of James was probably caused by Jude i., and it is difficult to believe, as Nösgen argues (see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 262), that in the same list and in such close proximity these two meanings "the son of" and "the brother of" should occur for the genitive, although no doubt it is possible grammatically; see Nösgen and Wendt, in loco. On the other hand, see Felten, note, p. 66. But Winer, to whom the latter refers, is by no means positive, and only expresses the opinion that ἄδελφος is perhaps to be supplied here and in Luke vi. 16 if the same Apostle is referred to in Jude i. (Winer-Moulton, p. 238). But the identification with the latter is very improbable, as he was most likely the brother of James, known as "the Lord's brother" (see Plummer on Luke, vi. 16, and Salmon, Introduction to N. T., pp. 473, 474, fifth edit.). It is also noteworthy that St. Luke uses ἄδελφος where he means "brother," cf. Luke iii. 1, vi. 14; Acts xii. 2. Blass, Grammatik des N. G., gives the same reference to Alciatii, ii., 2, as Winer, Τικκρέας ὁ Μετροδώρου, sc. ἄδελφος, but at the same time he declines to commit himself as to the passage in Acts and Luke vi. The list, it has been thought, is given here again by St. Luke to show the recovery of the Apostolic band from their denial and flight—so St. Chrysostom remarks that Luke did well to mention the disciples, for since one had betrayed Christ and another had been unbelieving, he hereby shows that, except the first, all were preserved (so to the same effect
There may also have been the desire of the author to intimate that although only the works of a few on the list would be chronicled, yet all alike were witnesses to Christ and workers for Him (Lumby).

Ver. 14. και ἴσως προσκαρτεροῦντες: on the construction see ver. 10. In N.T. found only in St. Luke and St. Paul (except once in St. Mark iii. 9); most frequently with the dative of the thing, of continuing steadfast in prayer; cf. vii. 4, Rom. xii. 12, Col. iv. 2, and cf. also ii. 42 or ii. 46 of continuing all the time in (ἐν) a place; in Acts viii. 13, x. 7, it is used with the dative of the person, and in Rom. xiii. 6 with τίς τι. It is found in Josephus with the dative of the thing, Ant., v. 2, 6, and in Polybius, who also uses it with the dative of the person. In LXX it is found in Numbers xiii. 21 and in Susannah ver. 6, Theod., also in Tobit v. 8, S.—ὁμοθυμαδὸν, a favourite word of St. Luke: Luca in Acts in deliciis est (Blass)—used ten or eleven times in Acts, only once elsewhere in N.T., Rom. xv. 6, where it has the same meaning, Vulgate unanimitas. In the LXX it is oftener found as the equivalent of Hebrew words meaning simply "together," and Hatch, Essays in B. G., p. 63, would limit it to this meaning in the N.T., but the word cannot be confined to mere outward assembling together; cf. Dem., Phil., iv., 147. ὁμοθυμαδὸν καὶ μᾶς γνώμης (Meyer-Wendt); so Luther einmiithig. It was very natural that St. Luke should lay stress upon the absolute unanimity of the early believers, and the word is used with reference to the Twelve, to the hundred- and-twenty, to the whole number of believers; truly the Holy Ghost was "amator concordiae" (Corn. à Lapide).

—τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσῃ: the latter noun cannot be supported by MS. authority; the two words mark the difference between general and specific prayer; cf. Bengel on 1 Tim. ii. 1, and cf. Luke, v. 33. It is very doubtful whether we can confine προσευχή here to the Temple prayers; rather the article, cf. vi. 4 and ii. 42, seems to point to a definite custom of common prayer as a bond of Christian fellowship (Hort, Ecclesia, p. 43, so Speaker's Commentary, in loco). As in his Gospel, so here and elsewhere in Acts, St. Luke lays stress upon frequency in prayer, and that too in all parts of the book (Friedrich, pp. 55-60).—σὺν γυναιξὶ: it is natural to include the women already mentioned in St. Luke's Gospel, cf., e.g., vii. 2, 3, xxiii. 55, "with the women," R.V., or the expression may be quite indefinite as in margin R.V. In this mention of the presence of women, as in the stress laid upon prayer, there is another point of unity between the book and the third Gospel, "The Gospel of Womanhood" (see also Ramsay, Was Christ born at Bethlehem? p. 50). (The mention of women would certainly indicate a private house rather than the Temple.) Erasmus and Calvin both interpret the words cum uxoribus, probably not without desire to make a point against celibacy. J. Lightfoot allows that this meaning may be correct, since the Apostles and disciples who had wives took them with them, "but," he adds, "it is too strait."—Μαριάμ (for Μαρία), so always according to W. H. of the Blessed Virgin, nominative, vocative, accusative, dative, except twice in a few of the best MSS. (Matt. i. 20, and Luke ii. 19). Cf. Appendix, p. 163. See also Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 28, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 91, note. The και may be taken either to comprehend her under the other women, or as distinguishing her from them. This is the last mention of her in the N.T., and the Scripture leaves her "in prayer"—σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ: they are previously mentioned as unbelieving (John vii. 5, and compare Mark vi. 4), but not only the Resurrection of the Lord but also that of Lazarus may well have overcome their unbelief. St. Chrysostom (so too Ecumenius) conjectures that Joseph was dead, for it is not to be supposed, he says, that when the brethren had become believers Joseph believed not. As the brethren are here distinguished from the Eleven, it would seem that they could not have been included in the latter (see, however, "Brethren," B.D. pp. 13, 14). But whatever meaning we give to the word "brethren" here or in the Gospels, nothing could be more significant than the fact that they had now left their
settled homes in Galilee to take part in the lot of the disciples of Jesus, and to await with them the promise of the Father (Felten). It may have been that James, "the Lord's brother," was converted by the Resurrection, I Cor. xv. 5, and that his example constrained the other "brethren" to follow him.

Ver. 15. καὶ εν ταῖσ ἡμέραις ταῦταις: St. Luke often employs such notes of time, used indefinitely like similar expressions in Hebrew—e.g., I Sam. xxviii. 1, both in his Gospel and in Acts. Fried rich, p. 9, Lekebusch, p. 53.—ἀναστάς: it is very characteristic of St. Luke to add a participle to a finite verb indicating the posture or position of the speaker. This word is found in St. Luke's Gospel seventeen times, and in Acts nineteen times, only twice in Matthew, six or seven times in Mark; cf. also his use of σταθείς, three times in Gospel, six times in Acts, but not at all in the other Evangelists.—Πέτρος: that St. Peter should be the spokesman is only what we should naturally expect from his previous position among the Twelve, but, as St. Chrysostom observes, he does everything with the common consent, nothing imperiously. The best fruits of his repentance are here seen in the fulfilment of his commission to strengthen his brethren. εν μέσω: another favourite expression of St. Luke both in his Gospel and in the Acts, in the former eight times, in the latter five times (four times in St. Matthew, twice in St. Mark).

Blass compares the Hebrew יָּנָּר, Grammatik des N. G., p. 126, and in loco. —μαθητῶν: Blass retains and contends that διδαχὴ has arisen from either ver. 14 or ver. 16; but there is strong critical authority for the latter word; cf. vi. 1. In LXX it is used in three senses; a brother and a neighbour, Lev. xix. 17; a member of the same nation, Exod. ii. 14, Deut. xv. 3. In the N.T. it is used in these three senses, and also in the sense of fellow-Christians, who are looked upon as forming one family. The transition is easily seen: (1) member of the same family; (2) of the same community (national), of the same community (spiritual). Kennedy, Sources of N.T. Greek, pp. 95, 96. On its use in religious associations in Egypt see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, 1., 82, 140, 209.—τε: here for the first time solitarium. On the frequent recurrence of this word in Acts in all parts, as compared with other books of the N.T., see Blass, Grammatik des N. G., pp. 257, 258.—συμμετέχων: R.V., "persons." Lightfoot compares the use of the word in Rev. iii. 4, xi. 13 (so too Wendt), where the word is used to signify any persons without distinction of sex, so that the word may have been used here to include the women also. But he considers that it rather means men as distinct from women, and so, as he says, the Syriac and Arabic understand it here. Its use in the sense of persons reckoned up by name is Hebraistic יָּנָּר LXX, Numb. i. 2, 18, 20; iii. 40, 43; xxii. 53 (Grimm-Thayer, sub vi.), but see also for a similar use on the Egyptian papyri, Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 24 (1897)._περὶ το αὐτό, "gathered together," R.V.; cf. Matt. xxii. 34, Luke xvii. 35. Acts ii. 1, 44, 47 (so W.H., R.V., see in loco, Wendt, Weiss), 1 Cor. xi. 20, xiv. 23. Holtzmann, in loco, describes it as always local, and it is no doubt so used in most of the above passages, as also in LXX Psalm ii. 2 (cf. Acts iv. 26), 2 Sam. ii. 13, 3 Macc. i. 3, Sus. v. 14, and in classical Greek. But when we remember the stress laid by St. Luke in the opening chapters of the Acts upon the unanimity of the believers, it is not unlikely that he should use the phrase, at all events in ii. 44, 47, with this deeper thought of unity of purpose and devotion underlying the words, even if we cannot render the phrase in each passage in Acts with Rendall (Acts, p. 34), "with one mind," "of one mind," —ως εκατον εἰκοσιν. Both Wendt and Feine reject the view that the number is merely mythical (Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, Weizsäcker), and would rather see in it a definite piece of information which St. Luke had gained. It is quite beside the mark to suppose that St. Luke only used this particular number because it represented the Apostles multiplied by 10, or 40 multiplied by 3. If he had wished to emphasise the number as a number, why introduce the ός?
16. "Andres adelphi, edei 1 ἐπληρωθήναι τὴν γραφήν ταύτην, ἢν προείπε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιόν διὰ στόματος Δαβίδ, περὶ ἱουδα τοῦ γενομένου ὁδηγοῦ τοῖς συλλαβοῦσι τὸν ἤησοῦν. 17. διὶ κατηριθμημένος ἢν σὺν

1 edii ABCDE, Origen, Eus., Ath., W.H., Weiss. edii D*, Vulg., Boh.; so Gig., Par., Aug. (Iren., Vig.), Hilgenfeld. Blass, p. xvii., in his Preface to β, argues that as Irenaeus omits 17a-20 and elsewhere seems to be ignorant of the death of Judas, so his text also omitted from κατηρ. εν ημιν to γενηθητω. In his revised edition Luke added 17a-20 and also substituted edei for the original δεὶ: "ut significaret ex parte jam esse ratum factum vetus vaticinium, exitu nemen Judae ". But the omission of Irenaeus may be accidental, or it has been suggested that he too may have regarded 17a-20 as a parenthesis and not actually part of Peter's speech. Δαβίδ; but in ΒBD, so W.H., Weiss Δαυείδ. Ace read ΔΑΔ; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 65, Blass, Proleg. (Acta Apost.), p. 34.

Ver. 16. "Andres adelphi: a mode of address indicating not only respect but also the solemnity of the occasion and the importance of the subject. There is nothing unclassical in this use of the vocative without ὦ at the beginning of speeches. Demosthenes, at least on some occasions, used the phrase "Andres Ἀθηναίοι without ὦ. Simcox, ubi supra, p. 76, note, and see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 258, note.—εδεί: very frequent in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts; in the former nineteen, in the latter twenty-five times, and in all parts of the book, Friedrich, ubi supra, p. 22 (Lekebusch). It expresses a divine necessity, and is used by all the Evangelists, as by St. Peter here, and by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 25), of the events connected with and following upon the Passion.—δεὶ, oportet, expresses logical necessity rather than personal moral obligation ὅψειλαν, debeat, or the sense of fitness, ἔπρεπεν, debebat. The three words are all found in Heb. ii. 1, 17, 10, on which see Westcott, Hebrews, p. 36, and Plummer's St. Luke, p. 247. St. Peter's speech falls into two parts, one introduced by δεί, and the other introduced by δει, ver. 21. —τὴν γραφήν: the reference is undoubtedly to the particular passages in the O.T. which follow, cf. Luke iv. 20. Acts viii. 35; see Lightfoot on Galatians iii. 22. There is no reference to Psalm xlii. 9, or this passage would have been quoted, but to the passages in ver. 20.—τοὺς ἑδένει, cf. Luke xxiv. 44, 45. θηρδῶ (which is very frequently used by St. Luke, Friedrich, ubi supra, p. 40) means more than "fulfil" in the popular acceptation of the word; it implies "to fill up to the full"; "Not only is our Lord the subject of direct predictions in the Old Testament, but His claims go to the full extent of affirming that all the truths which are imperfectly, and frequently very darkly shadowed forth in the pages, are realised in Him as the ideal to which they pointed " (Row, Bampton Lectures, pp. 202, 203).—τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον. St. Luke uses this, or a similar expression, πνεῦμα ἄγιον or τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, about forty times in Acts alone, whilst in St. Luke's Gospel alone it is used about as many times as in the three other Evangelists together (Lekebusch, Apostelgeschichte, p. 65, and Plummer, St. Luke, p. 14).—δύνας τοῖς συλλ. τὸν ἤησοῦν. St. Peter simply states a fact, but does not heap scorn or abuse upon Judas (Chrysostom, Hom., iii., cf. Theophylact). St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. John simply say of Judas ἐπαράβιον, "he who delivered Him up," or employ some similar expression; he is never called "the traitor" (St. Luke vi. 16, ἐγένετο προδότης, "became a traitor," see Plummer, in loco). This self-restraint is remarkable on the part of men who must have regarded their Master's Death as the most atrocious of murders (see Row, Bampton Lectures, pp. 179, 180, note). At the same time the word ὅθηνεσ seems to bring before us the scene in Gethsemane, how Judas went before the multitude, and drew near to Jesus to kiss Him (Luke xxii. 47), and to show us how vividly the memories of the Passion were present to St. Peter; cf. 1 Peter ii. 21 ff.).

Ver. 17. διὶ κατηριθμημένος ἢν κ.κ.λ. For the construction see ver. 10. Δει introduces the ground upon which the Scripture to be cited, which speaks of the vacancy in the Apostolic office, found its fulfilment in Judas; "he was numbered," "triste est numerari non manere," Bengel.—καὶ ἐλαχιν τὸν κάλρον: lit., "and obtained by lot the lot." κάλρος, a lot, that which is assigned by lot, the portion or share so assigned; so amongst the Greeks, and somewhat similarly in English, cf. in LXX Wisdom ii. 9, v. 5, Ecclesiasticus
18. οὕτως μὲν οὖν ἐκτίθητο χαρίον ἐκ τοῦ μισθοῦ τῆς ἁδικίας, καὶ πρηνίς γενόμενοι, καὶ ἔλαχε τὸν κλήρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης.

Τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ἔκτιθητο χωρίον ἀπὸ τοῦ μισθοῦ τῆς ἁδικίας, καὶ πρηνίς γεγονότοι. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔκτιθητο ἐγκριθείς

Ver. 18. οὕτως μὲν οὖν κ.τ.λ. This verse and the next are regarded in R.V. as a parenthesis (compare also W.H.), μὲν οὖν making the transition from St. Peter's own words to the explanatory statement of St. Luke; see Rendall's Appendix on μὲν οὖν, although he would place ver. 20 also in a parenthesis, Acts, p. 160 ff. For this frequent use of μὲν οὖν in Acts, see also Blass, who regards μὲν as used here, as in other places, without any following antithesis expressed by οὐ, Grammatik des N. G., pp. 261, 267, see also Hackett's note in loco. Spitta, Feine, Weiss, see in these two verses an editorial interpolation.—ἐκτίθητο χαρίον. To harmonise this with Matt. xxvii. 5, an explanation has been often used to this effect, that although Judas did not purchase the field, it was purchased by his money, and that thus he might be called its possessor. This was the explanation adopted by the older commentators, and by many modern. Theophylact, e.g., describes Judas as rightly called the κύριος of the field, for the price of it was his. It is no doubt quite possible that St. Peter (if the words are his and not St. Luke's) should thus express himself rhetorically (and some of his other expressions are certainly rhetorical, e.g., ἔλαχε μέσος), or that Judas should be spoken of as the possessor of the field, just as Joseph of Arimathea is said to have hewn his own tomb, or Pilate to have scourged Jesus, but possibly Dr. Ebersheim's view that the blood-money by a fiction of law was still considered to belong to Judas may help to explain the difficulty, Jesus the Messiah, ii., 575. Lightfoot comments, "Not that he himself bought the field, for Matthew resolvesthe contrary—nor was there any such thing in his intention when he bargained for the money," and then he adds, "But Peter by a bitter irris or sheweth the fruit and profit of his wretched covetise:" Hor. Heb. (see also Hackett's note). Without fully endorsing this, it is quite possible that St. Peter, or St. Luke, would contrast the portion in the ministry which Judas had received with the little which was the result of the price of his iniquity. —ἐκ τοῦ μισθοῦ τῆς ἁδικίας pro τοῦ ἐκτίθητο χαρίον μισθοῦ, a Hebraism, Blass, in loco, see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 268. The phrase only occurs again in 2 Peter ii. 13, 15; on this use of ἐκ see Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 146. Combinations of words with ἁδικία are characteristic of St. Luke (Friedrich). In the other Evangelists the word is only found once. John vii. 18. —καὶ πρὴν ἐλαχεῖ, Wendt (following Zeller and Overbeck) and others maintain
μεν ἐλάκησε μέσος, καὶ ἔξεχυθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ· 19.
καὶ γνωστὸν ἔγνετο τὰς τοὺς κατοικοῦν ἰερουσαλήμ, ὡστε
κληθήσεται τῇ ἡδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἄκελδαμά, 1

1 Ἄκελδαμά, so C, Syr. Harc., Chrys., Vulg.: Ἄκελδαμάξ ΝΑ 40, 61, Tisch.;
Ἀκελδαμάξ B, so W.H., Weiss: Ἄκελδαμάξ D (Blass in β-βιβα), so Hilg., and other
variants; in Gig., Par. -

that St. Luke here follows a different
tradition from St. Matthew, xxvii. 6 ff.,
and that it is only arbitrary to attempt
to reconcile them. But Felten and
Ζόκλερ (so too Lumby and Jacobson)
see in St. Luke's description a later stage
in the terrible end of the traitor. St.
Matthew says και ἐπελθὼν ἐπῆξα: if
the rope broke, or a branch gave way
under the weight of Judas, St. Luke's
narrative might easily be supplementary
to that of St. Matthew. Blass, in loco,
adopts the former alternative, and holds
that thus the narrative may be harmon
ised with that of St. Matthew, ῥυπὸ
fune Juda in terram procidisse. It is
difficult to see (as against Overbeck) why
πρῆνης γεν. is inconsistent with this.
The words no doubt mean strictly "falling
flat on his face" opposed to υπτίος,
not "falling headlong," and so they do
not necessarily imply that Judas fell over
a precipice, but Hackett's view that Judas
may have hung himself from a tree on
the edge of a precipice near the valley of
Hinnom, and that he fell on to the rocky
pavement below is suggested from his
own observation of the locality, p. 36,
Acts of the Apostles (first English edition),
see also Eidersheim, ιδι supra, pp. 575,
576. At all events there is nothing dis
concerting in the supposition that we
may have here "some unknown series of
facts, of which we have but two frag
mentary narratives", "Judas," B.D.,
and see further Plummer sub v. in Hast
ings' B.D. Διάλεξη: here only in the
N.T. λάκησα: a strong expression, signi
fying bursting asunder with a loud noise,
Hom., Iliad, xiii., 616; cf. also Acta
Thoma, 33 (p. 219, ed. Tfl.): ἐ δράκου
Φοτεινῆς Διάλεξης καὶ ἐπίθημα καὶ
ἔξεχυθη ὅ λει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ χολή, for the

Ver. 19. καὶ γνωστὸν ... τὰς τοὺς κατοικοῦν ἰερουσαλήμ: the words have
been taken to support the view that we
have here a parenthesis containing the
notice of St. Luke, but if St. Peter was
speaking rhetorically he might easily ex
press himself so. But many critics, who
refuse to see in the whole of the two
verses any parenthetical remarks of the
historian, adopt the view that τῇ διαλέκτῳ
αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν χωρίον αὐτῶ
are explanations introduced by St. Luke,
who could trust to his Gentile readers to
distinguish between his words and those
of St. Peter (Wendt, Holtzmann, Ζόκλερ,
Νόσγεν, Jungst. Matthias).—τῇ διαλέκτῳ:
only in Acts in the N.T., where it is used
six times in all parts; it may mean dia
lect or language, but here it is used in
the latter sense (R.V.) to distinguish
Aramaic from Greek (cf. its use in Poly
bius).—αὐτῶν, i.e., the dwellers of Jeru
salem, who spoke Aramaic—unless the
whole expression is used rhetorically, it
would seem that it contains the words,
not of St. Peter, who himself spoke
Aramaic, but of the author (see Blass, in
loco).—Ἀκελδαμά: the Aramaic of the
Field of Blood would be Νῷβν Ἰτίνυ,
and it is possible that the χ may be added
to represent in some way the guttural Ν,
just as Σιράχ = Ναβυδ, cf. Blass, in loco,
and Grammatik des N. G., p. 13. W.H. (so
Blass) read Ἄκελδαμάχ (and Αχελδαμάχ,
Tisch. and Treg.), see also on the word
Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 60 and 63. A
new derivation has been proposed by
Klostermann, Probleme in Apostelterte,
p. 6 ff., which has gained considerable
attention (cf. Holzmann, Wendt, Felten,
Ζόκλερ, in loco), viss.: Ἀκελδαμάχ = κοῦματάρθη,
so that the word = κομήτηριον, cf. Matt.
xxvii. 8. This is the derivation preferred
by Wendt, and it is very tempting, but
see also Enc. Bibl., I., 32, 1899, sub v.

It is true that the two accounts in St.
Matthew and St. Luke give two reasons
for the name Field of Blood. But why
should there not be two reasons? If the
traitor in the agony of his remorse rushed
from the Τemple into the valley of Hinnom,
and across the valley to "the pot
ner's field" of Jeremiah, the old name of
the potter's field might easily become
changed in the popular language into
that of "field of blood," whilst the rea
son given by St. Matthew for the name
might still hold good, since the blood
money, which by a fiction of law was
still considered to belong to Judas, was employed for the purchase of the accursed spot as a burial ground for strangers. See Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., 574, 575. Whatever may be alleged as to the growth of popular fancy and tradition in the later account in Acts of the death of Judas, it cannot be said to contrast unfavourably with the details given by Papias, Fragment, 18, which Blass describes as "insulsissima et fœdissima".

Ver. 20. The quotation is twofold, the first part from Psalm lxix. 26 (LXX, ichiii.); in the LXX we have αὐτῶν, changed here into αὐτοῦ with reference to Judas, whilst εν τοις σκηνώμασιν is omitted and the words εν αυτή, referring to ἐπαυλίς, are added. The omission would make the application of the words more general than in the original, which related to the desolation of the encampment and tents of a nomadic tribe. The other part of the quotation is verbatim from Psalm cviii. 8 (cix.), called by the ancients the Iscariot Psalm. With the exception of Psalm xxii., no Psalm is more frequently quoted in the N.T. than lxix.; cf. ver. 9 with John ii. 17; ver. 21 with Matt. xxvi. 34, and with John xix. 28; ver. 22 and 23 with Rom. xi. 9, 10; and ver. 9 with Rom. xv. 3. In these Psalms, as in the twenty-second Psalm, we see how the history of prophets and holy men of old, of a David or a Jeremiah, was typical of the history of the Son of man made perfect through suffering, and we know how our Lord Himself saw the fulfilment of the words of the suffering Psalmist (xli. 9) in the tragic events of His own life (John xiii. 18). So too St. Peter in the recent miserable end of the traitor sees another evidence, not only of the general truth, which the Psalmists learnt through suffering, that God rewarded His servants and that confusion awaited the unrighteous, but also another fulfilment in the case of Judas of the doom which the Psalmists of old had invoked upon the persecutors of the faithful servants of God. But we are not called upon to regard Psalm cix. as the Iscariot Psalm in all its details (see Perowne, Psalms, p. 538 (smaller edition)), or to forget, as Delitzsch reminds us, that the spirit of Elias is not that of the N.T. St. Peter, although he must have regarded the crime of Judas as a crime without a parallel, does not dwell upon his punishment, but passes at once to the duty incumbent upon the infant Church in view of the vacant Apostleship.—ἐπαυλίς: by many commentators, both ancient and modern (Chrys., Oecum., so too Nosgen, Overbeck, Wendt, Blase, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Jüngst), this is referred to the χωρίον, which was rendered desolate by the death of Judas in it, on the ground that γάρ thus maintains its evident relation to what precedes. But if the two preceding verses are inserted by St. Luke, and form no part of St. Peter's words, it would seem that ἐπαυλίς must be regarded as parallel to ἐπισκοπή in the second quotation.—ἐπισκοπήν: "his office," R.V. ("overseership," margin), so for the same word in LXX, Ps. cix. 8, from which the quotation is made. In the LXX the word is used, Num. iv. 16, for the charge of the tabernacle. St. Peter uses the word ἐπισκοπῶν in Peter ii. 25, and it is significant that there the translators of 1611 maintain the use of the word "bishop," as here "bishopsrock" (so R.V., "overseer," margin), whilst they use "overseer" and "oversight" (ἐπισκοπή), Acts xx. 28 and 1 Peter v. 2, where the reference is to the function of the elders or presbyters. The word ἐπισκοπή, of course, could not have its later ecclesiastical force, but the Apostolic office of Judas might well be described as one of oversight, and care of others; and it is significant that it is so described, and not only as a διάκονος (see below on ver. 25, and on ἐπισκοπῶν, xx. 28, note): "St. Peter would not have quoted the Psalm containing the expression ἐπισκοπή unless he had instinctively felt the word to be applicable to Judas' position" (Canon Gore in Guardian, 16th March, 1898).
2ο-23. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

εξήλθενεφ'ημάςο κύριος Ιησούς, 22. αρξάμενος από τον βαπτισμόν του Ιωάννου, εως της ημέρας ης ανελήφθη αφ' ημών, μάρτυρα της αναστάσεως αυτού γενόσαθι συν ημίν ένα τούτων. 23. Καί έστησαν δύο, 'Ιωσήφ τον καλούμενον Βαρσαβάν,1 και έστησαν εστίν τόν καλαμένον Βαρσαβάν,2 διεκκλήθη 'Ιουστός, καί

1 εως BCDE, so W.H., Wendt doubtful, Weiss; αερ ΝΑ 61—both εως and εστήσας, as Wendt points out, are frequent in Luke.
2 Βαροβαβαν C, Vulg. clm., Syrr.; Βαρσαββαν, so ΝΑΒΕ, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; Βαροβαβαν D, Gign., Par. tol., Aeth.—but Blass reads = W.H. in his β text—Wendt thinks that D may have been a confusion with ιν.36—see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56, on the spelling.

to render εφ' ημάς, “over us,” R.V., margin, for in full the phrase would run: εισήλθεν εφ' ημάς και εξήλθεν αφ' ημών. The formula shows that St. Peter did not shrink from dwelling upon the perfect humanity of the Ascended Christ, whilst in the same sentence he speaks of Him as ο κύριος.

Ver. 22. αρξάμενος, cf. note on verse 1. The word need not be restricted to our Lord's own baptism, but would include the time of the baptism preached by John, as his baptism and preaching were the announcement of, and a preparation for, the Christ. If St. Mark's Gospel, as there is every reason to believe, was closely connected with St. Peter, its opening verses give us a similar date for the commencement of the Apostolic testimony; cf. Schmid, Bibilische Theologie des N.T., p. 436.—Τοις της ημέρας: according to Wendt and Weiss, the relative is not attracted for ή, but isto be regarded as a genitive of time, but cf. Lev. xxiii.15, Ηaggai ii.18, Bar. i.15; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 226; Blass, ubi supra, p. 170.—μάρτυρα της αναστάσεως. It has been noted as remarkable that St. Peter here lays down eminence in any subjective grace or quality, as one of the conditions of Apostleship, but it is evident that from the first the testimony of the Apostles was not merely to the facts, but to their spiritual bearing, cf. chap. v. 32: “On the one side there is the historical witness to the facts, on the other, the internal testimony of personal experience” (Westcott's St. John, xvii, 27), and the appeal to Him “Who knew the hearts,” showed that something more was needed than intellectual competency. Spitta and Jungst (so Weiss) regard the whole clause έν τοις χρόνων ... αφ' ημών as introduced by a reviser, but on the other hand Hilgenfeld considers the words to be in their right place. He also rebukes Weiss for maintaining that the whole passage, vv. 15-26, could not have been composed by the author of the book, who gives no indication of the number of the Apostles, with whom the Twelve as such play no part, and who finds his hero outside their number. But Hilgenfeld points out that the Twelve have for his “author to Theophilus” a very important place; cf. ii. 14, 22, iv. 33, v. 12, 40, viii. 1, 14, ix. 27.

Ver. 23. έστησαν, not έστησεν: the latter reading, “nimium Petro dat, nihil concilio relinquit” (Blass). “They put forward,” R.V., not “appointed,” A.V., for the appointment had not yet been made.—'Ιωσήφ τον καλ. Βαρσαβάν, “Joseph called Barsabbas”. We cannot identify him with Joseph Barnabas (iv. 36), or with Judas Barsabbas (xv. 22). Barsabbas may have been a patronymic ‘son of Sabba,” but cf. Εnc. Βib., I., 487, 1899. It is only a conjecture that he was the brother of Judas Barsabbas just mentioned. The name Justus is probably a Roman surname, as Ιουστός indicates, adopted after the custom of the time, just as the second Evangelist took the Roman name Marcus in addition to the Hebrew John. Nothing more is said of him in the N.T. Eusebius ranks him with Matthias as one of the Seventy, H.E., i., 12, and Papias is said to have related concerning him that he drank deadly poison but escaped all harm, Euseb., H.E., iii., 39. On the connection of this tradition with Aristion see Nestle, Einleitung in das G. N. T., p. 240, and Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 231. If the reading of Blass in β, supported by the Latin, τον καλ Ιουστον (qui et Justus) may claim acceptance, it affords, as Belser notes, an interesting parallel with the Σαύλος ο καί Παύλος of xiii. 8. On the spelling of the word, see W.H. Appendix p. 166, and also Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 56, 57.—Απόστολος. Nothing more is known of him with certainty than that he must have fulfilled the qualifications required.
Matth. 24. και προσευξάμενοι εἶπον, Δι Κύριε, καρδιογνώστα πάντων, ἀνάδειξον ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ἕνα δι' ἐξέλεξο, 25. λαβεῖν τὸν Ἰωάν. 

The words may well have been addressed to Christ: St. Peter had just spoken of Him as the Lord, his own experience and that of his fellow-disciples must have taught him that Jesus was One Who knew the hearts of all men (John ii. 25, χxi. τ7), and he had heard His Master's claim to have chosen the Apostles (cf. Luke vi. 13, and ν. 2 above, where the same verb is used). On the other hand Wendt regards as decisive against this view that St. Peter himself in xv. 7 says εξελέξατο ο θεός and then in ver. 8 calls God καρδιογνώστης (cf. Jeremiah xvii. το, where Jehovah is said to search the heart). But the passage in Acts xiv. is much too general in its reference to consider it decisive against any special prerogative ascribed to Jesus here (viz., the choice of His own Apostles), and the references to 2 Cor. i. 1, Ephes. ii. 1, where St. Paul refers his Apostleship to God, may be fairly met by Acts xi. 17 and xxvi. 16. It is quite true that in iv. 20 Κύριε is used in prayer mainly addressed to the Lord Jehovah, but it is equally certain that prayer was directed to Christ in the earliest days of the Church (Zahn, Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche, pp. 1-38 and notes), see also below on ii. 21 (and cf. i Thess. iii. 11, 12, and 2 Thess. ii. 15; Archbishop of Armagh in Speaker's Commentary, iii. 600). —ἀνάδειξον: in Luke χ. 1 the only other passage in the N.T. where the word is used, it is applied to our Lord's appointment of the Seventy, and is rendered "appointed," A. and R.V. But here R.V. renders "show" as A.V. (Rendall, "appoint"). The verb however may be used in the sense of showing forth or clearly, and hence to proclaim, especially a person's appointment to an office (cf. the noun ἀνάδειξις also used by St. Luke only in his Gospel, i. 80); cf. for the former meaning, 2 Macc. ii. 8, cf. v. 6, and for the latter, 2 Macc. ix. 14, 23, 35; x. 11; xiv. 12, 26; 1 Esdras i. 35, viii. 23; so too the use of the word in Polybius and Plutarch (see Grimm-Thayer, sub v.), and Weiss, in loco). 

Ver. 25. τὸν κλήρον: R.V. τὸν τόπον marking the antithesis between the place in the Apostleship and "his own place" to which Judas had gone, Vulg. locum. —ἡ διακονία ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολή: as above we have not only the word διακονία used but also ἐπισκοπή, ν. τ7 and 20, so here too we have not only διακονία but also ἀποστολή, although no doubt there is a sense in which we may truly say with Dr. Hort (Ecclesia, p. 204) that Apostleship is the highest form of ministration. On the word ἀποστολή see xiii. 2, 3; the term was undoubtedly used in N.T. to include others besides the Twelve, although there is no reason to suppose that the qualification of having "seen the Lord" was in any case invalidated (cf. Gwatkin, "Apostle," Hastings' B.D., p. 126). The whole narrative before us which relates the solemn appeal of the Church to her Ascended Lord, and the choice determined upon in immediate sequence to that appeal, is clearly at variance with any conception of Apostleship as other than a divine commission received directly from Christ Himself (Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 130). —κατεβεῖ, "fell away," R.V. cf. LXX Ex. xxvii. 8, ἐκ της σκοτεινος Deut. ix. 12, xvii. 20, ἐκ τον ὄντος ἄνθρωπον (cf. xxviii. 14, A.), so the Heb. וַדַּעַת followed by הָלָּא. A.V. following Tyndall renders "by transgression fell," which lays too much stress upon "fell," which is not the prominent notion of the Greek verb, elsewhere "transgressed" (Humphry on Revised Version, p. 188). —ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦ θλιόν: on τόπος in the sense of social position, dignity, see Ecclesiasticus, xiii. 2, and also Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 95, of succeeding to the vacant place caused by death in a religious community. Here the phrase is usually explained as the place of punishment, Gehenna, cf. Baal-Turim on Numb. xxiv. 25 (and Gen. xxxi. 55) "Balaam ivit in locum suum," i.e., Gehenna, Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., while
24-26.
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κληρον ἡς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολής, εἰς ἡς παρέβη Ιούδας, πορευθηναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τῶν Ἰδιων. 26. καὶ ἔδωκαν κληρον αὐτῶν,


3 αὐτοῖς D'E, Syr. Harcl., Arm.; so Blass in β with Gig. and Par.1, so Hilg. αὐτοῖς ΝΑΒCD4, Vulg., and good versions; so Tiisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (probably the dative was misunderstood, see comment.).

on the other hand Schöttgen sees no need to explain the expression in this way. In each of the passages in the O.T. the word Ἰδιος does not occur in the LXX, although in the still more fanciful comment of the Rabbis on Job ii. 11, we have εἰς τὴν Ἰδιον χώραν. That the phrase Ἰδιος τόπων may be used in a good or bad sense is plain from Ignat., Magn., ν., in a passage which is naturally referred to the verse before us, where a man's "own place" denotes the place of reward, or that of punishment, cf., e.g., εἰς τὸν ἱδιόμενον τόπον, Polycarp, Phil., ix., where the words refer to the martyrs who were with the Lord, and εἰς τὸν ἱδιόλου τόπον τῆς δέξεος said of St. Peter, Clem. Rom., Cor. ν. Nöngén argues, Apostelchronik, pp. 88, 89, that we are not justified in concluding from a few Rabbinical passages which contain such fanciful interpretations of simple words (cf. the comment on Job ii. 11, quoted by Wetstein) that St. Peter must have meant " Gehenna ". In his wilful fall from the place chosen for him by God, Judas had chosen in self-will Ἰδιος τόπων, and this wilful and deliberate choice St. Peter would emphasise in contrast to the τόπος ἀποστολῆς about to be bestowed, ver. 25 (see also Rendall, Acts, p. 174). But however this may be, the words may well indicate a reserve on the part of St. Peter in speaking of the fate and destiny of Judas, characteristic of his reference to him cf. note on ver. 16. None of the other explanations offered can be deemed satisfactory, as, e.g., that the word πορευθηναι κ.τ.λ. refers to the successor of Judas; that Matthias should undertake the Apostolic circuit assigned to Judas (so Oecumenius, and amongst English commentators, Hammond); or, that the words refer to the house or home of Judas, or to his association with the Pharisees, or to his suicide and dishonoured burial, or to the χωρίον mentioned above. Spitta, amongst recent commentators, stands almost alone in referring the words back to ver. 26, and holds that they refer to the position of Judas as the guide to those who took Jesus. The sense of the passage is expressed in the reading of Α δίκαιον instead of Ἰδιων.

Ver. 26. καὶ ἔδωκαν κληρον αὐτῶν, "they gave forth their lots," A.V. But R.V. reads αὐτοῖς, "they gave lots for them". R.V. margin, "unto them". It is difficult to decide whether the expression means that they gave lots unto the candidates themselves or whether they cast lots for them—i.e., on their behalf, or to see which of the two would be selected. How the lot was decided we cannot positively say. According to Hamburger (Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, ii., 5, p. 723) the Bible does not tell us, as the expressions used point sometimes to a casting, sometimes to a drawing out, of the lots; cf. Proverbs xvi. 33: "Quo modo et ratione uti sunt Apostoli incertum est. Certum est Deum per eam declarasse Mathiam tum dirigendo sortem ut caderet in Mathiam juxta illud Prov. xvi. 33" (Corn. à Lapide). For the expression cf. Lev. xvi. 8. Hebraismus (Wetstein), so Blass. καὶ δόθη, i.e., through shaking the vessel, Jonah i. 7; cf. Livy, xxiii., 3; so in Homer and Sophocles τάλασσαι, cf. Josephus, Ant., vi., 5.—συγκαταριθμήθη: only here in N.T. "he was numbered with the eleven Apostles," i.e., as the twelfth. The verb is used in the middle voice for condemning with others, Plut., Them., 21, but as it occurs nowhere else we have no parallels to its use here. Grimm explains it " deponendo (κατά) in urnam calculo, i.e., suffragando assigno (alicii) locum inter (σύν)". But here it is used rather as an equivalent of συγκαταριθμήσεως; cf. ver. 17 (and also xix. 19), (Blass and Wendt, in loco) = ἐναρίθμησε, συμπληρώθησε, καταριθμήθησε, Hesychius. Wendt as against Meyer maintains that it is not proved that recourse was never again had to lots, because no other instance of such an appeal is recorded in
Acts. But it is most significant that this one instance should be recorded between the departure of the Lord and the outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, and that after Pentecost no further reference is made to such a mode of decision. Cf., e.g., x. 19, xvi. 6. With regard to the historical character of the election of Matthias, Wendt sees no ground to doubt it in the main, although he is not prepared to vouch for all the details, but he finds no reason to place such an event at a later date of the Church's history, as Zeller proposed. To question the validity of the appointment is quite unreasonable, as not only is it presupposed in ii. 14, vi. 2, but even the way in which both St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5) and the Apocalypse (xxi. 14) employ the number twelve in a technical sense of the Twelve Apostles, makes the after choice of Matthias as here described very probable (so Overbeck, in loco). No mention is made of the laying on of hands, but "non dicuntur manus novi Apostolo impositae; erat enim prorsus immediate constitutus," Bengel. See also on ver. 25, and xiii. 3.

Ascension of our Lord.—Friedrich in his Das Lukasevangelium, p. 47 ff., discusses not only similarity of words and phrases, but similarity of contents in St. Luke's writings. With reference to the latter, he examines the two accounts of the Ascension as given in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts. There are, he notes, four points of difference (the same four in fact as are mentioned by Zeller, Acts of the Apostles, i., 166, E. T.): (1) Bethany as the place of the Ascension, Luke xxiv. 30; Acts i. 12, the Mount of Olives; (2) the time of the Ascension; according to Acts the event falls on the fortieth day after the Resurrection, i. 3; according to the Gospel on the Resurrection day itself; (3) the words of Jesus before the Ascension are not quite the same in the two narratives; (4) in the Gospel the words appear to be spoken in Jerusalem, in the Acts at the place of the Ascension. Friedrich points out what Zeller fully admitted, that (1) has no importance, for Bethany lay on the Mount of Olives, and the neighbourhood of Bethany might be described quite correctly as ὁρός ἀλαώνως; (3) is not of any great importance (as Zeller also admitted), since Luke xxiv. 47-49 and Acts i. 4-8 agree in the main. With regard to (4), Friedrich is again in agreement with Zeller in holding that the difficulty might easily be solved by supposing some slight inaccuracy, or that the words in question were uttered on the way from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives; but he agrees also with Zeller in maintaining that the time of the Ascension as given in Luke's Gospel and in Acts constitutes the only definite contradiction between the two writings. But even this difficulty presents itself to Friedrich as by no means insuperable, since the author has not attempted to avoid apparent contradictions in other places in the Acts, and therefore he need not have felt himself called upon to do so in the passage before us, where the book seems at variance with his Gospel (see pp. 48, 49).

But Friedrich proceeds to emphasise the many points in which the history of the Ascension in Acts reminds us of the close of the Gospel (see also Zeller, u. s., ii., pp. 226, 227, E. T., and also Feine). Only St. Luke knows of the command of Jesus, that the Apostles should not leave Jerusalem, and of the promise of the Holy Spirit associated with it, Luke xxiv. 49, and Acts i. 4-8. So also Luke xxiv. 47 reminds us unmistakably of Acts i. 8; also Luke xxiv. 52 and Acts i. 12, Luke xxiv. 53 and Acts i. 14 (ii. 14) (cf. also Acts i. 5 and Luke iii. 16). But there is no need to adopt Friedrich's defence of the supposed contradiction with regard to the time of the Ascension. Certainly in the Gospel of St. Luke nothing is said of any interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension, but it is incredible that "the author can mean that late at night, vv. 29, 33, Jesus led the disciples out to Bethany and ascended in the dark!" Plummer, St. Luke, p. 569, see also Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 59, and Blass, Acta Apostolorum, p. 44. It is of course possible that St. Luke may have gained his information as to the interval of the forty days between the writing of his two works, but
II. 1. καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἡμῶν ἐντευκτὸς ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἦταν τὸ αὐτὸ. 2. καὶ γένετο ἀφίω ἐκ τοῦ συμπληροῦσθαι ΝΒ*; συντ. ΑΒ*CDE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss.

2. και εὐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ συμπληροῦσθαι, very likely as Blass says irr ποτε on β text, "ut in principio lectionis"—ἐν τῇ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν is now read by Blass in β, see comment. (See Page, Classical Review, July, 1897, p. 319, and cf. also Weiss, Codex D, p. 55, note.) D also reads before ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ the words ὁμοίων αὐτῶν περίων. Illeg. follows D.

After καὶ D inserts ἰδου (cf. Syriac characteristic, Chase).

however this may be (cf. Plummer, but against this view Zöckler, Apostelgeschicht., p. 173), it becomes very improbable that even if a tradition existed that the Ascension took place on the evening of the Resurrection, and that Luke afterwards in Acts followed a new and more trustworthy account (so Wendt), that the Evangelist, the disciple of St. Paul, who must have been acquainted with the continuous series of the appearances of the Risen Christ in 1 Cor. xv., should have favoured such a tradition for a moment (see Zöckler, u. s.). On the undue stress laid by Harnack upon the famous passage in Barnabas, Epist., xv., see Dr. Swete, The Apostle’s Creed, p. 68, Plummer, u. s., p. 564, and on this point and also the later tradition of a lengthy interval, Zöckler, u. s.

For the early testimony to the fact of the Ascension in the Apostolic writings, and for the impossibility of accounting for the belief in the fact either from O. T. precedents or from pagan myths, see Zahn, Das Apostolische Symbolum, pp. 76-78, and Witness of the Epistles (Longmans), p. 400 ff. The view of Hengstenberg that St. Luke gives us a full account of the Ascension in the Acts rather than in his Gospel, because he felt that the true position of such an event was to emphasise it more as the beginning of a new period than as a conclusion of the Gospel history, Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn, pp. 226, 227, deserves attention, and may be fitly compared with W.H., Notes on Select Readings, p. 73.

Chapter II.—Ver. 1. ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι, lit., “when the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled” (filled up). R.V. renders “was now come,” and a question arises as to whether the words mean this, or that the day was only being filled up, and not fully come. Blass interprets the expression to mean a short time before the day of Pentecost, not the day itself. Weiss and others suppose that the expression refers to the completing of the interval of time between the Paschal Feast and Pentecost. Vulgate (cf. Syriac) reads “cum completerent tur dies,” and so all English versions have “days” except A. and R.V. The verb is only used by St. Luke in the N.T., twice in his Gospel, viii. 23, and in the same sense as here, ix. 51, and once more in the passage before us. We have the noun συμπλήρωσις in the same sense in LXX 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, Dan. (Theod.) ix. 2, 1 Esdras i. 58; see Friedrich, οἰκ. supra, p. 44. The mode of expression is Hebraistic, as we see also from Exod. vii. 25, Jeremiah xxxvi. 10 (LXX). St. Luke may be using the expression of a day which had begun, according to Jewish reckoning, at the previous sunset, and which thus in the early morning could not be said to be either fulfilled or past, but which was in the process of being fulfilled (Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 90, 1895; Knabenbauer, in loco). The parallel passage in Luke ix. 51 cannot be quoted to support the view that the reference here is to a period preceding the day of Pentecost, since in that passage we have ἡμέρας, not ἡμέραν as here, and, although the interpretation of the word as referring to the approach of the Feast is possible, yet the circumstances and the view evidently taken by the narrator point decisively to the very day of the Feast (see Schmid, Biblische Theol., p. 283). On the construction ἐν τῷ with the infinitive, see Blass, Grammatik des N. G., pp. 232, 234, and Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, p. 27. It is quite in the style of St. Luke, who frequently employs it; cf. the Hebrew use of ה, Fried-
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II.

οδράνοι ἡχος ὄσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας, καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οίκον ὦ θαυμάζειν. 1

καθήμενοι; CD read καθεζομένοι so Lach., Meyer, Hilg.; but reading in text ΝΒΕ, minusc., Ath., Cyr.-Jer., Cyr.-Al., Theodrt., Wendt (as against Meyer), W.H., Weiss.

rich, p. 13, ubi supra, Lekebusch, Apostelgeschichte, p. 75). On Spitta’s forced interpretation of the word, see p. 100.

—τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς: no occasion to add ἡμέρα, as the word was used as a proper name (although as an adjective ἡμέρα would of course be understood with it); cf. 2 Macc. xii. 32 (Tob. ii. 1), μετὰ δὲ τὴν λεγομ. Πεντηκοστῆν.—

διαμεριζόμενοι, i.e., the hundred-and-twenty as well as the Apostles (Chrysostom, Jerome), and the expression may also have included other disciples who were present in Jerusalem at the Feast (so Hilgenfeld, Wendt, Holtzmann). This interpretation appears to be more in accordance with the wide range of the prophecy, ii. 16-21.—διομοθυμαδόν, see above on ver. 14. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ may simply = “together,” so that of the two expressions διαμερίζω, R.V., and this phrase “alterum abundat” (Blass, Weiss); but the reference may be to the room in which they were previously assembled; cf. i. 15.

Ver. 2. ἐφορώ: only in Acts, here, and in xvii. 6, xviii. 6; Klostermann’s Vindiciae Lucanae, p. 55; several times in LXX, but also in classical Greek in Thuc., Dem., Eur.—ἡχος στρεφερ ψηφιακ. του. βιαίος, lit., “a sound as if a violent gust were being borne along”. St. Chrysostom rightly emphasises the ὡς, so that the sound is not that of wind, but as of the rushing of a mighty wind (so too the tongues are not of fire, but as of fire). The words describe not a natural but a supernatural phenomenon, as Wendt pointedly admits. Wind was often used as a symbol of the divine Presence, 2 Sam. v. 24, Psalm civ. 3, r Kings xix. 11, Ezekiel xliii. 2, etc.; cf. Josephus, Ant., iii. 5, 2; vii. 4; here it is used of the mighty power of the Spirit which nothing could resist. St. Luke alone of the N.T. writers uses ἡχος—Heb. xii. 19 being a quotation, and it is perhaps worth noting that the word is employed in medical writers, and by one of them, Aretæus, of the noise of the sea (cf. ἡχος θαλασσα, Luke xxii. 25).—

διαμερίζω τὸν οίκον. If the Temple were meant, as Holtzmann and Zöckler think, it would have been specified, iii. 2, 11, v. 21.

Ver. 3. διαμεριζόμεθα. γλώσσα: the audible σημεῖον is followed by a visible: γλώσσα the organs of speech by which the wonderful works of God were to be proclaimed, so that the expression cannot be explained from Isaiah v. 24, where the tongue of fire is represented as an organ of destruction (Wendt, note, in loco). οὐκετι πυρός in their appearance and brightness. The words themselves therefore forbid reference to a natural phenomenon, to say nothing of the fact of the spiritual transformation of the Apostles which followed. Fire like wind was symbolic of the divine Presence, Exod. iii. 2, and of the Spirit who purifies and sanctifies, Ezekiel i. 13, Malachi, iii. 2, 3 (see Wetstein for classical instances of fire symbolic of the presence of the deity; cf., e.g., Homer, Iliad, xviii., 214; Virgil, Αεν., ii., 683). διαμεριζόμεθα, lit., dividing or parting themselves off. R.V. “tongues parting asunder,” so that originally they were one, as one mighty flame of fire. This rendering is strictly in accordance with the meaning of the verb. Vulgate dispertita (the word used by Blass). διαμερίζω is used once again in Acts ii. 45 in the active voice, and once only by St. Matthew and St. Mark (once by St. John as a quotation) in the middle voice, but six times by St. Luke (once by St. John as a quotation) in the middle voice. The singular best expresses the result of the tongues parting asunder, and of the distribution to each and all. So too διαμερίζεται ὁ Θεός ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνθρωπος, “upon each one of them,” R.V., cf. ver. 6 ἐν ἐκαστῷ (and ver. 8). The resting of a flame of fire upon the head as a token of the favour of Heaven may be illustrated from classical sources (see above and instances in Wetstein), but the thought here is not so much of fire as the token of divine favour, as of the tongue (as of fire) conferring a divine power to utter in speech divine things.

Ver. 4. ἀποφθέγγεσθαι—a word peculiar to Acts, cf. v. 14 and xxvi. 25; in the LXX used not of ordinary conversation, but of the utterances of prophets; cf. Ezek. xiii. 9, Micah v. 12, i Chron. xxv.
γλώσσαι ἄνευ πυρὸς, ἐκαθισάν· τε ἐφ' ἑνα ἐκαστὸν αὐτῶν. 4. καὶ ἐπέλθοντο ἑκατέρες Πνεύματος Αγίου, καὶ ἤφαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις, καθὼς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδίνον αὐτοῖς ἀποφθέγγεσθαι. 5. Ἡσαν δὲ ἐν ἱερουσαλήμ κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαίοι ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐθνῶν τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν. 6. γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης, συνήλθε τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη· ὅτι ἦκουσι εἰς ἐκαστὸς τῇ ἱδίᾳ

1 ἐκαθισαν εὐκαθισάν, D, probably emendation from γλωσσαι, but overwhelming evidence for -σεν.

Ver. 5. κατοικοῦντες, probably used not merely of temporary dwellers for the Feast, but of the devout Jews of the Diaspora, who for the purpose of being near the Temple had taken up their residence in Jerusalem, perhaps for the study of the Law, perhaps to live and to die within the city walls (see St. Chrysostom's comment on the word). They were not proselytes as is indicated by Ἰουδαίοι, but probably devout men like Symeon, Luke ii. 25, who is described by the same word εὐλαβεῖς, waiting for the consolation of Israel. The expression, as Zöckler points out, is not quite synonymous with that in ver. 14 (or with Luke xii. 4), and he explains it as above. There is certainly no need to consider the word, with Spitta and Hilgenfeld, as an epithet added by a later editor, or to omit Ἰουδαίοι, as Blass strongly urges (while Hilgenfeld desires to retain this word). The word may fairly be regarded as contrasted with Ἰακχαῖοι (ver. 7). The same view of it as applied here to foreign Jews who had their stated residence in Jerusalem is maintained by Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 291 (note).—κατοικοῦντες, probably not merely of temporary dwellers of the Feast, but of the devout Jews of the Diaspora, who for the purpose of being near the Temple had taken up their residence in Jerusalem, perhaps for the study of the Law, perhaps to live and to die within the city walls (see St. Chrysostom's comment on the word). They were not proselytes as is indicated by Ἰουδαίοι, but probably devout men like Symeon, Luke ii. 25, who is described by the same word εὐλαβεῖς, waiting for the consolation of Israel. The expression, as Zöckler points out, is not quite synonymous with that in ver. 14 (or with Luke xii. 4), and he explains it as above. There is certainly no need to consider the word, with Spitta and Hilgenfeld, as an epithet added by a later editor, or to omit Ἰουδαίοι, as Blass strongly urges (while Hilgenfeld desires to retain this word). The word may fairly be regarded as contrasted with Ἰακχαῖοι (ver. 7). The same view of it as applied here to foreign Jews who had their stated residence in Jerusalem is maintained by Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 291 (note).—κατοικοῦντες is used generally of taking up a permanent abode as in contrast to ταπεινοῖς used of temporary sojourn, and on the frequent use of the word in St. Luke, Friedrich, Philo supra, p. 39. But here it is followed most probably by εἰς not εἰ, constructio progressiva. cf. Wendt and Weiss as against W.H. (T.R. εἰ and so Blass in β'). Weiss, Apostelgeschichte, p. 36, regards this frequent use of εἰς as characteristic of the style of Acts, cf. ix. 21, xiv. 25, and considers it quite inconceivable that εἰ would be changed into εἰς, although the reverse is likely enough to have happened (Wendt).—εὐλαβεῖς, see viii. 2.—

ταπεινοῖς ἐθνῶν: "from every nation," so R.V.; "out of." A.V., but this would represent εἰ rather than εἰς, and would imply that they belonged to these different nations, not that they were born Jews residing among them and coming from them (Humphry, Commentary on R.V.).—τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, sc. Πνεύμον. The phrase is used frequently in LXX, cf. Deut. ii. 25, and in classical literature by Plato and Dem. If κατοικοῦντες includes the Jews who had come up to the Feast as well as those who had settled in Jerusalem from other countries, this expression is strikingly illustrated by the words of Philo, De Monarchia, ii., i, p. 223. The Pentecost would be more largely attended even than the Passover, as it was a more favourable season for travelling than the early spring (see Wetstein, in loco), and cf. Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 291, 307, E.T.

Ver. 6. φωνῆς ταύτης: "when this sound was heard," R.V. "He idem ήχος comm. 2," so Wetstein, who compares for φωνη in this sense Matt. xxiv. 31, 1 Cor. xiv. 7, 8 (2 Chron. ν. 13), and so most recent commentators (cf. John iii. 8); if human voices were meant, the plural might have been expected. But the word in singular might refer to the divine voice, the voice of the Spirit, cf. Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5. The A.V., so too Grotius, following Erasmus, Calvin, render the word as if φήμη, but the two passages quoted from LXX to justify this rendering are no real examples, cf., e.g., Gen. xiv. 16, Jer. xxvii. 14. —κατοικοῦντες: a characteristic word of St. Luke, occurring eight times in his Gospel, seventeen in Acts, and only seven times in rest of the N.T.; on the frequency with which St. Luke uses expressions indicative of fulness, see Friedrich, Das Lucasvangelium, pp. 40, 102. In inscriptions the word seems to have been used not only of political but of religious communities, see Deissmann, Neue Bibel-
1. The question has been raised as to whether it meant a dialect or a language. Meyer argued in favour of the former, but the latter rendering more probably expresses the author's meaning, cf. i. τg, and also χxii. 4ο, χxii. 2, χxvii. 4. The word is apparently used as the equivalent of γλώσσα, νν. I, Α. and R.V. "language". As the historian in his list, νν. ο, Ιο, apparently is following distinctions of language (see Rendall, Αcts, p. τ77, and Appendix, p. 359), this would help to fix the meaning of the word διάλεκτος here. Wendt in revising Meyer's rendering contends that the word is purposely introduced because γλώσσα, νν. 3, 4, had just been employed not in the sense of language but tongue, and so might have been misunderstood if repeated here with λαλεῖν. On the other hand it may be urged that some of the distinctions in the list are those of dialect, and that St. Luke intentionally used a word meaning both language and dialect.

Ver. 7. εξίσταντο: frequent in St. Luke, three times in his Gospel, eight in the Acts, elsewhere once in St. Paul, once in St. Matthew, four times in St. Mark. The word is often found in the LXX in various senses; cf. for its meaning here Gen. xiii. 33, Judith xiii. 17, xv. 1, I Macc. xv. 32, xvi. 22. πάντες—Γαλιλαίοι: there is no need to suppose with Schöttgen (so Grotius, Olshausen) that the term implies any reference to the want of culture among the Galileans, a letter in this way to emphasise the surprise of the questioners, or to explain the introduction of the term because the Galileans were "magia ad arma quam ad litteras et linguas idonei" (Corn. à Lapide). But if there is a reference to the peculiar dialect of the Galileans this might help to explain the introduction of Ιουδαίαν in ver. 9 (Wetstein followed by Weiss, but see below). Weiss sees here, it is true, the hand of a reviser who thinks only of the Apostles and not of the hundred-andtwenty who could not be supposed to come under the term Γαλιλαίοι. But whilst no doubt Γαλ. might be considered a fitting description of the Apostolic band (except Judas), Hilgenfeld well asks why the hundred-and-twenty should not have been also Galileans, if they had followed Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem.

Ver. 8. τη ιδίαδιαλ... .ενή εγεννήθημεν—used distributively as ver. τι ταίς ημετ. γλώσσαις shows—and hence cannot be taken to mean that only one language common to all, viz., Aramaic, was spoken on the outpouring of the Spirit.

Vv. 9-11. The list which follows has been described as showing the trained hand of the historian, whilst it has also been regarded as a distinctly popular utterance in Greek style (Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 149; but see also Rendall, Acts. Introd., p. 13). But, as Dean Plumtre well remarks, the omission of many countries which one might have expected shows that the list was not a made up list after the event, but that St. Luke had accurately mentioned the nations present at the Feast. The reference throughout is of course to Jews of the Dispersion, and Schürer (see too Schöttgen) well parallels the description given here of the extent of the Diaspora with the description in Agrippa's letter to the Emperor Caligula given by Philo (Legat. ad Gaium, 36, studien, pp. 59, 60 (1897), and see below on xv. 30.—συνχύθη—συνχύθη from συνχύνω (συνχέω), only found in Acts, where it occurs five times (cf. also συνχύθη, Acts xix. 29), see Moulton and Geden, sub v. For its meaning here cf. Gen. xi. 7, 9, I Macc. iv. 27, 2 Macc. xiii. 23, xiv. 28; Vulg., mente confusa est.— διαλέκτω: only in the Acts in N.T. The question has been raised as to whether it meant a dialect or a language. Meyer argued in favour of the former, but the latter rendering more probably expresses the author's meaning, cf. i. τg, and also χxii. 4ο, χxii. 2, χxvii. 4. The word is apparently used as the equivalent of γλώσσα, νν. I, Α. and R.V. "language". As the historian in his list, νν. ο, Ιο, apparently is following distinctions of language (see Rendall, Αcts, p. 177, and Appendix, p. 359), this would help to fix the meaning of the word διάλεκτος here. Wendt in revising Meyer's rendering contends that the word is purposely introduced because γλώσσα, νν. 3, 4, had just been employed not in the sense of language but tongue, and so might have been misunderstood if repeated here with λαλεῖν. On the other hand it may be urged that some of the distinctions in the list are those of dialect, and that St. Luke intentionally used a word meaning both language and dialect.
κατοικούντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν, Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν, Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, Ιο. Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν, Αἰγύπτον καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην, καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες

Mang., ii., 587). All commentators seem to be agreed in regarding the list as framed to some extent on geographical lines, beginning from Parthia the furthest east. Mr. Page holds that the countries named may be regarded as grouped not only geographically but historically. Of the Jews of the Dispersion there were four classes: (1) Eastern or Babylonian Jews, corresponding in the list to Parthians, Medes, Elamites; (2) Syrian Jews, corresponding to Judaea, Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia; (3) Egyptian Jews, corresponding to Egypt and the parts of Libya over against Cyrene; (4) Roman Jews.

(1) Parthia, mentioned here only in the N.T., is placed first, not only because of the vast extent of its empire from India to the Tigris, but because it then was the only power which had tried issues with Rome and had not been defeated, "Parthia" B.D. (Rawlinson). In Mesopotamia, Elam, and Babylonia were to be found the descendants of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes and of the kingdom of Judah, transported thither by the Assyrians and Chaldeans, now and until the reign of Trajan the subjects of the Parthians, but always of political importance to Rome from their position on the eastern borders of the Empire (Schürer, ubi supra, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 223, 224 E.T.). At the head of (2), ἱεροσόλυμα is placed by Mr. Page, i.e., at the head of the group with which in his view it is geographically connected. Of Asia, as of Syria, it could be said that Jews dwelt in large numbers in every city, and the statement that Jews had settled in the most distant parts of Pontus is abundantly confirmed by the Jewish inscriptions in the Greek language found in the Crimea. Seleucus Nicator granted to the Jews in Syria and Asia the same privileges as those bestowed upon his Greek and Macedonian subjects (Jos., Ant., xii., 31); and to Antiochus the Great was due the removal of two thousand Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia to Lydia and Phrygia (Schürer, l.c., and "Antiochus III.", B.D.2; Jos., Ant., xii., 3, 4). Mr. Page uses the word ἱεροσόλυμα as equivalent to the land of the Jews, i.e., Palestine and perhaps also to some part of Syria. In the former sense the word could undoubtedly be employed (Hamburger, "Judäa," Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 5; so too by classical writers and by Strabo, "Judæa," B.D.). But it is very doubtful how far the term can be extended to include any part of Syria, although Josephus (B.J., iii., 3, 5) speaks of the maritime places of Judæa extending as far as Ptolemais. It may well be that Syria was regarded as a kind of outer Palestine, intermediate between it and heathendom (Edersheim, Sketches of Jewish Social Life, pp. 16-19, 71, 73). St. Jerome reads Syria instead of Judæa, a reading to which Blass apparently inclines. Tertullian conjectured Armenia, c. Jud., vii., and Idumæa (so again Spitta), Bithynia and India have been proposed. It is often very difficult to say exactly what is meant by Asia, whether the term refers to the entire Roman province, which had been greatly increased in the first century B.C. since its formation in 133 B.C., or whether the word is used in its popular sense, as denoting the Αἰγεαν coast lands and excluding Phrygia. Here the term is used with the latter signification (Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 150, and also "Asia" in Hastings, B.D.). At the head of (3) stands Ἐγγυπτος, where the Jewish Dispersion, especially in Alexandria, played so important a part in the history of civilisation. The greatest prosperity of the Jews in Egypt began with Alexander the Great, but long before his time, in the seventh century B.C., Jewish immigrants were in the country (Schürer, ubi supra, pp. 226, 227, and "Alexandria," B.D.2). From Egypt the Dispersion penetrated further westward (Schürer, s. s., pp. 230, 231, and note), and in Libya Cyrenaica or Pentapolis, the modern Tripoli, the Jews were very numerous; cf. for their history in Cyrene 1 Macc. xv. 23; 2 Macc. ii. 23; Jos., Ant., xvi., 6, 1, 5, and Acts vi. 9, xi. 30, xiii. 1; Schürer, w. s., p. 232, and Merivale, Romans under the Empire, pp. 364, 365. The expression used here, τὰ μέρη τῆς Λ. τῆς κατὰ Κ., affords a striking parallel to that used by Dio Cassius, ἡ πρὸς Κυρήνην Αἰγύπτιος, liii., 12; cf. also Jos., Ant., xvi., 16; "Cyrene," B.D.3, and Hastings' B.D. In (4) we have for οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες. There is no ground for supposing that any Jews dwelt permanently in Rome before the
time of Pompey, although their first appearance there dates from the days of the Maccabees (I Macc. viii. 17, xiv. 24, xv. 15 ff.). Of the numerous Jewish families brought to Rome by Pompey many regained their freedom, and settled beyond the Tiber as a regular Jewish community with the rights of Roman citizenship. In 19 a.D., however, the whole Jewish population was banished from the imperial city, Jos., Ant., xviii., 3, 5; but after the overthrow of Sejanus it may be safely assumed that Tiberius allowed their return to Rome (Schürer, u. s., p. 232 ff.).—οι ἐπιδημούντες Ῥωμαίοι, "Sojourners from Rome," R.V., i.e., the Jews who live at Rome as sojourners—Roman Jews. Others take ἐπιδ. as referring to the Roman Jews who were making a temporary sojourn in Jerusalem for the Feast, or for some other purpose, the word being thus in a certain degree opposed to the κατοικούντες (of permanent dwelling) in ver. 5. Others again apparently take the expression as describing Roman Jews who, born in Rome, had taken up their dwelling in Jerusalem, and who are thus distinguished from those Jews who, born in Jerusalem, were Romans by right of Roman citizenship. The only other passage in which ἐπιδημούντες occurs is Acts xvii. 21 (but cf. κυρ. vii. 27, D and B (Blass)), and it is there used of the ξένοι sojourning in Athens, and so probably thus making a temporary sojourn, or who were not Athenians by birth or citizenship, as distinct from the regular inhabitants of Athens. Cf. Athenaeus, viii., p. 361 F.—οἱ Ρώμην κατοικούντες, καὶ οἱ ἐνεπικράτοι οἱ πόλεις, which passage shows that ἐπιδ. "minus significat quam κατοικεῖν" (Blass), and other instances in Wetstein. Hilgenfeld, whose pages contain a long discussion of recent views of the words in question, argues that according to what precedes we should expect καὶ οἱ κατοικούντες Ῥώμης, and according to what follows we should expect simply Ῥωμαῖοι, and he solves the difficulty by the arbitrary method of omitting καὶ οἱ ἐπιδ. before Ῥωμαῖοι, and ἰουδαῖοι τα καὶ προσήλυτοι. Not only would St. Luke in writing to a Roman convert of social rank like Theophilus be likely to mention the presence of Roman Jews at the first Christian Pentecost, but he would also emphasise the fact that they were not only Jews, or of Jewish origin, but that proselytes from heathendom were also included (Felten, Belser). In thus explaining the words Felten refers them, with Erasmus and Grotius, to οἱ ἐπιδ. Ῥωμαῖοι only, whilst Overbeck, Weiss, Holtzmann, Wendt, Belser, so Page, Hackett, refer them to the whole of the preceding catalogue. It is evident that Schürer takes the same view, for in speaking of the large offerings contributed by proselytes to the Temple at Jerusalem he mentions that in stating the number of Jews of every nationality living in Jerusalem the Acts does not forget to mention the proselytes along with the Jews, ii. 10 (u. s., p. 307).—κρήτες καὶ ἀραβεῖς: both names seem to have been added to the list as an after-thought. Even if we cannot accept Nösgen's idea that St. Luke is repeating verbatim the account which he had received orally from an eyewitness who had forgotten the Arabians and Cretans in going through the list geographically, yet the introduction of the two names in no apparent connection with the rest ought to show us that we are not dealing with an artificial list, but with a genuine record of the different nations represented at the Feast. Belser, who endorses this view, supposes that St. Luke obtained his information from an eyewitness who added the Cretans and Arabians supplementarily, just as a person might easily forget one or two names in going through a long list of representative nations at a festival. It is possible, as Belser suggests, that the Cretans and Arabians were thinly represented at the Pentecost, although the notices in Josephus and Philo's letter mentioned above point to a large Jewish population in Crete. The special mention of the Cretans is strikingly in accordance with the statement of the Jewish envoys to Caligula, viz., that all the more noted islands of the Mediterranean, including Crete, were full of Jews, "Cretae," B.D. and Schürer, u. s., p. 232. In R.V. "Cretans"; which marks the fact that the Greek Κρήτες is a dissyllable; in A.V. "Cretes" this is easily forgotten (cf. Titus i. 12).—μεγαλεία only found here
ΠΡΑΣΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ


in N.T.; the reading of T.R., Luke i. 49, cannot be supported; cf. Psalm lxx. (lxxi.) 19, where the word occurs in LXX. (Hebrew, מִּשְׁפָּרְתָא Ecclesiasticus xvii. 9, xviii. 4, xxxiii. (xxxvi.) 8, xiii. 21, 3 Macc. vii. 22, R. The word is found in Josephus, and also in classical Greek: used here not only of the Resurrection of the Lord (Grotius), but of all that the prophets had foretold, of all that Christ had done and the Holy Ghost had conferred.

Ver. 12. διηπόρουν: not found in LXX (only in Psalm lxxvi. 5, and Dan. ii. 3, Symmachus), and peculiar to St. Luke in the N.T., once in his Gospel, ix. 7 (xxiv. 4 ἄπορεως, W. H. and R. V.), and three times in Acts, cf. v. 24, x. 17. διηπόροντο in R. V. "were perplexed"; A.V. "were in doubt," although in Luke xx. 49 this or a similar word is rendered as in R.V., "were (much) perplexed." The Greek conveys the thought of utter uncertainty what to think, rather than doubt as to which opinion of several is tight (Humphry). The word no doubt is frequently found in classical writers, and is found also in Philo (not in Josephus), but it may be worth noting that ἄπορος, ἄπορος, ἄπορος, ἄπορος are all peculiar to St. Luke, and were terms constantly employed by medical writers (Hobart, Medical Language, etc., p. 163). τί ἂν οὗτο τούτο εἰναι—ὅλος was constantly used in this sense in classical writers, see instances in Wetstein. On the popular use of ὅλος instead of βούλωμαι in later Greek, cf. Blass, Acta Apostolorum, p. 15. Blass points out that St. Luke’s employment of βούλωμαι is characteristic of his culture, although it must be remembered that the Evangelist uses ὅλος (as here) very frequently.

Ver. 13. έτεροι δὲ: although the word is έτερος, not ἀλλος, it is doubtful how far it indicates a distinct class from those mentioned as speaking in vv. 7-12. At the same time not only πάντες, ver. 12, but also the behaviour of the έτερος seems to separate them from the εὐλαβείς in ver. 5.—χλευάζοντες: but stronger with the intensifying δια than the simple verb in xvii. 32; used in classical Greek, Dem., Plato, and in Polybius—here only in N.T., not found in LXX, although the simple verb is used (see below).—γλεύκους: if the rendering R.V. "new wine" is adopted, the ridicule was indeed ill-timed, as at the Pentecost there was no new wine strictly speaking, the earliest vintage being in August (cf. Chrysostom and Oecumenius, who see in such a charge the excessive folly and the excessive malignity of the scoffers). Neither the context nor the use of the word elsewhere obliges us to suppose that it is used here of unfermented wine. Its use in Lucian, Ep., Sat., xxii. (to which reference is made by Wendt and Page), and also in L.X.X., Job xxxix. 19, δια χλευάζοντο γλεύκους ἔλιν δειμένος, points to a wine still fermenting, intoxicating, while the definition of Hesychius, τὸ ἁπτόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν πατηθή, refers its lusciousness to the quality of its make (from the purest juice of the grape), and not of necessity to the brevity of its age, see B.D. "Wine." It would therefore be best to render "sweet wine," made perhaps of a specially sweet small grape, cf. Gen. xlix. 22. "The extraordinary candour of Christ’s biographers must not be forgotten. Notice also such sentences as ‘but some doubted,’ and in the account of Pentecost, ‘these men are full of new wine.’ Such observations are wonderfully true to human nature, but no less wonderfully opposed to any ‘accretion’ theory": Romanes, Thoughts on Religion, p. 156.

Ver. 14. σταθείς δὲ Πέτρος: St. Chrysostom rightly remarks on the change which had passed over St. Peter. In the place where a few weeks before he had denied with an oath that he knew “the man,” he now stands forth to proclaim him as the Christ and the Saviour. It is quite characteristic of St. Luke thus to introduce participles indicating the position or gesture of the speaker (cf. Friedrich, Zöckler, Overbeck); cf. St.
14. Standing before Peter and the eleven, \( \text{καὶ ἀπεφθέγξατο} \) to those present, he heard their voice, and he spoke to them, "Men of Judea and all who are in Jerusalem, let this be known to you..." (Acts 2:14-15). After the sound of the voice, Peter and the other apostles declared... (Acts 2:15-17)."
πράξεις ἀποστόλων

λέγει Θεός, ἐκεῖνω ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύοντες οἱ νεότεροι ἁμών 1 καὶ οἱ θυγατέρες ὡμῶν 2 καὶ οἱ νεάνισκοι ὡμῶν ἀνάοντες, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὡμῶν ἐνυπνία 3 ἐνυπνιάθησονται, 18. καὶ γέ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δοῦλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέρας ἐκείναις 4 ἐκεῖνω ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου,

1 For υμῶν . . . υμῶν D, Gig., Tert., "Rebapt." Hil. read αὐτῶν (referred by Harris to a Montanistic application).

2 συνεπα τ. Tert., Chr. (cf. LXX, but AS3 has -1016) ; but συνεπα τὸ NABCD 13, 27, 61, Epiph., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.

3 εν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις om. D, Gig. (Cypr.), Acta Perpetua. καὶ προφητεύουσιν om. D, Par.1, Tert. (Cypr.), Acta Perpetua (not in LXX). The two clauses come together in Syriac and may have been omitted together (Chase).

pression in itself suggests a contrast between the weakness and imperfection of humanity and the all-powerful working of the divine Spirit. The expression is Hebraistic, cf. Luke iii. 6, John xvii. 2, and Ecclus. xiv. 4, and often in LXX. In Joel's prophecy the expression only included the people of Israel, although the divine Spirit should be no longer limited to particular prophets or favoured individuals, but should be given to the whole nation. If we compare ii. 39, the expression would include at least the members of the Diaspora, wherever they might be, but it is doubtful whether we can take it as including the heathen as such in St. Peter's thoughts, although Hilgenfeld is so convinced that the verse ii. 39 can only refer to the heathen that he refers all the words from καὶ πάσι to the end of the verse to his "author to Theophilus". Spitta on the other hand regards the expression as referring only to the Jews of the Diaspora; if the Gentiles had been intended, he thinks that we should have had τοῖς εἰς μακράν ἔθνεσιν as in xxii. 21. Undoubtedly we have an analogous expression to ii. 39 in Eph. ii. 13, οἱ ποιὸς ὡς μακράν, where the words evidently refer to the heathen, but we must not expect the universalism of St. Paul in the first public address of St. Peter: for him it is still ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, "our God," ver. 39, and even the expression, προφήτων, iii. 26, in which Holtzmann sees a reference to the extension of the Messianic blessings to the Jew first and then to the Gentile, need only mean that in St. Peter's view these blessings could only be secured by the Gentile through becoming a proselyte to the faith of Israel. It is thus only that St. Peter's subsequent conduct becomes intelligible. The reading στέφω instead of ἐκεῖνω in the next clause before both νεότεροι and θυγατέρες if it is adopted (Blass B) would seem to extend the scope of the prophecy beyond the limits of Israel proper.—προφητεύουσιν: as Anna is called προφήτις, Luke ii. 36, so too in the Christian Church the daughters of Philip are spoken of as προφητεύουσιν, xxii. 9.—τοῖς εἰς μακράν: in LXX and Hebrew the order is reversed. It may be that Bengel is right in drawing the distinction thus: "Apud juvenes maximi vigint sensus externi, visionibus opportuni: apud senes sensus interni, somniis accommodati". But he adds "Non tamen adolescents a somniis, neque sensus a visionibus excluduntur" (see also Keil, in loco), and so Overbeck, Winer, Wendt see in the words simply an instance of the Hebrew love of parallelism.—καί γε (in LXX) = Hebrew בּוּּלְː (only here in N.T. and in xvii. 27 W.H. (and possibly in Luke xix. 42) = "and even," Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 255. The only good Attic instance of καί γε with an intervening word is to be found in Lysias, in Thocm. ii., 7, although not a strict parallel to the passage before us, Simcox, "Language of the N. T."., p. 168.

Ver. 18. As there was to be no limit of sex or age, so too there was no limit of condition. The word μου is not in the Hebrew, only in the LXX, but as it is found in the latter and in Acts it is argued that the words δοῦλος and δοῦλας do not mean those of servile rank, but are applied in a general sense to those who are worshippers, and so servants of God. But in retaining the word μου we are not obliged to reject the literal meaning "bond-servants," just as St. Peter himself, in addressing household servants and slaves, commands them to act ώς δοῦλοι Θεοῦ (1 Peter ii. 16): "Intelliguntur servi secundum carnum, diversi a liberis,
καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. 19. καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ ὁμορραγῷ, καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, καὶ αἵμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ατμίδα καπνοῦ. 20. ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος, καὶ ἡ σήμερη εἰς αἵμα, πρὶν ἡ
d
1 αἵμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ατμίδα καπνοῦ om. D, Gig., Par.¹, Hilg.

ver. 17, sed iidem servi Dei," Bengel. According to Maimonides, no slave could be a prophet, but as in Christ there was neither Jew nor Gentile, neither male nor female, so in Him there was neither bond nor free (see also Keil, in loco).— καὶ προφητεύσουσιν: an explanatory addition of the speaker, or an interpolation from ver. 17, not found either in Hebrew or LXX.

Ver. 19. The word σημεῖα is wanting in the Hebrew and the LXX, but the co-ordination of the two words τέρας and σημεῖον is frequent in the N. T. (John iv. 48, Acts iv. 30, Rom. xv. 19, 2 Cor. xii. 12), and even more so in the LXX (Exod. vii. 3, 9, Deut. iv. 34, Neh. ix. 10, Dan. vi. 27), so also in Josephus, Philo, Plutarch, Polybius. For the distinction between the words in the N. T., see below on ver. 22. τέρας is often used of some startling portent, or of some strange appearance in the heavens, so here fitly used of the sun being turned into darkness, etc. But God’s τέρατα are always σημεῖα to those who have eyes to see, and significantly in the N. T. the former word is never found without the latter. It is no doubt true to say that St. Peter had already received a sign from heaven above in the ἡχοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and a sign upon the earth below in the λαλεῖν τέραις γλώσσαις (Nösgen), but the whole context, vv. 19-21, shows that St. Peter’s thoughts had passed from the day of Pentecost to a period of grace and warning which should precede the Parousia. No explanation, therefore, of the words which limits their fulfilment to the Pentecostal Feast (see Keil, in loco, and also his reference to the interpretation of the Rabbis) is satisfactory.—σημεῖα is probably introduced into the text to emphasise the antithesis, as also are ἁμα and κατώ.— αἵμα καὶ πῦρ: if we see in these words σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, there is no need to refer them to such startling phenomena as rain of blood, or fiery meteors, or pillars of smoke rising from the earth (so De Wette, Overbeck), but rather to the bloodshed and devastation of war (so Holtzmann, Wendt, Felten); cf. our Lord’s words, Matt. xxiv. 6, 29. Dean Plumptre thinks of the imagery as drawn from one of the great thunderstorms of Palestine, and cf. Weber, Ἰουδαϊκή Τοιχολογία, pp. 356, 351 (1897).

Ver. 20. For similar prophetic imagery taken from the startling phenomena of an eclipse in Palestine, cf. Isaiah xiii. 10, Ezek. xxxii. 7, Amos viii. 9.—πρὶν ἡ ἀδύνατον. The LXX omit η, and Weiss contends that this is the reason of its omission here in so many MSS. Weiss retains it as in vii. 2, xxiv. 16; cf. also Luke ii. 26 (but doubtful). Blass omits it here, but retains it in the other two passages cited from Acts: “Ionicum est non Αττικicum”; cf. Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 130 (1893).—την ημέραν Κυρίου. It is most significant that in the Epistles of the N. T. this Ο. T. phrase used of Jehovah is constantly applied to the Coming of Jesus Christ to judgment: cf. 1 Thess. v. 2, 1 Cor. i. 8, 2 Cor. i. 14, Phil. i. 10; Sabatier, L’Apôtre Paul, p. 104.—καὶ επιφανή: if the word is to be retained, it means a day manifest to all as being what it claims to be, Vulgate manifestus, “clearly visible”; Luke xvii. 24; also 1 Tim. vi. 14, 2 Thess. ii. 8, where the word επιφάνεια is used of the Parousia (cf. Prayer-Book, “the Epiphany or Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles”).

But in the Hebrew the word נְקָרָה = “terrible,” not “clearly visible,” and the LXX here, as elsewhere, Hab. i. 7, Mal. i. 14 (Judges xiii. 6, A.), etc., has failed to give a right derivation of the word which it connects with נְקָרָה, to see, instead of with נְקָרָה, to fear (Niph. נְקָרָה and Part., as here, “terrible”). Zöckler holds that the LXX read not נְקָרָה, but נְקָרָה.
Ver. 21. ἐπικαλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, the usual LXX rendering of a common Hebrew phrase. The expression is derived from the way in which prayers addressed to God begin with the invocation of the divine name, Psalm iii. 2, vi. 2, etc., and a similar phrase is found in classical writers, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τοὺς θεούς, Xen., Cyrl. vii., i., 35; Plat., Tim., p. 27, c.; Polyb., xv., i., 13. From this it was an easy step to use the phrase as meaning the worshippers of the one God, Gen. iv. 26, xii. 8, 2 Kings v. 4. It is therefore significant that the Christian converts at Corinth are described by the same phrase as in 1 Cor. i. 2. Just as in Rom. x. 12 this same prophecy of Joel is beyond all doubt referred by St. Paul to the Lord Jesus, so here the whole drift of St. Peter's speech, that the same Jesus who was crucified was made both Lord and Christ, points to the same conclusion, ii. 36. In Joel Κύριος is undoubtedly used of the Lord Jehovah, and the word is here transferred to Christ. In its bearing on our Lord's Divinity this fact is of primary importance, for it is not merely that the early Christians addressed their Ascended Lord so many times by the same name which is used of Jehovah in the LXX—although it is certainly remarkable that in 1 Thess. the name is applied to Christ more than twenty times—but that they did not hesitate to refer to Him the attributes and the prophecies which the great prophets of the Jewish nation had associated with the name of Jehovah, Zahn, Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche, pp. 8, 10, 16 (1894), and for the force of the expression, ἐπικαλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, in 1 Cor. i. 2, see Harnack, History of Dogma, i., p. 29, E.T.—ὅς ἐστιν ἐπικαλεῖται: it would seem that in St. Peter's address the expression does not extend beyond the chosen people; cf. v. 36.—σωθήσεται: to the Jew salvation would mean safety in the Messianic kingdom, and from the penalties of the Messianic judgment; for the Christian there would be a partial fulfilment in the flight of the believers to Pella for safety when the Son of Man came in the destruction of Jerusalem; but the word carries our thoughts far beyond any such subordinate fulfilment to the fulness of blessing for body and soul which the verb expresses on the lips of Christ; cf. Luke vii. 50. And so St. Luke places in the forefront of Acts as of his Gospel the thought of Jesus not only as the Messiah, but also as the Ξριστός, Luke ii. 14; cf. Psalms of Sol., iv., 2 (Ryle and James).

Ver. 22. ἐπικαλεῖται: the tone of St. Peter throughout is that of a man who would win and not repulse his hearers, cf. v. 29, and so he commences the second part of his speech, in proof that Jesus was both Lord and Christ, with a title full of honour, reminding his hearers of their covenant relation with God, and preparing them for the declaration that the covenant was not broken but confirmed in the person of Jesus.—ι. τὸν Ναζ., "the Nazarene," the same word (not Ναζαρηνός) formed part of the inscription on the Cross, and it is difficult to believe with Wendt that there is no reference to this in St. Peter's words (cf. προσπήξαντες, vv. 23 and 36), although no doubt the title was often used as a description of Jesus in popular speech, iv. 10, xxvi. 9. No contrast could be greater than between Ιησοῦς, the despised Nazarene (ο Ν. ουτος, vi. 14) dying a felon's death, and Ιησοῦς Χριστός, v. 38, υψώθηκε, v. 33, no longer upon the Cross, but at a seat on the right hand of the Father (cf. John xii. 12); again the marvellous change which had passed over St. Peter is apparent: "If Christ had not risen," argues St. Chrysostom, "how account for the fact that those who fled whilst He was alive, now dared a thousand perils for Him when dead? St. Peter, who is struck with fear by a servant-maid, comes boldly forward" (so too Theophylact).—ἀνδρα ἀποδειξει. ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς υἱόν, "a man approved of God unto you,"
καὶ σημεῖοι, οίς ἐποίησε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεός ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, καθὼς καὶ ἠταί ὀδηγεῖ, 23. τοῦτον τῇ ὁρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνωσεὶ τοῦ

1 καὶ αὐτῷ; but καὶ om. in ABC*DE, Vulg. versions (Syr. Pesh.), Irint, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

R.V. The word, only used by St. Luke and St. Paul in the N.T. (cf. xxv. 7, 1 Cor. iv. 9, 2 Thess. ii. 4) = demonstrated, and "approved" in its old meaning would be a good equivalent; so in classical Greek, in Plato and Aristotle, shown by argument, proved, cf. xxv. 7. The sense of the word is given by the gloss in D ἐκδοκιμασμένον. It occurs in Esther ii. 9, AB, and iii. 13 (LXX), and several times in the Books of the Maccabees (see Hatch and Redpath, sub v.).—ἐνδείκνυε: Erasmus commends the wisdom of Peter, "qui apud rudem multitudinem Christum magnifice laudat, sed virum tantum nominat, ut ea facias paullatim agnoscent Divinitatem".—ἐνδείκνυε: probably here not simply for ὄντος (as Blass, and Felten, and others). The phrase means "a man demonstrated to have come unto you from God by mighty works," etc. If the words may not be pressed to mean our Lord's divine origin, they at least declare His divine mission (John iii. 2), divinitus (Wendt in loco).—διάκονος καὶ σημεῖοι: cf. 2 Cor. xii. 12, Heb. ii. 4, and 2 Thess. ii. 9; cf. Rom. xv. 19.—σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα: no less than eight times in Acts.—δυνάμεις is often rendered in a way which rather obscures its true form and meaning. Lit. = "powers," and so here in R.V. margin, where in the text we have "mighty works," so in Heb. ii. 4. St. Luke is fond of using δυνάμεις of the power inherent in Christ, and so the plural might well be used of the outward manifestations of this power in Christ, or through Him in His disciples. The word therefore seems in itself to point to the new forces at work in the world (Trench, N. T. Synonyms, ii., p. 177 fl.).—τέρατα: the word is never used in the N. T. alone as applied to our Lord's works or those of His disciples, and this observation made by Origen is very important, since the one word which might seem to suggest the prodigies and portents of the heathen world is never used unless in combination with some other word, which at once raises the N.T. miracles to a higher level. And so whilst the ethical purpose of these miracles is least apparent in the word τέρατα, it is brought distinctly into view by the word with which τέρατα is so often joined—σημεῖα, a term which points in its very meaning to something beyond itself. Blass therefore is not justified in speaking of σημεῖα and τέρατα as synonymous terms. The true distinction between them lies in remembering that in the N.T. all three words mentioned in this passage have the same denotation but a different connotation—they are all used for miracles, but miracles regarded from different points of view (see Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 406).—καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ οίδατε: Weiss rightly draws attention to the emphatic pronoun. The fact of the miracles was not denied, although their source was so terribly misrepresented; cf. "Jesus Christ in the Talmud," Laible, E.T. (Strane), pp. 45-50 (1893).—κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον (cf. xxiv. 26).—βουλή: Wendt compares the Homeric Δίος δ' ετελείετο βουλή. Both favourite words of St. Luke: ἡ βουλή used by him five times in the Acts, x. 42, xi. 29, xvii. 26, 31; once by St. Paul, Rom. i. 4; once in Hebrews, iv. 7, and only in St. Luke amongst the Evangelists, xxii. 22, where our Lord Himself speaks of the events of His betrayal by the same word, κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον (cf. xxiv. 26).—βουλή: Wendt compares the Homeric Δίος δ' ετελείετο βουλή. The phrase βουλή τοῦ Θ. is used only by St. Luke; once in his Gospel, vii. 30, and three times in Acts, xiii. 36, xx. 27 (whilst βουλή is used twice in the Gospel, eight times in the Acts, and only three times elsewhere in the N.T., 1 Cor. iv. 5, Ephes. i. 11, Heb. vi. 17), but cf. Wisdom vi. 4, ix. 13, and often ἡ βουλή of Kupio in LXX.—προγνωσε: the word is only found again in 1 Peter i. 2, and its
23-24. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

Θεού ἐκδότον λαβόντες, διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλετε.

24. δν Θεός ανέστησε, λύσας τὰς ώδίνας του θανάτου, καθότι οὐκ


occurrence in that place, and the thoughts which it expresses, may be classed amongst the points of contact between Acts and I Peter (see at end of chap. iii.). In the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, which at one time seemed to Peter impossible, cf. Matt. xvi. 22, he now sees the full accomplishment of God's counsel, cf. iii. 20, and I Peter i. 20 (Nosgen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 53, and also 48-52). In this spiritual insight now imparted to the Apostle we see a further proof of the illuminating power of the Holy Ghost, the gift of Pentecost, which he himself so emphatically acknowledges in his first epistle (i. 1-12).—διὰ χειρῶν, best explained as a Hebraism. Cf. for the frequent use of this Hebraistic expression, Blass, Grammatik des N. G., pp. 126, 127; and Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 141. In the LXX, cf. 2 Kings xiv. 27, 1 Chron. xi. 3, xxix. 5. St. Luke is very fond of these paraphrases with πρόσωπον and χείρ, see Friedrich, Das Luke Evangelium, p. 8, 9, and Leokebusch, Apostelgeschichte, p. 77; cf. v. 12, vii. 25, xi. 30, xiv. 3, xv. 23, xix. 11, so εν χειρι, εις χείρας—ανάρ: "lawless," R. V., generally taken to refer to the Roman soldiers who crucified our Lord, i. e., Gentiles without law, as in I Cor. ix. 21, Rom. ii. 14. In Wisdom xvii. 2 the same word is used of the Egyptians who thought to oppress the holy nation—they are described as ανάρ.

—προσπήξαντες, st., τῷ σταυρῷ: a graphic word used only here, with which we may compare the vivid description also by St. Peter in v. 20-32, x. 39, cf. 1 Peter ii. 24—the language of one who could justly claim to be a witness of the sufferings of Christ, 1 Peter v. 1. The word is not found in LXX, cf. Dio Cassius. ανείλετε: an Alexandrian form, see for similar instances, Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, pp. 159, 160. The verb is a favourite with St. Luke, nineteen times in Acts, twice in the Gospel, and only once elsewhere in the Evangelists, viz., Matt. ii. 16, and the noun ανάρας is only found in Acts viii. 10 (xxii. 20), cf. its similar use in classical Greek and in the LXX. The fact that St. Peter thus describes the Jewish people as the actual murderers of Jesus is not a proof that in such language we have an instance of anti-Judaism quite inconsistent with the historical truth of the speech (Baur, Renan, Overbeck), but the Apostle sees vividly before his eyes essentially the same crowd at the Feast as had demanded the Cross of Jesus before the judgment-seat of Pilate, Nosgen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 103.—δν Θεός ανέστησε, "est hoc summum orationis," Blass, cf. v. 32, and i. 22.

Ver 24. λύσας τὰς ώδίνας του θαν.: R. V. "pangs" instead of "pains" (all previous versions) approaches nearer to the literal form of the word—"birth-pangs," the resurrection of Christ being conceived of as a birth out of death, as the Fathers interpreted the passage. The phrase is found in the Psalms, LXX xvii. 4, cxiv. 3, but it is most probable that the LXX has here mistaken the force of the Hebrew נִלְעַם which might mean "birth-pangs," or the cords of a hunter catching his prey. In the Hebrew version the parallelism, such a favourite figure in Hebrew poetry, decides in favour of the latter meaning, as in R. V. Ps. xviii. 4, 5 (LXX xviii.), Sheol and Death are personified as hunters lying in wait for their prey with nooses and nets (Kirkpatrick, Psalms, in loco, the word נִלְעַם meaning snares by which birds or beasts are taken (Amos iii. 5)).
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ήν δυνατόν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. 25. Δαβίδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτὸν, "Προορώμην ἰ τὸν Κύριον ἐνώπιον μου διὰ παντὸς· ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐστίν, ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ. 26. διὰ τούτῳ εὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία


the previous verse the parallelism is also maintained if we read "the waves of death" (cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 5) "compassed me, the floods of ungodliness made me afraid". It is tempting to account for the reading σκίνεια by supposing that St. Luke had before him a source for St. Peter's speech, and that he had given a mistaken rendering of the word ἱππον. But it would certainly seem that λύσας and κρατεῖσθαι are far more applicable to the idea of the hunter's cords, in which the Christ could not be bound, since He was Himself the Life. A similar mistake in connection with the same Hebrew word ἱππον may possibly occur in 1 Thess. v. 3 and Luke xxi. 34. There is no occasion to find in the word any reference to the death-pains of Christ (so Grotius, Bengel), or to render σκίνεια pains and snares (Olshausen, Nösgen), and it is somewhat fanciful to explain with St. Chrysostom (so Theophylact and Occumenius) ὁ δάνατος σκίνει κατὰ καθὼς αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ δεινὰ ἐπιστρέφει. -καθότι: only found in St. Luke, in Gospel twice, and in Acts four times (Friedrich); generally in classical Greek καθ' ο ὅ (cf. Tobit i. 12, xiii. 4). -οὐκ ἦν δυνατόν . . . γὰρ: the words primarily refer to the proof which St. Peter was about to proffer, and the Scripture could not be broken. But whilst Baur sees in such an expression, as also in iii. 15, a transition to Johannine conceptions of the Person of Jesus, every Christian gladly recognises in the words the moral impossibility that the Life could be holden by Death. On the impersonal construction, see Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 151 (1893). - κρατεῖσθαι . . . ὑπ', cf. Luke xxiv. 16 (John xx. 23), only in these passages in passive voice in N.T., but cf. for similar use of the passive voice, 4 Macc. ii. 9, and so in Dem. Schmid commends this verse where the internal necessity of Christ's resurrection is thus stated with 1 Peter iii. 18, showing that the πνεύμα in Him possessed this power of life (Biblische Theologie des N. T., p. 402).

Ver. 25. Δαβίδ γὰρ λέγει: the words which follow are quoted by St. Peter from Psalm xvi.; and it has been said that the Apostle's argument would be the same if the Psalm were the work of some other author than David. But if the following Psalm and the Psalm in question may with considerable reason be attributed to the same author, and if the former Psalm, the seventeenth, may be referred to the period of David's persecution by Saul, then David's authorship of Psalm sixteen becomes increasingly probable (Kirkpatrick). In Delitzsch's view whatever can mark a Psalm as Davidic we actually find combined here, e.g., coincidences of many kinds which he regards as undoubtedly Davidic (cf. v. 5 with xi. 6, v. 10 with iv. 4, v. 11 with xvii. 15), and he sees no reason for giving up the testimony afforded by the title. But it is plain that David's experience did not exhaust the meaning of the Psalm, and St. Peter in the fulness of the gift of Pentecost interprets the words εἰς αὐτὸν, "with reference to Him," i.e., the Messiah (cf. St. Paul's interpretation of the same Psalm in xiii. 39). On the application of the Psalm as Messianic, cf. Eilersheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., p. 391, and Robertson Smith, Expositor, 1876, p. 351; -Κύριον = Jehovah.-ἐκ δεξιῶν μου: as a defence and helper. Cf. Παραστάτης, Xen., Cyr., iii., 3, 21. The imagery may be taken from such an expression, as also in iii. 15, a transition to Johannine conceptions of the Person of Jesus, every Christian gladly recognises in the words the moral impossibility that the Life could be holden by Death. On the impersonal construction, see Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 151 (1893). - κρατεῖσθαι . . . ὑπ', cf. Luke xxiv. 16 (John xx. 23), only in these passages in passive voice in N.T., but cf. for similar use of the passive voice, 4 Macc. ii. 9, and so in Dem. Schmid commends this verse where the internal necessity of Christ's resurrection is thus stated with 1 Peter iii. 18, showing that the πνεύμα in Him possessed this power of life (Biblische Theologie des N. T., p. 402).
refers rather to a joyful state of mind, "was glad." R.V., ἔγλαυξα ἄμετα used of outward and active expression of joy is rendered "rejoiced," R.V. (in A.V. the meaning of the two verbs is transposed). At the same time έφηράνθη is sometimes used in LXX and N.T., as in modern Greek of festive enjoyment, Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 155.—ή γλώσσα μου: in Hebrew יִלְלָעב, "my glory," i.e., my soul, my spirit (cf. Gen. xlix. 6, Schöttgen). The Arabs use a similar expression for the eye, the hand, or any member of the body held in special honour (cf. sunymy on Psalm cviii. 1).—έτι δὲ καὶ η σάρξ: flesh does not here mean the dead corpse but the living body (Perowne, Kirkpatrick).—κατασκηνώσει, "shall dwell in safety," R.V., "confidently," margin (O.T.); the expression is used frequently of dwelling safely in the Promised Land. In N.T. the R.V. translates "shall dwell," "tabernacle" margin, shall dwell as in a tent, a temporary abode. In its literal meaning, therefore, there is no reference to the rest of the body in the grave, or to the hope of resurrection from the grave, but the words must be understood of this life (Perowne); cf. Deut. xxxiii. 12, 28, Psalm iv. 8, xxv. 13, Jer. xxxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16. For the hope of the Psalmist, expressed in the following words, is primarily for preservation from death: "Thou wilt not give up my soul to Sheol [i.e., to the underworld, so that one becomes its prey], neither wilt thou suffer thy beloved one [singular] to see the pit" (so Delitzsch and Perowne, as also R. Smith and Kirkpatrick).—εἰς ἄδην: whilst it is true that the Psalmist "say nothing about what shall happen to him after death" (Perowne), he expresses his conviction that his soul would not be given up to the land of gloom and forgetfulness, the abode of the dead, dark and cheerless, with which the Psalmist cannot associate the thought of life and light (see also on ver. 31).—οὐδὲ δώσεις: in R.V. (O.T.) the word "suffer" is retained, but in R.V. (N.T.) we find "thou wilt not give," the Hebrew יִלְלָעב being used in this sense to permit, to suffer, to let, like δίδωμι and dare, Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 156 (1893).—τὸν δοσιν σου: the Hebrew חָסִיד which is thus sometimes translated in the LXX (Vulgate, Sanctus) is often rendered "thy beloved one," and the word denotes not only one who is godly and pious, but also one who is the object of Jehovah's loving-kindness. The word might well be used of Him, Who was not only the Holy One of God, but יִלְלָעב, "the beloved Son.". On the word חָסִיד see Kirkpatrick, Psalms, Appendix, p. 221.—.psi οὐδείς εἰς διαφθοράν: "corruption" or "the pit," margin R.V. (O.T.), but in the N.T. simply "corruption" (A. and R.V.), Vulgate, corrumpio. In the LXX the Hebrew יִלְלָעב is often rendered διαφθορά, "corruption," as if derived from יִלְלָעב יִלְלָעב, "to corrupt"; not, however, in the sense of corruption, putridity, but of destruction. The derivation however is probably from יִלְלָעב, to sink down, hence it means a pit, and sometimes a sepulchre, a grave, Psalm xxx. 10, lv. 24, so here "to see the grave," i.e., to die and be buried, cf. Psalm xlix. 10 (see Robinson's Gesenius, p. 1053, note, twenty-sixth edition). Dr. Robertson Smith maintains that there are two Hebrew words the same in form but different in origin, one masculine = putrefaction or corruption, the other feminine = the deep or the pit. So far he agrees with the note in Gesenius, u.s., that the word διαφθορά should here be rendered by the latter, the pit, but he takes the rendering, the deep or the pit, as an epithet not of the grave but of Sheol or Hades (see Expositor, p. 354, 1876, the whole paper on "The Sixth Word," by Dr. R. Smith, should be consulted, and p. 354 compared with the note in Gesenius), and this view certainly seems to fit in better with the parallelism.
28. *νηματος μοι οδοους ζωης: πληρωσεις με ευφροσυνης μετα του προσωπου σου.*
29. "Ανδρες αδελφοι, εξονειπειν μετα πατριαρχου Δαβιδ, ότι και οταν πατριαρχος εσκηνων εν ημίν, ουδεδωσεις τον οσιον σου διαφθοραν.

Ver. 28. *εγνωρισας μοι οδοους ζωης:* St. Peter quotes from the LXX, which has the plural *οδοους*—so in Proverbs v. 6, where Hebrew has the same word as here in the singular, the LXX translates *οδοους ζωης*—metá του προσωπου σου, "with thy countenance" = "in thy presence," margin: = Hebrew, "in thy presence". The LXX προσωπον is a literal translation of the Hebrew לְּעֵד, face or countenance, in the O.T. The expression is a common one in the O.T., "in God's presence"; cf. Psalm iv. 6, xvii. 15, xxvi. 6, cxl. 13. Grimm-Thayer explains (με) οντα μετα, etc., "being in thy presence" (see sub μετα, i. 2 b). The force of the expression is strikingly seen in its repeated use in Numbers vi. 25; cf. Exodus xxxiii. 14; Oehler, Theologie des A. T., pp. 46, 56, 62, and Westcott, Hebrews, p. 272. And so the Psalm ends as it had begun with God; cf. ver. 2, and ver. 11. The Psalmist's thoughts carried him beyond mere temporal deliverance, beyond the changes and chances of this mortal life, to the assurance of a union with God, which death could not dissolve; while as Christians we read with St. Peter a deeper and a fuller meaning still in the words, as we recall the Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascention of Him, of Whom it was written: ο λόγος σαρκς εγένετο και εσκηνων εν ημίν.

Ver. 29. *Ανδρες αδελφοι:* an affectionate form of address as compared with vv. 14 and 22 (cf. v. 7, xxii. 1), but still much more formal than iii. 17, where we have αδελφοι alone in St. Peter's pity for those who crucifying the Saviour knew not what they did. έξου, εστι, εστιν (with infinitive), cf. 2 Cor. xii. 4, only in N.T. Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 200 (1893), cf. LXX Esther iv. 2; 4 Macc. v. 18; not "may I speak unto you," but "I may say unto you," R.V., not = δεοσθω, but εκει (εδοσθω), Wendt, in loco. —μετα πατριαρχου: on the phrase, see below, iv. 13, and its repeated use by St. Luke; cf. Heb. iv. 16; Lat. sum fiducia, Westcott, Hebrews, p. 108. In the LXX the phrase is found, Lev. xxvi. 13, Esther viii. 12, 1 Macc. iv. 18, 3 Macc. iv. 1, vii. 12. St. Peter will first of all state facts which cannot be denied, before he proceeds to show how the words used of David are fulfilled in "great David's greater Son". He speaks of David in terms which indicate his respect for his name and memory, and as Bengel well says, "est igitur hoc loco prothetauma pravia sermonis mitigatio" ("est hanc prothetum ut aiunt rhetores," Blass, in loco). —του πατριαρχου, the name is emphatically used in the N.T. of Abraham; cf. Heb. vii. 4 (properly the άρχων (auctor), πατριας), and of the sons of Jacob, Acts vii. 8, 9, and cf. 4 Macc. vii. 19, used of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In the LXX it is used of the "heads of the fathers' houses," 1 Chron. ix. xxiv. 31, in a comparatively lower sense. Here used, as a term of high honour, of David, regarded as the ancestor of the kingly race. See on the word and its formation, Kennedy, Sources of New Testament Greek, p. 114. —και το μνημα αυτου εστιν εν ημίν, i.e., in Jerusalem, the mention of the tomb emphasises the fact and certainty of the death of David, and implies that his body had seen corruption. That David's tomb was shown in the time of Nehemiah we know from Neh. iii. 16. From Jos., Ant., vii., 15.3; xiii. 8, 4; B. J., 1. 2, 5, we learn that Solomon had buried a large treasure in the tomb, and that on that account one of its chambers had been broken open by Hyrcanus, and another by Herod the Great. According to Jos., Ant., xvi. 7. 1, Herod, not content with rifing the tomb, desired to penetrate further, even as far as the bodies of David and Solomon, but a flame burst...
forth and slew two of his guards, and the king fled. To this attempt the Jewish historian attributed the growing troubles in Herod's family. In the time of Hadrian the tomb is said to have fallen into ruins. Whatever its exact site, it must have been within the walls, and therefore could not correspond with the so-called "tombs of the kings" which De Saulcy identified with it. Those tombs are outside the walls, and are of the Roman period (Schurer, "The Jewish People," vol. i., p. 276, T.E., "David," B.D.7). Wetstein, in loco, quotes the testimony of Maundrell as to the sepulchres of David and his family being the only sepulchres within the walls. St. Jerome, Epist., xlvii., writing to Marcella, expresses a hope that they might pray together in the mausoleum of David; so that at the end of the fourth century tradition must still have claimed to mark the spot.

Ver. 30. προφήτης: as David could not have spoken this Psalm of himself, he spoke it of some other, who was none other than the Messiah—here the word is used in the double sense of one declaring God's will, and also of one foretelling how that will would be fulfilled.—υπάρχων: another favourite word of St. Luke, in his Gospel, and especially in Acts; in the former it is found seven times, and in the latter no less than twenty-four times, and in all parts (excluding τὰ υπάρχοντα), Friedrich, Das Lucas evangelium, p. 7. It is not used by the other Evangelists. In the N.T., as in later Greek, it is often weakened into an equivalent of ἐστιν; Blass, Gram-
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1. τού Ἁγ. Πν.; but τον τον τον Ν. AABCE 13, 61, 130, Vulg., Chrys., so W.H., Weiss; but TR. in DD, Ir., and accepted by Blass in β and by Hilg.

to historical shaping (Schmid, Biblische Theol. des N. T., p. 395, and Alford, in loco).—ἐγκατέλειψεν: introducing the words which follow as a fuller explanation, or simply as expressing a well-known fact.—οὐ: aorists, not futures, because from St. Peter's standpoint the prophecy had been already fulfilled (Felten, Wendt). With this verse we naturally compare the mention of Christ's descent into Hades and His agency in the realms of the dead in St. Peter's First Epistle, iii. 19 (cf. Phil. ii. 10, Ephes. iv. 9, Rom. x. 7; Zahn, Das Apost. Symbolum, pp. 71-74; but see also Schmid, ubi supra, p. 414). Thus while the words bore, as we have seen, a primary and lower reference to David himself, St. Peter was led by the Holy Ghost to see their higher and grander fulfilment in Christ.—εις Ἀδ. : on the construction see above on ver. 27, and on the Jewish view of Sheol or Hades in the time of our Lord as an intermediate state, see Charles, Book of Enoch, p. 168 and p. 94, and compare also the interesting although indirect parallel to 1 Pet. iii. 19, which he finds in The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, p. xiv. ff.; Weber, Jüdische Theologie, pp. 163, 341.

Ver. 32. οὐ: may be masculine = Christ, cf. xiii. 31, but is taken as neuter by Blass (op. cit., Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt, Felten). Bengel remarks "nempe Dei qui id fecit," and compares v. 32, x. 41, and 1 Cor. xv. 15.

Ver. 33. οὐ: the Ascension is a necessary sequel to the Resurrection, cf. Weiss, Leben Jesu, iii., 409 ff. and in loco. Or the word may mark the result of the assured and manifold testimony to the Resurrection, to which the Apostle had just appealed: "Confirma tua resurrectionis Christi, ascensio non potest in dubium vocari." Bengel.—τήν τε επαγγελίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος: best to take the words as an instrumental dative, so in v. 31, with the majority of recent commentators. On grammatical grounds it would be difficult to justify the rendering "to the right hand" (although taken in connection with v. 34 it would give very good sense), since such a combination of the dative alone is found only in the poets, and never in prose in classical Greek. The only other instances adduced, Acts xxi. 16 and Rev. ii. 16, can be otherwise explained, cf. Winer-Moulton, xxxii., p. 268. On Judg. xi. 16 (LXX) quoted in support of the local rendering by Fritzsche, see Wendt's full note in loco. The instrumental meaning follows naturally upon ver. 32—the Ascension, as the Resurrection, was the mighty deed of God, Phil. ii. 9. There is therefore no occasion to regard the expression with De Wette as a Hebraism, see Wetstein, in loco.—ὑψωθείς, cf. especially John xii. 32, and Westcott's note on John iii. 14. The word is frequently found in LXX. As Lightfoot points out, in our Lord Himself the divine law which He Himself had enunciated was fulfilled, ὁ ταπεινών εαυτόν υψωθήσεται (Luke xvi. 17, xviii. 14).—τήν τε επαγγελίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος κ.τ.λ., see above on i. 4 (Gal. iii. 14). The language of St. Peter is in agreement with, but yet independent of, that in St. John, while it calmly certifies the fulfilment of our Lord's promise. —ἐξέχεε: "hath poured forth," R.V. All previous English versions except Rhem. = A.V. The verb is used in the LXX in the prophecy cited above, Joel ii. 28, 29 (cf. also Zech. xii. 10), although it is not used in the Gospels of the outpouring of the Spirit. οὗτοι: either the Holy Ghost, as the Vulgate takes it, or an independent neuter "this which ye see and hear," i.e., in the bearing and speech of the assembled Apostles. St. Peter thus leads his hearers to infer that that which is poured out is by its effects nothing else than the Holy Ghost. It is noteworthy that just as Joel speaks of God, the Lord Jehovah, pouring out of His Spirit, so the same divine energy is here attributed by St. Peter to Jesus. See above on ver. 17.

Ver. 34. St. Peter does not demand belief upon his own assertion, but he again appeals to the Scriptures, and to words which could not have received a fulfilment in the case of David. In this appeal he reproduces the very words in which, some seven weeks before, our Lord Himself had convicted the scribes of error in their interpretation of this
πατρὸς, ἐξέχεε· τοῦτο δὲ νῦν ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε. 34. οὖν γὰρ
Δαβίδ ἀνὴρ εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν, λέγει δὲ αὐτὸς, "Εἰπεν δ’ Κύριος τῷ
κυρίῳ μου, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, 35. ἐως ἃν θὰ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου
ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου." 36. Ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γενοκτόνω πᾶς οἶκος
Ἰσραήλ ἦταν καὶ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησεν, τοῦτον τὸν
"Ιησοῦν δὲν ημείς εσταυρώσατε.

1 After ἐξέχεε and before τοῦτο D (Par.) insert ημῖν, and E, Syrr. (Pesh. and Hac.)
Sah. tol. demid., Ir., Did., Ambrt., Par. hoc donum. Harris ascribes this second
addition, though dubiously, to a Montanist; but cf. ver. 32, x. 45, xi. 17, although
in these passages δωρεα, not δωρον, is used.

2 καὶ Κ.: καὶ in all uncials, also Vulg., Syr. H., W. H., R. V., Weiss; om. by many
cursives, also Syr. Pesh. καὶ Χ. αὐτὸν ἘΠ 61, Ath., Epiph.: αὐτὸν καὶ Χ. δSΑΒCD

same Psalm (Matt. xxii. 44, Mark xii. 35, Luke xx. 41), and, "unlearned" in the
eyes of the scribes, had answered the question which they could not answer,
how David's Son was also David's Lord. No passage of Scripture is so constantly
referred to in the N. T. as this 110th Psalm, cf. references above, and also 1 Cor. xvi.
25, Heb. i., v. 6, vii. 17, 21, x. 13. The Psalm was always regarded as
 Messianic by the Jews (Weber, Jüdische Theologie, p. 357 (1897); Εdersheim,
Jesus the Messiah, ii., 72ο (Appendix); Cheyne, Origin of the Psalter, p. 35;
Driver, Introduction to O. T., pp. 362, 363; and if it had not been so in the
time of our Lord, it is obvious that His argument would have missed its point
if those to whom He addressed His question "What think ye of the Christ?" could have answered that David was not speaking of the coming Messiah. For
earlier interpretations of the Psalm, and the patristic testimony to its Messianic
character, see Speaker's Commentary, iv., and the authorship of the 110th Psalm,
Authorship of the 110th Psalm, with Appendix, 1895 (SPCK), and Delitzsch,
Psalms, iii., pp. 163-176, E.T.—κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου: κάθου contracted for κάθησο
(cf. also Mark xii. 36, Heb. i. 13); this "popular" form, which is also found in the
Fragments of the comic writers, is the present imperative of κάθημαι in
modern Greek, Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 162. In the LXX it is fre-
fquently used (see Hatch and Redpath, sub v.).—ὴμῖν: the word does not imply
that Christ shall cease to reign subsequently: the word here, as elsewhere,
does not imply that what is expressed will only have place up to a certain time
(cf. Gen. xxxiii. 15, Deut. vii. 4, 2 Chron. vi. 23; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 13), rather is it
true to say that Christ will only then rightly rule, when He has subjugated all
His enemies.—ἐως with ἐμῖν as here, where it is left doubtful when that will take
place to which it is said a thing will continue (Grimm-Thayer, and instances
sub ἐως, i., 1 b).—ὑποπόδιον, cf. Josh. x.
24, referring to the custom of conquering kings placing their feet upon the necks
of their conquered enemies (so Blass, in loco, amongst recent commentators).

Ver. 36. Ἀσφαλῶς: used here emphatically; the Apostle would emphasise
the conclusion which he is about to draw from his three texts; cf. xxi. 34, xxii. 30,
and Wisdom xviii. 6 (so in classical Greek).—πάς οίκος Ισρ., without the
article, for οίκος Ι. is regarded as a
proper name, cf. LXX, 1 Sam. vii. 2,
1 Kings xii. 23, Neh. iv. 16, Ezek. xlv. 6,
or it may be reckoned as Hebrew,
Blass, Grammatik des N. G., pp. 147,
158.—καὶ Κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν: the
Κύριος plainly refers to the prophetic
utterance just cited. Although in the
first verse of Ps. cx. the words τω Κυρίω
μου are not to be taken as a name of
God, for the expression is Adoni not
Adoni ("the Lord saith unto my Lord," R.V.), and is simply a title of honour
and respect, which was used of earthly
superiors, e.g., of Abraham, Moses,
Elijah, Sisera, Naaman, yet St. Peter
had called David a Prophet, and only in
the Person of the Risen and Ascended
Christ Who had sat down with His
Father on His Throne could the Apostle
see an adequate fulfilment of David's
prophecy, or an adequate realisation of
the anticipations of the Christ. So in
the early Church, Justin Martyr, Ἀπολ., i.,
60, appeals to the words of "the prophet
David" in this same Psalm as foretelling
the Ascension of Christ and His reign.
37. Ακούσαντες δὲ κατενύγησαν τῇ καρδίᾳ, εἰπόν τε πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποστόλους, Τί ποιήσωμεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί:

1 acousantes; before this word D (so Syr. Harcl. mg.) reads τοις παντεσ οι συνελθοντες και, and after κατενυγ. την καρδ. A adds και τινες εξ αυτων (ειπαν), so Hilg. According to Blass's theory this would show more account and detailed information, all were pricked, etc., but only some inquired—but on the other hand it may have been inserted to explain an apparent difficulty. According to Weiss, Codex D, p. 57, this and the following addition in D, νποδειξατε ημιν, are emendations of a kind similar to those which we find in ii. 45. In τοτε κ.τ.λ. in D, Harris sees either a lectionary preface or reader's expansion, to Luke xxiii. 48 (Chase points out that similar words occur in the Syriac of the two passages). In τοτε Weiss can only see one of the frequent ways in which the characteristic alterations of D are introduced.

λοιπους om. by D, Gig., Aug.—Hilg., and Blass, who omits it in β also, say "recte fort. et in a"; cf. v. 29. τοις σωματικος ιντικια ΕABCEΡ, Epiph., Chrys.; so Tisch., W. H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (as against Meyer), so also Blass in β; but Hilg. follows T.R. αδελφοι; after this word D adds νποδειξατε ημιν, so E, Gig., Par., Wer. tol., Syr. Harcl. mg., Aug., Prom.; so Hilg. The word could be well connected with the και τινες as indicating their earnestness and willingness; cf. Luke iii. 7, Matt. iii. 7 (to which Chase sees an assimilation), Acts ix. 16, xx. 35.

over His spiritual enemies. On the remarkable expression Χριστὸς Κύριος in connection with Ps. cx. 1, see Ryle and James, Psalms of Solomon, pp. 141-143, cf. with the passage here x. 36, 42. In i Peter iii. 15 we have the phrase Κύριον Χριστόν μεταμελήσατε κ.τ.λ. (R.V. and W. H.), "sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord" (R.V.), where St. Peter does not hesitate to command that Christ be sanctified in our hearts as Lord, in words which are used in the O.T. of the Lord of hosts, Isa. viii. 13, and His sanctification by Israel. If it is said that it has been already shown that in Ps. cx. 1 Christ is referred to not as the Lord but as "my lord," it must not be forgotten that an exact parallel to i Peter iii. 15 and its high Christology may be found in this first sermon of St. Peter, cf. note on vv. 18-23 and 33—τούτων τὸν Ι. δν υμείς εσταυρώσατε, "hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified," R.V., so Vulgate. The A.V., following Tyndale and Cranmer, inverts the clauses, but fails to mark what Bengel so well calls aculeus in fine, the stinging effect with which St. Peter's words would fall on the ears of his audience, many of whom may have joined in the cry, Crucify Him! (Chrysostom). Holtzmann describes this last clause of the speech as "ein schwerer Schlusstein zur Krönung des Gebäudes".

Ver. 37. κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν: no word could better make known that the sting of the last word had begun to work (see Theophylact, in loco) = com-pungo, so in Vulg. The word is not used in classical Greek in the same sense as here, but the simple verb νύσσειν is so used. In LXX the best parallels are Gen. xxxiv. 7, Ps. cviii. 16 (cix.): cf. Cicero, De Orat., iii., 34. "Hoc pietentiae initium est, hic ad pietatem ingressus, tristitiam ex peccatis nostris concepere ac malorum nostrorum sensu vulnerari... sed compunctioni accedere debet promptitudo ad parendum," Calvin, in loco.—τι ποιήσωμεν 1 conj., delib., cf. Luke iii. 10, 12, 14, Mark xii. 14, xiv. 12, John xii. 27, Matt. xxvi. 54, Burton, Moods and Tenses of N. T. Greek, pp. 76, 126, and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 28 ff. (1893).—άνδρες ἀδελφοι: indicating respect and regard—St. Peter's address had not been in vain—"nom ita dixerat prius" Bengel; but now the words come as a response to St. Peter's own appeal, v. 29, cf. also Oecumenius, (so too Theophylact), καλ οἰκετικώς αὐτῶν ἀδελφος καλοῦσιν, οὐ τρέφει ἐξελεξαν.—μετανοήσατε, Luke xxii. 47. The Apostles began, as the Baptist began, Matt. iii. 2, as the Christ Himself began, Matt. iv. 17, Mark i. 15, with the exhortation to repentance, to a change of heart and life, not to mere regret for the past. On the distinction between μετανοείν and μεταμέλομαι, see Trench, N. T. Synonyms, i., 208. Dr. Thayer remarks that the distinction drawn by Trench is hardly sustained by usage, but at the same time he allows that μετανοείν is undoubtedly the fuller and nobler term, expressive of moral action and issues, as is indicated by the fact that it is often employed in the imperative (μεταμέλομαι never), and
38. Πέτρος δὲ ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς, Μετανοήσατε, καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἐκατός ὑμῶν· ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· καὶ λήψετε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος. 39. ὑμῖν γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, καὶ πάσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, δόσους

by its construction with ἀπό, ἐν, cf. also Acts xx. 31, ἔν τις θεόν μετάνοια (Synonyms in Grimm-Thayer, sub μεταμελομαι). Christian Baptism was not admission to some new club or society of virtue, it was not primarily a token of mutual love and brotherhood, although it purified and strengthened both, cf. ver. 44 ff.

Ver. 38. ὑποτιθήματος: "Non satis est Christocredere, sedo portetet Christianum profiteri, Rom. x. 10, quod Christus per baptismum fieri voluit," Grotius. John’s baptism had been a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, but the work of St. Peter and of his fellow-Apostles was no mere continuation of that of the Baptist, cf. xix. 4, 5. Their baptism was to be ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰ.Χ. St. Peter’s address had been directed to the proof that Jesus was the Christ, and it was only natural that the acknowledgment of the cogency of that proof should form the ground of admission to the Christian Church: the ground of the admission to baptism was the recognition of Jesus as the Christ. The reading ἐν (see especially Weiss, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 35, 36) brings this out more clearly than ἐν. It is much better to explain thus than to say that baptism in the name of one of the Persons of the Trinity involves the names of the other Persons also, or to suppose with Bengel (so Plumptre) that the formula in Matt. xxviii. 19 was used for Gentiles, whilst for Jews or Proselytes who already acknowledged a Father and a Holy Spirit in baptism the name of the Lord Jesus sufficed; or to conjecture with Neander that Matt. xxviii. 19 was not at first considered as a formula to be adhered to rigidly in baptism, but that the rite was performed with reference to Christ’s name alone. This difficulty, of which so much has been made, does not appear to have pressed upon the early Church, for it is remarkable that the passage in the Didache, vii., 3, which is rightly cited to prove the early existence of the Invocation of the Holy Trinity in baptism, is closely followed by another in which we read (ix. 5) μηδείς ἔστε φανέτω μηδὲ πιάτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαρίστεις ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθήτων εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου, i.e., Christ, as the immediate context shows.—ἔν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν: ἐν, “unto” R.V., signifying the aim. It has been objected that St. Peter lays no stress upon the death of Christ in this connection, but rather upon His Resurrection. But we cannot doubt that St. Peter who had emphasised the fact of the crucifixion would have remembered the Master’s solemn declaration a few hours before His death, Matt. xxvi. 28. Even if the words in this Gospel εἰς ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν are rejected, the fact remains that St. Peter would have connected the thought of the forgiveness of sins, a prerogative which, as every Jew was eager to maintain, belonged to God and to God alone, with the (new) covenant which Christ had ratified by His death. Harnack admits that however difficult it may be to explain precisely the words of Jesus to the disciples at the Last Supper, yet one thing is certain, that He connected the forgiveness of sins with His death, Dogmengeschichte, i., pp. 55 and 59, see also “Covenant,” Hastings, B.D., p. 512.—ὑμῶν: the R.V. has this addition, so too the Vulgate (Wycl. and Rheims). As each individual ἐκατός was to be baptised, so each, if truly penitent, would receive the forgiveness of his sins.—τὴν δωρεὰν, not χάρισμα as in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 9, 28, for the Holy Ghost, the gift, was a personal and abiding possession, but the χάρισματα were for a time answering to special needs, and enjoyed by those to whom God distributed them. The word is used specially of the gift of the Holy Ghost by St. Luke four times in Acts, viii. 20, x. 45, xi. 17, but by no other Evangelist (cf., however, Luke xi. 13), cf. Heb. vi. 4 (John iv. 10).

Ver. 39. ὑμῖν γὰρ: the promise was made to the very men who had invoked upon themselves and upon their children, St. Matt. xxvii. 25, the blood of the Crucified. See Psalms of Solomon, viii., 39 (Ryle and James’ edition, p. 88).—
πάντως τοις εἰς μαρφαίν: no occasion with Wendt and others to limit the words to the Jews of the Diaspora. It must not be forgotten that the Apostles were not surprised that the Gentiles should be admitted to the Christian Church, but only that they should be admitted without conforming to the rite of circumcision. If we compare iii. 26, and Ephes. ii. 13, it would seem that no restriction of race was placed upon the declaration of the Gospel message, provided that it was made to the Jew first (as was always Paul's custom). Hilgenfeld interprets the words as referring beyond all doubt to the Gentiles, since had already expressed the Diaspora Jews. But he contends that as ver. 26 plainly intimates that the address was delivered only to Israelites, the words in question are added by "the author to Theophilus". He therefore places them in brackets. Jüngst in the same way thinks it well to refer them to the Redactor, and Feine refers them to Luke himself as Reviser. Weiss sees in the words an allusion to an O.T. passage which could only have been applied at first to the calling of the Gentiles, but which (in the connection in which it is here placed by the narrator) must be referred to the Jews of the Diaspora. It may well have been that (as in Holtzmann's view) St. Peter's audience only thought of the Jews of the Diaspora, but we can see in his words a wider and a deeper meaning, cf. Isaiah v. 26, and cf. also Isaiah ii. 2, Zech. vi. 15. Among the other commentators Oecumenius and Theophylact referred the words to the Gentiles. Ὑπὸ δὲ προσκαλοῦσαι Κύριος ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν. Wendt presses the ἡμῶν to favour his view that St. Peter thinks only of the Jews and not of the Gentiles, since he speaks of "our God," but Blass catches the meaning much better in his comment: "ἡμῶν Israelitarum, qui idem gentes ad se vocat". This gives the true force of προσκαλεῖ, "shall call unto him" (so R.V.). Oecumenius also comments on the words as revealing the true penitence and charity of Peter, ἐκεῖ γὰρ ὅταν ἔστων καταδίκασθαι, οὐκ ἔτι φθονοῖς δύναται.

40—42.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθησαν καὶ προσετέθησαν ἡμέραν ἐκείνης ὕψοι τρισχίλια.

42. Ἡσαν δὲ προσκαρτερούντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ  

προσετέθησαν; after the verb ἐν inserted by ΝΑΒCD 15, 18, 61, Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

thousand fear came upon every person, ψυχή, so Mr. Page, on μὴν σῶν, in loco. Mr. Rendall finds the answering δέ in ν. 42; two phases of events are contrasted; three thousand converts are added in one day—they clave stedfastly to the Christian communion. See also his Appendix on μὴν σῶν, p. 162.—ἐποδεικνύοντι τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ: used in classical Greek, especially in Plato, of receiving a teacher or his arguments with acceptance, and in the N.T. of receiving with approval; cf. xxiv. 3. The verb is only found in St. Luke in the N.T. with varying shades of meaning, twice in his Gospel, and five times in Acts in all parts. Only found in LXX in Apocryphal books, Tob. vii. 17, Judith xiii. 13 (but see Hatch and Redpath, sub υ.), and in the Books of the Maccabees; cf. xviii. 27, xxi. 17, xxviii. 3, xxxviii. 30, see below. —ἐβαπτίσθησαν. There is nothing in the text which intimates that the Baptism of the three thousand was performed, not on the day of Pentecost, but during the days which followed. At the same time it is not said that the Baptism of such a multitude took place at one time or in one place on the day of the Feast, or that the rite was performed by St. Peter alone, although others besides the Twelve may have baptised. See his note, in loco, and also Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 183.—προσετέθησαν, cf. ver. 47, and v. 14, xi. 24. In the LXX the same verb is used, Isa. xiv. 1, for a proselyte who is joined to Israel, so too Esth. ix. 27.—ψυχή, “souls,” i.e., persons. See on ver. 43.—ὁσιδραποκλίναι: the adverb is another favourite word of St. Luke (Friedrich)—it is not found in St. John, and in St. Mark only once, in St. Matthew three times, but in St. Luke’s Gospel eight or nine times, and in Acts six or seven times. As in i. 15 the introduction of the adverb is against the supposition that the number was a fictitious one. We cannot suppose that the influence and the recollection of Jesus had vanished within a few short weeks without leaving a trace behind, and where the proclamation of Him as the Christ followed upon the wonderful gift of tongues, in which many of the people would see the inspiration of God and a confirmation given by Him to the claims made by the disciples, hearts and consciences might well be stirred and quickened—and the movement once begun was sure to spread (see the remarks of Spitta, Apostelgeschichte, p. 60, on the birthday of the Church, in spite of the suspicion with which he regards the number three thousand).

Ver. 42. The growth of the Church not merely in numbers but in the increase of faith and charity. In R.V. by the omission of καὶ before τῇ κλάσει two pairs of particulars are apparently enumerated—the first referring to the close adherence of believers to the Apostles in teaching and fellowship, the second expressing their outward acts of worship; or the first pair may be taken as expressing rather their relation to man, the second their relation to God (Nösgen). Dr. Hort, while pointing out that the first term τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων (“the teaching,” R.V., following Wycliffe; cf. Matt. vii. 28, “doctrine,” A.V., which would refer rather to a definite system, unless taken in the sense of the Latin doctrina, teaching) was obviously Christian, so that the disciples might well be called scribes to the kingdom, bringing out of their treasures things new and old, the facts of the life of Jesus and the glory which followed, facts interpreted in the light of the Law and the Prophets, takes the next words τῇ κοινωνίᾳ as separated altogether from τῶν ἀποστόλων, “and with the communion”; κοινωνία, in Dr. Hort’s view by parallelism with the other terms, expresses something more external and concrete than a spirit of communion; it refers to the help given to the destitute of the community, not apparently in money, but in public meals, such as from another point of view are called “the daily ministration” (cf. Acts vi. 2, τραπέζαις). There are undoubtedly instances of the employment of the word κοινωνία in this concrete sense, Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. vii. 4, ix. 13, Heb. xiii. 26, but in each of these cases its meaning is determined by the context (and Zöckler, amongst recent commentators, would so
coινωνία 1 καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. 43. εγένετο δὲ πάσχει ψυχή φόβος, πολλὰ τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα διὰ τῶν ἄποσ-

1 καὶ τῇ κλάσει; om. καὶ Ν*ABCD* 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg., so Alford. κοινωνία τῆς κλάσεως τοῦ ἄρτου, so d, Vulg., Sah. (so in Gig., Par. τοῦ ἀρ. τῆς κλ.), of which Blass says "recte, nisi delenda τ. κλ.". But the Western readings look like attempts to remove a difficulty.

restrict its meaning here). But, on the other hand, there are equally undoubted instances of κοινωνία referring to spiritual fellowship and concord, a fellowship in the spirit; cf. 2 Cor. vi. 4, xiii. 14, Phil. ii. 1, Gal. ii. 9, 1 John i. 3, 6, 7; cf. also in classical writers, Arist., Ethic., viii., 9, 12, ἐν κοινωνίᾳ ἡ φίλα ἔστι. Here, if the word can be separated from ἄρτου, it may be taken to include the inward fellowship and its outward manifestation, ver. 44. May not a good parallel to this signification of the word be found in Phl. i. 5, where κοινωνία, whilst it signifies co-operation in the widest sense, including fellowship in sympathy, suffering and toil, also indicates the special and tangible manifestation of this fellowship in the ready almsgiving and contributions of the Philippian Church; see Lightfoot, Philippians, in loco. The word naturally suggests the community of goods, as Weizsäcker points out, but as it stands here without any precise definition we cannot so limit it, and in his view Gal. ii. 9 gives the key to its meaning in the passage before us—the bond which united the μαθηταί was the consciousness of their belief in Christ, and in the name ἀδελφοί the relationship thus constituted gained its complete expression.—τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου: no interpretation is satisfactory which forgets (as both Weizsäcker and Holtzmann point out) that the author of Acts had behind him Pauline language and doctrine, and that we are justified in adducing the language of St. Paul in order to explain the words before us, cf. 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 24, Acts xx. 7 (and xxvii. 35, Weizsäcker). But if we admit this, we cannot consistently explain the expression of a mere common meal. It may be true that every such meal in the early days of the Church’s first love had a religious significance, that it became a type and evidence of the kingdom of God amongst the believers, but St. Paul’s habitual reference of the words before us to the Lord’s Supper leads us to see in them here a reference to the commemoration of the Lord’s death, although we may admit that it is altogether indisputable that this commemoration at first followed a common meal. That St. Paul’s teaching as to the deep religious significance of the breaking of the bread carries us back to a very early date is evident from the fact that he speaks to the Corinthians of a custom long established; cf. “Abendmahl I.” in Hauck’s Real-Encyclopädie, heft i. (1896), p. 23 ff., on the evidential value of this testimony as against Julicher’s and Spitta’s attempt to show that the celebration of the Lord’s Supper in the early Church rested upon no positive command of Jesus. Weizsäcker’s words are most emphatic: “Every assumption of its having originated in the Church from the recollection of intercourse with Him at table, and the necessity felt for recalling His death is precluded—the celebration must rather have been generally observed from the beginning” Apostolic Age, ii., p. 279, E.T., and cf. Das apostol. Zeitalter, p. 594, second edition (1892), Beyschlag, Neutestamentliche Theol., i., p. 155. Against any attempt to interpret the words under discussion of mere benevolence towards the poor (Isaiah lviii. 7) Wendt regards xx. 6, 7 (and also xxvii. 35) as decisive. Weiss refers to Luke xxiv. 30 for an illustration of the words, but the act, probably the habitual act of Jesus, which they express, does not exhaust their meaning here. Spitta takes vi. 2, διακονέιν τραπέζας as = κλάσις ἄρτου, an arbitrary interpretation, see also below. The Vulgate connects τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου with the preceding κοινωνία, and renders in communicaciones fractionis panis, a rendering justified in so far as the κοινωνία has otherwise no definite meaning, and by the fact that the brotherly intercourse of Christians specially revealed itself in the fractio panis, cf. 1 Cor. x. 16, and Blass, in loco, and also B where he reads καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς κλάσεως τοῦ ἄρτου. But whilst Felten refers to the evidence of the Vulgate, and also to that of the Peshitto, which renders the words before us “in the breaking of the Eucharist” (so too in xx. 7), it is worthy of note that he refuses to follow the usual Roman
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

τάλων ἐγίνετο.1 44. πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν ἕτει τὸ αὐτό, καὶ
eἰχον2 ἀνατα κοινὰ, 45.3 καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἐπιτραπο-

1 In ver. 43 ἙΑΕ 13, many cursives, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh. add ἐν ἱεροσαλημ (which is added by D to των αποστ. in ver. 42); so Tisch., R.V. marg. But the addition is not found in BD 1, 31, 61, Sah., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aeth., Chrys.; so W.H., R.V. text, Weiss, Wendt. 

2 D (cf. Pesch.) reads καὶ οἱ κτήματα εἰχον ἡ υπάρξεις ἐπιτραποὺν; so Hilg. 

3 D (cf. Pesch.) reads καὶ οἱ κτήματα εἰχον ἡ υπάρξεις ἐπιτραποὺν; so Hilg. 

interpretation, viz., that the words point to a communion in one kind only, Apostelgeschichte, p. 94. It is possible that the introduction of the article before at least one of the words τὸς ἐλάσει (cf. R.V.) emphasises here the Lord’s Supper as distinct from the social meal with which it was connected, whilst ver. 46 may point to the social as well as to the devotional bearing of the expression (cf. Zieckler, note in loco), and this possibility is increased if we regard the words τῶν ἀποστόλων as characterising the whole sentence in ver. 42. But unless in both verses some deeper meaning was attached to the phrases τοὺς ἐλάσει τοῦ ἀρτοῦ—ἐλάσεις ἀρτοῦ, it seems superfluous, as Schöttgen remarked, to introduce the mention of common food at the time of a community of goods. No doubt St. Chrysostom (so Occum., Theophyl.) and Bengel interpret the words as simply = victus frugalisis, but elsewhere St. Chrysostom speaks of them, or at least when joined with κοινωνία, as referring to the Holy Communion (see Alford’s note in loco), and Bengel’s comment on ver. 42 must be compared with what he says on ver. 46. 

—καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, “and [in] the prayers” R.V. Dr. Hort suggests that the prayers may well have been Christian prayers at stated hours, answering to Jewish prayers, and perhaps replacing the synagogue prayers (not recognised in the Law), as the Apostles’ “teaching” had replaced that of the scribes (Judaisitic Christianity, p. 44, and Ecclesia, p. 45). But the words may also be taken to include prayers both new and old, cf. iv. 24, James v. 13 (Epiph. ii. 19, Col. iii. 16), and also Acts iii. 1, where Peter and John go up to the Temple “at the hour of prayer,” cf. Wendt, Die Lehre Jesu, ii., p. 159. 

Ver. 43. πάση ψυχῇ, i.e., every person, and so iii. 23, Hebraistic, cf. Lev. vi. 17, xvii. 12, etc., and cf. 1 Macc. ii. 38. In ver. 41 the plural is used rather like the Latin capita in enumerations, cf. Acts vii. 14, xxvii. 37, and LXX, Gen. xvi. 15, Exod. i. 5, Num. xix. 18, etc. But Winer-Moulton (p. 194, xxii. 7) would press the meaning of ἐκκλησια here, and contends that the fear was produced in the heart, the seat of the feelings and desires, so that its use is no mere Hebraism, although he admits that in Rom. xiii. 1 (1 Peter iii. 20) the single πάσα ψυχῇ = every person, but see l.c. —φόβος, cf. iii. 10, i.e., upon the non-believers, for “perfect love casteth out fear.” Friedrich notes amongst the characteristics of St. Luke that in his two books one of the results of miraculous powers is fear. Here the φόβος means rather the fear of reverential awe or the fear which acted quasi fero (Calvin), so that the early growth of the Church was not destroyed prematurely by assaults from without. There is surely nothing inconsistent here with ver. 47, but Hilgenfeld ascribes the whole of ver. 43 to his “author to Theophilus,” partly on the ground of this supposed inconsistency, partly be-
cause the mention of miracles is out of place. But it is nowhere stated, as Hilgenfeld and Weiss presuppose, that the healing of the lame man in iii. i f. was the first miracle performed (see note there, and Wendt and Blass).

Ver. 44. πάντες δὲ κ. τ. λ., Υ: iii.24, all, i.e., not only those who had recently joined, ver. 4. Επί το αυτό, see note on i. τ5; here of place. Theophylact takes it of the unanimity in the Church, but this does not seem to be in accordance with the general use of the phrase in the N. T. = ομοί, επί τον αυτόν τόπον (Hesychius). Blass points out that επί το αυτό demands ήσαν, and if we omit this word (W. H.) we must supply διών with επί το αυτό, as επί το αυτό είχον could not stand (W. H.). The difficulty raised by Hilgenfeld, Wendt, Holtzmann, Overbeck, in this connection as to the number is exaggerated, whether we meet it or not by supposing that some of this large number were pilgrims who had come up to the Feast, but who had now returned to their homes. For in the first place, επί το αυτό cannot be taken to mean that all the believers were always assembled in one and the same place. The reading in β, ver. 46, may throw light upon the expression in this verse κατα τον οίκον επί το αυτό, or the phrase may be referred to their assembling together in the Temple, ver. 46, and v. 12 may be quoted in support of this, where all the believers apparently assemble in Solomon's Porch. It is therefore quite arbitrary to dismiss the number here or in iv. 4 as merely due to the idealising tendency of the Apostles, or to the growth of the Christian legend. διών δέναι κοινά, "held all things common," R.V. Blass and Weiss refer these words with επί το αυτό to the assembling of the Christians together for common meals and find in the statement the exact antithesis to the selfish conduct in 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21. But the words also demand a much wider reference. On the "Community of Goods," see additional note at end of chapter.

Ver. 45. τα κτήματα...τας υπάρξεις: according to their derivation, the former word would mean that which is acquired, and the latter that which belongs to a man for the time being. But in ordinary usage κτήματα was always used of real property, fields, lands, cf. v. 1, whilst υπάρξεις was used of personal property (=τα υπάρχοντα in Heb. x. 34). This latter word, τα υπάρχοντα, was a favourite with St. Luke, who uses it eight times in his Gospel and in Acts iv. 32. No doubt κτήμα is used in LXX for field and vineyard, Prov. xxiii. 10, xxxi. 16, but the above distinction was not strictly observed, for τα υπάρχοντα, υπάρξις, are used both of movable and immovable property (see Hatch and Redpath, sub τ.). Επίπρασκαν: all three verbs are in the imperfect, and if we remember that this tense may express an action which is done often and continuously without being done universally or extending to a complete accomplishment (cf. iv. 34, xviii. 8. Mark xii. 41), considerable light may be thrown upon the picture here drawn (see Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 186, on the tense and this passage): "And kept getting... and distributing to all, as any man [τις] [not, every man, A.V.] had need." See Rendall, Acts, in loco, and on iv. 32, and Expositor, vii., p. 358, 3rd series.—καθότι: peculiar to St. Luke; in Gospel twice, and in Acts four times. Ἐν makes the clause more indefinite: it is found in relative clauses after ὅσ, ὅστις, etc., with the indicative—here it is best explained as signifying "accidisse aliquid non certo quodam tempore, sed quotidianum, quumque occasio ita ferret," quoted by Wendt from Herm., ad Vig., p. 820; cf. Mark vi. 36. Blass, in loco, and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 142 (1893). Grimm renders καθότι ἐν here "in so far," or
“so often as,” “according as.” Spitta refers vv. 45-47 to the Apostles only, but to justify this he is obliged to refer ver. 44 to his reviser. Hilgenfeld brackets the whole verse, referring it to his “author to Theophilus,” retaining ver. 44, whilst Weiss also refers the whole verse to a reviser, who introduced it in imitation of St. Luke’s love of poverty as indicated in his Gospel. But by such expedients the picture of the whole body of the believers sharing in the Apostles’ life and liberality is completely marred.

Ver. 46. ομοθυμαδόν, see note on i. 14.—προσκαρτερούντες, cf. i. 14.—ἐν τῷ λεπτῷ: we are not told how far this participation in the Temple extended, and mention is only made in one place, in xxii. 26, of any kind of connection between the Apostles or any other Christians and any kind of sacrificial act. But that one peculiar incident may imply that similar acts were not uncommon, and their omission by the Christians at Jerusalem might well have led to an open breach between them and their Jewish countrymen (Hort, 3 μдаistic Christianity, pp. 44, 45). No doubt the Apostles would recommend their teaching to the people by devout attendance at the Temple, cf. iii. 1, v. 20, 42, like other Jews.—κατ' οίκον, R.V. “at home” (so in A.V. margin). But all other English versions except Genevan render the words from house to house (Vulgate, circa domos), and this latter rendering is quite possible, cf. Luke viii. 1, Acts xv. 21, xx. 20. If we interpret the words of the meeting of the believers in a private house (privatim in contrast to the ἐν τῷ λεπτῷ, palam), cf. Rom. xvi. 3, 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, Col. iv. 15, Philémon 2, it does not follow that only one house is here meant, as Wendt and Weiss suppose by referring to i. 13 (see on the other hand Blass, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Spitta, Hort)—there may well have been private houses open to the disciples, e.g., the house of John Mark, cf. Dr. Edersheim, Sketches of Jewish Social Life, pp. 259, 260. Hilgenfeld, with Overbeck, rejects the explanation given on the ground that for this κατὰ τῶν ὁλίγων, or κατὰ τῶν ὁλίγων, would be required—an argument which does not however get over the fact that κατὰ may be used distributively with the singular—according to him all is in order if ii. 42 follows immediately upon 41, i.e., he drops 41 altogether, and proceeds to omit also the whole of vv. 43 and 45.—κλώντες άρτον: the question has been raised as to whether this expression has the same meaning here as in ver. 42, or whether it is used here of merely ordinary meals. The additional words μετελάμβανον τροφής have been taken to support this latter view, but on the other hand if the two expressions are almost synonymous, it is difficult to see why the former θλώντες άρτον should have been introduced here at all, cf. Knabenbauer in loco. It is not satisfactory to lay all the stress upon the omission of the article before άρτον, and to explain the expression of ordinary daily meals, an interpretation adopted even by the Romanist Beelen and others. In the Didache the expression θλώντες άρτον, chap. xiv. 1, certainly refers to the Eucharist, and in the earlier chap. ix., where the word θλῶμα occurs twice in the sense of broken bread, it can scarcely refer to anything less than the Αγαθή (Salmon, Introd., p. 59f, and Goold, The Church and the Ministry, p. 414, on the Eucharistic teaching in the Didache).—μετελ.: the imperf. denotes a customary act, the meaning of the verb with the gen. as here is frequently found in classical Greek; cf. LXX, Wisdom xviii. 9, 4 Macc. viii. 8, AR., and xvi. 18.—ἐν αγαλλιάσει: exulting, bounding joy; Vulgate, exultatione, “extreme joy,” Grimm, used by St. Luke twice in his Gospel, i. 14, 44—only twice elsewhere in the N.T., Heb. i. 9, quotation, and in Jude, ver. 24. The word, though not occurring in classical Greek, was a favourite in the LXX, where it occurs no less than eighteen times in the Psalms alone. This “gladness” is full of significance—it is connected with the birth of the forerunner by the angel’s message to Zacharias, Luke i. 14; the cognate verb θλάζω, ἀφέλω, common to St. Luke’s Gospel and the Acts, denotes the spiritual and exultant joy with which the Church age after age has rejoiced in the Song of the Incarnation, Luke i. 47.—ἀφελότητι καρδίας: rightly derived from α priv. and φελλεύς, stony ground = a smooth soil, free from stones (but see Zöckler, ἀφελής, αφελώς are all found (Wetstein), and just as the adj. θλής signified a man απλός εν τώ βίῳ, so the noun here used might well be taken as equivalent to ἀφλήτης (Overbeck) “in simplicity of heart,” simplicitate, Bengel. Wendt compares the words of Demosthenes, ἀφέλης καὶ παρρησίας μετόχος.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

οίκον ἀρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλίαις καὶ ἀφελόττητι καρδίας, 47. αἰνούντες τὸν Θεὸν καὶ εὐχόμενες χάριν πρὸς δόν τὸν

ii. 13, 20, xix. 37. Acts iii. 8, 9, elsewhere only in Rom. xv. 11 (a quotation), and Rev. xix. 5, with dativ of person, W.H. The praise refers not merely to their thanksgivings at meals, but is characteristic of their whole devotional life both in public and private; and their life of worship and praise, combined with their liberality and their simplicity of life, helped to secure for them the result given in the following words, and an unmolested hearing in the Temple: "Hunc inveniunt (favorem) qui Deum laudant." Bengel. αἰνέω is very frequent in the LXX, and nearly always of the praise of God, but cf. Gen. xlix. 8, Prov. xxxi. 28, 30, 31, Esclus. xlv. 1, etc.—εὐχόμενες χάριν: if the life of the Church at this stage has been compared with that of her divine Master, inasmuch as it increased in wisdom and stature, another point of likeness may be found in the fact that the Church, like Christ, was in favour with God and man.—χάριν: very frequent in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts (Friedrich), only three times in the Gospel of St. John, and not at all in St. Matthew or St. Mark. In the O.T. it is often used of finding favour in the sight of God, and in the N.T. in a similar sense, cf. Luke i. 30, Acts vii. 46. It is also used in the O.T. of favour, kindness, goodwill, especially from a superior to a inferior (Gen. xviii. 3, xxxii. 5, etc.), so too in the N.T., here, and in Acts vii. 10. See further note on Acts xiv. 3. In Luke's Gospel eight times, in Acts seven times. See also Plummer's full note on Luke iv. 22, Sanday and Headlam's Romans, p. 10, and Grimm-Thayer, sub v. Rendall would render "giving Him thanks before all the people," and he refers to the fact that the phrase "is always so rendered elsewhere (though once wrongly translated, Heb. xii. 28). But the phrase is also found in LXX, Exodus xxxiii. 12, 1 Esdras vi. 5 (see also Wetstein, in loco) in the sense first mentioned.—4 διὰ κυρίου προσεδέθη, i.e., the Lord Christ, cf. ver. 36 (as Holtzmann, Wendt, Weiss, amongst others). The pure and simple life of the disciples doubtless commended them to the people, and made it easier for them to gain confidence, and so converts, but the growth of the Church, St. Luke reminds us, was not the work of any human agency or attractiveness.—τοὺς σωματικοῦς: naturally connected with the prophecy in ver. 21 (cf. v. 40), so that the work of salvation there attributed to Jehovah by the Old Testament Prophet is here the work of Christ: the inference is again plain with regard to our Lord's divinity. The expression is rightly translated in R.V. (so too in 1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15. See Burton, Moods and Tenses in N. T. Greek, pp. 57, 58). It has nothing to do, as Wetstein well remarks, with the secret counsels of God, but relates to those who were obeying St. Peter's command in ver. 40. An apt parallel is given by Mr. Page from Thuc., viii. 44. Gift of Tongues, ii. 4. λαλών εἰς έτέρας γλώσσας.—There can be no doubt that St. Luke's phrase (cf. γλώσσαις καναί, Mark xvi. 17, W.H., margin, not text), taken with the context, distinctly asserts that the Apostles, if not the whole Christian assembly (St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, including the hundred-and-twenty), received the power of speaking in foreign languages, and that some of their hearers at all events understood them, vv. 8, 11 (εὐθέρας). (On the phrase as distinguished from those used elsewhere in Acts and in 1 Cor., see Grimm-Thayer, sub v., γλώσσα 2, and Blass, Acta Apost., p. 59, "γλώσσα εἰτιαν ap. att. per se est lingua peregrina vel potius vocabulum peregrinum"). Wendt and Matthias, who have recently given us a lengthy account of the events of the first Christian Pentecost, both hold that this speaking with tongues is introduced by St. Luke himself, and that it is a legendary embellishment from his hand of what actually took place; the speaking with tongues at Pentecost was simply identical with the same phenomenon described elsewhere in x. 46, xix. 6, and in 1 Cor. xii. xiv. This is plain from St. Peter's own words in xi. 15, 17; so in xix. 6, the speaking with tongues is the immediate result of the outpouring of the Spirit. So too Wendt lays stress upon the fact that St. Paul says λαλ. εἰς τήν γλώσσαν, but not λαλ. έτέρ. γλ. The former was evidently the original mode of describing the phenomenon, to which Luke recurs in his own description in x. 46 and xix. 6, whereas in the passage before us his language represents the miraculous enhancement of the events of Pentecost. M'Giffert, in the same way, thinks that the writer of Acts, far re-
moved from the events, could hardly avoid investing even the common phenomena of the Glossolalia with marvel and mystery. Wendt however admits that this embellishment was already accomplished by Christian tradition before Luke. But if St. Luke must have had every means of knowing from St. Paul the character of the speaking with tongues at Corinth, it does not seem unfair to maintain that he also had means of knowing from the old Palestinian Christians, who had been in union with the Church at Jerusalem from the beginning, e.g., from a John Mark, or a Mnason (ἀρχαίος μαθητής, xxii. 16), the exact facts connected with the great outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost (Schmid, Biblische Theologie, pp. 278, 279). But it is further to be noted that Wendt by no means denies that there was a miraculous element, as shown in the outpouring of the Spirit, in the events of the Pentecostal Feast, but that he also considers it quite unlikely that Luke's introduction of a still further miraculous element was prompted by a symbolising tendency, a desire to draw a parallel between the Christian Pentecost and the miraculous delivery of the Law, according to the Jewish tradition that the one voice which proceeded from Sinai divided into seventy tongues, and was heard by the seventy nations of the world, each in their mother tongue (so Zeller, Pfeiderer, Hilgenfeld, Spitta, Jüngst and Matthias, and so apparently Clemens in his Speaking with Tongues, Expository Times, p. 345, 1899). But in the first place there is no convincing evidence at the early date of the Christian Pentecost of any connection in Jewish tradition between the Feast of Pentecost and the giving of the Law on Sinai (cf. Schmid, Biblische Theologie, p. 286; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopadie des Judentums, i., 7, 1057, and Holtzmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 330), and it is significant that neither Philo nor Josephus make any reference to any such connection; and in the next place it is strange, as Wendt himself points out, that if Luke had started with the idea of the importance of any such symbolism, no reference should be made to it in the subsequent address of Peter, whereas even in the catalogue of the nations there is no reference of any kind to the number seventy; the number actually given, νν. 9, 11, might rather justify the far-fetched notice of Holtzmann (u. s., p. 331), that a reference is meant to the sixteen grandsons of Noah, Gen. x. 1, 2, 6, 21. Certainly Heb. ii. 2-4 cannot, as Schmid well points out against Holtzmann, lead to any such connection of ideas as the μερισμοί πνεύμ. αγ. are evidently the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit. We may readily admit that the miracle on the birthday of the Christian Church was meant to foreshadow the universal progress of the new faith, and its message for all mankind without distinction of nation, position, or age. But even if the Jewish tradition referred to above was in existence at this early date, we have still to consider whether the narrative in Acts could possibly be a copy of it, or dependent upon it. According to the tradition, a voice was to be expected from Heaven which would be understood by different men in their mother tongues, but in our narrative the Apostles themselves speak after the manner of men in these tongues. For to suppose that the Apostles all spoke one and the same language, but that the hearers were enabled to understand these utterances, each in his own language, is not only to do violence to the narrative, but simply to substitute one miraculous incident for another. Nor again, as Wendt further admits, is there any real ground for seeing in the miraculous event under consideration a cancelling of the confusion of tongues at Babel which resulted from rebellion against God, for the narrative does not contain any trace of the conception of a unity of language to which the Jewish idea appears to have tended as a contrast to the confusion of Babel (Test. xii., Patr., Ἰουδ., xxv.). The unity is not one of uniformity of speech but of oneness of Spirit and in the Spirit. At the same time there was a peculiar fitness in the fact that the first and most abundant bestowal of this divine gift should be given at a Feast which was marked above all others by the presence of strangers from distant lands, that a sign should thus be given to them that believed not, and that the firstfruits of a Gentile harvest should be offered by the Spirit to the Father (Iren., Ἀδυνατικαί, iii., 17), an assurance to the Apostles of the greatness and universality of the message which they were commissioned to deliver. But there is no reason to suppose that this power of speaking in foreign languages was a permanent gift. In the first place the Greek language was known throughout the Roman Empire, and in the next place Acts xiv. 11 (see in loco) seems to forbid any such view. The speaking
with tongues in Acts ii. and in other passages of the N.T. may be classed as identical in so far as each was the effect of the divine Πνεύμα, each a miraculous spiritual gift, marking a new epoch of spiritual life. But in Acts we have what we have not elsewhere—the speaking in foreign tongues—this was not the case in Corinth; there the speaking with tongues was absolutely unintelligible, it could not be understood without an interpreter, i.e., without another gift of the divine Spirit, vis., interpretation, i Cor. xii. 10, 30 (the word "unknown" inserted in A.V. in i Cor. xiv. is unfortunate), and the fact that the Apostle compares the speaking with tongues to a speaking in foreign languages shows that the former was itself no speaking in foreign tongues, since two identical things do not admit of comparison (Schmid, u. s., pp. 288, 289).

Peter might well express his belief that Cornelius and those who spoke with tongues had also received the Holy Ghost, cf. x. 44, xi. 17, 24, in loco; but it does not follow that the gift bestowed upon them was identical with that bestowed at Pentecost—there were diversities of gifts from the bounty of the One Spirit. Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 78; Evans in Speaker’s Commentary on i Cor., p. 334; Plumptre, B.D. on "Tongues, Gift of"; Weissacker, Apostolic Age, ii., pp. 272, 273, E.T., and Feine, Eine Vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas, n., p. 167; Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 177; Page, Acts of the Apostles, note on chap. ii., 4; and A. Wright, Some N.T. Problems, p. 277 ff.

The objection urged at length by Wendt and Spitta that foreign languages could not have been spoken, since in that case there was no occasion to accuse the Apostles of drunkenness, but that ecstatic incoherent utterances of devotion and praise might well have seemed to the hearers sounds produced by revelry or madness (cf. i Cor. xiv. 23), is easily met by noting that the utterances were not received with mockery by all but only by some, the word έτεροι apparently denoting quite a different class of hearers, who may have been unacquainted with the language spoken, and hence regarded the words as an unintelligible jargon.

Spitta attempts to break up Acts ii. 1-13 into two sources, i.8, 4, 12, 13, belonging to A, and simply referring to a Glossolalia like that at Corinth, whilst the other verses are assigned to B and the Redactor, and contain a narrative which could only have been derived from the Jewish tradition mentioned above, and introducing the notion of foreign tongues at a date when the Glossolalia had ceased to exist, and so to be understood. Spitta refers συμπληροῦσθαι ii. 1 to the filling up of the number of the Apostles in chap. i., so that his source A begins καὶ εν τω συμπλ. . . επλήσθησαν πάντες π. αγ., Apostelgeschichte, p. 52. It is not surprising that Hilgenfeld should speak of the narrative as one which cannot be thus divided, upon which as he says Spitta has in vain essayed his artificial analysis.

Community of Goods.—The key to the two passages, ii. 42 ff. and iv. 32 ff., is to be found in the expression in which they both agree, occurring in ii. 45 and iv. 35, καθὼς ἐν τις χριστιαν ἔλεγαν. Such expressions indicate, as we have seen, not reckless but judicious charity (see also Ramsay, St. Paul, etc., p. 373, and
reading in D, ii. 45); they show wise management, as in early days St. Chrysostom noted in commenting on the words, so that the Christians did not act recklessly like many philosophers among the Greeks, of whom some gave up their lands, others cast great quantities of money into the sea, which was no contempt of riches, but only folly and madness (Hom., viii.). Not that St. Luke's glowing and repeated description (on St. Luke's way of sometimes repeating himself as here, see Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text*, p. 85) is to be confined to the exercise of mere almsgiving on the part of the Church. Both those who had, and those who had not, were alike the inheritors of a kingdom which could only be entered by the poor in spirit, alike members of a family and a household in which there was one Master, in Whose Name all who believed were brethren. In this poverty of spirit, in this sense of brotherhood, "the poor man knew no shame, the rich no haughtiness" (Chrys.).

But whilst men were called upon to give ungrudgingly, they were not called upon to give of necessity: what each one had was still his own, τα υπάρχοντα αυτώ, iv. 32, although not even one (οὐδεν) of them reckoned it so; the daily ministration in vi. 1 seems to show that no equal division of property amongst all was intended; the act of Barnabas was apparently one of charity rather than of communism, for nothing is said of an absolute surrender of all that he had; the act of Ananias and Sapphira was entirely voluntary, although it presented itself almost as a duty (Ramsay, *Ant.*, i. 16). At Joppa, ix. 36, 39, and at Antioch, xi. 29, there was evidently no absolute equality of earthly possessions —Tabitha helps the poor out of her own resources, and every man as he prospered sent his contributions to the Church at Jerusalem.

It is sometimes urged that this enthusiasm of charity and of the spirit (ἐνθουσιασμός, as Blass calls it), which filled at all events the Church at Jerusalem, was due to the expectation of Christ's immediate return, and that in the light of that event men regarded lands and possessions as of no account, even if ordinary daily work was not neglected (O. Holtzmann, *Neuest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 233). But it is strange that if this is the true account of the action of the Church at Jerusalem, a similar mode of life and charity should not have found place in other Churches, *e.g.*, in the Church at Thessalonica, where the belief in Christ's speedy return was so overwhelmingly felt (Felten). No picture could be more extraordinary than that drawn by O. Holtzmann of the Christian Church at Jerusalem, driven by the voice of Christian prophets to enjoin an absolutely compulsory community of goods in expectation of the nearness of the Parousia, and of Ananias and Sapphira as the victims of this tyrannical product of fanaticism and overwrought excitement. It is a relief to turn from such a strange perversion of the narrative to the enthusiastic language in which, whilst insisting on its idealising tendency, Renan and Pfleiderer alike have recognised the beauty of St. Luke's picture, and of the social transformation which was destined to renew the face of the earth, which found its pattern of serving and patient love in Jesus the Friend of the poor, whose brotherhood opened a place of refuge for the oppressed, the destitute, the weak, who enjoyed in the mutual love of their fellows a foretaste of the future kingdom in which God Himself will wipe all tears from their eyes. Whatever qualifications must be made in accepting the whole description given us by Renan and Pfleiderer, they were at least right in recognising the important factor of the Person of Jesus, and the probability that during His lifetime He had Himself laid the foundations of the social movement which so soon ennobled and blessed His Church. It is far more credible that the disciples should have continued the common life in which they had lived with their Master than that they should have derived a social system from the institutions of the Essenes. There is no proof of any historical connection between this sect and the Apostolic Church, nor can we say that the high moral standard and mode of common life adopted by the Essenes, although in some respects analogous to their own, had any direct influence on the followers of Christ. Moreover, with points of comparison, there were also points of contrast. St. Luke's notice, ii. 46, that the believers continued steadfastly in the Temple, stands out in contrast to the perpetual absence of the Essenes from the Temple, to which they sent their gifts (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 2, 5); the common meals of the Essene brotherhood naturally present a likeness to St. Luke's description of the
early Christian Church, but whilst the Essenes dined together, owing to their scrupulosity in avoiding all food except what was ceremonially pure, the Christians saw in every poor man who partook of their common meal the real Presence of their Lord. Of all contemporary sects it may no doubt be said that the Christian society resembled most nearly the Essenes, but with this admission Weizsäcker well adds: "The Essenes, through their binding rules and their suppression of individualism, were, from their very nature, an order of limited extent. In the new Society the moral obligation of liberty reigned, and disclosed an unlimited future." *Apostolic Age*, i., 58 (E.T.). It is often supposed that the after-poverty of the Church in Jerusalem, Rom. xv., 26, Gal. ii. 10, etc., was the result of this first enthusiasm of love and charity, and that the failure of a community of goods in the mother city prevented its introduction elsewhere. But not only is the above view of the "communism" of the early Christians adverse to this supposition, but there were doubtless many causes at work which may account for the poverty of the Saints in Jerusalem, cf. Luke xviii. 11. "Two men went up into the Temple to pray," *i.e.*, from the lower city to Mount Moriah, the hill of the Temple, "the hill of the house," on its site see "Jerusalem," B.D. The verb is in the imperfect, because the Apostles do not enter the Temple until ver. 8. St. Chrysostom comments: Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἦσαν καὶ τὸν Ιησοῦν ἔχον μέσον, Matt. xviii. 20. -επί τὴν ώραν τῆς προσευχῆς, not during or about, but marking a definite time, for the hour, *i.e.*, to be there during the hour—some times the words are taken to mean towards the hour": see Plummer on Luke x. 35 (so apparently Weiss). Page renders "for, *i.e.*, to be there at the hour" (so Felten, Lumby). In going thus to the Temple they imitated their Master, Matt. xxvi. 55.—τὴν ἑωράκην, *i.e.*, 3 P.M., when the evening sacrifice was offered, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 4, 3. Eidersheim points out that although the evening sacrifice was fixed by the Jews as between the evenings, *i.e.*, between the darkness of the gloaming and that of the night, and although the words of Psalm cxxxiv., and the appointment of Levite singers for night service, 1 Chron. ix. 33, xxiii. 30, seem to imply an evening service, yet in the time of our Lord
the evening sacrifice commenced much earlier, *The Temple; its Ministry and Services*, pp. 115, 116. According to Schürer, followed by Blass who appeals to the authority of Hamburger, there is no ground for supposing that the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day were regular stated times for prayer. The actual times were rather (1) early in the morning at the time of the morning sacrifice (see also Edersheim, *u. s.*, p. 115); (2) in the afternoon about the ninth hour (three o'clock), at the time of the evening sacrifice; (3) in the evening at sunset (*Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., 290, E.T.). The third, sixth, and ninth hours were no doubt appropriated to private prayer, and some such rule might well have been derived from Psalm iv. 7; cf. Dan. vi. 11. This custom of prayer three times a day passed very early into the Christian Church, *Didache*, viii. 3. To Abraham, Isaac and Jacob the three daily times of prayer are traced back in the *Berachoth*, 26 b; Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, p. 99.

Ver. 2. τις, by its position as in Luke xi. 27 directs attention to this man, "the man was conspicuous both from the place and from his malady" Chrys., *Hom.*, viii.—χωλός ... υπάρχων: "a certain man that was lame" R.V., otherwise υπάρχων is not noticed, fittingly used here in its classical sense expressing the connection between the man's present state and his previous state, see on ii. 30.—εβαστάζετο: imperfect, expressing a customary act, the man was being carried at the hour of worship when the Temple would be filled with worshippers (Chrysostom); or the verb may mean that he was being carried in the sense that the bearers had not yet placed him in the accustomed spot for begging, cf. 2 Kings xviii. 14, *Ecclesiasticus* vi. 25, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 36; Theod.—οὐ εἰσώη: the imperfect used of customary or repeated action in past time, Burton, *Syntax of Moods and Tenses*, etc., p. 12, on the form see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 121; Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 48: in Acts there are several undoubted instances of the way in which the imperfect 3rd plural of verbs in μι was often formed as if from a contract verb, cf. iv. 33, 35, xxvii. 1.—πρὸς τὴν θύραν: R.V. "door" although in ver. 5 we have not θορα, but πύλη.—τὴν λευ. Ὄπελαν: it may have been the gate of Nicana (so called because Judas Maccabaeus had nailed to the gate the hand of his conquered foe, 1 Macc. vii. 47). The description given of it by Josephus, B. J., v., 5, 3, marks it as specially magnificent, cf. also Hamburger, *Real-Encycl.*, ii., 8, p. 1198. This view was held by Wetstein, see, *in loco*, Nicana's gate. Another interpretation refers the term to the gate Shushan, which was not only close to the Porch of Solomon, but also to the market for the sale of doves and other offerings, and so a fitting spot for a beggar to choose (Zöckler). The gate may have been so called because a picture of the Persian capital Susa was placed over it (Hamburger, *u. s.*), i.e., Town of Lilies. Cf. Hebrew Shushan, lily, the lily being regarded as the type of beauty.

Mr. Wright, *Some N.T. Problems*, 1898, has recently argued that the eastern gate of the Court of the Women is meant, p. 304 ff. (so too Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 180, E.T.). This court was the place of assembly for the services, and a beggar might naturally choose a position near it. The decision to which of these gates reference is made to is rendered more difficult by the fact that, so far as we know, no gate bore the name "Beautiful". But the decision apparently lies between these alternatives, although others have been proposed, cf. John Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loco*, and Wright, *u. s.* In such notices as the mention of the Beautiful Gate, Solomon's Porch, Feine sees indications of a true and reliable tradition.—τοῦ αἰτείν: genitive of the purpose, very frequent in this form, genitive of the article with the infinitive both in the N.T. and in the LXX, cf. Gen. iv. 15, 1 Kings i. 35, Ezekiel xxi. 11; Luke xxiv. 16, see especially Burton, *Syntax of Moods and Tenses*, p. 150. It is very characteristic of St. Luke, and next to him of St. Paul—probably indicates the influence of the LXX, although the construction is found in classical Greek, cf. Xen., *Anab.*., iii., 5, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 172 (1893). It was a common thing for beggars amongst the Jews as amongst the Christians (just as amongst the Romans, Martial, i., 112) to frequent the Temple.
ιερόν. 3. δι' αυτούς πέτρον καὶ ιωάννην μελλόντας εἰσέλθειν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἡμών 8
dιελθοῦσιν λαβεῖν. 4. ἀπείχες δὲ πέτρος εἰς αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ
'ιωάννῃ, εἶπε: "βλέψων εἰς ἡμᾶς. 5. ὁ δὲ ἐπείχεν αὐτοῦ, προσδοκῶν

1 For παρὰ τῶν εἰσὶν εἰς τὸ λειτύρον D has παρ' αὐτοῖς εἰσὶν τοῦ, but
not received by Blass in β (Chase sees in first part exact reproduction of Syriac
αὐτῶν being carelessly repeated).
2 For οἱ ἰδὼν D, Flor. read οὗτος (so Gig., Par.) αἰτείσας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἰδὼν (Chase: interpolation arose in Syriac). Belser again sees the longer form
which Luke abbreviated in α.
3 After ἐρωτα D, Flor., Par.1 insert αὐτοὺς λαβεῖν (ΣΑΒΕ, b, 13, 61, Vulg.,
Boh., Arm., Chrys.) om. by DP, h, Fl., Gig., Par.1, Syr. Harcl., Lucif.—Blass
4 For αἰτείσας D, Flor., Par.2 read ἐμβλέψας (ἐμβλέπειν not uncommon in the
Gospels); (σὺν λαούν in D is attributed by Chase to Syriac influence, cf. Aquila,
σὺν τον οὐρανόν καὶ σὺν την γῆν); Hilg. follows D.
5 For εἰπε Flor. has "(a)στάς dixite i", so in β εἰπεν εἰς αὐτοῦ, in which
αἰτείσας εἰς εμα (ἡμᾶς D); εμα is curious, but may be earlier edition, or introduced
later because John here says nothing. Throughout the passage D, as compared
with T.R. or with W.Η., introduces different synonyms for "see". Thus T.R.
ἰδὼν . . . αἰτείσας . . . βλέψων, D αἰτείσας (τοὺς ὀφθ. καὶ ἰδὼν) . . . ἐμβλέψας
. . . αἰτείσας, or from Belser's point of view, we must see in the T.R. three words
for "see" which may be introduced by Luke in revising his rough draft. But it is
difficult to account even in a rough draft for αἰτείσας in ver. 5 instead of ἡτενεν,
and for the καὶ introduced before εὐτεν without any construction in ver. 4.
6 ἐπείχεν αὐτοῖς; D reads αἰτείσας; Flor. represents ἡτενεν εἰς αὐτού (so β),
see above. But in the fact that D reads αὐτοῖς instead of εἰς αὐτοὺς (οὐ), as we
might expect after αἰτείσας, Weiss sees a further proof of the secondary character of
the reading.

and Churches for alms. St. Chrysostom
notes the custom as common as it is to-
day in continental cathedrals or modern
mosques.—ἐλεημοσύνην: common in
the LXX but not classical, some-
times used for the feeling of mercy
(ἐλέος), Prov. iii. 3, xix. 22, and con-
stantly through the book; and then for
mercy showing itself in acts of pity,
almsgiving, Tobit i. 3, xii. 8, cf. Acts
ιξ. 36, x. 2, where it is used in the plural,
as often in the LXX. Our word aims
is derived from it and the German
Almosen, both being corruptions of the
Greek word.

Ver. 3. ἡρωτα λαβεῖν: "asked to
receive," R.V., as other English versions
except A.V. The expression is quite
classical, αἰτών λαβεῖν, Aristoph., Plut.,
240, cf. Mark i. 17, and LXX, Exodus
xxiii. 15, for similar instances of a re-
dundant infinitive. The verb is in the
imperfect, because the action of asking
is imperfect until what is asked for is
granted by another, Blass, in loco, and
Grammatik des N. G., pp. 187, 236, and
Salmon, Hermathena, xxii. p. 228.

Ver. 4. ἀπείχες, cf. i. 10. βλέψων
εἰς ἡμᾶς: it has sometimes been thought
that the command was given to see
whether the man was a worthless beggar
or not (Nösgen), or whether he was
spiritually disposed for the reception of
the benefit, and would show his faith (as
in our Lord's miracles of healing), or it
might mean that the man's whole at-
tention was to be directed towards the
Apostles, as he evidently only expects
an alms, ver. 5. At the same time, as
Feine remarks, the fact that the narra-
tive does not mention that faith was
demanded of the man, forms an essential
contrast to the narrative often compared
with it in xiv. 9.

Ver. 5. ὁ δὲ ἐπείχεν, sc., νοῦν (not
tοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς); cf. Luke xiv. 7, 1
Tim. iv. 16, Ecclesiasticus xxxix. (xxxiv.)
2, 2 Macc. ix. 25 (Job xxx. 26, A.S.3
al.) with dative τοῖς; so in Polybius.

Ver. 6. ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον: the words
do not suggest the idea of a complete com-
munism amongst the believers, although
Oecumenius derives from them a proof
of the absolute poverty of the Apostles.
They may perhaps be explained by remembering that if the Apostles had no silver or gold with them, they were literally obeying their Lord's command, Matt. x. 9, or that whatever money they had was held by them in trust for the public good, not as available for private charity. Spitta, who interprets ii. 45 of the Apostles alone (pp. 72-74), sees in St. Peter's words a confirmation of his view, and a further fulfilment of our Lord's words in Luke xii. 33, but if our interpretation of ii. 44 ff. is correct, our Lord's words were fully obeyed, but as a principle of charity, and not as a rule binding to the letter. St. Chrysostom (Hom., viii.) justly notes the unassuming language of St. Peter here, so free from boasting and personal display. Compare Peter i. 18 (iii. 3), where the Apostle sharply contrasts the corruptible gold and silver with higher and spiritual gifts (Scharfe).—δ δε έχω: the difference between this verb and έχω may be maintained by regarding the latter as used of worldly belongings, έχω of that which was lasting and most surely held.—εν τω ονόματι: no occasion to prefix such words as λέγω σοι for the expression means "in the power of this name" (cf. Matt. vii. 22, Luke x. 17, Acts iv. 10, xvi. 18, James v. 14, Mark xvi. 17). So too the Hebrew בְּכָל in the name of anyone, i.e., by his authority, Exodus v. 23, and thus "in the name of Jehovah," i.e., by divine authority, Deut. xvii. 19, Jer. xi. 21, and frequently in the Psalms, cf. also Book of Enoch, xlvii. 9 (Charles, p. 48). On the use, or possible use, of the phrase in extra-biblical literature, see Deissmann, Biblestudien, p. 145, and also Neue Bibelstudien, p. 25 (1897). When Celsus alleged that the Christians cast out demons by the aid of evil spirits, Origen claims this power for the name of Jesus: τοιούτῳ γὰρ δόντα τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, cf. also Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph., 85.—I. X. τοῦ Ναζωραίου: the words must in themselves have tested the faith of the lame man. His part has sometimes been represented as merely passive, and as if no appeal of any kind were made to his faith contrasted with xiv. 9 (ver. 16 in this chapter being interpreted only of the faith of the Apostles), but a test of faith was implied in the command which bade the man rise and walk in the power of a name which a short time before had been placed as an inscription on a malefactor's cross, but with which St. Peter now bids him to associate the dignity and power of the Messiah (see Plumptre, in loco). It is necessary from another point of view to emphasise this implied appeal to the man's faith, since Zeller and Overbeck regard the omission of faith in the recipient as designed to magnify the magic of the miracle. Zeller remarks: "Our book makes but a single observation on his state of mind, which certainly indicates a receptivity, but unfortunately not a receptivity for spiritual gifts". But nothing was more natural than that the man should at first expect to receive money, and his faith in St. Peter's words is rather enhanced by the fact that the Apostle had already declared his utter inability to satisfy his expectations. St. Luke much more frequently than the other Evangelists names our Lord from His early home Nazareth, in which frequency Friedrich sees another point of likeness between St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, Das Lucas-evangelium, p. 83. Holtzmann attempts to refer the whole story to an imitation of Luke v. 18-26, but see as against such attempts Feine, Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas, pp. 175, 190, 200. Ver. 7. πιάσας, cf. xii. 4: so in LXX, Cant. ii. 15, Ecclesiasticus xxiii. 21, A. al. πιάσας very similar to, if not exactly, a partitive genitive, found after verbs of touching, etc., inasmuch as the touching affects only a part of the object (Mark v. 30), and so too often after verbs of taking hold of, the part or the limit grasped is put in the genitive, Mark v. 41 (accusative being used when the whole person is
αυτῶν τῆς δεξιάς χειρὸς ἡ γείρει τοὺς παραχρήματα δὲ ἵστερεώθησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ βάσεις καὶ τὸ σφυρᾶ, 8 καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἀπῆλθε καὶ περιεπάτησε, καὶ εἰσῆλθε σύν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ιερὸν περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος καὶ

1 ἡ γείρει ΝΑΒCG 15, 18, 61, Syr. (P. and H.), Arm., Sah., Boh., Aeth., Bas., Cypr., Lucif. insert αὐτὸν; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (but omitted by Meyer) —omitted in DEP.


3 καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἐστι ὁμιλεῖται, after this word D inserts χαιρῶν (Ε), Flor. gaudens εἰς ορών καὶ εξαλλόμενος in β, so Hilg. περιπατῶν καὶ αὐτοῦ, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass. It is difficult to determine the precise order of events—possibly "leaping" is not mentioned at all in Western text, and in it the healed man does not at all events "leap" in the Temple. It is again difficult to believe that in this passage the common text comes from a revision of the author, and not rather through corruption and confusion.

seized, Matt. xiv. 3), Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 100, cf. classical use in Eurip., Hec., 523. The meaning of πιάζω in N.T. and in the LXX has passed into modern Greek = πιάνω = "seize, apprehend" (Kennedy). For a similar use see also 2 Cor. xi. 32, Rev. xix. 20, and John vii. 30, 32, 33, 44, viii. 20, x. 39, xi. 37, xxi. 3, 10.—παρα-χρήμα, i.e., παρά τὸ χρήμα, forthwith, immediately, auf der Stelle, on the spot, especially characteristic of St. Luke, both in Gospel and Acts (cf. εὐθύς of St. Mark). It is found no less than ten times in the Gospel, and six to seven times in Acts, elsewhere in N.T. only twice, Matt. xxi. 19, 20; several times in LXX, Wisdom xviii. 17, Tobit viii. 3, 5, 2 Macc. iv. 34, 38, etc., 4 Macc. xiv. 9, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 39, 42, Theod., and in Num. vi. 9, xii. 4, ABR, Isaiah xxix. 5, for Hebrew, ὄνυς; frequent in Attic prose; see also Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, pp. 22, 29. But as the word is so manifestly characteristic of St. Luke it is noteworthy that in the large majority of instances it is employed by him in connection with miracles of healing or the infliction of disease and death, and this frequency of use and application may be paralleled by the constant employment of the word in an analogous way in medical writers; see, e.g., Hobart, Medical Language of St. Luke, and instances in Hippocrates, Galen, Dioscorides. —ἐπιστερεώθησαν: στερεῶν = to make firm or solid; it cannot by any means be regarded only as a technical medical term, but as a matter of fact it was often employed in medical language (so also the adjective στερεός), and this use of the word makes it a natural one for a medical man to employ here, especially in connection with βάσεως and σφυρᾶ. It is used only by St. Luke in the N.T. (ver. 16 and xvi. 5), but very frequently in the LXX. The nearest approach to a medical use of the word is given perhaps by Wetstein, in loco, Xen., Ped., viii.—αἱ βάσεις, "the feet" (Βάσεις). The word is constantly used in LXX, but for the most part in the sense of something upon which a thing may rest, but it is found in the same sense as here in Wisdom xiii. 18; cf. also Jos., Ant., vii. 3, 5, so in Plato, Timæus, 92, A. It was in frequent use amongst medical men, and its employment here, and here only in the N.T., with the mention of the other details, e.g., the more precise σφυρᾶ, "anklebones," also only found in this one passage in N.T., has been justly held to point to the technical description of a medical man; see not only Hobart, p. 34 ff., u. s., and Belcher's Miracles of Healing, p. 41, but Bengel, Zöckler, Rendall, Zahn.

Ver. 8. ἐξαλλόμενος: not leaping out of his couch (as has sometimes been supposed), of which there is no mention, but leaping up for joy (cf. Isaiah lv. 12, Joel ii. 5) (on the spelling with one λ see Blass, p. 51); cf. also Isaiah xxxv. 6. This seems more natural than to suppose that he leaped because he was incredulous, or because he did not know how to walk, or to avoid the suspicion of hypocrisy (Chrys., Hom., viii., so too Occumenius). St. Chrysostom remarks that it was no less than if they saw Christ risen from the dead to hear Peter saying: "In the name," etc., and if Christ is not
raised, how account for it, he asks, that
those who fled whilst He was alive, now
dared a thousand perils for Him when
dead?—but καὶ περιεπάτει : “ he stood
and began to walk,” R.V., thus marking
the difference between the aorist and the
imperfect. Such vivid details may have
been derived from St. Peter himself, and
they are given here with a vividness
characteristic of St. Mark’s Gospel, of
which St. Peter may reasonably be re-
garded as the main source. If St. Luke
did not derive the narrative directly from
St. Peter, he may easily have done so
from the same Evangelist, John Mark, see
on chap. xii., and Scharfe, Die petrinische
Stellung des N. T. Literatur, pp. 50, 56
(1893).—αινώντον θεόν: commentators
from the days of St. Chrysostom have
pointed that by no act or in no place could
the man have shown his gratitude more
appropriately; characteristic of St. Luke,
to note not only fear, but the ascription
of praise to God as the result of miracu-
los deeds; cf., έ. g., Luke xxix. 17, 31,
Matt. xiv. 16, 31, Matt. xiv. 35, Mark vi. 54.—καθη-
μένος : imperfect, may refer to the cus-
tomary action of the man: or may be
equivalent here to an imperfect, a force
of the imperfect usual in similar cases
when reference is made to a time before
the actual time of recognition, Blass,
Grammatik des N. G., p. 188.—επί: for
the local dative cf. ν. 9, Matt. xxiv. 33,
Mark xiii. 29, John v. 2, Rev. ix. 14.—
word peculiar to St. Luke in the N.T.
(see St. Luke alone uses ἐκθάμβος, ver.
11); used from Homer downwards, of
amazement allied to terror or awe, cf.
LXX, Ezek. vii. 18, Cant. iii. 8, vi. 3 (4),
(10).—ἐκτάσεως : for the word in a
similar sense, Mark v. 42, xvi. 5, Luke v.
26. Its use in ordinary Greek expresses
rather distraction or disturbance of mind
caused by a shock. The word is very
common both in Hippocrates andAre-
taeus. In the LXX it is employed in
various senses, cf. Deut. xix. 8, 28,
ἐκτάσει διανοίας ; elsewhere it is used
of agitation, trouble, 2 Chron. xxix. 8,
and most frequently of terror, fear, 1
Sam. xi. 7, Ezek. xxvi. 16. See further
on. Here the word expresses more than
simple astonishment as its collocation with
ἐκθάμβος shows (Wendt, in loco), rather
“bewilderment,” cf. Mark v. 42. See on
ii. 43 for this characteristic of St. Luke.
But there is no occasion to conclude
with Weiss that these strong expressions
as to the effect of the miracle show that
it must have been the first which the
disciples performed. It was the unique
nature of the miracle which affected the
beholders so powerfully.
Ver. 11. κρατούντος: in his joy and
gratitude, “ holding them” in a physical
sense, although it is possible that it
signified that the healed man joined
himself to the Apostles more closely as
a follower (iv. 14), fearing like the
demoniac healed by Christ (Luke viii. 38)
lest he should be separated from his
benefactors, cf. Cant. iii. 4.—ἐκτάσις τοῦ
τοῦ καλ. Ι.: better “ portico,” R.V.
margin; colonnade, or cloister (John x.
23). It derived its name from Solomon,
and was the only remnant of his temple.
A comparison of the notices in Josephus,
B. J., v., 5, 1; Ant., xv., 11, 5 and xx., 9, 7,
make it doubtful whether the foundations
only, or the whole colonnade, should be
referred back to Solomon. Ewald’s idea
that the colonnade was so called because
it was a place of concourse for the wise
in their teaching has not found any
support: Stanley’s Jewish Church, ii.,
I. Κρατούντος δὲ τοῦ ἱαθέντος χωλοῦ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ ἱωάνην,
συνεθάραμε πρὸς αὐτοὺς πᾶς ο λαὸς ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλομνῇ
Σολομώντος, ἐκθάμβοι. 12. Ἡδών δὲ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς τὸν
λαὸν, "Ἀνδρεὶς Ἰσραήλες, τί θαυμάζετε ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ἢ ἢμῖν τί ἀπετί-
ζετε;" ὡς ἴδια δυνάμει ἡ ἐσφεπίσχοι τού πεποίηκος αὐτῶν;

1 τοῦ ἱαθέντος; but αὐτοῦ in ABCDE 61, Vulg., Syrr., P. H., Sah., Boh., Arm.,
so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss; Rec. = prob. beginning of a church lectionary. But in
ver. 11 Western text quite different. D, Flor., εὐπορευομένῳ (Fl.-νων) δέ τοῦ Π. καὶ
λ. συνεπιστρεφομένῳ κρατῶν αὐτοῦ, and D continues (not Flor. = a) οί δὲ ἔμπιστηντες
ἐστησαν εν τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλ. Σ. εκθάμβοι (but in β Blass brackets the last word); Hilg.
follows D. There is a distinction evidently drawn between the area of the Temple
and Solomon's Porch, "nam porticus illa extra aream sacram fuit," Blass; and ἱερον
might perhaps be so used as distinct from the outer court or cloisters. If so, the
Western text may contain the more precise account of a writer who wishes to bring
the Apostles and the lame man from the one into the other, in accordance with the
topography with which he was familiar. But if, as Weiss admits, εὐπορο... συνεπιστρεφο-
ντο is implied in the κρατῶν and change of locality, cf. vv. 8 and 11, we may
see the theory of Blass, in which the theme συνεπιστρεφοντες εστησαν εν τῇ στοᾷ τῇ κα-
λ. is drawn upon or made use of by the writer Blass is familiar with. Weiss, in the case
of verse 11, refers it to the evening of the day of Pentecost; Hilg. to the second
day of Pentecost. Weiss, Codex D, p. 60; cf. ii. 1, 15; may be careless transcription or
through translation. D has τοῦτο before and after πεποίηκοτον (Harris, Latinising; Chase, due to Syriac); but see iv. 7—the second
τοῦτο perhaps confusion with τοῦ σε το;

Ver. 12. This address of St. Peter divides itself into two parts, 12-16, 17-26,
and although it covers much of the same ground as in chap. ii., there is no need
to regard it with Overbeck and Holtzmann as unhistorical: see Blass, in loco,
and Feine; the latter points out that St. Peter would naturally, as in chap. iii.,
take the incident before him as his text, place it in its right light, and draw from
it an appeal to repentance and conversion. But whilst we may grant the
common and identical aim of the two discourses, to proclaim the Messiahship
of Jesus before the Jews, none can fail to see that in chap. iii. the Messianic
idea becomes richer and fuller. Jesus is the prophet greater than Moses:
Jesus is the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant, through which the blessing of
Abraham is to extend to all the earth, Matt. viii. 11. And more than this: St.
Peter has learnt to see in the despised Nazarene not only the suffering servant
of Jehovah (παῖς), but in the servant the King, and in the seed of David the Prince
of Life. And in the light of that revelation the future opens out more clearly
before him, and he becomes the first prophet in the Messianic age—the spirit-
11—13.
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13. ὁ Θεός Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὁ Θεός τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἐδόξασε τὸν παῖς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν ὑμῖν. Παρεδώκατε, καὶ ἐκ τῆς κρίσεως Θεός εἶναι αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ ἱστορία πρὸς τὴν ἡμερολογίαν τοῦ Ωσίππου ἕως ὅτου ἔλθῃ ἡ ἱστορία πρὸς τὴν ἡμερολογίαν τοῦ Ωσίππου ἔς ὥς πεποιηκόσιν τοῦ περιπατείν.

1. ὁ Θ. Αβρ. καὶ Ισ. καὶ Ιακ. ΒΕΡ 61, Sah., Syr. (Ρesh. Ηarcl.), so W.Η., Weiss, R.V.,Τ.Ε. Wendt, who explainsthe readingin Τisch.,Ηilg. introducing (ο)Θεος (ΝSΑCD) beforeΙσ. and beforeΙακ. as out of LΧΧ, Exod. iii.6 (cf.Μatt. xxii.32).

2. παρεδώκατε; D adds εις κρισιν, so Ηilg.: Ε εις κριτηριον (cf. also Flor.,Par.).

3. ο Θεος Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ισαάκ καὶ Ιακώβ, ο Θεός των πατέρων ἡμών, εδόξασε τον παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν δνυμείς παρεδώκατε, καὶ ο Θ. Αβρ. καὶ Ισ. καὶ Ιακ. ΒΕΡ 61, Sah., Syr. (Ρesh. Ηarcl.), so W.Η., Weiss, R.V.,Τ.Ε. Wendt, who explainsthe readingin Τisch.,Ηilg. introducing (ο)Θεος (ΝSΑCD) beforeΙσ. and beforeΙακ. as out of LΧΧ, Exod. iii.6 (cf.Μatt. xxii.32).

4. "παρεδωκατε; D adds εις κρισιν, so Ηilg.: Ε εις κριτηριον (cf. also Flor.,Par.).

5. ...ual presence which the believers now enjoyed, and by which those mighty deeds are wrought, is only a foretaste of a more visible and glorious Presence, when the Messiah should return in His glory; and for that return repentance and remission of sins must prepare the way (see Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, pp. 31, 32). On St. Peter's discourses see additional note at end of chapter.

6. απεκρίνατο: cf. Luke xiii.14, χίν.3, answered, i.e., to their looks of astonishment and inquiry. The middle voice as here, which would be the classical usage, is seldom found in the N.Τ., but generally the passive aorist, απεκρίθη, and so in the LΧΧ. "In Biblical Greek the middle voice is dying, in modern Greek it is dead," Plummer. Thus in modern Greek, ὑποκρίνομαι in the passive = to answer, Kennedy, Sources of N.Τ. Greek, p.155, and Βlass, Grammatik des N. G., p.44. - ὡς πεποιηκόσιν τοῦ περιπατείν: this use of the infinitive with the genitive of the article, instead of the simple infinitive with or without ὡστέ, to express a purpose, or result as here: "non de consilio sed de eventu" (Βlass), may be illustrated from the LΧΧ, Gen. xxxvii. 18, ΙChron. xlv.6, Isaiah ν.6. - ἐποίησα: "godliness," R.V., as always elsewhere in A.V., i.e., by our piety towards God, as always in the Bible, although ἐποίησα may be used like the Latin pietas of piety towards parents or others, as well as of piety towards God. It is frequently used in the LΧΧ of reverence towards God, εἰς, so too in Josephus, πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, cf. Prov. i. 7, xiii. 11, Isaiah xi. 2, Wisdom x. 12, and often in 4 Macc. In Trench, N. Τ. Syriacms., ii., p.106, and Grimm-Thayer, sub v. In the N.Τ. the word is used, in addition to its use here, by St. Paul ten times in the Pastoral Epistles, and it is found no less than four times in 2 Peter, but nowhere else. St. Chrysostom, Hom. ix., comments: "Do you see how clear of all ambition he is, and how he repels the honour paid to him?" so too Joseph: Do not interpretations belong to God?

Ver. 13. ὁ Θεός Ἀβραάμ κ.τ.λ.: the words were wisely chosen, not only to gain attention and to show that the speaker identified himself with the nation and hope of Israel, but also because in Jesus St. Peter saw the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham. — ἐδόξασεν, John viii. 54, xi. 4. Again we mark the same sharp contrast as in St. Peter's former address—God hath glorified . . . but you put to an open shame. The objections of Weiss, who traces a reviser's hand in the double mention of the glorification of Jesus in ver. 13 and in 15, fail to secure the approval of Spitta, Feine, Jungst, who all hold that ἐδόξασε refersto the power of the Risen Jesus, shown in the healing of the lame man, which Peter thus expressly emphasises. But the glorification was not, of course, confined to this miracle: "auxit gloria hoc quoque miraculo" (Βlass). — τὸν παῖς: "his Servant," R.V. (margin, "Child"). Vulgate has filium, which all other English versions (except A.V., "Child") seem to have followed. But the rendering "Servant" is undoubtedly most appropriate, cf. ver. 26, and iv. 27, 30 (employed in the Messianic sense of Isa. xiii. 11, liii. 11, where the LΧΧ has παις, Hebrew יְשֵׁי). In Matt. xii. 18 the Evangelist sees the fulfilment of the first passage in Jesus as the Christ, the Servant of Jehovah. Wendt rightly emphasises the fact that no Apostle ever bears the name παίς Θεού, but δοῦλος; cf. iv. 29. The LΧΧ Moses is called both παῖς and δοῦλος. The rendering of R.V. is generally adopted, and by critics of very varying schools, e.g., Overbeck, Nögen, Holzmann, Felten, Hilgenfeld. Zöckler, whilst he adopts the rendering "Servant," still maintains that Luther's translation, Kind Gottes, cannot be regarded as incorrect (cf. the double meaning of the word in classical literature). Certainly he seems justified in maintaining that in the numerous parallels in the sub-apostolic writings the conception of the Servant by no means always excludes that of the Son, e.g., Epist. ad Diogn., viii., 11 and 9, where of
III. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

1 Πιλάτου; B* D read Πειλ., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg.—see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 43. κριναντος εκεινου απολ.; D adds αυτου θελοντος and prefixes του (om. in D); confute θελοντος assim. to Luke xxiii. 20.

2 ηρνησασθε, but D, Iren., Aug. have εβαρυνατε (aggravastis), so Hilg.; Nestle (so Blasc, Chase, and see also Belser) believes confusion arose in Syriac between ητησατε, ητησασθε, displaced ηρνησασθε, and became corrupted into ητησατε, transl. aggravastis); see also Blash, Philology of the Gospels, p. 54, and also Dalman, Die Worte θεsu, p. 54, and Eng. Bibl., i., 56. φονεα, after this word D inserts ζην και, so E, Flor., Aug. Gloss.; but Belser sees in it a marked contrast to φονεα, "that a murderer should live," original. αυτου om. ΝΑΒ, Tisch., W.H., R.V.

God's great scheme it is said Ανεκοινωσατο μνην το ταιδι (to His Son alone), called in ιι του θαιδιου (Παιδι; cf. Martyr. Polye., xiv., 3, where the same phrase occurs, reminding us of Matt. iii. 17 (Col. i. 13, Eph. i. 6) and xiv. 1, where God is spoken of as θειφρον του ταιδιου (Παιδι), and if there is no thing in the context to determine the exact sense of the word, in the previous chapter St. Clement had written ιι γαρ ο θεος και ιι δ Κυριος ιησους Χριστος και το τουαιμα το θαιδιου κ.λ.; cf. also Barnabas, Επιστ. (iii., 6), vi., 1; Apost. Const., viii., 5, 14, 39, 40, 41; and Didache, ix., 1, 2, 3; x., 2, 3, where, however, at the first introduction of the word, David and Jesus are both called by it in the same sentence. In the Didache the title is found altogether five times, once as above, and four times as applied to Jesus alone. But these passages all occur in the Eucharistic Prayers of the Didache (placed by Rench as early as 80-90 A.D.), and in them we find not only the title "Lord" used absolutely of Jesus, ix., 5, but He is associated with the Father in glory and power, ix., 4. Knowledge, faith, and immortality are made known by Him, spiritual food and drink, and eternal life are imparted by Him, x., 2, 3. Zöckler, Apostligeschichte, in loco; Lock, Expositor, p. 183 ff. (1891), "Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts"; Schmid, Biblische Theologie, p. 405. But further: if we bear in mind that the "Servant of the Lord" must have meant for a Jew, and for a Jew so well versed in the O.T. Prophets as St. Peter, it becomes a marvellous fact that he should have seen in Jesus of Nazareth the realisation of a character and of a work so unique (cf. Isaiah xlii. 1 ff., xlix. 1-3, 5, 8, 1. 4-9, lii. 13-14, 12). For if we admit that the word "Servant" may be used, and is sometimes used, of the nation of Israel (cf. Isaiah xili. 8, xlvi. 4), and if we admit that some of the traits in the portrait of Jehovah's " Servant" may have been suggested by the sufferings of individuals, and were applicable to individual sufferers, yet the portrait as a whole was one which transcended all experience, and the figure of the ideal Servant anticipated a work and a mission more enduring and comprehensive than that of Israel, and a holiness and innocence of life which the best of her sons had never attained (Driver, Isaiah, pp. 175-180). But not only in His miraculous working, but in His Resurrection and Ascension St. Peter recognised how God had glorified His Servant Jesus; and whilst it was natural that the word "Servant" should rise to his lips, as he recalls the submission to betrayal and death, whilst he never forgets the example of lowliness and obedience which Christ had given, and commends to poor Christian slaves the patience and humility of Him Who was "the first Servant in the world" (1 Peter ii. 18-25), he sees what prophets and wise men had failed to see, how the suffering "Servant" is also "the Prince of Life," cf. chap. v. 15, and v. 31—βασιλευς μων; there is no regular answering δι in the text (cf. i. 1), but the words in ver. 15 δ θεος ξυρεφν express the antithesis (Blass, Wendt, Holtzmann). In dwelling upon the action of Pilate and the guilt of the Jews, the Apostle loses the direct grammatical construction; he emphasises the denial (ηρνησασθε twice) and its baseless; but nothing in reality was more natural, more like St. Peter's impetuosity.

2 Cor. x. 1—The expression need not be explained as a Hebraism, it is found several times in Polybius; see Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 23. In the LXX it is frequent in various senses, and sometimes simply in the sense of before, in the presence of, a person, 1 Sam. xvii. 8, 1 Kings i. 23, 1 Chron. xvi. 3, Jer. lii. 12, 33, Judith x. 23, xi. 5, etc. Rendall takes the words as usually denoting an open encounter with an opposite party face to face, cf. xxv. 16, Gal. ii. 11, and so here; the Jews met Pilate's proposal to free the prisoner with a point-blank denial.

13 is referred by Hilgenfeld to the revising hand of "the author to Theophilus," and he sees in its introduction a proof of the anti-Judaism of the reviser, whilst Jüngst prefers to regard the first part of ver. 14 as an insertion, but this Hilgenfeld will not accept, as thus the antithesis in ver. 15 is not marked.—κρίναντος: "when he had determined," R.V., not a purpose only, but a decision, Luke xxiii. 16.—κατακρίνετο, not averted, emphasising the antithesis between what Pilate had determined and what they had done: "before He determined, He did not mean you" (Chrys.).

Ver. 14. τον ἁγίον καὶ δίκαιον: both epithets are used of John the Baptist, Mark vi. 20, ἅγιον δίκαιον καὶ ἁγίον, but Jesus is emphatically "the Holy and Righteous One." R.V. Not only is the sinlessness of His human character emphasised, but also associated with the language, Luke xxiii. 16.—κατακρίνετο: "when he had determined," R.V., not a purpose only, but a decision, Luke xxiii. 16.—κατακρίνετο, not averted, emphasising the antithesis between what Pilate had determined and what they had done: "before He determined, He did not mean you" (Chrys.).

Ver. 15. τὸν δὲ ἄρχηγον τῆς ζωῆς: again the words stand in marked contrast not only to φονέα but also to απεκτείνατε; magnificum antitheton, Bengel. The word is rendered "Author" in the margin of R.V. (Vulgate, auctorem) but "Prince" in the text and so in v. 31 (Vulg., principem). In the two other passages in
16. καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ δόματος αὐτοῦ, τούτον, ὃν θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἶδατε, ἐστερέωσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ ἑδώκεν

which the word occurs in the N.T., viz.,
Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2, R.V. renders “Author,”
“the author of their salvation,” “the
author and perfecter of our faith,” margin “captain” (Vulgate, auctorem); see
Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 49, 305. Christ
is both the Prince of life and the Source
(auctor) of life: “Vitam aliis dat Christus,” opp. fœnus qui admit” (Blass).
Grimm and others draw a distinction
between the meaning attaching to
the word here and in v. 31. The use of
the word in the LXX may help to justify
such a distinction, for whilst it is found
in the sense of a leader or a captain
(Num. xiv. 4, Judith xiv. 2), or the chief
of a family or tribe (Num. vii. 26; “every one a prince” in Num. xiii. 2, but
in the next verse “heads of the children
of Israel”), it is also used to signify the
author, or beginner, the source, cf. 1
Macc. ix. 61, x. 47, Micah i. 13 (although
it was never used for a prince or to de
scribe kingly attributes); but in many
respects the rendering “Prince” may be
compared with the Latin princeps, which
signifies the first person in order, a chief,
a leader, an originator, the founder of a
family (in the time of the emperors it was
used of the heir to the throne). So in
classical Greek the word was used for a
leader, a founder, Latin auctor, for the
first cause, author, so God τῶν πάντων,
Plat., and also for a prince, a chief, and,
especially in later Greek, of the person
from whom anything good or bad first
proceeds in which others have a share,
e.g., αρχηγὸς καὶ αἴτιος combined (ante
signamus et auctor), Polyb., i., 66, 10;
Hdtian., ii., 6, 22, and as Alford points
out in Heb. ii. 10, this later usage
throws a light upon its meaning in
Acts iii. 15, cf. Chrys. on Heb. ii. 10,
ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας τούτος τῶν
αἰτίων τῆς σωτηρίας. Christ is the source
of life, a life in which others share
through Him; in this very place where
St. Peter was speaking our Lord had
spoken of Himself as the giver of eternal
life, John x. 28, although doubtless the
expression may include the thought that
in Him was life in its fullest and widest
sense, physical, intellectual, moral,
spiritual. St. Chrysostom comments on
the words “Prince of Life,” Hom., ix.: “It follows that the life He had was not
from another, the Prince or Author of
Life must be He who has life from Himself”. Theophylact and Oecumenius see
in the words a contrast to the ϕωνή, in
that Christ gives life, while the murderer
takes it away—a contrast deepened by the
words of St. Peter’s fellow-disciple whom
he here associates with himself in his
appeal to the people, cf. 1 John iii. 15.
In ver. 31 ἀρχ., in its rendering “Prince”
of kingly dignity may be compared with
the use of the word in Thuc., i., 132,
Aesch., Agam., 259. Rendall sees in the
expression both here and Acts v. 31 a
reference to Jesus (the name used by St.
Peter) as the second Joshua. As Joshua
was the captain of Israel and led them
across the Jordan into the land of promise,
so Jesus was the Captain of the
living army of the Resurrection; and for
Saviour, v. 31, he compares Matt. i. 21.
Such associations may be included in St.
Peter’s words, but they seem much more
applicable to v. 31. In modern Greek the
word ἀρχηγὸς = leader, in the ordinary
sense, Kennedy, Sources of N.T. Greek,
p. 153; see Grimm, sub υ.-ου may
refer to οὖν, cf. i. 8, xiii. 30, or to the
fact of the Resurrection, cf. ii. 32, v. 32,
x. 39. R.V. reads “of whom” in the
margin.

Ver. 16. ἐπὶ: so T.R., and so Weiss
and Wendt: “on the ground of faith
5 (not expressing the aim as if it meant
with a view to faith in His name). But
the name is no mere formula of incanta
tion, see xix. 13, nor is it used as, in
Jewish tradition, the name of God, in
scribed on the rod of Moses, was said to
have given him power to work his
miracles in Egypt and the wilderness,
see above on ver. 5. On the use of
ὄνομα in formula of incantation, see
Deissmann, Bibelstudien, pp. 25-54.—
ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ: “the faith which is
through Him,” not by it, i.e., the name
—not only the healing power is through
Christ, but also the faith of the Apostles
as of the man who was healed, cf.,
especially, 1 Pet. i. 21. τοῦτος δὲ αὐτῶν
πιστεύοις εἰς Θεόν, i.e., his converts
through Christ are believers in God: He
is the object and the author of our faith.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

... 

αὐτόν τὴν ὀλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν. 17. καὶ νῦν, 

καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί, οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, ὡσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀρχοντες 

κατὰ ἄγνοιαν, ἀδελφοί, οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, ὡσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀρχοντες 

ὑμῶν. 18. ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀ προκατήγγειλε διὰ στομάτος πάντων τῶν

Ver. 17. καὶ νῦν: favourite formula of transition, cf. vii. 35, x. 5, xx. 25, xxii. 16, i john ii. 28, 2 john 5. See Wendt and Page, in loco. Bengel describes it as "formula transseuntis a praeterno ad praesens". Blass, "i.e., quod attinet ad ea quae nunc facienda sunt, ver. 19". — ἀδελφοί: affectionate and conciliatory, cf. ver. 12, where he speaks more formally because more by way of reproof: "One of the marks of truth would be wanting without this accordance between the style and the changing mental moods of the speaker" (Hackett).

κατὰ ἄγνοιαν: the same phrase occurs in LXX, Lev. xxii. 14 (cf. also Lev. v. 18, Eccles. v. 5). On κατὰ in this usage, see Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 149, who doubts whether it is quite good Greek. It is used in Polybius, and Blass compares κατ' ἀνάγκην (Philem., ver. 14), which is found in Xen., Cyr., iv. 3. Their guilt was less than if they had slain the Messiah κατὰ πρόθεσιν, κατὰ προαίρεσιν, or εν χειρὶ ὑπερφάνην, Num. xv. 30, and there-

fore their hope of pardon was assured on their repentance (cf. i pet. i. 14, εν ἄγνοια, and Psalms of Solomon, xviii., 5, for the same phrase). St. Peter speaks in the spirit of his Master, Luke xxiii. 34. See instances in Wetstein of the antithesis of the two phrases κατ’ ἄγνοιαν κατὰ πρόθεσιν (προαίρεσιν) in Polybius.—οἱ ἀρχοντες ὑμῶν, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 8. The guilt of the rulers was greater than that of the people, but even for their crime St. Peter finds a palliation in the fact that they did not recognise the Messiah, although he does not hold them guiltless for shutting their eyes to His holiness and innocence.

Ver. 18. δε: a further mitigation; whilst they were acting in their ignorance, God was working out His unerring counsel and will.—πάντων τῶν προφητῶν: not to be explained by simply calling it hyperbolic. The prophets are spoken of collectively, because the Messianic redemption to which they all looked forward was to be accomplished through the death of Christ, cf. x. 43. The view here taken by St. Peter is in striking harmony with his first Epistle, i. 11, and ii. 22-25.—παθεῖν τὸν Χ. αὐτοῦ, R.V., "his Christ," cf. Luke xvii. 25, xxiv. 26. The phrase, which (W. H.) is undoubtedly correct, is found in Psalm ii. 2, from which St. Peter quotes in iv. 26, and the same expression is used twice in the Apocalypse, but nowhere else in the N. T.; xi. 15, xii. 10 (cf. also Luke ii. 26, ix. 20). See also the striking passage in Psalms of Solomon, xviii., 6 (and ver. 8), εν ἀνάξει Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, and Ryle and James on Psalm xvii. 36. The paradox that the suffering Messiah was also the Messiah of Jehovah, His Anointed, which the Jews could not understand (hence their ἄγνοια), was solved for St. Peter in the Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus. On the suffering Messiah, see note xxvi. 23.—ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτω: "He thus fulfilled," i.e., in the way described, vv. 14, 15. On πλήρωσε, see i. 16. "In the gardens of the Carthusian Convent . . .
near Dijon . . . is a beautiful monument. . . . It consists of a group of Prophets and Kings from the O.T., each holding in his hand a scroll of mourning from his writings—each with his own individual costume and gesture and look, each distinguished from each by the most marked peculiarities of age and character, absorbed in the thoughts of his own time and country. But above these figures is a circle of angels, as like each to each as the human figures are unlike. They, too, as each overhangs and overlooks the Prophet below him, are saddened with grief. But their expression of sorrow is far deeper and more intense than that of the Prophets, whose words they read. They see something in the Prophetic sorrow which the Prophets themselves see not: they are lost in the contemplation of the Divine Passion, of which the ancient saints below them are but the unconscious and indirect exponents: “Stanley’s Jewish Church, pref. to vol. ii.

Ver. 19. επιστρέψατε: “turn again,” R.V.; cf. also Matt. xiii. 15, Mark iv. 12, and Acts xviii. 27 (Luke xxii. 32), in each of these passages, as in the text, A.V., “should be converted,” following the Vulgate, convertantur. But the verb is in the active voice in each of the passages mentioned; cf. LXX, x Kings viii. 33, 2 Chron. vi. 24, 37, Isaiah vi. 10 (“turn again,” R.V.), Tobit xiii. 6—επιστρέψατε ἀμαρτωλοί: this passive rendering in the Vulgate and A.V. testifies to the unwillingness in the Western Church to recognise the “conversion” to God as in any degree the spontaneous act of the sinner himself—men have enlarged upon Lam. v. 21, but have forgotten James iv. 8 (Humphry, Commentary on the R. V., pp. 31, 32).—οὕτως τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι: in the LXX the verb is found in the sense of obliterating αμαρτίας, Ps. 1. (ii.) 1, 91; Isaiah xiii. 25, Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 20, Jer. xviii. 23, with ἀμαρτίας, 2 Macc. xii. 42, with ἀμάρτημα (cf. 3 Macc. ii. 19, ἀναληθέων with ἀμαρτίας), and in N.T.; cf. Col. ii. 14. For other instances of its use in the N.T., cf. Rev. iii. 5, with Deut. ix. 14, Ps. ix. 5, etc., and see also Rev. vii. 17, xxi. 4. In Psalms of Solomon it is used twice—one of blotting out the memories of sinners from off the earth, Psalm ii. 19; cf. Exod. xvii. 14, etc., and once of blotting out the transgressions of Saints by the Lord, Psalm xiii. 9. Blass speaks of the word as used “de scriptis proprie; itaque etiam de debita pecunia”; cf. Dem., 791, 12 (Wendt), and see also Wetstein, in loco. The word can scarcely be applied here to the Baptism (as Meyer), for which a word expressing washing would rather be required, cf. xxii. 16, although no doubt, as in ii. 38, Baptism joined with Repentance was required for the remission of sins.—δῶς δὲ: not “when” (as if δῶς = ἄρα), but “that so there may come,” R.V., δὲ with δῶς indicates that the accomplishment of the purpose is dependent upon certain conditions; here dependent upon the repentance. In the N.T. there are only four instances of this use of δῶς δὲ, all in pure final clauses, viz., in the text, Luke ii. 35, and in two quotations from the LXX, Acts xv. 17 (where δὲ is wanting in LXX, Amos ix. 12), and Rom. iii. 4 = LXX, Ps. l. (11.) 4, 80 that this usage is practically peculiar to St. Luke in the N.T. Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 80 (1893); Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 207, and Burton, N.T. Moods and Tenses, p. 85.—καιροί ἀναψύξεως: the word ἀναψύξεως, used only by St. Luke, means refreshing or refreshment. In the LXX it occurs in Exod. viii. 15 (but cf. Aq. on Isaiah xxviii. 12, and Sym. on Isaiah xxxii. 15), where it is translated “respite,” although the same Hebrew word יִתְקַי, in the only other place ἀναψύξεως (cf. Acts viii. 25), in which it occurs, Lam. iii. 56, may have the sense of “relief” (see Dr. Payne Smith, in loco, Speaker’s Commentary, vol. v.). In Strabo ἀναψύξης is found in the sense of recreation, refreshment, x., p. 459; see also Philo, De Abru., 29, and cf. the verb ἀναψύχω in 2 Tim. i. 16 (cf. Rom. xv. 32, ἀναψύξεως μεθ’ ὑμών, DE, refigreretur vobiscum, Vulgate, and Nosgen on Acts iii. 10). Rendall would render it here “respite,” as if St. Peter urged the need of repentance that the people might obtain a respite from the terrible visitation of the Lord. But the καιροί ἀναψύξεως, are identified by most commentators with the ἀποκαταστάσεις, and ἀναψύξεως need by no means be rendered “respite”. Nosgen, connecting the words with the thought of ἀνακάθωσις (cf. the various renderings in Rom. xv. 32), would see here a fulfilment of Christ’s promise, καθὼς ἀνακάθωσεν ὑμῖν, Matt. xi. 28, to those who turned to Him in true re-
pentance, and so in his view the expression applies to the seasons of spiritual refreshment which may be enjoyed by the truly penitent here and now, which may occur again and again as men repent (Isaiah lxvi. 16); so J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., interprets the word of the present refreshing of the Gospel, and God’s present sending of Christ in His ministry and power, and in the same manner ἀποστείλη, i.e., not at the end of the world, when Christ shall come as Judge, but in the Gospel, which is His voice. But the context certainly conceives of Christ as enthroned in Heaven, where He must remain until His Second Advent, although we may readily admit that there is a spiritual presence of the enthroned Jesus which believers enjoy as a foretaste of the visible and glorious Presence at the Parousia, Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, p. 31 ff.—πάντοθε ἀποστείλων τοῦ Κ. πρόσωπ, lit., face, often used as here for “the presence”; cf. Hebrew, ἀπό προσώπος τοῦ Κ. πρόσωπ., lit., face, often used as here for the presence”; cf. Hebrew, "ΣΕρ, frequently in LXX, and see above on ii. 28, here of the refreshment which comes from the bright and smiling presence of God to one seeking comfort (so Grimm). The phrase occurs three times in Acts v. 41, vii. 45, elsewhere in 2 Thess. i. 9, and three times in Apoc. On St. Luke’s fondness for phrases with πρόσωπον (από, πρό, κατά), see Friedrich (Das Lucasevangelium, pp. 8, 9, 89). The Lord is evidently God the Father, the καιροί are represented as present before God, already decreed and determined, and as coming down from His presence to earth (Weiss, Wendt). Christ speaks, i. 6, of the seasons which the Father hath set in His own power, and so St. Chrysostom speaks of God as αἰτιός of the seasons of refreshment.

Ver. 20. καὶ ἀποστείλη, i.e., at His Parousia. The construction is still ἀποστείλη with the verb. ἀποστείλη is here used as in Luke iv. 18, 43, expressing that the person sent is the envoy or representative of the sender (πέμπω is also used of the mission of our Lord).—τὸν προκεκηρυγμένον, T.R., see on ver. 18; but W.H., Blass, Weiss, τὸν προκεκηρυγμένον ὑμῖν Χριστόν, ὑμῖν: “the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus”. So R.V. This verb is found with accusative of the person in the sense of choosing, appointing, in Acts xxii. 14, xxvi. 16, and nowhere else in the N.T.; cf. Josh. i. 12, 2 Macc. iii. 7, viii. 9, Exod. vi. 13 (cf. its use also in Dem., Polyb., Plut., and instances in Wetstein); Latin eligere, destinare. The expression here refers not only to the fact that Jesus was the appointed Christ, inasmuch as the covenant with Abraham was fulfilled in Him, ver. 25, but also to the return of Jesus as the Christ, the Messianic King, at His Parousia, in accordance with the voices of the Prophets. This is more natural than to suppose that the expression means foreordained, i.e., from eternity, although St. Peter’s words elsewhere may well be considered in connection with the present passage, 1 Pet. i. 20.

Ver 21. μὲν: no answering δέ expressed, but the antithesis is found in the ἔχει χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως, “quasi dicat: ubi iliid tempus venerit, ex coelo in terras redibit,” Grotius (so Weiss, Blass).—ὅτι δὲ οὐρανόν δέχεσθαι: the words have been rendered in three ways: (1) “whom the heaven must receive,” i.e., as the place assigned to Him by God until the Parousia, Phil. iii. 20, Col. iii. 4. In this case δέ is not used for δέι, as if St. Luke were referring to the past historical fact of the Ascension only, but Christ’s exaltation to heaven is represented as a fact continually present until His coming again; or (2) the words have been taken as if όν were the subject, “who must possess the heaven”. But the former seems the more natural rendering, so in A.V. and R.V., as more in accordance with the use of δέχεσθαι, and κατέχειν would be rather the word in the second rendering (see Wendt’s note). Zöckler takes the words to mean “who must receive heaven,” i.e., from the Father. Here St. Peter corrects the popular view that the Messiah should remain on earth, John xii. 34, and if we compare the words with the question asked in i. 6, they show how his views had changed of his Master’s kingdom (see Hackett’s note).—ἔχει χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως: the latter noun is not found either in LXX or elsewhere in the N.T., but it is used by Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch. In Josephus, Ant., xi. 3, 8, 9, it is used of the restoration of the Jews to their own land from the captivity, and also in Philo., Decal., 30, of the restoration of inheritances at the Jubilee. The key to its meaning here is found not in the question of the disciples in i. 6, but in our Lord’s own saying, Matt. xvii. 11, Mark ix. 12, “Elías truly
first cometh, and shall restore all things," καὶ ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, and cf. LXX, Mal. iv. 6, where the same verb is found (ἈΠΟΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΙΣ). It was the teaching of the Scriptures that Elias should be the forerunner of the Messiah, Mal. iv. 5, and Matt. xvii. 11, and xi. 14. But his activity embraced both an external and an internal, i.e., a moral restoration, Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 10. He is said καταστήσεις φυλάς Ἰακώβ, to enable those who had been illegally excluded from the congregation to attain their inheritance, but he is eager also for the moral and religious renewal of his people. All disputes would be settled by him at his coming, and chiefly and above all he conducts the people to a great repentance, which will not be accomplished before he comes, Luke i. 16, 17 (Mal. iv. 6, LXX). This is the inward and moral side of the ἀποκατάστασις, Matt. xvii. 11, Mark ix. 12. But as in Acts i. 6 our Lord had corrected the ideas of the disciples as to an external restoration of the kingdom to Israel, so in the Gospels He had corrected their ideas as to the coming of Elias, and had hidden them see its realisation in the preaching of John the Baptist in turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just. And so the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων had already begun, in so far as men's hearts were restored to obedience to God, the beginning of wisdom, to the purity of family affection, to a love of righteousness and a hatred of iniquity. Even when the thoughts of the N.T. writers embrace the renewal of the visible creation, the moral and spiritual elements of restoration were present and prominent; cf. 2 Pet. iii. 13, Rom. viii. 19-21, Rev. xxi. 5. So too the ΤΑΛΙΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ, in Matt. xix. 28, is joined with the rule which the disciples would share with their Lord, and involved great moral issues. A renewal of all things had no doubt been foretold by the prophets, Is. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxv. 17; it was dwelt upon in later Jewish writings, and often referred to by the Rabbis (cf., e.g., Book of Enoch, xlv., 2; lxii., 1; xci., 16, 17; Apocrypha of Baruch, xxxii.), and instances in Eder, Ἰεσοῦς ὁ Μεσσηιας, ii., p. 343; but even amongst pious Israelites there was always a danger lest their hopes for the future should be mainly associated with material prosperity and national glorification. It is perhaps significant that Josephus uses the two terms ἀποκατάστασις and ΤΑΛΙΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ in close conjunction of the restoration of the Jews to their own land after the exile. How this restoration of all things was to be effected, and what was involved in it, St. Peter does not say, but his whole trend of thought shows that it was made dependent upon man's repentance, upon his heart being right with God, see Weber, "Jüdische Τheologie," p. 352 ff. (1897); Eder, Ἰεσοῦς ὁ Μεσσηιας, ii., pp. 343, 706; Hauck's Τreal-Ενκυκλοπαδιε, "Ἀποκατάτασις," p. 616 ff. (1896).—ὁν refers to χρόνων, so R.V. "whereof," i.e., of which times. Holtzmann and Wendt on the other hand refer ὃν to πάντων. But the words of our Lord in Matt. xix. 11 certainly point to the former reference, and the words are so taken by Weiss, Page, Hackett. In the article from Hauck quoted above, the writer speaks of the reference to χρόνων as the more correct, and points out that if ὃν is the relative to πάντων, the restoration spoken of would no longer be a restoration of all things, but only of those things of which the prophets had spoken. On the prophecies referred to see above. All the words from πάντων to προφητῶν are ascribed by Hilgenfeld to his "author to Theophilus"; the thought of the prophets existing απ' αιώνος (Luke i. 70) belongs in his opinion to the Paulinism of this reviser, just as in Luke's Gospel he carries back the genealogy of Jesus not to Abraham but to Adam. To a similar Pauline tendency on the part of this reviser, Hilgenfeld refers the introduction in vv. 25, 26 of the promise made to Abraham embracing all the nations of the earth (Gal. iii. 16), and also the introduction of the word πρῶτον (Rom. i. 16, ii. 9), to show that not only upon the Jews, but also upon the Gentiles had
22. "Moses indeed, yea and all the Prophets from Samuel— not "truly" as in A.V., as if में were an adverb. The quotation is freely made from Deut. xviii.15. On the Messianic bearing of the passage see Weber, *Judische Theologie*, p. 364 (1897), and Lumby, *Acts, in loco*. Wetstein sees no necessity to refer the word ἐπρότετον, ver. 22, to Jesus, but rather to the succession of prophets who in turn prophesied of the Coming One. But "similitudo non officit excellentiae" (Bengel, so Wendt), and the words in Deuteronomy were *fulfilled* in Christ alone, the new Law-giver; the Revealer of God's will, of grace and truth, "Whom the Lord knew face to face," Who was from all eternity "with God". But the N.T. gives us ample reason for referring the verse, if not to the Messiah, yet at least to the Messianic conceptions of the age. To say nothing of St. Stephen's significant reference to the same prophecy, vii. 37, it would certainly seem that in the conversation of our Lord with the Samaritan woman, John iv. 19 sq., the conception of the Messianic prophet is in her mind, and it was upon this prediction of a prophet greater than Moses that the Samaritans built their Messianic hopes (Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 272, and see also for Deut. xviii. 15, and its Messianic fulfilment, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 110 ff.). On other allusions in St. John's Gospel to the anticipation in Deut. xviii. 15 see Bishop Lightfoot, *Expositor*, i. (fourth series), pp. 84, 85; there are, he thinks, four passages, John i. 21, 25, vi. 14, vii. 40, in all of which "the prophet" is mentioned (so R.V. in each place). But whilst in St. John the conception is still Jewish (that is to say, St. John exhibits the Messianic conceptions of his countrymen, who regard the Christ and the prophet as two different persons), in Acts it is Christian. St. Peter identified the prophet with the Christ (and so inferentially St. Stephen). (But see also Alford's note on St. John vi. 14, and also Weber, sub ντά, p. 354, for the view that Jeremiah was o Προφ., in John i. 21, 25, vii. 40 (cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 14), whilst Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, i., pp. 67-69, E.T., should also be consulted.) —ώς εμέ: rendered by A.V. and R.V. "like me" (the meaning of the Hebrew, in loco), but in margin R.V. has "as he raised up me," a rendering adopted as the only admissible one of the Greek by Page and Rendall; as no doubt it is, if we read ὡς αὐτόν, as in LXX, Deut. xviii. 18. But is found in the LXX in v. 15. Certainly the rendering in A.V. and R.V. could not be applied to any one prophet so truly as to Christ, and the ως αὐτόν is a rendering of the familiar Hebrew נַּא (Lumby), which is so frequent in the LXX; see also Grimm-Thayer, sub ντά, and Delitzsch, *Messianische Weissagungen*, p. 46 ff., second edition (1899).

Ver. 23. Εστι τε δι', cf. ii. 17. The expression, which is not in the Hebrew,
In the LXX, Deut. xviii. 19, following the Hebrew, the words are εγώ εκδίκησω εξ αυτού, "I will require it of him". But the phrase which St. Peter uses was a very common one, from Gen. xvii. 14, for the sentence of death, cf. also Exod. xii. 15, 19, Lev. xvii. 4, 9, Num. xv. 30. Here again the quotation is evidently made freely or from memory. The strong verb, although frequent in the LXX, is found only here in the N.T. It is used by Josephus and by Philo, but not in classical Greek. The warning is evidently directed against wilful disobedience, and is expressed in terms signifying the utterness of the destruction from the people. But in their original meaning in the O.T. they need not refer to anything more than the penalty of the death of the body, and it is not necessary to see in them here any threat of eternal punishment in Gehenna (so Wendt, Holtzmann, Felten). If the word has any eschatological bearing it would support the theory of annihilation more easily. Grotius explains εξολεθ., "morte violenta aut immatura," and he adds "mystice etiam Rabbini hoc ad poenas post hanc vitam referunt," but this is quite apart from the primary meaning of the word.

Ver. 24. Σαμουήλ : On Samuel as the founder of the prophetical schools and the pattern of all later prophets, see Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 6, p. 854; "Prophecy," cf. Midrash Shemuel, c. 24, where Samuel is called the Rabbin, the chief and teacher of the prophets (Wetstein, in loco, and Lumby), cf. also Heb. xi. 32, Deut. vii. 1, and των prophetων, "of the prophets," an unmistakable tautology. Wendt considers the expression as inaccurate, see his note, and for a full discussion cf. Winer-Moulton, lxvii. 2, who compares Luke xxiv. 27, = "all the series of prophets beginning from Samuel" (Page); "longa tamen successione, unco tamen sensus" (Calvin). καθεξ., used by St. Luke alone, Luke i. 3, vii. 1, Acts xi. 4, xviii. 23. In Greek writers =

εξολοθρευθήσεται εκ του λαού. 24. και πάντες δε οι προφηται ἀπὸ Σαμουήλ και τῶν καθεξῆς, δοσι διάλησαν, καὶ προκατήγγειλαν

1 osis, D has ἐλάλησεν—Harris accounts for as quod quod of d, read as quod, and so δ. T.R. has the support of ΒBCΩEP; so W.H., Weiss. ὁ in ΒCΩD, Vulg., Gig., Par.2.

seems to call attention to what follows.—εξολοθρευθήσεται εκ του λαού: "shall be utterly destroyed" (ἐξ), R.V. In the LXX, Deut. xviii. 19, following the Hebrew, the words are εγώ εκδίκησω εξ αυτού, "I will require it of him." But the reference is not merely to the prophetical sayings relating to the last judgment, but also to the promises of salvation and to all which is connected with the χρόνοι αποκαταστάσεως. Moreover the reference to Samuel is made because of Nathan's prediction, "the fundamental prophecy respecting the seed of David," 2 Sam. vii. 12 ff., in which it is foretold that mercy shall not be taken away even in the midst of punishment. Blass explains the expression τας ημέρας ταύτας, "regni felicis Messianici"; but we must remember that it does not follow that the popular views of the Messianic kingdom and judgment were still held by St. Peter.

Ver. 25. ὑμείς, as in ver. 26, emphatic, "obligata auditores" Bengel, cf. ii. 39, Rom. ix. 4, xv. 8; their preference and destiny ought to make them more sensible of their duty in the reception of the Messiah; υιοί," sons "as in Matt. viii. 12, R.V. The rendering "disciples" (Matt. xii. 2), even if υιοί could be so rendered with προφητῶν (J. Lightfoot, Kuinoel), could not be applied to της διαθήκης. The expression is Hebraistic, see Grimm-Thayer, sub υιός, 2, and on many similar expressions Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 163 ff.—διάθ. διέθετο, cf. Heb. viii. 10, x. 16, Gen. xv. 18, 1 Macc. i. 11, for a similar construction in LXX.
In more than seventy places, so also frequently in classical writers.—

The application of the prophecy to the Messiah as the seed of Abraham by the Rabbinical writers, see Wetstein on Gal. iii. 16 (and Ebersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., p. 712); so by St. Luke, although the words of the prophecy were first uttered in a collective sense.—

πατριάς: “families,” R.V., Luke ii. 4, Eph. iii. 15; “kindreds,” A.V., is the rendering of other words, iv. 5, vii. 3. πατριά is found in LXX (and in Herodotus); in Gen. xii. 3 φυλαί is used, and in xvii. 18 άνθρωποι, but in Ps. xxii. 27 and in 1 Chron. xvi. 28 we have the phrase αλλήλου των άνθρωπων (but see Nosgen, *in loco*). In this quotation, cf. Gal. iii. 8, 16, and in the πρώτον of the next verse we may see a striking illustration of the unity of Apostolic preaching, and the recognition of God’s purpose by St. Peter and St. Paul alike (Rom. i. 16, ii. 9, 10).—

ενευδοκιμείν: *of the instrument as often:* the verb is not used in classical writers, but Blass gives several instances of verbs similarly compounded with εν, *cf. ενευδαιμονεῖν, ενευδοκίμεῖν.* The compound verb is found several times in LXX.

Ver. 26. πρώτον-υμίν: again emphatic. In the words of St. Peter we may again note his agreement with St. Paul, xiii. 46, Rom. i. 16 (x. 11), although no doubt St. Peter shared the views of his nation so far that Gentiles could only participate in the blessings of the Messianic kingdom through acceptance of Judaism.—

ενευδάσει, *cf. ver. 22, τον παίδα, “his servant,” R.V., see above on ver. 13. Ενευρέσει also shows that ενευρέσει also shows that εν εύρος, here refers not to the Resurrection but to the Incarnation.—

γενέσθαι: as in the act of blessing, present participle; the present participle expressing that the Christ is still continuing his work of blessing on repentance, but see also Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 171.—

The use of εν governing the dative with the infinitive is most commonly temporal, but it is used to express other relations, such as manner, means, as here (*cf. iv. 30, where the attempt to give a temporal sense is very far-fetched, Hackett, in loco*); see Burton, *u. s.*, p. 162, and Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 232. This formula of εν with the dative of the article and the infinitive is very common in St. Luke, both in his Gospel and in the Acts, and is characteristic of him as compared with the number of times the same formula is used by other writers in the N.T., Friedrich, *Das Lukansevangelium*, p. 37, and also Zeller, *Acts of the Apostles*, ii., p. 196. E.T.; so also in the LXX the same construction is found, *cf. Gen. xix. 16, xxxiv. 15, etc.*—

γενέσθαι: probably intransitive (Blass, Grimm, and so often in LXX, although the English A. and R.V. may be understood in either sense). Vulgate renders “ut convertat se unusquisque,” but the use of the verb elsewhere in Luke xxiii. 14 (*cf. also Rom. xi. 26, Isa. lix. 20*) makes for the transitive sense (so Weiss, *in loco*). The argument from ver. 19 (as Alford points out) does not decide the matter either way (see also Holtzmann).—

πονηρίων, *cf. Luke xi. 39,* and adjective πονηρός frequent both in the Gospel and in the Acts; in LXX both words are very common. The word may denote miseries as well as iniquities, as Bengel notes, but the latter sense is demanded by the context. πρώτον according to Jüngst does not mark the fact that the Jews were to be converted first and the Gentiles afterwards, but as belonging to the whole clause, and as referring to the first and past sending of Jesus in contrast to the second (ver. 20) and future sending in glory. But to support this view Jüngst has no hesitation in regarding 25b as an interpolation, and so nothing is left but a reference to the διαθήκη of God with the fathers, *i.e.*, circumcision, which is quite in place before a Jewish audience.

**St. Peter’s Discourses.**—More recent German criticism has departed far from the standpoint of the early Tubingen school, who could only see in these discourses the free composition of a later
age, whilst Dr. McGiffert, in spite of his denial of the Lucan authorship of Acts, inclines to the belief that the discourses in question represent an early type of Christian teaching, derived from primitive documents, and that they breathe the spirit of St. Peter and of primitive Jewish Christianity. Feine sees in the contents of the addresses a proof that we have in them a truthful record of the primitive Apostolic teaching. Just the very points which were of central interest in this early period of the Church's life are those emphasised here, e.g., the proof that Jesus of Nazareth, the Crucified One, is the Messiah, a proof attested by His Resurrection, the appeal to Israel, the chosen people, to repent for the remission of sins in His name. Nor is there anything against the speeches in the fact of their similarity, in their first and early preaching, as Feine urges, the Apostles' thoughts would naturally move in the same circle, they would recur again and again to the same facts, and their addresses could scarcely be other than similar. Moreover we have an appeal to the facts of the life of Jesus as to things well known in the immediate past: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man," etc.—plainly and fearlessly St. Peter emphasises the manhood of his Lord—the title which is never found in any of the Epistles leads us back to the Passion and the Cross, to the earliest records of the Saviour's life on earth, Acts xxiv. 9, xxii. 8. And yet the Crucified Nazarene was by a startling paradox the Prince or Author of Life (see note on ἁρχηγός); by a divine law which the Jews could not discern He could not save Himself—and yet another paradox—there was no other Name given amongst men whereby they must be saved.

St. Paul could write of Him, Who took upon Him the form of a servant, Who humbled Himself, and became obedient to the death of the Cross, Phil. ii. 6; and St. Peter, in one familiar word, which so far as we know St. Paul never used, brings before his hearers the same sublime picture of obedience, humility, death and glory; Jesus is the ideal, the glorified "Servant" of God (see note on iii. 13). But almost in the same breath St. Peter speaks of the Servant as the Holy and Righteous One, iii. 14; holy, in that He was consecrated to the service of Jehovah (ἅγιος, iv. 27, 30, see note, and ii. 27); righteous, in that He was
also the impersonation of righteousness, a righteousness which the Law had proclaimed, and which Prophets and Kings had desired to see, but had not seen (Isaiah lii. 11). But whilst we note these titles, steeped each and all of them in O.T. imagery, whilst we may see in them the germs of the later and the deeper theology of St. Paul and St. John (see Dr. Lock, "Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts," Expositor, iv. (fourth series), p. 178 ff.), they carry us far beyond the conception of a mere humanitarian Christ. It is not only that Jesus of Nazareth is set before us as "the very soul and end of Jewish Prophecy," as Himself the Prophet to whom the true Israel would hearken, but that He is associated by St. Peter even in his earliest utterances, as none other is associated, with Jehovah in His Majesty in the work of salvation, ii. 34; the salvation which was for all who called upon Jehovah's Name, ii. 21, was also for all in the Name, in the power of Jesus Christ, iv. 12 (see notes, l. c, and cf. the force of the expression ἐπικαλέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα in 1 Cor. i. 2, Schmid, Biblische Theologie, p. 407); the Spirit which Joel had foretold would be poured forth by Jehovah had been poured forth by Jesus raised to the right hand of God, ii. 18, 33 (see further notes in chap. x. 36, 42, 43).

One other matter must be briefly noticed—the correspondence in thought and word between the St. Peter of the early chapters of the Acts and the St. Peter of the First Epistle which bears his name. A few points may be selected. St. Peter had spoken of Christ as the Prince of Life; quite in harmony with this is the thought expressed in 1 Pet. i. 3, of Christians as "begotten again" by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. St. Peter had spoken of Christ as the Holy and Righteous One, so in the First Epistle he sets forth this aspect of Christ's peculiar dignity, His sinlessness. As in Acts, so also in 1 Pet. the thought of the sufferings of Christ is prominent, but also that of the glory which should follow, chap. i., ver. 11. As in Acts, so also in 1 Pet. these sufferings are described as undeserved, but also as foreordained by God and in accordance with the voices of the Prophets, 1 Pet. i. 11 and ii. 22-25. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. it is the special task of the Apostles to be witnesses of the sufferings and also of the resurrection of Christ, chap. v. 1. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. we have the clearest testimony to the δόξα of Christ, 1 Pet. i. 21 and iv. 11. As in Acts stress is laid not only upon the facts of the life of Christ, but also upon His teaching, x. 34 ff., so also in 1 Pet., while allusions are made to the scenes of our Lord's Passion with all the force of an eye-witness, we have stress laid upon the word of Christ, the Gospel or teaching, i. 12, 23, 25, ii. 2, 5, iii. 19, iv. 6. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. we have a reference to the agency of Christ in the realm of the dead, 1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6. As in Acts, x. 42, so in 1 Pet. Christ is Himself the judge of quick and dead, iv. 6, or in His unity with the Father shares with Him that divine prerogative, cf. i. 17. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. the communication of the Holy Spirit is specially attributed to the exalted Christ, cf. Acts ii. 33, 1 Pet. i. 11, 12. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. Christ is the living corner-stone on which God's spiritual house is built, Acts iv. 12 and 1 Pet. ii. 4-10. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. not only the details but the whole scope of salvation is regarded in the light and as a fulfilment of O.T. prophecy, cf. Acts iii. 18-25, 1 Pet. ii. 22, 23, and i. 10-12. But this correspondence extends to words, amongst which we may note πρόγνωσις, Acts ii. 23, 1 Pet. i. 2, a word found nowhere else in the N.T., and used in each passage in the same sense; ἐναρξαμένος, 1 Pet. i. 17, and only here in the N.T., but cf. Acts x. 34, εἰς ἔννοιαν προστασίας 

εἴλον twice used by St. Peter in Acts v. 30, x. 39 (once by St. Paul), and again in 1 Pet. ii. 24; δείχνως only in the Cornelius history, Acts x. 28, by St. Peter, and in 1 Pet. iv. 3; μάρτυς with the genitive of that to which testimony is rendered, most frequently in the N.T. used by St. Peter. cf. Acts i. 22, vi. 32, x. 39, and 1 Pet. v. 1; and further, in...
Chapter IV.—Ver. 1. λαλούντων δι' αυτῶν: the speech was interrupted, as the present participle indicates, and we cannot treat it as if we had received it in full. It is no doubt possible to infer from αυτῶν that St. John also addressed the people.—επέστησαν αυτοίς: commonly used with the notion of coming upon one suddenly, so of the coming of an angel, xii. 7, xiii. 11, Luke ii. 9, xiv. 4, sometimes too as implying a hostile purpose, cf. vi. 12, xvii. 5, and St. Luke (x. 40), xx. 1. For its use in the LXX cf. Wisdom vi. 5, 8, xix. 1.—οἱ ιερεῖς: the priests, so A. and R.V., but the latter, margin, “the chief priests,” see critical note. ἀρχιερεῖς would comprise probably the members of the privileged high-priestly families in which the high-priesthood was vested (Schürer, u. s., pp. 258, 259, 267, and Eidersheim, u. s., and History of the Jewish Nation, p. 139), Acts v. 24, 26, Jos., Ant., xx. 6, 2, B. J., vi., 5, 3. For the use of the term in the LXX, see Schürer, u. s., p. 258. In 2 Macc. ii. 4, the “governor of the Temple” is identified by some with the officer here and in v. 24, but see Rawlinson’s note in loco in Speaker’s Commentary.

—καὶ οἱ Σαδσουκαῖοι: at this time, as Josephus informs us, however strange it may appear, the high-priestly families belonged to the Sadducean party. Not that the Sadducees are to be identified entirely with the party of the priests, since the Pharisees were by no means hostile to the priests as such, nor the priests to the Pharisees. But the Sadducees were the aristocrats, and to the aristocratic priests, who occupied influential civil positions, the Pharisees were bitterly opposed. Jos., Ant., xvi., 10, 6, xviii., 1, 4, xx., 9, 1. Schürer, u. s., div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 29-43, and div. ii., vol. i., p. 178 ff. The words οἱ Σαδσ. and ἡ οὔσα ἀρίστες τῶν Σ., ver. 7, are referred by Hilgenfeld to his “author to Theophilus,” as also the reference to the preaching of the Resurrection as the cause of the sore trouble to the Sadducees; but the mention of the Sadducees at least shows (as Weizsäcker and Holtzmann admit) that the author of Acts had correct information of the state of parties in Jerusalem: “The Sadducees were at the helm, and the office of the high-priest was in Sadducean hands, and the Sadducees predominated in the high-priestly families” (Weizsäcker, Apostolic Age, i., 61, E.T.).

Ver. 2. διαπονούμενον, cf. xvi. 18, only in Acts in the N.T., not, as often in classical Greek, referring to the exertions made by them, but to the vexation which they felt, “being sore troubled,” R.V. (πόνος, dolor, Blass), cf. LXX, Eccles. x. 9, used of pain caused to the body, and 2 Macc. ii. 28, R. (A. al. ἄτονοις), but cf. Aquila, Gen. vi. 6, xxxiv. 7, ἰ Sam. xx. 3, 34, of mental grief.—ἐν τῷ ημῶν:
In the didache, the authors of the didache taught the people, and they accused Jesus of resurrection from the dead. And they laid their hands on them, and they enjoined them to keep the day, for it was already evening.

Many of those hearing the word believed, and it came to pass that... (omitted for brevity)

...and many of those hearing the word believed, and the number increased, but... (omitted for brevity)

...it must be distinguished from (ή) ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. It is the more limited term implying that some from among the dead are raised, while others as yet are not; used of the Resurrection of Christ and of the righteous, cf. with this passage 1 Peter i. 3 (Col. i. 18), but see also Grimm-Thayer, sub ἀνάστασις. It was not merely a dogmatic question of the denial of the Resurrection which concerned the Sadducees, but the danger to their power, and to their wealth from the Temple sacrifices and dues, if the Resurrection of Jesus was proclaimed and accepted (see Wendt and Holtzmann, in loco). It is no unfair inference that the chief priests in St. John occupy the place of the Sadducees in the Synoptists, as the latter are never mentioned by name in the fourth Gospel; and if so, this is exactly in accordance with what we should expect from the notices here and in Acts v. 17, and in Josephus; see on the point Lightfoot in Expositor, 1890, pp. 86, 87.

Ver. 3. επέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας: the verb is always as here joined with the same noun in Acts, and twice in the Gospel; the phrase is found once in Matthew and Mark, and twice in John; see Luke xx. 19, xxii. 12, Acts iv. 3, v. 18, xii. 1, xii. 27, cf. in LXX, Gen. xxii. 12, 2 Sam. xviii. 12; Esther vi. 2, so also in Polybius. —τήρησιν, cf. v. 18, only used elsewhere in N.T. by St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 19; in Thuc., vii., 86 (Wendt), it denotes not only the act of guarding, but also a place of custody. Five times in LXX, but in the former sense. For another instance of its meaning as a place of custody (see Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 55), on papyrus in Egypt, second or third century after Christ. —ήν γαρ εσπέρα ήδη, cf. iii. 1, the judicial examination must therefore be postponed until the next day, see Jer. xxi. 12, on which it appears that the Rabbis founded this prohibition against giving judgment in the night (Lumby and Felten, in loco). —ἔσπερα: only in St. Luke in the N.T., Luke xxii. 11, Acts iv. 3 (xx. 15, W. H. margin) and xxviii. 23.

Ver. 4. ἔγινεν: "came to be" R.V., only here in St. Luke, except in the quotation in i. 20 (see also vii. 13, D., and Blass in ἀιλεησίτικο, frequently in LXX; in N.T. cf. 1 Thess. ii. 14, Col. iv. 11; also Jos., Ant., x., 10, 2, Winer-Schmiedl, p. 108, note). —ἀνάρριψαν. This word here appears to be used of men only (so Wetstein, Blass), cf. Matt. xiv. 21, Mark vi. 40, for although we cannot argue with Weiss from v. 14, that women in great
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5. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν αὐριον ἡ συναχήσει τῶν αρχοντῶν τούτων ἀρχιερέως καὶ γραμματείως εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ Ἀννάν τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ Καϊάφαν καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, καὶ δόσιν ἦσαν ἕκαστον ἀρχιερεῖκοι.


The instances above from the Gospels are generally quoted to confirm the view here taken, but Wendt, in loco, curiously used the same passages in proof that άρχοντες here includes women. The numbers are regarded by him as by Weizsäcker as artificial, but see above on i. τ. 5.

Ver. 5. Ἐγένετο δὲ: the formula is another characteristic of St. Luke's style, Friedrich, Das Lucas evangelium, p. 13, also Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, pp. 26, 29. Compare for the type of construction, according to which what takes place is put in the infinitive mood, depending upon ἐγένετο, ix. 32, 37, 43, xi. 26, xiv. 1, and other instances in Dr. Plummer's exhaustive note, St. Luke, p. xiv. τοις τῷ ἀριθμῷ: here only and in Luke x. 35, in N. T. For the temporal use of ἐπὶ iii. 1—συναχήσει, i.e., the Sanhedrim. ἀρχιερεῖς here = ἀρχιερεῖς, who are mentioned first as a rule, where the N. T. enumerates the different orders of the Sanhedrim, whilst of ἀρχιερεῖς is an interchangeable expression, both in the N. T. and in Josephus (see, for instance, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., pp. 177, 205, E. T.), although there are instances in which both words occur together, Luke xxiii. 13 and xxiv. 20. Whatever may have been the precise significance of the term ἀρχιερεῖς, Schürer, u. s., pp. 203-206, E. T., it included, beyond all doubt, the most prominent representatives of the priesthood, belonging chiefly, if not entirely, to the Sadducean party. πρεσβυτέρους: those members were known simply by this title who did not belong to either of the two special classes mentioned. γραμματείς: the professional lawyers who adhered to the Pharisees, Jos., Ant., xviii., 6, 2. Even under the Roman government the Sanhedrim possessed considerable independence of jurisdiction, both civil and criminal. Not only could it order arrests to be made by its own officers, but it could dispose, on its own authority, of cases where the death penalty was not involved, Schürer, u. s., p. 187, E. T., and Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, p. 103 ff.—εἰς Ἰερουσαλημ: Weiss would restrict εἰς τεp, to the scribes of Jerusalem to distinguish them.
from the scribes of Galilee, but it is doubtful whether the words can bear this (see also Rendall, who favours the same view as Weiss). Holtzmann and Wendt, on the other hand, defend εις, and suppose that the members of the Sanhedrim were obliged to hurry into the city from their country estates. Zöckler applies εις θεό, not only to γραμματείας, but also to the other members of the Sanhedrim, and sees in the words an intimation that the sitting was hurriedly composed of the members actually present in Jerusalem.

Ver. 6. "Ἀννᾶς: Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Annas, was the high priest actually in office, but like other retired high priests, the latter retained not only the title, but also many of the rights and obligations of the office. Josephus certainly appears to extend the title to ex-high priests, and so in the N.T., where ἀρχιερεύς appear at the head of the Sanhedrin as in this passage (ἐξοντες), the ex-high priests are to be understood, first and foremost, as well as the high-priest actually in office. The difficulty here is that the title is given to Annas alone, and this seems to involve that he was also regarded as president of the Sadducees, whereas it is always the actual ἀρχιερεύς who presides, cf. Acts v. 17, vii. 1, ix. 1, xxii. 5, xxiii. 2, 4, xxiv. 1. But not only is the laxity of the term to be considered, but also the fact that Annas on account of his influence as the head of the γένος αρχιερατικόν may have remained the presiding ἀρχιερεύς in spite of all the rapid changes in the tenure of the high-priestly office under the Romans.

These changes the Jews would not recognise as valid, and if the early chapters of Acts came to St. Luke as seems probable from Jewish Christian sources, Annas might easily be spoken of as high-priest. His relationship to Caiaphas helps to explain the influence and power of Annas. On Hamburger's view (Real-Encyclopädie des jüdenthums, ii., 8, p. 1151, "Synhedron"), that a Rabbi and not the high-priest presided over the Sadducees, see Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, p. 522, and Schürer, u. s., p. 180. For Annas, see Jos., Ant., xviii., 2, 12, xx., 9, 1, and see further "Annas" in B.D.² and Hastings' B.D.—ιδιρρησ: identified by J. Lightfoot (cf. also Wetstein) with the famous Johanan ben Zacchai, president of the Great Synagogue after its removal to Jamnia, who obtained leave from Vespasian for many of the Jews to settle in the place. But the identification is very uncertain, and does not appear to commend itself to Schürer; see critical note above.— Ἀλέξανδρος: of him too nothing is known, as there is no confirmatory evidence to identify him with the brother of Philo, alabarcho of Alexandria, and the first man of his time amongst the Jews of that city, Jos., Ant., xviii., 6, 1, xix., 5, 1, xx., 5, B.D.² and Hastings' B.D., "Alexander".

Ver. 7. ἐν τῷ μέσῳ: according to the Mishnah the members of the court sat in a semicircle, see Hamburger, u. s., to be able to see each other. But it is unnecessary to press the expression, it may be quite general, cf. Matt. xiv. 6, Mark iii. 3. On the usual submissive attitude of prisoners, see Jos., Ant., xiv., 9, 4. In this verse R.V. supplies "was there" as a verb, Annas being its subject. Various attempts to amend the broken construction—all the proper names are in the nominative (not in accusative as T.R.), so W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss; D. reads συνήχθησαν, so Blass in B.—ἐν ποία: by what kind of power; or may = τίνι, xxiii. 34.—ἐν ποίω ονόματι: in virtue of what name? "nomen hic vis ac potestas" Grotius and Wetstein, in loco. They ask as if they would accuse them of referring to some magical name or formula for the performance of the miracles, xix. 13 (on ὄνομα see iii. 16), cf. LXX, Exodus v. 23. Probably they would like to bring the Apostles under the condemnation pronounced in Deut. xiii. 1. "So did they very foolishly conceive that the very naming of some name might do wonders—and the Talmud forgets that Ben Sadha wrought miracles by putting the unutterable name within the skin of his foot and then sewing it up," J. Lightfoot. —ὑμείς: as if in scorn, with depreciatory emphasis at the close of the question, so Wendt, and Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 160.—τούτο: not this teaching (Ols-hausen), but the miracle on the lame man.

Ver. 8. πληθεὶς πνεῦ̆ς ἀγ.: the whole phrase is characteristic of St. Luke, who employs it in the Gospel
βύτεροι τού Ἰσραήλ, εἰς ἡμεῖς σήμερον ἀνακρινόμεθα ἐπὶ εὐεργεσίᾳ ἃνθρώπου ἀνθενοῦς, ἐν τίνι οὗτος σέσωσται· 10 τοῦ Ἰσραήλ om. ΒΑΒ, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aeth., Cyr., so Tisch., W.R., Weiss; but retained in DEP, Flor., Par., Syrr. (P. and H.), Ir., Chrys., Cyrp., so Meyer, Blass, Hilg. D adds εν αλλῳ δε σουβεν to this verse, so E, Flor., Syr. Harcl. mg., Cyrp.; but see Weiss, Codex D, p. 64, and, on the other hand, Belser.

1 toú Ἰσραήλ om. ΒΑΒ, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aeth., Cyr., Μειέρ, Βλας, Ηιλγ. D adds εν αλλῳ δε σουβεν to this verse, so Ε, Flor., Syr.}

three times and in Acts five (Friedrich, Lekebusch, Zeller). Acts has sometimes been called the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, and the number of times St. Luke uses the title "Holy Spirit" justifies the name, see above also p. 63. All three expressions, πνεύμα ἀγιον, τὸ ἀγιον πνεύμα, and τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἀγιον are found in the Gospel and Acts, though much more frequently in the latter, the first expression (in the text) occurring quite double the number of times in Acts as compared with the Gospel, cf. in the LXX, Ps. l. (li.) 11, Isa. lixii. 10, 11, Wisdom i. 5, ix. 17; and with Ι Cor. ii. 10, 12, cf. Wisdom ix. 17, and Isa. lixii. 10, 11. On the omission of the article see Simcox, Language of N.T. Greek, p. 49. Πλησθείς—the verb πίμπλημι common both in Gospel and in Acts, only found twice elsewhere in N.T., as against thirteen times in Gospel and nine times in Acts (Friedrich, Lekebusch). The word was also very frequent in LXX, cf. Ecclesiasticus xviii. 12, A. The phrase πλησθήναι πνεύμ. ἀγιον is peculiar to St. Luke, in Gospel three times, i. 15, 41, 67, and Acts ii. 4, iv. 31, ix. 17, xii. 9, cf. Luke xii. 12, and xxii. 14; see also Matt. x. 20, Mark xii. 11. St. Peter's courage in thus openly proclaiming the Crucified for the first time before the rulers of his people might well be significantly emphasised, as in ver. 13. St. Chrysostom comments (Hom., x.) on the Christian wisdom of St. Peter on this occasion, how full of confidence he is, and yet how he utters not a word of insult, but speaks with all respect.

Ver. 9. εἰ: chosen not without oratorical nicety, if, as is the case = ἐκείνη ἡμεῖς, expressing at the same time the righteous indignation of the Apostles in contrast to the contemptuous ἡμεῖς of ver. 7, and their surprise at the object of the present inquiry; so too in ἐν εὐεργεσίᾳ. St. Peter again indicates the unfairness of such inquisitorial treatment ("cum alias dijudicari debeant, qui malum facerunt," Bengel).—ἀνακρινόμεθα: used here of a judicial examination, see xii. 19 and Luke xxiii. 14, and cf. Acts xxiv. 8, xxviiii. 18, and 1 Cor. ix. 3, although the strictly technical sense of ἀνάκρισις as a preliminary investigation cannot be pressed here.—ἐπ' εὐεργ. ἄνθρωπος: "concerning a good deal done to an impotent man"—the omission of the articles in both nouns adds to St. Peter's irony: "he hits them hard in that they are always making a crime of such acts, finding fault with works of beneficence," Chrys., Ηom., x.; ἀνθρώπου on the objective genitive, Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 260 and 267.—ἐν τίνι: "by what means," R.V.; "in whom," margin. The neuter instrumental dative, cf. Matt. v. 13, is supported by Blass, Weiss, Holtzmann, and others, as if the expression embraced the two questions of ver. 7. Rendall, following the older commentators, regards the expression as masculine.—Οὗτος: the healed man is thought of as present, although nothing is said of his summons; "this man," R.V.—σεσώσται: the word familiar to us in the Gospels, Luke vii. 50, Mark x. 52, with the pregnant meaning of health for body and soul alike.

Ver. 10. St. Peter does not hesitate to refer his judges to the same passage of Scripture which a few short weeks before Jesus of Nazareth had quoted to a deputation of the Sanhedrim. In that case too the question put to Jesus had been as to the authority by which He acted, Matt. xxii. 42, Mark xii. 10, Luke xxi. 17. It is possible that the words from Ps. cxviii. 22 were already regarded as Messianic, from the fact that the people had welcomed Jesus at His public entry into Jerusalem with part of a verse of the same Psalm, ver. 26, Ederseheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., 368. Moreover, the passage, Isa. xxviii. 16, which forms the connecting link between the Psalm and St. Peter's words, both here and in his First Epistle (1 Pet. ii. 7, cf. Rom. ix. 33, x. 11), was interpreted as Messianic, apparently by the Targums, and un-
the pronoun finds its subject better in the ἐν τούτῳ, masculine of ver. 10. See Winer-Schmiedel, p. 216.—ἐξουθενηθείς: in the LXX and in the Gospels the word used is ἀπεδοκίμασαν. St. Peter, quoting apparently from memory, used a word expressing still greater contempt. It is used, e.g., very significantly by St. Luke in his Gospel, xxiii. 11, and again in xviii. 9. The word is found in none of the other Gospels, and is characteristic of St. Luke and of St. Paul (cf. Rom. xiv. 3, 1 Cor. i. 28, 1 Cor. vi. 4, etc.). It occurs several times in the LXX; cf. Wisdom, iii. 11, iv. 18, Ecclesiasticus xix. 1, 2 Macc. i. 27, and Psalms of Solomon, ii., 5. In classical writers it is not found at all.—ὁ γενόμενος εἶς, “which was made,” R.V. Blass compares the Hebrew phrase לְגָּדוֹל and finds parallels in v. 36, Luke xiii. 19, but γίγνεται εἶς, while common in the LXX, is a correct expression in classical Greek, although the places in the N.T. in which the formula is found in O.T. quotations are undoubtedly Hebraisms (see below on ν. 36), Winer-Schmiedel, p. 257, and with this may be connected the frequency of its occurrence in the Apocalypse (see Scock on the phrase, Language of the N.T., p. 143).—κεφαλὴν γωνίας: not “the topmost pinnacle-stone,” but a corner-stone uniting two walls, on which they rested and were made firm, cf. the meaning of ἀκρογωνιαίος (Isa.xxviii.16), 1 Pet. ii. 6-8, Eph. ii. 20, which is used here by Symmachus instead of κεφ. γων. The Hebrew לְגָּדוֹל elsewhere always refers not to the upper part of the building, but to the lower (Isa. xxviii. 16, Jer. li. 26, Job xxxviii. 6, ὁ βαλὼν λίθον γωνιαίον, Delitzsch). Probably therefore the expression here refers to a foundation-stone at the base of the corner. On the occurrence of the phrase from Ps. cxviii. 22 in St. Peter’s First Epistle, and in his speech here, see p. 119, and also Scharfe, Die Petrinische Strömung, 2 c., p. 126.
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IV.

13. Θεωρούντες δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου παρρησίαν καὶ Ἰωάννου, καὶ καταλαβόμενοι ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοι ἄγραμματοι εἰσὶν καὶ ἰδιώται, ἰδιώται,

Ver. 12. ἡ σωτηρία, cf. v. 31, xvii. i.e., ἐκ τοῦ ζωκῆν, the Messianic salvation. The interpretation which would limit ἡ σωτηρία to bodily healing is less satisfactory; infinitely higher than the healing of one man, ver. 9, stands the Messianic salvation, for which even the Sanhedrists were hoping and longing, but see also Rendall's note, in loco. A parallel to the expression is found in Jos., Ant., iii., 1, 5, but there are many passages in the O.T. which might have suggested the words to St. Peter, cf. Isa. xii. 2, xiii. 6-8, iii. 10.—οὔτε γὰρ δόμα, see on i. 15, ii. 21. σωτηρία is the best reading, Winer-Moulton, iii. 10, "for not even is there a second name"—the claim develops more precisely and consequently from the statement ἐν άλλῳ οὐδὲν έτεροςμεν, ἐπίδυοιν—άλλος δὲ, επί πλειόνων (cf. i. Cor. iii. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 1, Gal. i. 6, 7), Ammonius, quoted by Bengel.—τὸ δεδομένον: on the force of the article with the participle, see Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., pp. 183, 184 (1893) τοῦτο γάρ τὸ ἄγραμμα, τὸ δεδομ. ἐν ἄνθρωποις, μόνον έστιν ἐν τῇ δικ. . . . and Blass, Grammatik des Ν. G., p. 238; cf. Luke xviii. 9, Gal. i. 7, Col. ii. 8.—Ω δεί σωθήναι: " Jesus when He spoke of the rejection as future, predicted that the stone would be a judgment-stone to destroy the wicked builders. But Peter takes up the other side, and presents the stone as the stone of Messianic salvation; this name is the only name under heaven that is a saving name. Here Peter apprehends the spiritual significance of the reign of the Messiah," Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, p. 34, and the whole passage.

Ver. 13. Θεωρούντες δὲ, cf. iii. 16, not merely βλέπ., as in ver. 14, but " inest notio contemplandi cum attentione aut admiratione," Tittm., Synon. N. T., p. 121. The present participle marks this continuous observation of the fearless bearing of the Apostles during the trial (Rendall).—παρρησία: either boldness of speech, or of bearing; it was the feature which had characterised the teaching of our Lord; cf. Mark viii. 32, and nine times in St. John in connection with Christ's teaching or bearing; and the disciples in this respect also were as their Master, c. iv. 29, 31 (ii. 20); so too of St. Paul, xxviii. 31, and frequently used by St. Paul himself in his Epistles; also by St. John four times in his first Epistle of confidence in approaching God: " urbem et orbe hac parrhesia vicerunt," Bengel. Cf. παρρησιάζεσθαι used of Paul's preaching, ix. 27, 28, and again of him and Barnabas, xiii. 46, xiv. 3, of Apollos, xviii. 26, and twice again of Paul, xix. 8, xxi. 26; only found in Acts, and twice in St. Paul's Epistles, Eph. vi. 20, i Thess. ii. 2, of speaking the Gospel boldly. For παρρησία, see LXK, Prov. xiii. 5, i Macc. iv. 18, Wisdom v. i. (of speech), cf. also Jos., Ant., ix. 10, 4, xv., 2, 7.—Ιωάννου: even if St. John had not spoken, that " confidence towards God," which experience of life deepened, I John iv. 17, v. 14, but which was doubtless his own name; but it is evidently assumed that St. John had spoken, and it is quite characteristic of St. Luke's style thus to quote the most telling utterance, and to assume that the reader conceives the general situation, and procedure in the trial, Ramsay's St. Paul, pp. 371, 372.—καὶ καταλαβόμενοι: " and had perceived" R.V., rightly marking the tense of the participle; either by their dress or demeanour, or by their speech (cf. c. 34, xxv. 25, Eph. iii. 18), Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 181).—ἐπὶ τοὺς δὲ εἰς τὸ 'Ι. ήσαν ἰδιώται: the word properly signifies a private person (a man occupied with τὰ ίδια), as opposed to any one who
holds office in the State, but as the Greeks held that without political life there was no true education of a man, it was not unnatural that ιδιώτης should acquire a somewhat contemptuous meaning, and so Plato joins it with ἄνθρωπος, and Plutarch with ἀναπραγματίζων and ἀναπραγματικον (and instances in Wetstein). But further: in Trench, u. s., p. 136, and Grimm, sub v., the ιδιώτης is "a layman," as compared with the λατρευς, "the skilled physician," Thuc. ii. 48, and the word is applied by Philo to the whole congregation of Israel as contrasted with the priests, and to subjects as contrasted with their prince, cf. its only use in the LXX, Prov. vi. 8 (cf. Herod., ii., 81, vii., 199, and instances in Wetstein on 1 Cor. xiv. 16). Bearing this in mind, it would seem that the word is used by St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 16, 23, 24) of believers devoid of special spiritual gifts, of prophecy or of speaking with tongues, and in the passage before us it is applied to those who, like the αγράμματοι, had been without professional training in the Rabbinical schools. The translation "ignorant" is somewhat unfortunate. ιδιώτης certainly need not mean ignorant, cf. Plato, Legg., 830, άνδρών σοφών ιδιωτών τε και συνετών. St. Paul uses the word of himself, ιδιώτης εν λόγω, 2 Cor. xi. 6, in a way which helps us to understand its meaning here, for it may well have been used contemptuously of him as here by the Sadducees of Peter and John (so R.V., W. H. Weiss), is very Lucan (see Ramsay's paraphrase above); for this closely connecting force of τε cf. Weiss's commentary, passim. With συν κ. τ. λ. Weiss compares Luke viii. 38, xxii. 56.

Ver. 14. άστωτα: standing, no longer a cripple, frivo talo (Bengel), and by his presence and attitude affording a testimony not to be gainsaid.—συν αὐτοῖς, i.e., with the disciples. We are not told whether the man was a prisoner with the disciples, but just as the healed demoniac had sought to be with Jesus, so we may easily imagine that the restored cripple, in his gratitude and faith, would desire to be with his benefactors: "great was the boldness of the man that even in the judgment-hall he had not left them: for had they (i. e., their opponents) said that the fact was not so, there was he to refute them," St. Chrysostom, Hom., x. On St. Luke's fondness for the shorter form, έστώτα not έστηκώς, both in Gospel and Acts, see Friedrich, Das Lucas euangelium, p. 8.—ουδέν εἶχον αντειπεῖν: only used by St. Luke in the N.T., Luke xxi. 15. The miracle, as St. Chrysostom says, spoke no less forcibly than the Apostles themselves, but the word may be taken, as in the Gospel, of contradicting personal adversaries, i.e.,...
15. Κελεύσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐξώ τοῦ συνεδρίου ἀπελθεῖν, συνεβαλον πρὸς ἄλληλους. Ιο. λέγοντες, Τι ποιήσομεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις; ὅτι μὲν γὰρ γνωστόν σημεῖον γέγονεν δὲ αὐτῶν, πάντες τοῖς κατακόμβοις ἱερουσαλημίῳ φανερόν: καὶ οἱ δυνάμεις ἀφοσίασθαι. 17. ἀλλ' ἕνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖον διακαταθήκη εἰς τὸν λαὸν, ἀπελθῇ ἀπελπισμένα αὐτοῖς μηκέτι λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ

1 ἀπελπισμένων: D, Flor. insert before, τοις κατακόμβοις. D also omits last clause of ver. 13, and puts in altered form at end of ver. 14 τινες δὲ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. The τινες δὲ would follow naturally enough if we read with Flor. χειροτονεῖτε δὲ παντες at the beginning of ver. 13; but see connection of passage in comment.


3 φανερον, D reads φανερωτερον, according to Blass (in β retained), for superl. defended by Belser and Hilg.

4 ἀπελπισμένῳ: τινες δὲ εξ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Τhe τινες δὲ would follow naturally enough if we read with Flor. ακουσαν τε παντες at the beginning of ver. 13, but see connection of passage in comment.

Ver. 15. συνεβαλον πρὸς ἄλληλους, sc. λόγους: only in St. Luke's writings, in different significations; cf. for the construction here, Eurip., Iphig. Aul., 830, and Plutarch, Mor., p. 222, C.—see on xvii. 18.

Ver. 16. τί ποιήσομεν: for the deliberative subjunctive, which should be read here, cf. ii. 37; it may express the utter perplexity of the Sanhedrists (so Rendall); in questions expressing doubt or deliberation, the subjunctive would be more usual in classical Greek than the future indicative, Blass, u. s., p. 205.—δε μὲν: μὲν answered by ἄλλα in ver. 17 (omitted by D.), cf. Mark ix. 12, see Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 168, and for other instances of μὲν similarly used, see also Lekebusch, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 74, 75.—γνωστόν, that which is a matter of knowledge as opposed to δοξαστόν, that which is matter of opinion (so in Plato). The word is characteristic of St. Luke, being used by him twice in the Gospel, ten times in Acts, and elsewhere in N.T. only three times (Friedrich).

Ver. 17. ἐπὶ πλεῖον may be taken as = latius (2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9) or = diutius (Acts xx. 9, xxiv. 4), but the context favours the former. The phrase is quite classical, and it occurs several times in LXX, cf. Wisdom viii. 12; 3 Macc. v. 18.—διανυσματικῶς: only here in N.T. but frequently used in classical writers in active and middle—to divide into portions, to distribute, to divide among themselves—here = lest it should spread abroad (or better perhaps in D (β)). It has been taken by some as if it had a parallel in ὡς γάγραινα νομήν ἐξει, 2 Tim. ii. 17, and expressed that the report of the Apostles' teaching and power might spread and feed like a cancer (see Bengel, Blass, Zockler, Rendall), but although νεῖμω in the middle voice (and possibly διανυσμάτω) could be so used, it is very doubtful how far διανυσματικῶς could be so applied. At the same time we may note that διανυσματικῶς is a word frequently used in medical writers, Hobart, Medical Language of St. Luke, pp. 196, 197, and that it, with the two other great medical words of similar import, διασπείρασιν and ἀναδόνα, is peculiar to St. Luke. In the LXX διανυσματικός is only found once, Deut. xxix. 16 (25), in its classical sense as a translation of the Hebrew קָנִים.

—διανυσματικῶς διανυσμένων: if we retain the reading in T.R., the phrase is a common Hebraism, cf. v. 28, xxiii. 14, i. 17, 30, Luke xxii. 15, cf. John vi. 20, James v. 7, and from the LXX, Matt. xiii. 14, xv. 4. The form of the Hebrew formula giving the notion of intenseness is rendered in A.V. by "straitly," as by the revisers (who omit διανυσματικῶς here) in v. 28. Similar expressions are common in the LXX, and also in the Apocrypha, cf. Ecclus. xlviii. 11, Judith vi. 4, and occasionally a similar formula is found in Greek authors, see especially Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 83, and Blass, Grammatik des N. G., pp. 116, 117.—
Καλεσάντες αυτούς, παρήγγειλαν αυτοῖς τὸ καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι μηδὲ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ονόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 

ο δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀποκριθέντες πρὸς αὐτούς εἶπον, Ἐι δικαῖον ἐστιν ἐν πόλει τῶν θεῶν, ὡμῶν ἀκούεις μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κρίνατε. 

ο δὲ δυνάμεθα γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀ εἴδομεν καὶ ηκούσαμεν μὴ καθόλου φθέγγεσθαι μηδὲ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ονόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

At the beginning of ver. D, Flor., Syr. Harcl. mg., Lucif., Hilg. add συγκατατιθεμένων δι' αὐτῶν τῇ γνώμῃ. Belser sees here the hand of Luke who omitted the clause in revision, as he thinks no one could have added it (so τα ρηματα αυτων after λαον in ver. 17, see β); but, on the other hand, Weiss, Codex D, p. 61. 


"εἰδομεν"ΒΕΡ, Chrys., Cyr.; ειδαμενδ SΑΒ*D 4, Chrys., so Tisch., W.Η., Weiss, Hilg.; see W.Η., App., p. 171 (so for εἰπαν above), Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112.

επί τοῦ ονόματι: on the name, i.e., resting on, or with reference to, this name, as the basis of their teaching, Winer-Moulton, xlvi. c., cf. v. 28, and Luke xxiv. 47, ix. 48, xxi. 8. The phrase has thus a force of its own, although it is apparente interchangeable with έν, ver. 10 (Simcox, see also Blass, in loco); Rendall takes it = "about the name of Jesus," επί being used as often with verbs of speech. 

τοῦτο: "quem nominantur, v. 28, vid. tamen 18," Blass; (on the hatred of the Jews against the name of Jesus and their periphrastic titles for him, c.g., otho ha'ish, "that man," "so and so," see "Jesus Christ in the Talmud," H. Laible, pp. 32, 33 (Streane)).

Ver. 18. καθόλου: only here in Ν.Τ. The word which had been very common since Aristotle (previously καθ'όλου) is quite classical in the sense in which it is used here, and it is also found a few times in the LXX (see Hatch and Redpath for instances of its use without and with the art., as here in T.R.). It is frequently used by medical writers, Hobart, Medical Language of St. Luke, p. 197.—μὴ φθέγγεσθαι: "not to utter a word," so Rendall, έν μητιρε ουδεμεν (Blass). The word seems to indicate more than that the disciples should not speak, "ne hiscerent aut ullam vocem ederent," Erasmus. In contrast to διδάσκειν we might well refer it to the utterance of the name of Jesus in their miracles, as in iii. 6; only found twice elsewhere in N.T., and both times in 2 Peter, ii. 16, 18, but its use is quite classical, and it is also found several times in LXX.

Ver. 19. Parallel sayings may be quoted from Greeks and Romans, and from Jewish sources, see instances in Wetstein, cf. Plato, Apol., 29, D., the famous words of Socrates: πιστέωμεν τῷ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ θεοῦ, and Livy, xxxix. 37; Jos., Ant., xvii., 6, 3; xviii. 8, 2; on έν πόλει see ver. 10: άκούειν = πειθαρχεῖν, v. 29, and cf. iii. 22, Luke x. 16, xvi. 31: μᾶλλον = πωλεῖν, cf. Rom. xiv. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 21.—κρίνατε: this appeal to the Sadducees could only be justified on the ground that the Apostles were sure of the validity of their own appeal to a higher tribunal. No man could lay down the principle of obedience to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the king or to governors, more plainly than St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 13, cf. Rom. xii. 2), and he and his fellow-disciples might have exposed themselves to the charge of fanaticism or obstinacy, if they could only say οὐ δύναμον καὶ ήκούσαμεν, cf. Acts i. 8. The same appeal is made by St. John, both in his Gospel (i. 14) and in his First Epistle (i. 2), in vindication of his teaching; and here the final answer is that of St. John and St. Peter jointly.

Ver. 20. οὐ . . . μή: on the two negatives forming an affirmative cf. 1 Cor. xii. 15; Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 220 (1893). Winer-Moulton, lv. 9, compares Aristoph., Kan., 42; see also Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 184. 

Ver. 21. προστεθήκεισαν: "when they had further threatened them" R.V., or the word may mean "added threats to their warning" ver. 18 ("prius enim tantum præceperunt," Erasmus). So Wendt as against Meyer; cf. in LXX, Ecclus. xiii. 3, S., and Dem., p. 544, 26.—κατάλυσαν: "dimiserunt [iii. 13] non absolverunt," Blass; see St. Chrysostom's striking contrast between the boldness of the Apostles and the fear of their judges (Hom., xi.).—
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

λαλεῖν. 21. οἱ δὲ προσαπειλησάμενοι ἀπέλυσαν αὐτοὺς, μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὸ πώς κολασώνται αὐτοὺς, διὰ τῶν λαῶν, ὅτι πάντες ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν ἐπί τῷ γεγονότι. 22. ἐτῶν γὰρ ἦν πλείων τεσσαράκοντα 2 ἔνδιπτω τοῦ θεοῦ τούτο τῆς ιδέσεως.

23. Ἀπολύθησεν δὲ ἢλθον πρὸς τοὺς ἱδίους, καὶ ἀπῆγγελεν διὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι πάντες εδόξαζον τὸν Θεοῦ επί τῷ γεγονότι. 24. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες, ὦ μονομαθῶν ἢραν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεοῦ, καὶ εἶπον,

1 D seems to read μη εὑρισκοντες αιτιαν, so Hilg., see Harris (p. 90).

2 τεσσαρ., see on i. 3.

3 After ακούσαντες D adds καὶ εἴγγυντες την του θεου ενεργείαν, so Hilg.—Belser and Zöckler hold that the clause cannot be a later addition, but Weiss objects that no reference is found to the words in ver. 29 which follows. εἴγγυντες is used more frequently by St. Luke than by the other Evangelists, but ενεργεία is entirely confined to St. Luke in the N.T.

tο πώς: finding nothing, namely (τὸ), how they might, etc.; this use of the article is quite classical, drawing attention to the proposition introduced by it and making of it a compound substantive expressing one idea, most commonly with an interrogation; it is used by St. Luke and St. Paul, and both in St. Luke’s Gospel and in the Acts, cf. Luke i. 62, ix. 46, xix. 48, xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24, Acts xxii. 30, Rom. viii. 26, 1 Thess. iv. 1, cf. Mark ix. 23. So here the Sanhedrists are represented as asking themselves το πώς κολ. (Friedrich and Lekebusch both draw attention to this characteristic of St. Luke’s writings). See Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., pp. 67, 68 (1893). κολ. only here and in 2 Pet. ii. 9 in N. T.; cf. 3 Macc. vii. 3, where it is also used in middle, expressing to cause to be punished, cf. 1 Macc. vii. 7, AS.—διὰ τὸν λαὸν belongs not to ἀπελυσαν, but rather το πώς κολ. κ.τ.λ.—ἐδόξαζον: see on ii. 46; cf. Luke ii. 20, 2 Cor. ix. 13, for the construction; the verb never has in Biblical Gr. mere classical meaning of to think, suppose, entertain an opinion (but cf. Polyb., vii. 53, 10; δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἐρετῇ); in the LXX very frequently of glory ascribed to God, see Plummer’s note on Luke ii. 20.

Ver. 22. Characteristic of St. Luke to note the age, as in the case of Eneas, ix. 33, and of the cripple at Lystra, xiv. 8, cf. also Luke vii. 42 (although Mark also here notes the same fact), xiii. 11. The genitive with εἰναι or γίγνεσθαι, instead of the accusative, in reference to the question of age, is noted by Fried-rich as characteristic of St. Luke; cf. Luke ii. 42 (iii. 23), viii. 42, and here; but cf. Mark v. 42.—ἐγεγόνει: in this episode “with its lights and shades” Overbeck (so Baur) can only see the idealising work of myth and legend, but it is difficult to understand how a narrative which purports to describe the first conflict between the Church and the Sanhedrim could be free from such contrasts, and that some collision with the authorities took place is admitted to be quite conceivable (Weizsäcker, Apostolic Age, i., 46, E.T.); we should rather say that St. Luke’s power as an historian is nowhere more visible than in the dramatic form of this narrative (Ramsay, St. Paul, u. s.).

Ver. 23. τοὺς ἱδίους: not necessarily limited to their fellow-Apostles (so Meyer, Blass, Weiss), but as including the members of the Christian community (so Overbeck, Wendt, Hilgenfeld, Zöckler), cf. xxiv. 23, John xiii. 1, 1 Tim. v. 8, and also of one’s fellow-countrymen, associates, John i. 11, 2 Macc. xii. 22.

Ver. 24. ὦ μονομαθῶν: see above on i. 14. The word must not be pressed to mean that they all simultaneously gave utterance to the same words, or that they were able to do so, because they were repeating a familiar Hymn; it may mean that the Hymn was uttered by one of the leaders, by St. Peter, or St. James (Zöckler), and answered by the responsive Amen of the rest, or that the words were caught up by the multitude of believers as they were uttered by an inspired Apostle (so Felten, Rendall).—ἡραν φωνὴν: the same phrase is used in Luke xvii. 13, 50 in Acts ii. 14, xiv. 11,
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

21—25.

Δέσποτα, οὐ 1 ὁ Θεός ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανόν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν
θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, 25. ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαβίδ τοῦ
παιδός σου εἰπὼν, "Ἰνα τι ἐφρύαξαν ἕθη, καὶ λαοὶ μελέτησαν

1 ο Θεός DEP, Gigg., Par., verss., Ir., Luc., so Meyer, so Hilg.; but om. ΝΒΑ, best
MS. of Vulg., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (who refers the construction
of the words to Isaiah xxxvii.16).

2 ο διὰ στόματος Δαβίδ τοῦ παιδός σου εἰπὼν P 1, 31, Chrys., so Meyer; but τοῦ
omitted by ΝΑΒΕΔΕΡ. ο τοῦ πατρός ημῶν διὰ στόματος Δαβίδ
παιδός σου εἰπὼν, so ΣΒΕ 13, 15, 27, 29, 36, 38; so Lach., Treg., Tisch., W.H.,
R.V., Alford. ο διὰ πν. αγ. διὰ στομ., τοῦ πατρός ημῶν Δ., so Vulg., Iren.,
apparently for improvement in order. D reads διὰ πν. αγ., διὰ τοῦ στόματος
λαλησας Δ., omit. τοῦ πατρός ημῶν; so apparently Syr. Pesh., Boh. P, Hil.,
and Aug. omit πνευμάτως αγιού—Syr. Harcl., Arm. place διὰ πν. αγ. after παιδός
σου; so Par. Blass in β omits τοῦ πατρός ημῶν and brackets πν. αγ., prac-
tically agreeing with T.R. (see also Acta Apost., p. 77). W.H. mention the
extreme difficulty of the text and hold that it contains a primitive error (so also
Holtzmann), and each makes an attempt at solution, App., Select Readings, p. 92.
Felten follows the solution offered by Westcott. Weiss, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 39,
40 (1893), speaks of πνευμάτως αγιού as perfectly senseless (so too Zöckler, who
follows T.R.) and regards the expression as an old gloss for στόμα Δ., but which
afterwards came into the text with the latter words; or some scribe, as he thinks,
may have introduced διὰ πν. αγ. expected by him from i. 2, 16 (see also Blass, in
loc), and then continued the text lying before him. Weiss therefore follows P
although it omits τοῦ πατρός ημῶν, which Weiss retains and reads ο τοῦ πατρός
ημῶν διὰ στομ. Δ. παιδός σου εἰπὼν. Wendt and Alford maintain that the more
complicated readings could scarcely have arisen through additions to the simpler
text of T.R. and that the contrary is more probable.

xxii. 22, ἐπαιρεῖν, and also in Luke xi. 27. Both phrases are peculiar to St.
Luke, but both are found in the LXX, and both are classical (Friedrich, Das
Lucasevangelium, p. 29, and Plummer on Luke xi. 27).—Δέσποτα κ.τ.λ.: the
words form the earliest known Psalm of
Thanksgiving in the Christian Church.
In its tenor the Hymn may be compared
with Hezekiah's Prayer against the
threats of Assyria, Isa. xxxvii. 16, 20.
It begins like many of the Psalms (xviii.,
xix., xxxi.) with praising God as the
Creator, a thought which finds fitting
expression here as marking the utter
impotence of worldly power to with-
stand Him. The word Δέσποτα, thus
used in the vocative in addressing God
here and in Luke ii. 29 only (found
nowhere else in Gospels, although several
times in the Epistles), expresses the
absolute control of a Master over a
slave, cf. also Luke ii. 29, where τὸν
δούλον σου answers to it, as here τοῖς
dούλοις in ver. 29. It also expresses
here as often in the LXX the sovereignty
of God over creation, cf. Job v. 8, Wis-
dom vi. 7, Judith ix. 12. So Jos., Ant.,
v. 3, 21, puts it into the mouth of Moses.
It is very rarely used in the N.T. as a
name of God or of Christ, but cf. Rev.
vi. 10 of God, and 2 Pet. ii. 1 of Christ
(where the metaphor of the master and
slave is retained), and see Jude ver. 4,
R.V. (although the name may refer
to God); and so in writings ascribed to
men who may well have been present, and
have taken part in the Hymn. The word
is also used of the gods in classical
Greek; but the Maker of heaven and
earth was no "despot," although His
rule was absolute, for His power was
never dissociated from wisdom and love,
The use of the word in Didache, x.,
3, in prayer to God, see Biggs' note.

Ver. 25. The words form an exact
quotation from the LXX (Psalm ii.
1). Ἰνα τι, again in quotation, viii.,
26; cf. Luke xiii. 7, 1 Cor. x. 29; twice
in Matt. ix. 4, xxvii. 46, quotation;
W.H., Blass (Weiss, ἰνατί), κ., γένηται,
Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 14, and
Winer-Schmiedel, p. 36.—ἐφρύαξαν: in
the active for ἐφρύασσαν, primarily of
the snorting and neighing of a high-
spirited horse, then of the haughtiness
and insolence of men; twice it is used as
a dep. in LXX, 2 Macc. vii. 34, R.; iii. 2,
κενά; 26. παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

27. συνήχθησαν γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄλλης ἡμέρας, πάντων τῶν ταῖον παῦσα οἱ ἤρωι, ἐν ἀγίωσιν, Ἡρῴδης τε καὶ Πόντιος Πιλάτος, συν ἐκεῖ καὶ λαοὶ


2 Πιλατος; but B Πειλατος, so Tisch., W.H.; see on iii. 13.

2, and so in profane writers.—δόγμα, i.e., the Gentiles, see on ver. 27. λαὸς might be used, and is used of any people, but it is used in Biblical Greek specially of the chosen people of God, cf. Luke ii. 32. Acts xxvi. 17, 23. Rom. xv. 10, and it is significant that the word is transferred to the Christian community, which was thus regarded as taking the place of the Jewish theocracy, Acts xv. 14, xviii. 10. Rom. i. 25, i Peter ii. 10; Hort, Ecclesias, pp. 11, 12. Grimm, sub v., λαὸς; so too in the LXX, ἀνθρόπους in the plural is used in an overwhelming number of instances of other nations besides Israel, cf. Psalm lvi. (lvii.) 9. Zech. i. 17. in N.T., ἀνθρώπους = pagans. Rom. iii. 29. and Roman Christians, Rom. xv. 27. cf. populus, the Roman people, as opposed to gentes, Lucan, Phars., ii. 82, 83 (Page); Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 98.

Ver. 26. παρέστησαν: not necessarily of hostile intent, although here the context indicates it; R.V., "set themselves in array," lit. "presented themselves," an exact rendering of the Hebrew יָשָׁם, which sometimes implies rising up against as here, Psalm ii. 2. and cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 13 (R.V. margin). Of the generally accepted Messianic interpretation of the Psalm, and of the verses here quoted, there can be no doubt, cf. Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii. 716 (appendix on Messianic passages), and Wetstein, in loco. The Psalm is regarded as full of Messianic references (Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, pp. 132-140, and 492, 493), cf. e.g., the comment on this verse of the Psalm in the Mechilta (quoted in the Yalkut Shimoni, ii. f. 90. i Sch. p. 227), Perowne, Psalms (small edition), p. 16; and Edersheim, u. s. The Psalm carries us back to the great Davidic promise in 2 Sam. vili. 11-16, and it reflects the Messianic hopes of the Davidic period. That hope the N.T. writers who quote this Psalm very frequently or refer to it, cf. xiii. 33. Heb. i. 5. v. 5; see fulfilled in Christ, the antitype of David and of Solomon. Thus the gathering together of the nations and their fruitless decrees find their counterpart in the alliance of Herod and Pilate, and the hostile combination of Jew and Gentile against the holy Servant Jesus, the anointed of God, and against His followers; although the words of the Psalm and the issues of the conflict carry on our thoughts to a still wider and deeper fulfilment in the final triumph of Christ's kingdom, cf. the frequent recurrence of the language of the Psalm in Rev. xii. 5, xix. 15, and cf. i. 5, ii. 26, 27.

Ver. 27. γάρ: confirms the truth of the preceding prophecy, by pointing to its historical fulfilment, and does not simply give a reason for addressing God as ὁ εἰπών—to emphasise this fulfilment συνῆχθησαν is again quoted, and placed first in the sentence.—ἐπ' αληθείας, of a truth, i.e., assuredly, Luke iv. 25, xx. 21, xxii. 59, Acts x. 34; so too in LXX, Job ix. 2, and also in classical Greek. The phrase is characteristic of St. Luke, and is only used elsewhere in N.T. in Mark xii. 14, 32, the usual expression being εν αληθείᾳ, never used by St. Luke (Friedrich).—καὶ λαοὶ, see on iii. 13.—δν έχρισας: showing that Jesus = του Χριστού named in the quotation just made, cf. Luke iv. 18. and Isa. lxi. 1 and Acts x. 38. Nösgen compares also John x. 36, and refuses to limit the reference to iii. 21. The words may no doubt be referred to the Baptist, but they need not be confined to that.—Ἡρῴδης = βασιλείς of the Psalm, Π. Πιλάτος = ἀρχοντες, but Nösgen, referring to iii. 17, regards the ἀρχοντες as included in the λαοὶ. Ηρ. instead of Ηρωίδης, Βlass, in loco, and Grammatik des N. G., pp. 7, 8, the iota subscript W. H. thus accounted for; Winer-Schmiddel, p. 41. Ἠρωίδης καὶ λαοὶ: the first word = the centurion and soldiers, those who carried out the orders of Pilate; λαοῖς the plural (quoted from the Psalm) does not refer with Calvin to the different nationalities out of which the Jews
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26-3ο. Ισραήλ, 28. ποιήσαι δόσα ή χείρ σου καὶ ή βουλή σου 1 προώρισε γενέσθαι. 29. καὶ τὰ νῦν, Κύριε, ἐπιδε ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ δος τοῖς δούλοις σου μετὰ παραθησίας πάσης λαλεῖ τὸν λόγον σου, 30. ἐν τῷ τὴν χειρὰν σου ἑκτείνει τε εἰς ίασίν, καὶ σημεία καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδὸς σου Ἰησοῦ.

1 σου omit A'B, Arm., Lucif. (Cod. Am. of Vulg.), so W.H., Weiss, Wendt; retained by Ναδεπ, Vulg., vers., Irint, so Tisch. Here, as commonly, Tisch. follows Ρ. W.H., B—and difficult, as often, to decide; insertion appears more obvious than omission.

who came up to the Feast were gathered, but possibly to the tribes of Israel, Grimm-Thayer, sub, λαός, like Ὑποτάσσομαι. Gen. lix. 10, Deut. xxxii. 8, Isa. iii. 13, etc., R.V., "the peoples of Israel". St. Luke's Gospel alone gives us the narrative of Herod's share in the proceedings connected with the Passion, xxiii. 8-12; see Plumptre, in loco, and Friedrich, Das Lucasangelium, pp. 54, 55.

Ver. 28. τοι ήθελαν, infinitive of purpose, see on iii. 2; but even this purpose was overruled by God to the accomplishment of His will, cf. Luke xiiii. 22, xxiv. 26, συνήλθον μεν γὰρ ἕκαστον ἐν Χειρὶ... ἐποίειν δὲ καὶ σὺν Χειρὶ, Occum. —ἡ χείρ σου, a common expression to signify the controlling power of God, cf. in the N.T. (peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts) the phrases χείρ Κυρίου, Luke i. 66, Acts xi. 21, xiii. 11. —ἡ βουλή: only used by St. Luke, cf. Luke vii. 30, Acts ii. 23, xiii. 36, xx. 27. —προώρισε: only in St. Luke and St. Paul, but never in LXX or Apocrypha, Rom. viii. 29, 30, 1 Cor. ii. 7, Ephes. i. 5, 11, but the thought which it contains is in striking harmony with St. Peter's words elsewhere: cf. ii. 23, x. 42, and 1 Pet. i. 2, 20, ii. 4-6—see above on Peter's speeches—cf. Ignat., Ephes., tit.—ἡ χείρ connected with β. by Zeugma, since only βουλή directly suits the verb; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 2, and Luke i. 64. (The two verses (27, 28) are referred by Hilgenfeld to the "author to Theophilus". In his view there is a want of fitness in introducing into the Church's prayer the words of the Psalm, and their reference to the closing scenes of the life of Jesus; he thinks with Weiss that in the αὐτὼν of ver. 29 there is quite sufficient reference to the words of the Psalm.)

Ver. 29. τὰ νῦν (cf. iii. 17) only used in the Acts v. 38, xvii. 30, xx. 32, xxvii. 22, but frequently found in classical writers (Wetstein), cf. also 1 Macc. vii.

35, ix. 9; 2 Macc. xv. 8, Klostermann, Vindiciae Lucanae, p. 53. As elsewhere St. Peter's words have a practical bearing and issue, ii. 16, iii. 12 (Felten).—ἐπίδοσα: only used here and in Luke i. 25, and both times of God; so in Homer, of the gods regarding the affairs of men (and so too in Dem. and Herod.), cf. the use of the simple verb ἔδιδω in Gen. xxiii. 14, and also of ἔδίδω in Gen. xvi. 13, 1 Chron. xvii. 17, Ps. xxx. (xxxi. 7), 2 Macc. i. 27, and vii. 2.—τὸν λόγον σου: a characteristic phrase in St. Luke, cf. his use of ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ver. 31, four times in his Gospel, and twelve times in Acts, as against the use of it once in St. Mark, St. John and St. Matthew, xv. 6 (W.H.). The phrase is of frequent occurrence in St. Paul's Epistles, and it is found several times in the Apocalypse.—μετὰ παραθησίας, see above on iv. 13. There is an antithesis in the Greek words, for boldness of speech was usually the privilege, not of slaves, but of freemen—but it is the duty of those who are in the service of Christ (Humphry, Acts, in loco).

Ver. 30. ἐν τῇ τε κ.τ.λ., iii. 26: a Hebraistic formula; for similar expressions used of God cf. Exodus vii. 5, Jeremiah xv. 6, Ezek. vi. 14, etc., most frequently in the act of punishment; but here the context shows that it is for healing, Luke v. 13, vi. 10; "while thou stretchest forth thine hand"—the construction is very frequent in Luke and the Acts, see Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 162, and Friedrich, p. 37. Commenting on the prayer, St. Chrysostom writes: "Observe they do not say 'crush them, cast them down',... let us also learn thus to pray. And yet how full of wrath one would be when fallen upon by men intent upon killing him, and making threats to that effect! how full of animosity! but not so these saints."

—γιγνεσθαι: A. and R.V. make γιγ. to depend upon δόσα, but better to regard it.
31. Καὶ δεήθηντων αὐτῶν ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι, καὶ ἐπλήθησαν ἀπαντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ παρρησίας.  

1 At end of ver. D (E, Ir., Aug.) adds παντι τω θελοντι πιστευειν (last word omitted by Aug.); so Hilg. Chase points out that Syriac often inserts "will" when nothing corresponding in Greek, but see Harris on a primitive Latin redaction, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 89, 90.

as infinitive of purpose, subordinate to ἐν τῷ κ.τ.λ. (see Wendt and Page). Weiss regards from καὶ συμ. to γιν. as the reviser's insertion.—ἐις τασσ. St. Luke alone employs the good medical word ἰασίς, see ver. 22, and Luke xiii. 32, so whilst ἰασίς is used only three or four times by St. Matthew, two or three times by St. John, and once by St. Mark, it is used by St. Luke eleven times in his Gospel, and three or four times in the Acts. The significant use of this strictly medical term, and of the verb ἰασίς in St. Luke's writings, comes out by comparing Matt. xiv. 36, Mark vi. 56, and Luke vi. 19, see Hobart. ἰασίς — ἱσω, paronomasia: Wordsworth. In this ver., 30, Spitta, agreeing with Weiss as against Feine, traced another addition in the reviser's hand through the influence of source B, in which the Apostles appear, not as preachers of the Gospel, but as performers of miraculous deeds.

Ver. 31. δεήθηντων, cf. xvi. 26, where a similar answer is given to the prayer of Paul and Silas: the verb is characteristic of St. Luke and St. Paul, and is only used by these two writers with the exception of one passage, Matt. ix. 38; in St. Luke's Gospel it is found eight times, and in Acts seven times, and often of requests addressed to God as here, cf. x. 2, viii. 24, Luke x. 2, xxi. 36, xxxii. 2, 1 Thess. iii. 10. See on αἰτέω, Grimm- Thayer (Synonyms). This frequent reference to prayer is characteristic of St. Luke both in his Gospel and the Acts, cf. Acts i. 14, ii. 42, iv. 31, vi. 4, x. 2, xiii. 3, xvii. 23, xvi. 13, 25, xxviii. 8; Friedrich, Das Lucasmalgelium, pp. 59, 60.—ἐσαλεύθη, ἰασίς, xvi. 26; Luke (vi. 38, 49, vii. 24) xxi. 26; Heb. xii. 26, 27; in the O.T. we have similar manifestations of the divine Presence, cf. Ps. cxiv. 7, Amos ix. 5, where the same word is used; cf. also Isa. vi. 4, Hag. ii. 6, Joel iii. 16, Ezek. xxxviii. 19. For instance of an earthquake regarded as a token of the presence of a deity, see Wetstein, in loco; Virgil, Æneid, iii., 90; Ovid, Met., xv., 672, and so amongst the Rabbis, Schöttgen, Hor. Heb., in loco. In the Acts it is plainly regarded as no chance occurrence, and with regard to the rationalistic hypothesis that it was merely a natural event, accidentally coinciding with the conclusion of the prayer, Zeller admits that there is every probability against the truth of any such hypothesis; rather may we see in it with St. Chrysostom a direct answer to the appeal to the God in whose hands were the heaven and the earth (cf. Iren., Adv. Haer., iii., 12, 5). "The place was shaken, and that made them all the more unshaken" (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius).—συνηγμένοι, "were gathered," so in ver. 27; the aorist in the former verse referring to an act, but here the perfect to a state, but impossible to distinguish in translation, Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 45. That the shaking is regarded as miraculous is admitted by Weiss, who sees in it the reviser's hand introducing a miraculous result of the prayer of the Church, in place of the natural result of strengthened faith and popular favour.—καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν, ver. 8. So here the Holy Ghost inspired them all with courage: He came comfortari, to strengthen; they had prayed that they might speak the word μετά παρρ. and their prayer was heard and fulfilled to the letter (ver. 3 τ) as Luke describes "with simple skill".—ἐλάλουν: mark the force of the imperfect. ἐπλήσθ. (aorist), the prayer was immediately answered by their being filled with the Holy Ghost, and they proceeded to speak, the imperfect also implying that they continued to speak (Rendall); there is no need to see any reference to the speaking with tongues. Feine sees in the narrative a divine answer to the Apostles' prayer, so that filled with the Holy Ghost they spoke with boldness. And he adds, that such divine power must have been actually working in the Apostles, otherwise the growth of the Church in spite of its opposition is inexplicable—a remark which might well be considered by the deniers of a miraculous Christianity. It is in reality the same
32. ΤΟΥ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία ἕνα: καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν ἔλεγεν ὅτιον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτοῖς ἀκατὰ κοινὰ.

33. καὶ μεγάλη δυνάμει απεδίδοντο τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, χάρις ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ, ΧΆΡΙΣ

After μα ΙΔΕ, Cypr., Amb., Zeno insert καὶ οὐκ ἡ διακρίσις (χωρίσμος, Ε) εν αὐτοῖς οὐδέμα (τίς, Ε); so Hilg. Belser (so too Zockler) again sees an original reading which, beautiful as it is, was sacrificed to brevity; but Weiss objects that the words are no explanation of the preceding words, which point, as the context shows, to a fulness of love rather than to the mere absence of division. But it is possible that the words at first have been written in close connection with what follows as a fuller picture of the ψυχῆ μα and afterwards abbreviated. Chase suggests Syriac assim. to John ix. 16, where Greek has σχισμα—see further on this and other points in connection with parallel passage in ii. 44 ff., Harris, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 57, 85.

argument so forcibly put by St. Chrysostom: "If you deny miracles, you make it all the more marvellous that they should obtain such moral victories—these illiterate men!" Jungst refers the whole verse to a redactor, recording that there was no present reference with reference to whom the παρρησία could be employed. But the distinction between the aorist ἐπλήσ. and the imperfect ἐλάλουν shows that not only the immediate but the continuous action of the disciples is denoted.

Ver. 32. δέ marks no contrast between the multitude and the Apostles; it introduces a general statement of the life of the whole Christian community, cf. xv. 12, 30. On St. Luke's frequent use of words expressing fulness, see iv. 32. Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 59 (1807), points out that in the inscriptions πλήθος with a genitive has a technical significance, not only in official political life, but also in that of religious communities, cf. Luke i. 10, xix. 37, Acts ii. 6, but especially xv. 30; so too iv. 32, vi. 2, 5, xv. 12, xix. 9, xxi. 22, where the word = Menge or Masse, but Gemeinde.

—καρδία καὶ ψυχῆ μία: it is difficult to distinguish precisely between the two words, but they undoubtedly imply entire harmony in affection and thought according to a common Hebrew mode of expression; cf. passages in the LXX in which both ψυχῆ and καρδία occur as here with μία, 1 Chron. xii. 38, 2 Chron. xxxi. 12 (Wetstein); but in each passage the Hebrew word is the same, יָם, and it would include not only affection and emotion, but also understanding, intelligence, thought; cf. Phil. i. 27, ii. 2, 20. "Behold heart and soul are what make the together!" Chrys. δοός φίλος, ψυχῆ μία, Plutarch, cf. instances in Blass, in loco, from Aristotle and Cicero. Grotius comments "erant ut Hebraei loquuntur ποινιν ὄνων. —καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς, "and not one of them said," R.V., i.e., not one among so many; cf. John i. 3. οὐδὲ εἷς, "not even one thing"; cf. Rom. iii. 10; see above on ii. 45 and J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., in loco. On the difference between the classical and N.T. use of the infinitive after verbs of declaring, see Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., pp. 51, 52, 153, 155 (1806); except in Luke and Paul the infinitive tends to disappear, whilst these two writers retain the more literary usage.

Ver. 33. ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον, "gave the Apostles their witness," R.V. See ver. 12. τὸ μαρτ., prop., "res qua testimonio est," but sometimes in N.T. pro μαρτυρία (Blass). ἀπεδ., however, implies paying or rendering what is due; it suggests that there is a claim in response to which something is given (Westcott on Heb. xiii. 11); cf. Matt. xii. 36, Luke xii. 59, xvi. 2, xx. 25, Rom. xiii. 7, 1 Cor. vii. 3, etc. This was its first and strict significance in classical Greek, cf. also its use in LXX, frequently. The Apostles therefore bear their witness as a duty to which they were pledged, cf. i. 8, 22, iv. 20; καὶ ἐς περὶ ὀφλήματος λέγει αὐτὸ, Oecum.—ὑπάρχει μεγάλη: the words may include miraculous powers, as well as stedfast witness. But the τε must not, as Weiss maintains, be so taken as to indicate that χάρις μεγάλη was the result, as in ii. 47. For if we regard χάρις as referring to the favour of the people (as in the former narrative in ii.), the γάρ in ver. 34 seems to point to the love and liberality of the Christians as its cause. But many commentators prefer to take χάρις as in vi. 8 (and as in Luke ii. 40, Hilgenfeld), of the grace of God, since here as there it is used absolutely, and ver. 34 would thus be a proof of the efficacy of this grace, cf. 2 Cor. ix. 14.
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IV.

τε μεγάλη ἡν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς. 34. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ὑπήρξεν ἐν αὐτοῖς· δοσι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπήρξον, πωλοῦντες ἐφερόν τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων, 35. καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων· διεδίδοτο δὲ ἑκάστῳ καθότι ἤν τις χρείαν εἶχεν.

1 τις ὑπηρξεν DEP, Chrys.; τις ἡν ΝΑΦ 15, 69, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss; ην τις B. D reads σοι κτήτορες ὑπαν οἰκ. ἡ χορ. ὑπήρξον πωλοῦντες καὶ φέροντες combination, so Hilg.; Harris thinks erant Lat. brought in ησαν out of place, while Chase refers to fusion of true Greek text with Syr. trans. Whatever theory we adopt it seems that both ησαν and υπηρχεν got into the text, and that alteration was made so as to include them both. Blass's theory seems difficult to accept although St. Luke, with whom υπηρχεν is such a favourite word, might conceivably have written υπηρχον πωλοντες και φεροντες in a rough draft.

2 διεδίδοτο BП; διεδίδοτο ΝΑΒ'DΕ, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 121; Blass, Grammatik, p. 48; Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 159.

χάρις, as Bengel maintains, may include grace, favour with God and man, as in our Lord Himself, Gratia Dei et favor populi.

Ver. 34. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής: cf. Deut. xv. 4, where the same adjective occurs; cf. xv. 7, 11, xxiv. 14, Isa. xli. 17. No contradiction with vi. 1, as Holtzmann supposes; here there is no ideal immunity from poverty and want, but distribution was made as each fitting case presented itself: "their feeling was just as if they were under the paternal roof all for a while sharing alike," Chrys., Hom., xi.—δοσι γὰρ ὑπήρξον, "non dicitur: omnes hoc fecerunt [aorist] ut jam nemo vel fundum vel domum proprium haberet, sed: vulgo [saepes] hoc fiebat [imperfect] ad supplendum fiscum communem pauperibus destinatum; itaque nunquam dearet quod daretur," Blass, in loco, cf. remarks on ii. 47.—τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων, "the prices of the things which were being sold". The language shows that we are not meant to infer that the men sold all that they had (cf. Wetstein, especially Appian, B. Civ., v., p. 1088, τιμὰς τῶν ἐτι πιπρασκ.), τιμοῦσιν et πιπρασκ. both imperfect (Blass), and see also Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 58.—κτήτορες in N.T. only here, rarely elsewhere, see instances in Wetstein; not in LXX, but cf. Symmachus, Joel i. 11.

Ver. 35. The statement marks, it is true, an advance upon the former narrative, ii. 44, but one which was perfectly natural and intelligible. Here for the first time we read that the money is brought and laid at the Apostles' feet. As the community grew, the responsibilities of distribution increased, and to whom could the administration of the common fund be more fittingly committed than to the Apostles? The narrative indicates that this committal of trust was voluntary on the part of the Ecclesia, although it was marked by an act of reverence for the Apostles' authority. The fact that Barnabas is expressly mentioned as laying the value of his field at the Apostles' feet, may be an indication that the other members of the community were acting upon his suggestion; if so, it would be in accordance with what we know of his character and forethought, cf. ix. 27, xi. 22-24, Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 47, 48. There is no reason to reject this narrative as a mere repetition of ii. 44, 45. The same spirit prevails in both accounts, but in the one case we have the immediate result of the Pentecostal gift, in the case before us we have the permanence and not only the vitality of the gift marked—the Christian community is now organised under Apostolic direction, and stress is laid upon the continuance of the "first love," whilst the contrast is marked between the self-sacrifice of Barnabas and the greed of Ananias and Sapphira, see Rendall, Acts, p. 196, and also Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 198, in answer to recent criticisms.—παρὰ τοὺς πόδας: the Apostles are represented as sitting, perhaps as teachers, xxii. 3, cf. Luke ii. 46, and also as an indication of their authority: the expression in the Greek conveys the thought of committal to the care and authority of any one, cf. v. 2, vii. 58, xxii. 20, so Matt. xv. 30, or that of reverence and thankfulness. Oecumenius sees in the words an indication of the great honour of the Apostles, and the...
reverence of those who brought the money. Friedrich notes the expression as characteristic of St. Luke's style, since it is used by him five times in the Gospel, six times in Acts, and is found in the N.T. only once elsewhere, see above, cf. Cicero, Pro Flacco, 28, and instances in Wetstein.—ιδιόθετο: impersonal, or τὸ ἑργόσιον may be supplied, Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 159, cf. Exodus v. 13, ἱδιόθετο, but A-ιθοτο, but AΒ'S-ιθοτο; 1 Cor. xi.23, Winer-Schmieder, p. 121.—καθότι: only found in St. Luke in N. T., twice in Gospel, four times in Acts; Luke i. 7, xix. 9, Acts ii. 24, 45, iv. 35, xxii. 31; on the imperfect with ἀν in a conditional relative clause, Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, pp. 13, 125, and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 142 (1893). cf. ii. 45. 33b-35 are ascribed by Hilgenfeld to his "author to Theophilus," but this reviser must have been very clumsy to introduce a notice involving a general surrender of all landed property, as Hilgenfeld interprets the verse, which could not be reconciled with St. Peter's express words in v. 4—words which, on Hilgenfeld's own showing, the reviser must have had before him.

Ver. 36. Ιωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἰωσήφ δὲ δὲ οἱ ἐπικλήθεις Ἐλίσαι.
37. οὐπάρχοντοσ αὐτῶ ἄγρον, πωλήσας ἡνεγκε τὸ χρήμα, καὶ ἠθήκε παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων.

1 αγρον; D has χωριον, but αγρος only here in Acts. For χωριον cf. iv. 34, v. 3, 8.

2 παρὰ BP, Chrys., so W.H. (so Lach.); προς ΝΕ 15, 18, 37, so Tisch., Weiss, Wendt; cf. ver. 35 and v. 2.

name βαρνεβούς, which D. considers rightly = Son of Nebo; cf., e.g., Symmachus, Isa. xlvi. 1, who renders Ἰββ.

Nebo (transcribed by the LXX, Aquila and Theodotion, Ναβύ), by Νεβοŭς. The view of the connection or identity of βαρναβᾶς with βαρνεβοῦς is facilitated by the fact that in other words the sound in Nebo is replaced by α; cf. Nebuchadnezar = LXX Ν α βουδονοσοφ, so Nebuzaradan = LXX Ν α βουδαβαν. Very probably therefore βαρνεβοῦς will occur instead of βαρναβᾶς, - as being the constant termination of Greek names.

In his Neue Bibelstudien, p. 16, Deissmann is able to refer to an Aramaic inscription from Palmyra, dating 114 A.D., with the word Barnebo, and cf. also Enc. Bibl., i. 484.—Ανέβησα: although the Levites were not allowed to hold possessions in land, since God Himself was their portion (Num. xviii. 20, Deut. x. 9), yet they could do so by purchase or inheritance, cf. Jer. xxxii. 7-12, or it is possible that the field of Barnabas may not have been in Palestine at all (see Bengel, but, on the other hand, Wendt, in loco), and that the same Messianic regulations may not have applied to the Levites in other countries (Weinstein). It would also seem that after the Captivity the distribution of land, according to the Mosaic Law, was no longer strictly observed (Overbeck, Hackett (Hastings’ B.D.), “Barnabas,” e.g., Josephus, a Levite and Priest, has lands in the vicinity of Jerusalem, and gains others in exchange for them from Vespasian, Vita, 76.—Κύπρος τῷ γάενα: soon after the time of Alexander, and possibly before it, Jews had settled in Cyprus, and 1 Macc. xv. 23 indicates that they were there in good numbers. This is the first mention of it in the N.T.; see also xi. 19, 20, xiii. 4-13, xv. 39, xx. 16, and the geographical notices in xxi. 3, xxvii. 4. From the neighboring island, Cyprus, Barnabas might well have been sent to the famous University of Tarsus, and so have made the acquaintance of Saul. In this way the previous acquaintance between the two men goes far to explain succeeding events, ix. 27: see “Cyprus,” B.D. (Hastings), Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i. 2, 216.—γάενα, “a man of Cyprus by race,” R.V., not “of the country of Cyprus”; γάενα refers to his parentage and descent, cf. xviii. 2, 24.

Ver. 37. άγρου, better “a field” R.V.; the possession was not great, but if the field lay in the rich and productive island of Cyprus, its value may have been considerable. —τὸ χρήμα: rarely in this sense in the singular, only here in the N.T., and never in Attic Greek, but cf. Herod., iii., 38, and instances in Wetstein, and see Blass, in loco. The money, i.e., the proceeds, the money got (German Erlos). Lumby suggests that the word may be used here to indicate the entirety, the sum without deduction, in contrast to the action of Ananias and Sapphira, v. 2. The same unselfish spirit manifested itself in Barnabas at a later date, when he was content to live from the produce of his hands, I Cor. ix. 6. Possibly at Tarsus, so near his own home, he may have learnt with Saul in earlier days the craft of tent-making, for which the city was famous (Ath.). In connection with this passage, and ix. 26, see Renan’s eulogy on the character of Barnabas. In him Renan sees the patron of all good and liberal ideas, and considers that Christianity has done him an injustice in not placing him in the first rank of her founders, Apostles, p. 191, E.T.

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. Ἄνηρ δὲ τίς: in striking contrast to the unreserved self-sacrifice of Barnabas, St. Luke places the selfishness and hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira. It is in itself no small proof of the truth of the narrative, that the writer should not hesitate to introduce this episode side by side with his picture of the still unbroken love and fellowship of the Church. He makes no apology for the facts, but narrates them simply and without comment.—Ἀνναίας — written in W.H. (so Blass) ‘Αν, prob. Hebrew Ἰαναίας = Hananiah = to whom Jehovah
V. Ι-4.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

V. Ι.Ανήρ δέ τις Ανανίας ὁνόματι, σύν Σαπφείρη τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐπώλησε κτήμα, 2. καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, συνειδυίας καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἑνέγκας μέρος τι παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐδήκην. 3. εἶπε δὲ Πέτρος, Ἀνανία, διατὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαι σε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιόν, καὶ νοσφίσασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ χωρίου; 4. οὐχίμένον σοί ἔμενε, καὶ πραθεν ἐν τῇ σῇ ἐξουσίᾳ υπήρχε; τί διʼ ἐδοὺ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου

1 Αν. συμφατις ΝΒΕΠ, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 256; ov. Αν. AD, Vulg., Chrys. Σαφφιρης AP, so Tisch., W.H., so Blass in β; Σαφφιρης B, so Weiss. Many variations: Ν Σαφφιρης, D σαφφιρης, corr. Σαφφιρης (so Hilg.); E has Σαφφηρης; see comment.

has been gracious (the Hebrew name of Shadrach, Dan. i. 6, LXX, Jer. xxviii. 1, Tob. v. 22, Song of the Three Children, ver. 66) (Lumby, but see also Wendt, note, in loco).—Σαφφιρης, so also W.H., either from σάφφειρος (σάμφ., so here Σαμφ., ξΣ"), a sapphire, or from the Aramaic ניר, beautiful. The latter derivation is adopted by Winer-Schmiedel, p. 76. It is declined like κτήμα, μάχαιρα, Acts x. 1, xii. 2, etc., in N.T., and so makes dative, Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 80, 93, and Blass, u. s. —κτήμα = χωρίον, ver. 3: but may mean property of any kind. It is used in the singular several times in the LXX, as a possession, heritage, etc., Job xx. 29, Prov. xii. 27, xxxi. 16, Wisdom viii. 5, Eccles. xxxvi. 30, li. 21, etc.

Ver. 2. ἐνοσφίσατο: may merely mean from its derivation, to set apart νόσφι. But both in LXX and N.T. it is used in a bad sense of appropriating for one's own benefit, purloining, Josh. vii. 1. of Achan, 2 Macc. iv. 32, so here and in ver. 3, and Tit. ii. 10, cf. also a similar use of the word in Jos., Ant., iv., 8. 29 (so in Greek authors, Xen., Polyb., Plut.). —κτήμα: the same combination in Josh. vii. 1 (cf. li. 17 above, έκκεχάνατο, cf. Hebrew έκκεχαν). See Bengel's note, in loco, on the sin of Achan and Ananias.) —συνειδυίας: it was thus a deliberate and aggravated offence. On the irregular form, instead of μένω, cf. the LXX, Exod. viii. 21, 24, 1 Sam. xxv. 20; and see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 81, note, and Blass on instances from the papyri, in loco.—ταῖς τοῦτοῖς τοῖς: a further aggravation (iv. 35), since the money was brought ostentatiously to gain a reputation for the donors. Blass well comments: "in conventu ecclesiae hoc liberalitatis documentum editum"; cf. Calvin, who in marking the ambition of Ananias to gain a reputation for liberality adds: "ita fit ut pedes Apostolorum magis honoret quam Dei oculos".

Ver. 3. διάτι: not simply "why?" but "how is it that"? R.V., cf. Luke ii. 49; the force of the Greek seems to emphasize the fact that Ananias had it in his power to have prevented such a result, cf. James iv. 7. Peter v. 9.—ἐπλήρωσεν, occupied (cf. John xvi. 6), so that there is room for no other influence, Eccles. ix. 3. On the Vulgate, tentavit, which does not express the meaning here, see Felten's note. —ψεύσασθαι, sc., ὥστε, often omitted; cf. Luke i. 54, the infinitive of conceived result, see Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, pp. 148, 154. The verb with the accusative of the person only here in N.T., but in LXX, Deut. xxxiii. 29, Psalm lxv. 3, Isa. livii. 11, Hos. ix. 2, 4 Macc. v. 34, etc., and frequently in classical writers.

Ver. 4. οὐχί, "id quaeuit quod sic esse nemo negat," Grimm, "while it remained, did it not remain thine own?" R.V. Very frequent in Luke as compared with the other Evangelists, see also vii. 50. This rendering better retains the kind of play upon the word μένω, to which Weiss draws attention, and compares 1 Macc. xv. 7 for the force of μενεν. —πραθεν, i.e., the price of it when sold (rectius πραθήκην τὸ ἀργύριον, cf. Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 57 (1866)); so αυτὰ in ii. 45 is used for the prices of the possessions and goods sold. The whole question, while it deprived Ananias of every excuse, also proves beyond doubt that the community of goods in the Church of Jerusalem was not compulsory
to πράγμα τούτο; but D, Par., Sah. read τοιοῦτον τούτο—πράγμα
Av. НАБЕР, Chrys. prefix article, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt. πενών;
D, Par., so Hilg., prefix παραχρήμα— and Par. also adds after πεν. επιτην γην,
cf. ix. 4, read by Blass in β. ταυτά om. Η*АВ, verss., Orig., Lucif., so Tisch., W.H., R.V.,
Wendt, Weiss; cf. ver. 11 end.

but voluntary.—ἰςωτίδια, power or right (ἐξωτικά): "The Ecclesia was a society
in which neither the community was lost
in the individual, nor the individual in the
community," Hort, Ecclesia, p. 48.—τα ταυτά, sc., τά ταύταν ήταν, cf. Luke ii. 49, and
Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 101 (1893),
Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 173.—
ἐξεγινεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, xix. 21, and Luke
xxi. 14. The phrase is rightly described
as having a Hebraistic colouring. cf.
LXX, i Sam. xxii. 12, Dan. i. 8, Hag.
ii. 16, 19, Mal. i. 1, and the Homeric
θίζαται ἐν φρέσι, ἐν θυμῷ βάλεσθαι.
—το πράγμα τούτο: so frequently
in LXX, Gen. xliv. 15, Exod. i. 18,
Josh. ix. 24, 1 Chron. xxi. 8; Viteau,
Le Grec du N. T., p. 149 (1896).—οὐκ
ἐψεύσω: the words do not here of course
mean that Ananias had not lied unto
men, but an absolute negative is employed
in the first conception, not to annul it,
but rhetorically to direct undividedatten
tion to the second, cf. Matt. x. 20, Mark
ix. 37, 1 Thess. iv. 8, Winer-Moulton,
Iv. 8. 6. The dative of the person is
found after ἐψεύσων in the LXX, but
not in classical Greek. The sin of
Ananias was much more than mere
hypocrisy, much more than fraud, pride
or greed—hateful as these sins are—the
power and presence of the Holy Spirit
had been manifested in the Church, and
Ananias had sinned not only against
human brotherhood, but against the
divine light and leading which had made
that brotherhood possible. In the words
there lies an undeniable proof of the
personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost,
and a refutation of Macedonius long
before he was born (see Bede's note
in loco, and on patristic authorities,
Felten). We cannot satisfactorily
explain the words by supposing that offence
against the public spirit of that Church
is meant, and that the sin against the
Holy Ghost may be identified with this.
Ver. 5: ἀκων, "as he heard these
words" = μεταθέσεων, so Weiss, Blass,
Rendall.—ἐξομαχεῖα: only found here, in
ver. 10 of Sapphira, and xii. 23 of the
death of Herod, in the N.T.; not found
in classical writers, and only twice in the
LXX, Judg. iv. 21 where A reads it to
tell the death of Sisera, but = a He-
brew word which may only mean to faint,
to faint away; Ezek. xxi. 7 (12) where it
translates a Hebrew word יִתנֵל meaning
to be faint-hearted, to despond, to be
dim. But as Blass points out it is used
by Hippocrates; indeed it would seem
that its use is almost altogether confined
to medical writers (Hobart, Zahn). It
is therefore a word which may probably
be referred to St. Luke's employment of
medical terms; Hobart, Medical Lan-
guage of St. Luke, p. 37, for instances of
its use not only in Hippocrates but in
Galen and Areteaus (Lumby refers to
Acta Andr. et Matth. Aprot., 19, where
the word is also used of men suddenly
falling down dead). In classical Greek
ἀποναίκος (βλω), or ἀπον., absolutely is the
term employed. There can be no
doubt that the narrative implies the
closest connection between the guilt of
Ananias and his sudden death. It there-
fore cannot be regarded as a narrative of
a chance occurrence or of the effect of a
sudden shock caused by the discovery of
guilt in St. Peter's words. No one has
shown more clearly than Baur (Paulus,
I. 27-33, especially against Neander) that
all such explanations are unsatisfactory
(see also Zeller and De Wette). In
the early history of the Church, Origen,
Tract. ix. in Matt., had espoused the
view that Ananias had died overcome by
shame and grief at the sudden detection
of his sin. But no such explanation could
account for the death of Sapphira which
Peter foretells as about to follow
without delay. That the narrative is not
without historical foundation is frankly
admitted by Wendt, and also by Baur,
Zeller, Overbeck, and most recently
by Weissacker, Holtzmann, Spitta. But
this stern condemnation of any attempt
to lie unto God is a stumbling-block even
to those who with Wendt recognise not
only some historical fact underlying the
narrative, but also the danger and culpability of the action of Ananias and his wife. It may however be justly observed that our Lord Himself had condemned no sin so severely as that of hypocrisy, and that the action of Ananias and Sapphira was hypocrisy of the worst kind, in that they sought by false pretences to gain a reputation like the Pharisees for special sanctity and charity; the hypocrisy of the leaven of the Pharisees had entered the Church (Baumgarten), and if such a spirit had once gained ground in the Christian community, it must have destroyed all mutual affection and all brotherly kindness, for how could men speak the truth, every one with his neighbour, unless their love was without hypocrisy? Rom. xii. 9; how could they claim to be citizens of a city, into which none could enter who "made a lie"? Rev. xxi. 27, xxii. 15. The sin before us was not only deceitful, but also the danger and culpability of the action of Ananias and his wife. It may however be justly observed that our Lord Himself had condemned no sin so severely as that of hypocrisy, and that the action of Ananias and Sapphira was hypocrisy of the worst kind, in that they sought by false pretences to gain a reputation like the Pharisees for special sanctity and charity; the hypocrisy of the leaven of the Pharisees had entered the Church (Baumgarten), and if such a spirit had once gained ground in the Christian community, it must have destroyed all mutual affection and all brotherly kindness, for how could men speak the truth, every one with his neighbour, unless their love was without hypocrisy? (Chrys., Hom., xxii., on ver. 9), and in its deliberateness it came perilously near that sin against the Holy Ghost which, whatever else it may mean, certainly means a wilful hardening against divine guidance. For further considerations on the necessity of this unhesitating condemnation of such a sin at the outset of the life of the Church, see St. Chrysostom's remarks. We must guard against supposing that St. Peter had imprecated the death-penalty upon Ananias (as Porphyry asserted, see against such a view, Jerome, Epist., 130). St. Jerome speaks of Ananias and Sapphira as not only deceitful, but also as timid stewards, keeping back a part of the price "through fear of famine which true faith never fears". On his judgment that the avenging stroke was inflicted, not in cruelty to them, but as a warning to others, see below.—και ἔγιντο φόβος μέγας κ.τ.λ., i.e., upon all who were present, as distinct from ver. 11—but see Page's note. Overbeck, with De Wette, regards the remark as proleptical, as if the writer hurried to describe the impression made—but why should the words not include the judgment uttered by St. Peter? for the construction see Luke i. 65, iv. 36. On the characteristic reference to φόβος as following upon the exhibition of divine miraculous power both in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, see Friedrich, Das Lukaevangelium, p. 77, and above on ii. 43.

Ver. 6. ἀναστάντες, see on ii. 14.—οἱ νεώτεροι: the fact that they are called simply νεώτεροι in ver. 10 seems decisive against the view that reference is made to any definite order in the Church. Nor is it certain that we can see in the fulfilment of such duties by the νεώτεροι the beginnings of the diaconate, although on the natural distinction between πρεσβύτεροι and νεώτεροι it may well have been that official duties in the Church were afterwards based, cf. 1 Tim. v. 1, Tit. ii. 1-6, 1 Pet. v. 5, Clem. Rom., i., 3; iii., 3; xxii., 6; Polycarp, Epist., v., 3 (cf. Luke xxii. 26). In comparatively early days it belonged to the duties of the deacons to provide for the burial of the strangers and the poor, but it seems hardly probable that οἱ νεώτεροι were appointed as a separate body to bury the dead, before any attempt had been made to relieve the Apostles of the more pressing duty of distributing the public funds, vi. 1. On the other hand it is possible that the company of public "buriers" whom the prophet saw in vision, Ezek. xxxix. 12-16, may have become quite customary in N.T. days. R.V. margin renders simply "the younger men".—συνέστειλαν, "wrapped him round," R.V., probably in their own mantles (for no formal laying-out in robes can be supposed by the context), for which προστάλλειν would be the usual word, cf. Eur., Tryod., 378 (see Grimm, Blass, Weiss). But Meyer on the other hand is against the parallel, and argues, following Grotius, that the word should be rendered "placed him together," i.e., laid out or composed his limbs, so that he might be carried out more conveniently (so too Overbeck, Holtzmann, Zöckler). Vulgate, amoveriunt, followed by Luther, Erasmus, Beza, cannot be said to be supported by any parallel use of the word (Par.2 also same verb as Vulg.). The word is frequently used by medical writers in various senses, one of which, to bandage, to compress by bandaging, is that which seems to afford a possible parallel to its use here, Hobart, Medical Language, etc., pp. 37, 38. The use of the word by Josephus, Ant., xviii., 3; xix., 4, is not sufficient to justify us in taking it here to express all the preparations for burial.—ἐξενέγκαν: outside the walls of the city, the usual place for graves—only prophets and kings had their graves in the city—Hamburger,
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

δε ως ώρων τριών διάστημα, καὶ γυνὴ αυτοῦ μὴ εἰδίναι τὸ γεγονός εἰσῆλθεν. 8. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ Πέτρος,1 Ἐστι μοι, εἰ τοσοῦτον τὸ χωρίον ἀπέθανε; τό δὲ εἶπε, Ναι, τοσοῦτον. 9. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὴν, Τί ὁ συνεφώνηθη;2 ὁμι τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου; ἢ δὲ οἱ πόδες τῶν θαφάντων τὸν ἄνδρα ἑτέρα τῇ θύρᾳ, καὶ εξενέγκαν τὸν. 10. ἐπεσε δὲ παραχρῆμα παρὰ τῶν πόδων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέψυξεν εἰσελθόντες δὲ οἱ νεανίσκοι εὐρόν αὐτὸν νεκράν, καὶ ἐξέκασται

1 For εἰς μοι εἰ . . . αἰτθ. D reads επερωτησω σε ειαρα το χ. τοσ. απεδ., so Hilg.; cf. Sah.

2 συνεφώνηθη D has συνεφώνησαν, so Hilg.; but in β Blass has T.R. (see Chase on retrans. from Syriac—possibly active may be a retranslation of Latin convenit, Harris).


- ἔκκοιμησα: partly for sanitary reasons, partly to avoid defilement; the interval between death and burial was very brief, especially in Jerusalem (Numb. xix. 11, Deut. xxv. 23, Hamburger, v. s. 2, 2, 161, “Beerdigung,” with reference to this passage, Edersheim, u. s., p. 168; for the existing custom in Jerusalem of speedy burial, see Hackett, in loco, and Schneller, Kennst du das Land? (eighth edition), p. 188).


Ver. 8. τοσοῦτον, monstrat βεεuniam, Blass, so Zöckler, Holtzmann, Felten, Weiss, and others: genitive of the price. The position of the word in the question is emphatic, cf. Luke xv. 29. Blass would render non pluris (Bornemann, tantilli), but this is implied rather than expressed by the word here (see Wendt’s note for classical instances). The question of St. Peter and the emphatic reply of Sapphira show that opportunity was given her by the inquiry to retract, and that she wilfully persisted in her sin (Chrys.; so Calvin, “tempus illiad resipiscendum datur”).

Ver. 9. τί συνεφωνήθη: only here in the N. T. in the passive, for its use in the active, xv. 15. Blass maintains that this passive usage συμφωνεῖται τοι is Latin rather than Greek (convenit inter alios), and that it may have arisen from the intercourse between Greeks and Romans, see in loco, and Grammatik des N. G., pp. 112, 235; in LXX only in the active. Cf. also Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 155 (1893).

The aggravation was that they committed the deed as with one soul, just as upon a settled compact between them,” Chrys., Hom., xii.; cf. the plural απέδοσα. — παραχρῆμα: the rendering “to tempt,” does not seem to express the idea so well as “to try,” to make trial whether the Holy Ghost would discover their deception, whether He knew all things: cf. xv. 10, and in LXX, Exod. xvii. 2, 7, Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 41, 56, etc. (in Rev. ii. 2 the same verb as here = “try,” A. and R.V.). — οἱ τοδὲ, see on i. 10. οἱ τοδὲ, cf. Luke i. 79, Rom. iii. 15, x. 15. A Hebraistic expression—the whole description is full of dramatic intensity—the returning steps of the νεώτεροι are heard επὶ τῇ θύρᾳ. But Alford thinks that they were probably bare-footed, and that the words mean that the time was just at hand for their return, cf. James v. 9.—εξενέγκαν τὸν, see on ver. 6.

Ver. 10. παραχρῆμα, see on iii. 7. The introduction of the word shows that...
12. And the word of the apostles was spreading abroad, and great fear came on all the church, and on everyone who heard them.

13. But the rest of the believers were afraid, and were all united, saying, "We cannot continue in this way."

1. εἴρησαν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς. II. καὶ εὐγενεῖς φόβος μέγας ἐφ' ᾧ ἡ ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἴπε τάντας τοὺς αἰκούντας ταῦτα.

12. διὰ δὲ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγένετο σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῇ λαῷ τολμᾶτε, καὶ ἤσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸς ἄπαντες ἐν τῇ στοᾷ ἐστιν. 13. τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὖν οὗτοι ἐτὸλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς,

1. εἴρησαν, D reads συνεπιλαμβάνετε εἰρήνεκαν; so Hilg.

2. ἄπαντες, D, Sah., Aeth. add εἰς τὸ νησὺ. -Εἰς τῷ νησὶ συνήγενον. But the words εἰς τῷ νησῷ are not received by Blass in B; Acta Apost. in loco, he says: "cf. ii. 43, videur interpolation esse; nam sec. iii. 10, haec porticus extra τὸ λεπὼν erat, cf. ver. 21". Συνιστοῦνται, see above, iii. 11.

the writer regarded the death as supernatural, see above on ver. 5. ἐπάς, by, beside her husband = παρά νιθ dative, Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 135, note; Winer-Moulton, xlix. h. Although the whole narrative shows that in each case the death was caused by the judgment of God, yet nothing whatever is said as to the world beyond the grave: "As it is, both the man himself is benefited, in that he is not left to advance further in wickedness, and the rest, in that they are made more earnest." Chrys., Hom., xii. Wendt points out that the punishment inflicted by St. Paul, 1 Cor. v. 5, was of a wholly different kind, because it had the avowed aim of saving the spirit of the sinner in the day of the Lord by delivering him over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh; but it should not be forgotten that St. Peter himself speaks of a judgment according to men in the flesh, which has its issue in a life according to God in the spirit (1 Pet. iv. 6). St. Augustine's words may fairly be quoted ποτα against but in favor of applying to the cases before us the principle of judgment employed by St. Paul: "Credendum est autem pos quod hanc vitam eis pepercerit Deus. . . . Correpti sunt mortis flagello, ne supplicio punitur æterno," Serm., de Verbis Act. v., 4, cf. Orig., Tract. v., in Matth., and Jerome, Epist. cxxx. See Speaker's Commentary, in loco, and Bengel, Felten, Zockler, Plumptre. Felten's reverent thoughts, p. 124, may well be compared with the remarks of Dr. Pusey on the case of Ananias, What is of Faith? etc., p. 14.

1. φόβος μέγας: evidently one purpose in the infliction of this stern penalty was at once obtained, see above on ver. 5. -ἐπὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ: St. Luke, as it seems, uses the word ἐκκλησίᾳ here for the first time. Dr. Hort thinks that he may employ it by antici-
in the dignity and office of Apostleship, properly so called, having seen the judgment that one of the Twelve had brought upon Ananias, one of their own number (as Lightfoot ranks Ananias amongst the hundred-and-twenty); (2) of non-believers as contrasted with ἀποστάται; this is adopted by Blass, but it obliges him to translate κολλάσθαι, sē eis immiscere = interpellare, vexare, whereas the word is more often used, as he admits, both in the Acts and in the LXX of friendly intercourse.

Ver. 14. μάλλον δέ προσετίθεντο: the favour of the people which still protected the Church (cf. ver. 17) resulted in further increase of believers, “were the more added,” utm so mchr.; imperfect, signifying the continuous growth of the Church; on the verb see ii. 41. πληθύνει, plural (only here in N.T.), because not only men as in iv. 4, but women also (Weiss), but Bengel “pluralis grandis: jam non initur numerus, uti 4, 4,” to the same effect Blass, “sepe fiebat ut Magnus numerus accederet, inde plur. hic tantum N.T.” On St. Luke’s characteristic fondness for this and similar words see iv. 32. γυναικῶν: this mention of women forms as it were an introduction to the further mention in vi. 1 ff., cf. viii. 3, where women are again mentioned amongst the victims in the general persecution of the Church (see Plumptre’s note, in loco). This constant reference to the share of women in the ministry of the Gospel and the life of the Church is characteristic of St. Luke in both his writings.

Ver. 15. ὡστε καὶ εἶς, “insomuch that they even,” R.V.—κατά, T.R., so Alford, Meyer, “all down the streets,” as if the streets were entirely beset with sick folk (see Holtzmann, in loco). πλατείας, feminine of the adjective πλατύς, sc., οδός, a broad way, so here, the open streets, in classical Greek, and frequently in LXX, chiefly for Hebrew, בֵּית. Tobit xiii. 17, Judith i. 14, viii. 14, 22, 1 Macc. i. 55, ii. 9, 3 Macc. i. 18, used by St. Luke three times in his Gospel, ch. xx. 26, xvii. 21, but only here in Acts, see below on ix. 11. For κλινών read κλιναρίων, which is found only here in N.T., not at all in LXX, and very rarely in other Greek authors, Aristoph, Frag., 33, d, and Arrian, Epict. Diss., iii. 5, 13, where it is used for the couch of a sick person; Artem., Onier., ii. 57. As Dr. Hobart points out, St. Luke employs no less than four different words for the beds of the sick, two in common with the other Evangelists, viz., κλίνη (not in John), and κράβαττος (not in Matthew). But two are peculiar to him, viz., κλιναρίον (Luke v. 19, 24), and κλινάριον only here. Neither word is found in the LXX, but κλιναρίον, although rare elsewhere, is used in Artem., also in Plutarch, and Dion. Hal. (Antiq. Rom., vii., 68), for a litter for carrying the sick, Hobart, Medical
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αυτών. 16. συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περί πόλεων εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, φέροντες ασθενεῖς καὶ ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, οὓς θεραπεύοντο ἀπαντεῖς. 1

1 as D.E.P demid., Arm., Chr., so Meyer; om. ΝΑΒ vers., so Tisch., W. H., R. V., Weiss, Wendt. οὕς θεραπεύοντο ἀπαντεῖς, D. Par. (Gig., Lucif.) read καὶ λέγω ταῦτα; both verbs almost equally common. At end of verse “ duo codices Bergeri” add et magnificabant Dominum ι. C., added by Blass in β (Greek); cf. Acts xix. 17.

Language, etc., pp. 116, 117. Dr. Kennedy sees in κλινίδιον an instance of rare words used by the comic poets, especially Aristophanes. found also in the N. T., and almost nowhere else, and hence a proof of the “colloquial” language of the N. T. writers (Sources of N. T. Greek, pp. 76-79). But the fact remains that the word in question is found only in St. Luke, and that both it and κλινάριον were employed for the couch of a sick person.—ἀρχομένου Πέτρου, genitive absolute, “as Peter came by,” R. V. (very frequent in Luke), it does not mean, as Felten admits, that none of the other Apostles possessed such powers.—καί = καὶ ἐὰν— even if it were only his shadow, “at the least his shadow,” R. V., cf. Mark v. 28, vi. 56, 2 Cor. xii. 16; the usage is not unclassical, Soph., Elect., 1483: Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 170; Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 118 (1893).—ἐπισκιάσῃ with dative, Luke i. 35, Mark ix. 7; B so W. H., future indicative συν, a construction common with ὅσως in classical Greek (Page); for other examples of the future indicative with ὅσως see Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 81 (1893), of which several are found in classical Greek; cf. Luke xiv. 20, xx. 10, 1 Cor. ix. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 1, Acts xxii. 24, W. H.; John vii. 3, Gal. ii. 4, etc.; Burton, u. s. p. 86. Undoubtedly this action of the people showed the lively power of their faith (Chrys., Theod., Aug.), but the further question arises in spite of the severe strictures of Zeller, Overbeck, Holtzmann, as to how far the narrative indicates that the shadow of Peter actually produced the healing effects. Ver. 16 shows that the sick folk were all healed, but Zockler maintains that there is nothing to show that St. Luke endorses the enthusiastic superstitious of the people (so J. Lightfoot, Nøsgen, Lechler, Rendall). On the other hand we may compare Matt. ix. 20, Mark vi. 56, John ix. 5, Acts xix. 12; and Baumgarten’s comment should be considered, although it is not actually said that a miraculous power went forth from Peter’s shadow, it is a question why, if no such power is implied, the words should be introduced at all into a narrative which evidently purports to note the extraordinary powers of the Apostles. The parallels just instanced from the Gospels could, of course, have no weight with critics who can only see in such comparisons a proof that the Acts cannot rise above the superstitious level of the Gospels, or who start like Renan with “an absolute rule of criticism,” viz., the denial of a place in history to all miraculous narratives. β adds ἀπηντότους γὰρ εἰς τ. Ν. T.: but even here, as Blass says, Luke does not distinctly assert that cures were wrought by the shadow of Peter, although there is no reason to deny that the Evangelist had this in mind, since he does not hesitate to refer the same miraculous powers to St. Paul. Hilgenfeld refers vv. 14-16 to his “author to Theophilus,” and sees in the expressions used in ver. 16 a reminiscence of Luke vi. 17.

Ver. 16. δὲ καὶ: very common in St. Luke, Luke ii. 4, iii. 9, v. 10, ix. 61, xiv. 12, etc., and also nine times in Acts. St. John uses it frequently, but seldom in Matt. and Mark; used for the sake of giving emphasis.—πέρι only here, strengthened for περί, not in LXX, but see Hatch and Redpath, found in Acta Andr. et Matth. Apocr., 26 (see Lumbly’s note), in classics from ΑΕschylus.—τῶν π. πόλεων, “the cities round about Jerusalem,” omitting εἰς before Περασ. —ἐχλομένους: only here in N. T., cf. Luke vi. 18, οἱ ἐνοχλομένοι (W. H., R. V.) ὑπὸ πν. ἀκαθ. Both verbs are peculiar to St. Luke in the N. T. in connection with disease (ἐνοχλεῖν is used in Heb. xii. 15 in a different sense), and both were often used by medical writers. In Tobit vi. 8, ἰχλῇ the simple verb is used of the vexing and disturbing of an evil spirit, and ἐνοχλεῖν is used several times in the LXX, of being troubled with sicknesses, Gen. xlviii. 1, 1 Sam. xix. 14, xxx. 13, Mal. i. 13. So J. Weiss, who is by no means inclined to overrate Dr.
17. 'Anastásēς δὲ ἁρχιερεύς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἢ οὖσα αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, ἔπλήσθησαν ζῆλου. 18. καὶ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ θετόντες αὐτοὺς ἐν τηρήσει.

1 ἀναστάς, Par. reads Ἀννας, “cod. Dubl. ap. Berger” (Blass); so also Prov. after ἀναστ. Blass follows Par. in β. ἀναστάς is no doubt a very common word, but Western reading may have possessed the true text, cf. iii. 6, but if Ἀννας is original then ἀναστάς is a corruption, not a revision.

Hobart’s work, regards the use of the two verbs just mentioned as the employment in St. Luke of technical medical terms, Evangelium des Lukas, pp. 273, 274 (1892); found in Hipp., Galen, Dioscorides, cf. in the latter, Mat. Med., iii., 116, τούς ὑπὸ ἐπίσκοπος βηχής καὶ ὀρθοπνοίας ἐξιλαμβάνουσα ὑπηρετεῖες, see also Luke vi. 19, viii. 46, for a like effect following on the manifestation of the miraculous powers of Christ.

Ver. 17. ἀναστάς, see on i. τ5, cf. vii. 9: it may denote a hostile intention (but need not force this), Mark iii. 26, Luke x. 35, Matt. xii. 41, in LXX, Job xvi. 8; see Overbeck, Blase, Weiss; ὁ ἁρχι, i.e., Annas not Caiaphas, iv. 6. — πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ: the context seems to imply that more are included than referred to in iv. 6. — ἢ οὖσα αἵρεσις (= οἱ εἰσιν αἵρεσις), a rare employment of the relative in the N.T., but found in Luke and Paul, most of all in the latter; cf. Acts xvi. 12, 1 Cor. iii. 17, Gal. iii. 16, Ephes. iii. 13, vi. 2, Phil. i. 28, etc. (cf. Rev. iv. 5, v. 9); Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 192 (1896).—αἵρεσις: (1) a choosing, choice, so in classical writers, cf. also LXX, Lev. xxii. 18, 21, 1 Macc. vii. 30; (2) that which is chosen, a chosen method of thought and action; (3) later, a philosophic principle; those who have chosen certain principles, a school, a sect, so six times in Acts. It is used thrice elsewhere in N.T., 1 Cor. xi. 29, Gal. v. 20, 2 Pet. ii. 1 in the plural, of factions or parties within the Church; in its later ecclesiastical use, applied to doctrines, “heresies,” which tended to cause separation from the Church. The word need not therefore be used in a bad sense, although it is so used of the Nazarenes, cf. xxiv. 5, 14, xxviii. 22, whilst on the other hand St. Paul uses it of the Pharisees, xxvi. 5 (cf. xv. 5), in no depreciatory sense (cf. its use by Josephus of the Sadducees, Ant., xx. 9, 1). Lumby gives a disparaging use of the word in Aporc. Act. Phil. in Hellad., 10, see his note. It is not expressly said by St. Luke that Annas was a Sadducee, although he seems to imply it. But this is not in itself inconceivable (see iv. 1) in spite of the strictures of Zeller and Overbeck; Josephus distinctly says, u.s., that the son of Annas who bore his father’s name was of the sect of the Sadducees, and if he mentions this as something peculiar, and as showing why the younger Annas was so bold and insolent (Zeller, cf. Nössen’s note, in loco), yet there is no difficulty in supposing that the elder Annas was at least associated with the Sadducees if only for political reasons.—ζήλου: jealousy, R.V., so rightly A.V. in xiii. 45; Wycliffe “envy,” cf. Rom. xiii. 13, 1 Cor. iii. 3, 2 Cor. xi. 2, Gal. v. 20, James iii. 14, 16, Clem. Rom., Cor., iii., 4 and iv.-vi. (cf. Numb. xxv. 10, 11, 1 Macc. viii. 16, οὔτε φθόνος οὔτε ζῆλος ἐν αὐτοῖς, and ii. 54, 58, Psalms of Solomon, ii., 27), and in some places of the jealousy which God has, as in 2 Cor. xi. 2, Numb. xxv. 10, 11, and cf. Psalms of Solomon, ii., 27, iv., 2, 1 Macc. ii. 54. But φθόνος is capable only of an evil signification. By Aristotle ζῆλος is used in its nobler sense (Rhet., ii., 11), as opposed to τὸ φθονεῖν, but it seems to be used by other writers as = φθόνος or coupled with it. The meaning is defined by the context. Trench, N. T. Synonyms, i., 99. Here the envy and jealousy of the Sanhedrim was provoked by the popular favour shown to the disciples, and hence to their doctrine of the resurrection.

Ver. 18. ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας: a phrase used twice in St. Luke’s Gospel, and three times in the Acts, cf. Gen. xxii. 12. Cf. Hebrew לַן תַּנְפָּשׁ, in public ward,” R.V. דָּפָא, used here as an adjective, only found in N.T. in Acts, in the three other passages used as an adverb, xvi. 37, xvii. 28, xx. 20 (2 Macc. vi. 10, 3 Macc. ii. 2), cf. Thuc., v. 18, where דָּפָא the public prison. See note above on iv. 3. Hilgenfeld is so far right in pointing out that the two imprisonments, iv. 3 and v. 18, are occasioned by two different causes, in the first case by the preaching of the Apostles
17—20.
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δημοσία. 19. ἀγγέλος δὲ Κυρίου διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἤνοιξε τὰς δύρας τῆς φυλακῆς, ἐξαγαγὼν τε αὐτούς εἶπε, 20. Πορεύεσθε, καὶ σταθέντες
to the people, and in the second by the reverence which their miracles gained from the people.

Ver. 19. ἀγγέλος δὲ Κ.: the narrative must be accepted or rejected as it stands. As Wendt, following Zeller in earlier days, candidly admits, every attempt to explain the narrative by referring the release of the prisoners to some natural event, such as an earthquake or lightning, or to some friendly disposed person, who with the assistance of the gaoler opened the prison doors, and who was mistaken by the Apostles for an angel in the darkness and excitement of the night, is shattered at once against the plain meaning of the text. Nor can it be deemed satisfactory to believe that St. Luke has unconsciously given us two narratives of the liberation of St. Peter, here and in xii., and that the former is merely an echo of the later deliverance transferred to an earlier date (Weiss, Sorof, Holtzmann). But St. Luke had the best means of knowing accurately the events narrated in xii. from John Mark (see below on chap. xii., and Ramsay, St. Paul, etc., p. 385), Introd., p. 17, and there is no ground whatever for supposing that xii. is simply an embellished version of this former incident. Attempts have been made to show that St. Luke introduces the same doubling of narratives in his Gospel (Wendt, Holzm., etc.), e.g., the sending forth of the disciples in ix. 3 and x. 1, but the former chapter is concerned with the mission of the Twelve, and the latter with that of the Seventy. Further objections have been made as to the uselessness of the miracle—the disciples are found to be imprisoned again! But not only was the miracle a source of fresh strength and faith to the disciples, but—as Hilgenfeld notes—their release can scarcely be described as purposeless, since it called forth a public transgression of the command of silence imposed upon the two chief Apostles, iv. 17—21. Moreover, the deliverance was another indication to the Sadducees, if they would have accepted it, that it was useless for them to attempt to stay the movement. "Quis ergo usus

angeli?" asks Blass; and he answers: "Sed est aliquis: augeatur enim apostolorum audacia (21), tum ira adversariorum magis accenditur; nihilominus Deus suos perire non patitur". That the Sadducees should ignore the miracle (ver. 28) is surely not strange, although it may well have influenced their subsequent deliberations; that the action of the Sadducees should now be more coercive than on the former occasion was only natural on the part of men who feared that vengeance would be taken on them for the death of Jesus by an uprising of the people (vv. 28 and 26).—διὰ νυκτὸς = νυκτός, νυκτωρ (cf. Luke ii. 8) in classical Greek. The phrase is used four times by St. Luke in Acts, cf. xvi. 19, xvii. 10, xix. 31, and cf. Luke v. 5 (and ix. 37, D, διὰ τῆς ημέρας): nowhere else in N. T. In all the passages Meyer thinks that the expression means throughout the night, but such a meaning would be inconsistent with the context at all events here and in xvi. 19; and xvii. 10 is doubtful. — See Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 129, "by night" (nachts). Simcox speaks of this expression in Acts as an "almost adverbial phrase," Language of N. T., p. 140.

Ver. 20. Πορεύεσθε: characteristic of St. Luke both in Gospel and Acts. The word appears here in Acts for the first time, and it is found in St. Luke’s Gospel about fifty times, and in this book nearly forty (Friedrich, Lekbusch).—σταθέντες, ii. 14, on this pictorial use of the word, see Page’s note, and Friedrich, Das Lucas evangelium, p. 42; so also ἀναστάς, ἀναστάς, ἀνερθεσίς, καθίσας, στραφείς—here it intimates the boldness with which the Apostles were to proclaim their message.—ἐν τῇ λεψι—they were to speak not only boldly but publicly.—τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης (cf. xiii. 20, τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης, and Rom. vii. 24, i.e., the life to which the whole Apostolic preaching referred, the life which the Sadducees denied, bestowed by Him who was Himself the Resurrection and the Life, cf. iii. 15, iv. 12. This or a similar explanation is accepted by Holzm,
 lodge in the early morning always to the meetings of this life.  

After hearing, they entered the holy place, and taught.  

Paragomenos, having come, the assembly of the people of Israel, and sent them.  

For synhedrion D has egenethentes to pwei kai syngekalasmenon (so also Hilg.); may be addition for sake of clearness, or omitted in revision; assim. to our Lord's trial and the Jewish authorities seems unnecessary.

Wendt, Weiss, Zöckler, Blass. On the attempt to explain the words as simply = these words of life, see Winer-Moulton, xxxi.3, 5, and see also Grimm, sub v. ῥήμα.

Ver. 21. ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀρθροῦ, "about daybreak," R.V., i.e., without delay they obeyed the angel's command (Weiss). The words may also indicate the customary usage of Palestine where the heat was great in the daytime. The people rose early and came to our Lord to hear Him, Luke xxi.38 (John viii.2). ὑπὸ = sub, circa (of time), so in classical Greek, Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 132. The first sacrifice took place in the Temple very early, Edersheim, Temple and its Services, p. 132, and it may be that the Apostles went to catch the people at the hour of their early devotions (Plumptre).—ὑπὸ is used nowhere else in the N.T. with an accusative in this sense, cf. Tobit vii.11, S. al; ὑπὸ τὴν νύκτα, 3 Macc. v. 2.—παραγενόμενος: having come, i.e., to the place where the Sadducees met, not merely pleonastic; the verb may fairly be regarded as characteristic of St. Luke in both his writings—it occurs eight times in his Gospel and thirty in the Acts, and frequently absolutely as here—elsewhere in N.T. only eight or nine times, frequent in LXX.—τὸ συνεδρῖον καὶ πάσαν τὴν γερουσίαν: does γερουσία represent an assembly or body in addition to the συνεδρῖον, or do the two words represent the same Court? The word γερ. appears nowhere else in the N.T., but in the LXX it is used in several places of the Jewish Sanhedrin, 1 Macc. xii.6; 2 Macc. iv.10, iv.44, xi.27, Jud. iv.8, xiv.4, xv.8. In the N.T. the Sanhedrin is also called πρεσβυτέριον, Luke xxii.66, Acts xxii.5. If the two words denote the same body καὶ must be regarded as merely explicative (so Wendt as against Meyer) to emphasise the solemn importance and representative nature of the assembly (so Grimm-Thayer to signify the full Sanhedrin sub v. γερ. and so apparently Blass). If we adopt Rendall’s view καὶ may still be explicative, but in another way, specifying the comprehensive character of this meeting as compared with the hasty and informal gathering in iv. 5, 6 (cf. Kunoel’s view, in loco). The difficulty has caused others to suggest that γερ. refers to men of age and experience who were asked to join the Council as assessors, or to some other assembly larger than the Sanhedrin and only summoned on special occasions. For the former view, Lumby and Plumptre (see also Page’s note) refer to Mishna, foma, i., i, where mention is made of “the chamber of the assessors,” parhedin = πάρεδροι. Further we may note, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 172, E.T., in a note on this passage points out that as there can be no doubt as to the identity of the two conceptions συνεδρῖον and γερουσία (so too Zöckler and Weiss, in loco), καὶ must be taken as explanatory, or St. Luke makes a mistake in assuming that the συνεδρῖον was of a less comprehensive character than the γερουσία, “the Sanhedrin and all the elders of the people together”. Schürer prefers the latter alternative, but the former may reasonably be maintained not only from the Greek text but also because St. Luke’s information admittedly derived from a Jewish-Christian source is not likely to have been inaccurate. Hilgenfeld agrees with Weiss that in the source the O.T. expression γερουσία, Exod. iii.16, iv.29, xi.21, stood alone, but that the reviser prefixed the usual expression συνεδρῖον which in v. 27 and 34 is found without any addition. On “Synhedrion,” see Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, ii., 8, 1149, and “Aelteste,” i., 1, pp. 59, 60, and O. Holtzmann, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, pp. 175, 176 (1893).—πρεσβυτέριον, xvi.26; Thuc.
1 After παραγνώμην D adds καὶ ανασταρέσαντες τιν φυλακήν, so Par., Vulg., Syr. H. mg.; cf. ver. 23, assimilation or revision?

2 εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον, αὐχθήναι αὐτούς. 22. οἱ δὲ υπηρέται παραγενόμενοι οὐχ εὑρόν αὐτοὺς εἰκονα εν τῇ φυλακῇ, αναστρέψαντες δὲ απήγγειλαν, λέγοντες, 23. "Οτι τὸ μὲν δεσμωτήριον εὑρομεν κεκλεισμένον εν τῇ φυλακῇ, καὶ τοὺς φυλακας εξω εστῶτας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν αὐτούς, ἐσω οὐδένα εὑρομεν. 24. ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν 

25. παραγενόμενος δὲ τὸς απήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, "οτι οὐδε εἰσεθοῦ ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, εἰσιν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ ἑστῶτες καὶ διδάσκοντες τὸν
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V.

26. Τότε ἀπελθὼν ὁ στρατηγὸς σὺν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ἦγαγεν αὐτούς, οὗ μετὰ βίας, ἐφοβοῦτο γὰρ τὸν λαὸν, ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν. 27. ἀγαγόντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς ὁ ἄρχοντας λέγων, οὐ δὲ παραγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν μὴ ἔλθῃ τοῦδε τοῦ συνεδρίου τοῦτο; καὶ ιδοὺ, πεπληρώκατε τὴν ἱερουσαλήμ τῆς ἱδαξῆς ὑμῶν, καὶ βουλεύσατε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς τὸ

1 ἦγαγεν AE, Vulg., Chrys., Lucif.; D* ήγαγον; την ΝΒΔ9, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss. 
2 ἀρχεῖον; D, Gig., Par., Lucif. have περέας, Flor. praetor = στρατηγός, instead; other additions in Flor., but no difference in sense.
3 στρατηγός, Vulg., Chrys., Lucif., D* ηγαγόν; ηγεν δSBD, so Τisch., W.Η., Weiss. 
4 ηγαγεν ΑΕ, Vulg., Chrys., Lucif., D* ηγαγον; ηγεν δSBD, so Τisch., W.Η., Weiss. 

εφοβοῦντο γάρ τὸν λαόν, ινά μὴ λιθασθώσιν, Flor. om., represents φοβοῦμενος μηποτελιθασθη υπο του λαου; D φοβουμενος γαρ. ιναom. δSΒDΕ 5,13,4ο,96,so Τisch., W.Η., Weiss, Gentile.

ηγαγεν ΑΕ, Vulg., Chrys., Lucif., D* ηγαγον; ηγεν δSBD, so Τisch., W.Η., Weiss. εφοβουντο...λιθασθωσιν, Flor. om., represents φοβουμενος μηποτελιθασθη υπο του λαου; D φοβουμενος γαρ. ιναom. δSΒDΕ 5,13,4ο,96,so Τisch., W.Η., Weiss, Gentile.

εφοβουντο γάρ τὸν λαόν: the favour of the people which the Apostles so fully enjoyed at this time might well have caused an outbreak of fanaticism as later in the case of Stephen. The subjectsto εφοβ. and toέστησαν(27) areο στρατ. and οι υπηρέται. St. Chrysostom well comments on those who would thus fear - not God, but the people. On the Greek of the verse, see Viteau, Le Grec du N.T., p. 56 (1896). -ίνα μη λιθασθώσιν: the reading μη undoubtedly correct, so W.Η., Wendt, Weiss, Wendt, who think with Alford that it was suggested by επηρώτησεν; Blass retains the negative, so Hilg.

27. ἔστησαν, cf. iv.7, during the investigation the judges would sit, vi.15, xxiii.3, the accused, the witnesses, and those speaking, stood, Mark xiv.57, 6ο, Ατς iv.7, ν.27, 34, vi.13, χxiii.9, Ο. Ηoltzmann, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, p. 177.

28. παραγγελεῖν παραγγείλεμεν: for the Hebraism cf. iv.17, “we straitly,” etc., R.V. (and A.V.), expressing intensity - “commanding, we commanded you,” Wycliffe. The T.R. makes the clause a question, commencing with ου, but the evidence is too strong against it, evidently it was occasioned by the επηρώτησεν, but St. Chrysostom adopts it, see Hom., xiii., 1. Bengel remarks on παραγγελία, “pudet dicere minando, iv.17, nam non poterant ponerre.” But St. Chrysostom rightly notes that they ought to have asked πῶς ἔξηλθε, i.e., from the prison, but they ask as if nothing had happened. -ιν αὐτόστι νού, 6ο, Ατς iv.17, here as there the Council do not mention the name of Jesus, perhaps because they disdained it; in sharp contrast stands not only St. Peter’s mention of the name, but his glorying in it, ver. 3ο, 31. —τὴν ἱερουσαλήμ: fem. here and elsewhere, cf. Gal. iv.25, Rev. iii.12, 8ο in Matt.
30. πέτρος και οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶτον, ἵνα μὴ μακάριον ἡ ἀνθρώποις. 30. ὁ θέας τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἤγειρεν ἤσυχον, δι' ὅμεις διεξεράσθη

ο Π., article om. ΝΑΒΕΗΡ, Bas., Chrys., so W. H., Weiss; εἶπον, but -αν ΝΑΒΕ, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss. At the commencement of the verse αποκ. . . . τος αὐτοῦ is omitted in D, and the words πειθαρχεῖν δεί (δε in D) follow as part of the high priest's remarks; but Blass in β, following Flor., Gig., Lucif., adds to αποκ. δε Πετρος the words εἶτεν πρὸς αὐτοῦ, and proceeds "τινὶ πειθαρχεῖν δεὶ Θεὸν ἡ ἀνθρώποις;" making these words a question asked by Peter of the high priest, who, replies, according to a further addition of Flor., Gig., ο δε εἶτεν "Θεῷ." Weiss, Codex D, p. 64, thinks that the emendator took offence at the repetition of iv. 19, and therefore places the words πειθαρχεῖν δεί (not δεί) κ.τ.λ. on the lips of the high priest as if he thus took up his own words contemptuously in addressing the Apostles, and the whole from βουλεσθε might thus originally have formed a question: "You wish to bring this man's blood upon us—but thus, indeed, to obey God rather than man? Such blood revenge cannot surely be the command of God:" but see further Blass, in loco, and Weiss, u. s. D, Flor., Gig. all add at the end of ver. 29, as introductory to ver. 30, ο δε Πετρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς.

ii. 3, Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 32; Winer-Schmidt, p. 153—διδαχής, "teaching," R.V., cf. Matt. vii. 28—βουληθε: the charge was untrue—the wish was their own, not that of the Apostles, cf. Matt. xxvii. 25. St. Peter's earnest desire was that they should be saved.—παγανισμ, xviii. 6, xxii. 20, and 2 Sam. i. 16, cf. 2 Peter ii. 1, 5; nowhere else in N. T.—φωνα: to bring His blood upon us, i.e., the vengeance of the people for His murder. αἷμα πρὸ φόνον, Hebraistic—no thought of divine punishment from their point of view; cf. LXX. Gen. xx. 9, Exod. xxxii. 34. Judges ix. 24, and cf. Josh. xii. 15 (in N. T., Matt. xxviii. 35. Rev. xviii. 24).

Ver. 29. St. Peter as the spokesman, primus inter parsi; the Apostles as a body are associated with him in his answer: "but Peter and the Apostles," R. V. A. V. renders "Peter and the other Apostles," and we may understand an ellipse of άλλοι or λοιποί before οἱ ἀπόστολοι, Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 286.—ἀποκ., cf. Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. xxix (up to p. xxvii). The word is used by St. Luke and St. Paul; cf. ver. 32, xxvii. 21. Titus iii. 1; in this chapter and in St. Paul, in its classical use, obeying one in authority, or τοῖς νόμοις, etc. The word is used in Polybius, and Josephus, and frequently in Philo, but only three times in the LXX; cf. 1 Esd. viii. 94, of obeying the law of the Lord. The reply of St. Peter, who speaks for all the Apostles, is practically the same as in iv. 19, but still more decisive in its tone as was natural after the recent command, ver. 20.

Ver. 30. ὁ θέας τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, cf. iii. 13. St. Peter, as before, will not dissociate himself from the commonwealth of Israel, or his hearers from the message and works of the Christ.—ἡγείρεν: does this word refer to the Resurrection, or to the sending of Jesus into this world, and His raising up by God as the Messiah? The former is the view taken by St. Chrysostum, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and amongst moderns by Meyer-Weidt, Nösgen, Alford, Overbeck, Pelten, Blass, Hultzmann, Weiss, Higgenfeld; but in iii. 15, 10, the phrase is ἡγείρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν (cf. Ecclesiast. xlviii. 5: ὁ εγείρας νεκρῶν ἐκ θανάτου), although in x. 40, xiii. 17, the word evidently refers to the Resurrection. Others interpret the word as ἀνίστημι in iii. 22, and as in xiii. 22, ἡγείρειν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δανείδ (cf. Luke i. 69, vii. 16), so Calvin, Bengel, De Wette, Lachler, Hackett, Page. One of the chief arguments for the former interpretation is the contrast marked in the next clause between the death of the Cross and the Resurrection, but this contrast would still be marked by the following verb. Is it not possible that, as in the days of old God had raised up a Saviour, or Saviours, for Israel, cf. Jud. ii. 18, ἡγείρει K. αὐτοῖς εἰρήται, Jud. iii. 9, 15, ἡγείρει K. σωτῆρα τῷ Ἱ., St. Peter may now speak of Him as raising up Ἰησοῦν, i.e., a Saviour? see further, ver. 31.—διεξεράσθη, cf. xxvi. 21, "whom ye slew, hanging Him on a tree," R. V., not as in A. V., "whom ye slew and hanged on a tree," which would make the words refer to a Jewish mode of punishment, for, according to Jewish
kreμασάντες επὶ ξύλου. 31. τούτων ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα ὑψωσε τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ. δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ ἱσραήλ καὶ ἀφεσὶν ἁμαρτιῶν. 32. καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔσωμεν αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου, ὅ ἐδώκεν τῷ θεῷ τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ.


law, only those were hanged who were already dead (Deut. xxvi. 22, Josh. x. 26). The word which means in middle to lay hands upon, and so to slay, to kill, is only used by St. Luke (not in LXX), and forcibly represents the guilt of the Jews in the murder of Jesus, as if they had perpetrated it with their own hands (cf. xxvi. 24), "made away with violently," Page; cf. instances in Wetstein (trucidastes).—κρεμασάντες επὶ ξύλου, LXX, Gen. xli. 10, Deut. xxxii. 22, 23, Josh. x. 26, Esth. v. 14, vi. 4 (Gal. iii. 13). Although St. Luke uses κρεμασθείς of crucifixion, Luke xxiii. 39, St. Peter alone uses the exact phrase of the text given in x. 39, and so he too has ἐξολοθρεῖν, 1 Pet. ii. 24, for the Cross (although St. Paul uses the same word, Acts xiii. 29). The word may therefore have a place amongst the many coincidences between St. Peter's addresses and the language of his Epistles, see above on pp. 121 ff. The fact that their victim was thus accursed in the eyes of the law aggravated their guilt, and at the same sharply contrasted their act and that of God; for a similar contrast see iii. 14, 15.

Ver. 31. ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα: the former word as it is used here without any qualification, cf. iii. 15, may imply, like σωτήρα, a reference to the earlier days of Israel's history, when God raised up for them from time to time judges of whom the title ἀρχηγός, Jud. xi. 6, 11, might be used no less than σωτήρ. In Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, St. Peter saw the true Leader and Saviour. For St. Peter no less than for St. Paul the ascended Jesus had led captivity captive and received gifts for men, cf. Luke xxiv. 47-49.—δύων τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, cf. ii. 33: "exalt with his right hand," R.V., "at" margin. Here as elsewhere Briggs interprets τῇ δεξιᾷ as local not instrumental, and prefers R.V. margin, Messiah of the Apostles, p. 37, note; but see note on ii. 33 above. The verb is used also by St. John, iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32, and also by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 9 (see Wetcott on St. John iii. 14). But in the passive (as twice in St. John) it is employed in the LXX of the high exaltation of the Servant of God, in the picture which had evidently passed before the eyes of St. Peter, Isaiah lii. 13; and he sees in the ascension of his Lord, and His spiritual sovereignty, a fulfilment of the prophecy of the suffering Servant, who is also a Prince and a Saviour.

Ver. 32. "And we are witnesses of these things," R.V. (W. H.), but in margin, "witnesses in Him," εν αὐτῷ (cf. Luke xxiv. 47); "nos in eo testes sumus," Iren., see also above critical notes. For an explanation of the reading in T.R. and the two genitives, see Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 84, note, and compare 2 Cor. v. 1, Phil. ii. 30, 1 Thess. i. 3.—ρημάτων: here = Hebrew רְנס, cf. x. 37 (Grotius, Blass), the words standing for their contents, i.e., the things, the facts. Meyer understood the facts to be the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus, but Wendt understands them to be the gifts of the Messianic salvation mentioned in ver. 31, and compares ver. 20. But the use of the word in ver. 20 need not limit its use here: the Apostles were called above all things to witness to the facts of Christ's life, x. 37, and the γεν. in ver. 20 depended upon the Resurrection. In Luke i. 37 R.V. has "no word," βήμα, where A.V. has "no thing," cf. Luke i. 65, where A.V. has "things" in the margin.
33. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεκρίνοντο, καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο ἀνελεῖν αὐτῶς.
34. Ἀναστὰς δὲ τὸς ἄγιον ἰδίως ἁγιασάτος, ἐνόματι Γαμαλιήλ.

(ὑμαῖν), καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο αὐτοὺς.

33. διεκρίνοντο: lit., were sawn asunder (in heart), dissecabantur, Vulgate (cf. use of finito in Persius and Plautus), cf. vii. 54 (Luke ii. 35), Euseb., H. E., v., i., 6 (see Grimm, στό v.). The word is used in its literal sense in Aristoph., Equites, 768, Plato, Conv., p. 193 α, and once in the LXX, t Chron. xx. 3. The rendering “sawed their teeth” would certainly require τους οδόντας as in other cases where the verb (and the simple verb also) has any such meaning. Dr. Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, pp. 72, 73, also refers to its use in the comic poet Eubulus (Meineke), 3, 255, and classes it among the words (colloquial) common to the comic poets (including Aristophanes) and the N.T. Here we have not the pricking of the heart, ii. 37, which led to contrition and repentance, but the painful indignation and envy which found vent in seeking to rid themselves of the disciples as they had done of their Master.—ἀνελεῖν: the verb is found no less than nineteen times in Acts, twice in St. Luke’s Gospel, and only two or three times in the rest of the N.T., once in Matt. ii. 16, Heb. x. 9 (2 Thess. ii. 8); often used as here in LXX and classical Greek; it is therefore not one of those words which can be regarded as distinctly medical terms, characteristic of St. Luke (so Hobart and Zahn), although it is much used in medical writers. The noun ἁναίρεσις, viii. 1, is only found in St. Luke, and is also frequent in medical writers, Hobart, Medical Language of St. Luke, pp. 209, 210; but this word is also used in LXX of a violent death or destruction, cf. Numb. xi. 15, Judith xv. 4, 2 Macc. v. 13. At the same time it is interesting to note that ἐπιχειρεῖν, another medical word characteristic of St. Luke, and used by him in the sense of attempting, trying, is found with ἀνελεῖν in Acts ix. 20, cf. Zahn, Einleitung, iii., p. 384, with which Hobart compares ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἑαυτὸς ἁναλεῖν ἐπιχειρεῖ τὸ νόσημα (Galen), see in loco.

34. Ἀναστάς, see ver. 17.—συνεδρίπ: the word is used here and in ver. 27 above, without ἀγωνία, and
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

V.

νομοδιδάσκαλος τίμιος παντί τῷ λαῷ, ἐκλέκτων ἐξω βραχὺ τι τοὺς ἀποστόλους 1 ποιῆσαι, 35. ἐπὶ τε πρὸς αὐτούς, ἀνδρεῖς Ἰσραηλίται, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τούτους τί μελετε πράσσειν.

1 τι ΗΡ (put by many before ποιησαι); om. ΝΑΒΔΕ, vers., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. τοὺς ἀποστόλους DEHP, Par., Flor., Gig. (Vulg. am.cor. tol.), Sah., Syrr. P. and H., Aeth., Chrys.; τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ΝΑΒ (Vulg.), Boh., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, so also Blass in β; cf. vv. 35, 38, but here in narrative ἀνθρωπ. seemed undignified word.

2 αὐτούς; D (Flor.), Sah. has τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς συνεδρους (-ιους), d has "concilium," Flor. "ad totum concilium". Ἰσραηλίται, see above.

this seems to indicate that in ver. 21 the Sanhedrin is meant, and no additional council. —Γαμαλιήλ: it has sometimes been urged that Saul, the persecutor, could not have been the pupil of such a man as is here described—a man who was so liberal in his religious opinions, and so adverse to political agitation. But whatever may have been the extent of his liberality, Gamaliel remained firmly attached to the traditions of the fathers, and whilst we may see in his recorded principle his abhorrence of wrangling and over-scrupulosity, we may also see in it a proof of his adherence to traditionalism: "Procure thyself a teacher, avoid being in doubt; and do not accustom thyself to give tithes by guess" (Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, p. 128). But in itself there is nothing strange in the fact that Saul should surpass the zeal of Gamaliel, for not only does history often show us how one side of the teaching of a master may be exaggerated to excess by a pupil, but also the specific charge against Stephen of destroying the Temple and of changing the customs of Moses had not been formulated against St. Peter and his brother-Apostles, who still attended the Temple worship, and whose piety gained them the regard of the people. That charge against the first martyr was nothing less than the charge brought against Jesus of Nazareth: the burning words and scathing denunciations of Stephen could only be answered, as those of Jesus had been answered, by the counter charge of blasphemy, and the punishment of death (see Sahatier’s L’Apôtre Paul, 21 ff.).

Gamaliel appears as an ordinary member, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the high priest was always the President during the Roman-Herodian period. Not until after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the priesthood had lost its importance, was a Rabbi chosen as President of a reconstituted Sanhedrin. For a summary of the views for and against the Rabbinic tradition that this Gamaliel was the President of the Sanhedrin, see Appendix iii., “The President of the Sanhedrin,” by the late Rev. H. A. White, in Dr. Edersheim’s History of the Jewish Nation, p. 522 ff. The influence of Gamaliel may easily be understood (1) when we remember that whilst the ἄρχοντας belonged chiefly if not exclusively to the Sadducees, the Pharisees who also had seats in the Sanhedrin (cf. Acts xxiii. 6, and Jos., B. Ζ. ii., 17, 3, Vita, 38, 39, C. Apion, ii., 22) possessed practically a predominating influence in the Council. The remark of Jos., Ant., xviii., 1, 4, gives us, as Schürer says, “a deep insight into the actual position of matters,” Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 175 ff., E.T., and O. Holtzmann Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 175. (2) But we have also to take into account the personal influence of the man, which was no doubt at its height about the time described in Acts v.—he died A.D. 57-58. Not only was he the first teacher of the seven to whom the title Rabban was given (higher than that of Rab or Rabbi), but Jewish tradition respecting him shows the dignity and influence which attached to his name, Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, ii., 2, 236, and see on the titles given to Gamaliel, Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 239-246, and Schürer, u. s., p. 364. We may see a further proof of his influence in the fact that a certain proviso with regard to the determining leap year, which was passed in the Sanhedrin in his absence, was only to come into force if it received the confirmation of Gamaliel (Edajoth, vii., 7). So far then St. Luke’s account of the weight which would be carried by Gamaliel in the assembly is amply justified, and Schürer’s description of the constitution of the Sanhedrin, u. s., p. 174 ff., is sufficient reply to the strictures of Jüngst.


3 ανηρεθη, instead Ν.Τ. has διελυθη αυτος δι' αυτου (dissolutis sunt omitted below). Eus. and Par. read κατελυθη (the latter dissolutus est = διελ. or κατελ.); see Blast, who maintains with Belser that this word rather than ανηρεθη is required by Gamaliel's argument, but why? εαυτοει, after this word διελ. omitted by D, και om. in d, and και εγεν. in Par. but διελ. (dissoluti sunt) retained. (Weiss holds that the corrector refers to the subject of κατελυθη not to Θευδας but to αριθμος.)
37. After these things, Judas the Galilean rose up in the days of the enrollment, and gathered together a great multitude of people, persuading them to follow him to the Jordan, saying that the waters would divide and all those who followed him. But the Roman procurator, Cuspius Fadus, sent a troop of horsemen to meet him, some of his followers were slain, others taken captive, whilst he himself was made prisoner and beheaded, and his head was sent to Jerusalem. Josephus, Ant., xv., 1, 9.

But a serious chronological discrepancy must be faced if the Theudas of Josephus is the Theudas of St. Luke. Gamaliel speaks of a Theudas who arose before the days of the enrollment, i.e., about 6-7 B.C. But are they the same? As early as the days of Origen their identity was denied (c. Cels., i., 57), see “Acts,” B.D. Bishop Lightfoot, p. 40, and in comparing the two accounts in Josephus and Acts there is no close resemblance beyond the name, see Nösgen, in loco, and Belser, Theol. Quartalschrift, i., p. 70 (1896). St. Luke speaks definitely of 400 followers; Josephus evidently considers that the pretender was much more successful, so far as numbers were concerned, for he writes: πείθει τόν πλείων δικλον. These and similar discrepancies are also well insisted upon by Zahn in his recent Introduction, ii., 416, 417 (1899), and his own conclusion is that only such ordinary words are common to the two accounts as Luke, ἀνηρέθη, Ιούδας; Jos., ἀνείλε, Luke, ἐπείθε, and that we cannot get beyond the bounds of possibility that the two authors refer to the same fact (on Zahn’s criticism of Krenkel’s view of the dependence of Luke on Josephus in the narrative, see u. s.). In referring to the appearance of the many false Messiahs, such as the Theudas of Josephus, Ant., xx., 5, 1, Dr. Edersheim, Sketches of Jewish Social Life, p. 66, remarks: “Of course this could not have been the name, and the movement were not solitary in Israel at the time”; see also Ramsay, Was Christ born in Bethlehem? p. 259. And no testimony could be stronger than that of Josephus himself to the fact that at the time of the Advent Judaea was full of tumults and seditions and pretenders of all kinds, Ant., xvii., 10, 4, 8; B. J., ii., 4, 1. The view has been maintained by many commentators that the Theudas of Josephus may reasonably be supposed to be one of the many false teachers and leaders mentioned by the Jewish historian and not always by name, who pandered to the feverish hopes of the people and gave themselves out as of kingly rank—(so recently Belser, Felen, Page, Plumptre, Knabenbauer). The name Theudas contracted from Theodorus may not have been so common as that of Simon or Judas (although on the other hand, see Nösgen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 147)—“Josephus describes four men bearing the name of Simon within forty years, and three that of Judas within ten years, all of whom were instigators of rebellion”—but it was the Greek equivalent to several familiar Hebrew names, e.g., Jonathan, Matthias; and Bishop Lightfoot allows that there is something to be said for Wieseler’s suggestion that on the ground of the name the Theudas here may be identified with Matthias, the son of Margalothus, an insurgent in the time of Herod, prominent in the pages of Josephus, Ant., xvii., 6, 2 (see also Zöckler on the whole question, Apostelgeschichte, p. 139, 2nd edit.). We must admit the objection of Wendt that this and other identifications of names and persons cannot be proved (and some of them certainly are very precarious, as Alford pointed out), but we cannot suppose that St. Luke could have made the gross blunder attributed to him in the face of his usual accuracy (see Blass, Acta Apostolorum, p. 90), or endorse with Schürer what he calls “the slight authority of the Acts in such matters” (Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 169). If it is hardly possible that Josephus can have been mistaken, although some writers...
κάκείνος ἀπέλευ, καὶ πάντες ὅσι ἐπέθειντο αὐτῷ διεσκορπίσθησαν.

38. καὶ τὰ τῶν λέγω ὅμι, ἀπόστητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων, καὶ

have held that it is by no means impossible that even here he may have been (cf. Alford, Rendall, Belser, and compare the remarks of Zahn, ubi supra), we may at least claim the same probability of freedom from error for St. Luke, "temporum bene memorum se scriptor monstrat: quo minus est probabile uum de Theudas tam gravior errasse quam pliereque putant" (Blass), and see the recent remarks of Ramsay, Was Christ born at Bethlehem? p. 252 ff. It cannot be said that some recent attempts at a solution of the difficulty are very promising; for whilst H. Holtzmann severely blames Blass for maintaining that even here he may have been (cf. Alford, Rendall, Belser, and compare the remarks of Zahn, ubi supra), we may at least claim the same probability of freedom from error for St. Luke, * temporum bene memorem se scriptor πmonstrat: quo minus est probabile εum de Τheuda tam gravitererrassequam Ρlerique putant* (Βlass), and see the recent remarks of Ramsay, Was Christ born at Βethlehem: p. 252 ff. It cannot be said that some recent attempts at a solution of the difficulty are very promising; for whilst Η. Ηoltzmann severely blames Βlass for maintaining that some Christian had interpolated the name Τheudas in the text of Josephus (see Blass, in loco, and p. xvi., edit. min.), he himself is prepared to endorse the view τεcently maintained amongst others by Clemen that the writer of Acts in his mention of Theudas gives us a vague but yet recognisable recollection of Jos., *Ant., xx., 5, 15; see in loco and Theol. Literaturzeitung, 3, 1896, and 13, 1897.* B. Weiss thinks that the notorious difficulty may easily be got rid of by supposing that the reviser inserted the example of Τheudas in the wrong place, *Einleitung in das N. T.,* p. 574.— λέγων είνα τινα εαυτόν: of consequence, really "somebody," cf. viii. 9 (and R.V.); "ein grosser Mann," Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.,* p. 76; so it has its opposite, οὐδείς, cf. instances in Weitstein in classical Greek; so in Latin *quidam, aliquid, Juvenal, i., 74; Cicero, ad Atticum, iii., 15; and cf. also 1 Cor. iii. 7, Gal. ii. 6, vi. 3; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.,* p. 148 (1893). And yet the jealous eye of the Pharisees was blind to the difference between such a man as Theudas, whom Gamaliel so contemptuously described, and the Apostles who sought not their own honour (Nōsgen); cf. Vulgate, "dicens se esse aliquem," so Rhem. and Wycl., "saying that he was somebody".——προσεκολλήθη: better reading προσκλίθη, a word not found elsewhere in N.T., cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 24; and so also in LXX, cf. Ps. xxxix. (xl.) 2, Symmachus; cf. Polyb., iv., 51, 5; so also πρόσκλησις, for its further use see Clem. Rom., Cor., xlvii., 4.—οὐχί (οὐ) τερακοσίων, see above on "Theudas".—άνηρεθή, see also on ἀνθρώπων, ver. 33, often of violent death in Acts. The two clauses stand in sharp contrast—the one emphasises the large number which joined Theudas, the other the fact that notwithstanding he was slain; cf. iv. 10. —διελύθησαν κ.τ.λ.: nowhere else in N.T., but its use is quite classical, cf. Thuc., ii., 12; Xen., Cyr., v., 5, 43; Polyb., iv., 2. Blass remarks that the whole phrase "aptē de secta que paulatim dilabitur, minus aptē de multitudine per vim disjecta".—γένοντο εἰς οὐδέν: phrase only here in N.T. (cf. xix. 27), but see in LXX, Job xxiv. 25, Isa. xl, 17, Wisd. iii., 17, xx. 16. γένομαι εἰς in LXX and also in classics; in N.T. cf. Luke xiii. 19, xx. 17, Acts iv. 11, and cf. 1 Thess. iii. 5. In the first passage it is Hebraistic; in the passage before us and in 1 Thess. the phrases are quite possibly Greek, cf. especially Simcox, *Language of the N. T.,* p. 143. The phrase is more frequent in St. Luke's writings than in any other books of the N.T., except the Apocalypse.——Ver. 37. Ιουδας ο Γαλ.: here too an inaccuracy might have been charged against St. Luke, but it is to be noted that while Josephus speaks of Judas as a Gaulonite in one passage, *Jos., Ant.,* xviii., 1, 1, he frequently, as both Belser and Wendt point out, speaks of him as a Galilean, cf. Ant., xviii., 1, 6; xx., 5, 2; B. f., ii., 8, 1, and 17, 8. But the name Galilean might easily be given to him because Galilee was the scene of his exploits, or because Gamala, his home, belonged to Lower Gaulonitis, which was reckoned as part of Galilee. The accuracy of St. Luke in the account of Judas is remarkable, for Gamaliel speaks of his insurrection as coming to nothing. He could so speak, say in 34 or 35 A.D., but not some ten years later, when the followers of Judas had again gathered together, and formed a kind of school or party, to say nothing of the rebellion of his three sons, James, Simon, and later, Menahem; see Belser, n. 3, p. 61, so Lightfoot, n. 3, Nōsgen, and Alford's note.

As we consider the characteristics of such men as Theudas and Judas, it is difficult to suppose that the age which produced them could have produced the Messiah of the Gospels. He is, in truth, the Anti-Christ of Judaism. Instead of giving Himself out to be somebody, Jesus is meek and lowly of heart; instead of stirring revolt in Galilee, a burning furnace of sedition. His blessing is upon
the peace-makers; instead of seeking a kingly crown, like Judas the Gaulonite, He withdraws from those who would take Him by force, and make Him a king; instead of preaching revolt and licence in the name of liberty for merely selfish ends, He bade men render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; instead of defiantly bidding His followers to be in subjection to no man, and inaugurating a policy of bloodshed and murder, He bade them remember that whilst One was their Master and Teacher, they all were brethren. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. iii., p. 80, E.T., well points out that we have a literary memorial of the views and hopes of the Zealots in the *Assumption of Moses*, which goes so far as to prophesy that Israel will tread on the neck of the eagle, i.e., the Romans, x. 8; but see also edition of *Assumption of Moses* by Prof. Charles, p. 42.

Ver. 37. *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογ.*, see Blass, *in loco*, on St. Luke's accuracy. We must be careful to distinguish this from Luke ii. 1. The tribal method of numbering which forms an essential part of St. Luke's story in the Gospel may explain why no such serious disturbance followed as resulted from the Roman numbering and valuation which marked Quirinus' second Roman administration, "the great census," *ὁ ἄνωτος*, (in 6-8 A.D.), taken when Judaea had just become a part of the Roman province of Syria. This "great census," taken after the Roman method, involved the imposition of a tax, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 1, 1, and it was this impost which roused the indignation of Judas. To pay tribute to a foreign power was to violate an Israelite's allegiance to Jehovah: "We have no Lord and Master but God," was the watchword of Judas and his followers. For the whole subject see Ramsay, *Expositor*, April and June, 1897, and *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (1898), e.g., pp. 107, 108, 127, 139. — *καὶ ἄνωτος λαός*: used here transitively, and here only in the N.T., cf. Deut. vii. 4, and in classical writers, Herod., i., 76. The verb *ἀφίστημι* is not found in any of the Gospels except St. Luke's, where it occurs four times, and in the Acts six times. It is not only one of the words characteristic of the two books, but also of St. Luke and St. Paul (so also *μεθίστημι*, see on xix. 26), as it is only found once outside St. Paul's Epistles (in which it is employed four times), viz., Heb. iii. 12; "drew away some of the people," R.V. There is no word which actually expresses this as in T.R., where we have *ἀλέκαν* = "much." — *διεσκορπίσθησαν*: it is true that the sect revived under the name of Zealots, and played an active part in the Jewish wars, but there is no reason for charging St. Luke's account with inaccuracy (so Overbeck following De Wette). The fate of the leader and the dispersion of his followers was quite sufficient to point the moral which Gamaliel wished to draw.

Ver. 38. *καὶ τὰ νῦν*, cf. also in iv. 29, xvii. 30, xx. 32, xxvii. 22. *τὰ* neuter accusative absolute — as respects the present, now, cf. 2 Macc. xv. 8; thus in all parts of Acts, *Vindicia Lucana*, Klostermann, p. 53. so Zeller, Leke-
39-4ο. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

αὐτῷ, μῆτοτε καὶ θεομάχοι εἴρεθη. 40. Ἐπείσθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκάλεσμένοι τοὺς ἀποστόλους, δείραντες παρήγγειλαν μὴ λαλεῖν

1 αὐτῶ C*HP, Vulg. (clem. and demid.), Sah., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Chrys.; autors ΜABCDEC, Vulg. (am. fu.), Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aeth., Bede, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.—αὐτῶ may have come in from το οργόν πάντοτε. Flor. apparently paraphrases latter part of verse, see Blass b. After autors E, Gig., Wern. add οὔτε οὐδὲ οἱ ἀρχοντες οὐτε ἰησους οὐτε τυράννοι, so Hilg. Belser lays special stress on these words, whilst Weiss only sees here and in the following words of D unfortunate attempts at emending; cf. Wisd. xii. 14, οὕτω βασιλεὺς ἡ τυραννίς, and see also below on vi. 10. D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor. demid., 33 mg., 180 add απεχεσθήνει αὐτῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ. Weiss sees an empty repetition of ver. 38, but Belser finds in απεχ. that which enables the construction of the following μὴ ποτε καὶ τ.τ.λ. to run quite smoothly.

busch, Friedrich. The expression is quite classical.—έδαψε: ἐδώ characteristic of Luke, and is only used once elsewhere in the Gospels, Matt. xxiv. 43 (also in 1 Cor. x. 13), but twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and seven times in Acts—ἀπεχεσθήνει occurs only thrice in Acts: viii. 22, xiv. 17.—καταλυθήσεται, "will be overthrown," R.V. eteγtere, Blass, so Rendall. This rendering gives the proper force of the word: it is not διαλύομαι as in ver. 36, which might be rendered "will be dissolved," but ἔκτα indicates subversion, cf. Rom. xiv. 20, Acts vii. 14, Gal. ii. 18: cf. 2 Macc. ii. 22, 4 Macc. iv. 16, and frequently ibid., Vulgate, "dis solvetur.

Ver. 39. εἴναὶ... οὕτως δὲ: it has sometimes been thought that the change of mood from subjunctive to indicative, "but if it is of God," as if indicating that the second supposition were the more probable (cf. Gal. i. 8, 9), indicates sympathy on the part of Gamaliel. It is of course possible that he may have been rendered favourable disposed towards the Christians by their strict observance of the Law, and by their appeal to a doctrine which widely divided Pharisees and Sadducees. Others have attributed the change in mood, not to Gamaliel at all, but to the author (so Overbeck, Holtzmann), and have maintained (so Blass, Weiss, cf. Winer-Moulton, xii. 2) that the indicative may be used because the second is the case with which the Council had actually to deal, the assertion, i.e., of the Apostles. There may also be an underlying contrast between the transitoriness of all mere human schemes, all of which would be overthrown, and the certainty of that which is "of God," and which has Him for its Author. There cannot be the least ground for supposing that Gamaliel's counsel was in its tenor a mere invention, as it bears the impress of a thorough Rabbinical wise saying, cf. Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, v., 24 (Taylor, p. 93, second edition). See too Herod., ix., 16; Eur., Hippol., vi., 76; for the construction, cf. Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 96, and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., pp. 103, 113 (1893), who compares LXX, Gen. xlix. 23, 26.—οὐ δύνασθε: R.V. and W. H., δυνάσθε. καταλυσαι with accusative of person in Xen., Cyr., viii., 5, 24; Plato, Legg., iv., p. 714, C., cf. 4 Macc. iv. 16. But without this addition it is usual to refer back to προσέχετε in ver. 35 (cf. Luke xxi. 34) for the construction of μῆτοτε; but μῆτοτε... εἴρεθη may be explained on the principle that a verb of fearing is sometimes unexpressed, the idea of fear being supplied by the context (in clauses where μὴ with the subjunctive is found), Burton, u. s., p. 96.—μῆτοτε, "lest haply," its use in later Greek, Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 208, and sometimes interpreted (so Alford, Wendt, Holtzmann), as if it meant not only against man but also against God. θεομάχοι: not found elsewhere, but cf. LXX, Job xxvi. 5, Symm., and in Prov. ix. 18, xxi. 16, applying the word to the Rephaim (see B. D. 2 "Giants"); in 2 Macc. vii. 19 we have θεομάχειν επιχειρήσεις. In classical Greek the same verb is found, see Grimm and Wendt for instances; θεομάχεια, Plato, Rep., 378, D. (as certain books of the IIiad were called, especially the xii.). The tolerance of the sentiments here attributed to Gamaliel is undoubtedly in perfect accordance with what we know of his character and opinions; the decisions attributed to him, e.g., that relating to the law of the Sabbath (Hamburger, Real-Encyclopadie des Judentums, ii., 2, 237; see also Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 239-246, and cf. also Renan, Apostles, p. 153, E. T.), are marked by a
tendency to mildness and liberality; and perhaps a still more remarkable illustration of the same tendency is afforded by the enactment so often referred to him (Hamburger, u. s.) to allow to the poor of the heathen, as well as of Israel, the gleaning and a participation in the corn left standing in the corner of the fields, to inquire after the welfare of the Gentile poor, to maintain them, to visit their sick, to bury their dead (the prayer against heretics belonged not to this Gamaliel, but to Gamaliel II.). But the decision of Gamaliel was not prompted by any sympathy with the Christians; it was the judgment of toleration and prudence, but certainly nothing more, although it scarcely falls under the head of "cynical"; it was rather, as Ewald called it, that of an ordinary politician. No credence whatever can be attributed to the tradition that Gamaliel became a Christian, or that he was secretly a Christian, although we may sympathise with St. Chrysostom's words, "it cannot be that he should have continued in unbelief to the end". The Talmud distinctly affirms that he died a Jew, and, if he had betrayed his faith, we cannot understand the honour which Jewish tradition attaches to his name, "Gamaliel," B.D.; Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 364. Wendt, while he refuses to admit the historical character of the speech of Gamaliel, is evidently puzzled to discover any definite grounds for St. Luke's wilful introduction of the famous Rabban into the scene (so too Feine). He therefore supposes that the decision in ver. 38, in which he sees a wise saying similar to those attributed to other Rabbis, was assigned by tradition to Gamaliel, and that St. Luke, who was in possession of the further tradition that Gamaliel had given a decisive judgment in the trial of the Apostles, introduces this saying into the speech which he attributes to Gamaliel as fitting to the occasion. But there is no indication in our authorities that the sentiment thus attributed to Gamaliel was in any way different from what might have been expected of him (see Schürer, Jewish People, u. s.). The chief objection to the speech, viz., the alleged anachronism involved in the mention of Theudas, really begs the question as to its authenticity, and even on the supposition of an inaccuracy in the point mentioned, we cannot get rid of the fact that the attitude of Gamaliel in itself betrays no inconsistency. It was this alleged anachronism which caused Spitta to refer the incident of Gamaliel in this chapter to his inferior source B., and to refuse to adopt the solution of Weiss and Feine, who solved the difficulty involved in the mention of Theudas by introducing the hand of a reviser.
41-42. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ονόματος αυτού κατηξιώθησαν ατιμασθήναι. 42. πασάν τε ημέραν εν τῷ λεῷ καὶ κατ’ οἶκον οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελίζομενοι ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 3

1 After om. a few cursives read αὐτοῦ; but om. ABCDHP, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.
2 Flor., Gig. add Ἰησοῦν, Par. adds Christi (see for variations Alford and Wendt). R.V., W.H., Weiss have τὸν Χριστὸν ἤνευον; D, Flor., Par. τὸν κυρίον Ι.Χ., so Hilg.

penalty which must have been a very painful one, although the command not to exceed forty stripes often led to its mitigation, was often inflicted by the synagogues, and not only by the great Sanhedrim, for all kinds of offences as against heretics and others. These verses 40-42, with the exception of the words ἐντώ ιερ. κατ’ οίκον, were referred by Jungst to the redactor on the ground that they do not fit in well after Gamaliel's speech, and that the Apostles would have been at once released, but the Apostles were punished for a transgression of the command previously laid upon them in iv. 18. According to Jungst, who here follows Spitta, the original conclusion of the narrative is to be found in inserting after ver. 39, chap. vi. 7! Here we are told is a notice, which is quite out of place where it now stands, that a great number of the priests were obedient to the faith: this was the result of the speech of Gamaliel, and his warning not to be found "fighting against God"; a speech delivered in the Sanhedrim in the midst of the priests!

Ver. 4 τ. οιμεν οὔν: no answering δέ as after i. 6, ii. 41, but explained because immediately upon ἑλπίζων (which answers to ἐκάλεσαν) follows χαιρόντες, marking the attitude of the Apostles, and showing how little they proposed to obey the injunction from fear of further punishment. But see also Mr. Rendall's note, and also his Appendix on μὴ οἴνον, Acts, p. 163, in which he examines this view at length; according to him there is an answering δέ, but it is found in the antithesis to this sentence in chap. vi. 1, the connection being that the Apostles now became more absorbed in their spiritual work, and a murmuring arose in consequence of their neglect of the distribution of the common funds. But this antithesis does not seem natural, and a censure on the Apostles is not necessarily contained in vi. i. ff.—ὑποεὐπόνοον χαιρόντες: "imperf. quia descriptur modulus" (Blass, Grammatik des N. G., p. 186; if one prophecy of their Lord had been already fulfilled, another was fulfilled in the sequel, Matt. v. 11, 12, Phil. i. 29.—κατηξιώθησαν . . . ἀτιμασθήναι: oxymoron, cf. 2 Cor. vii. 8-10; cf. Bengel's note—he calls it "eximum oxy."); The verb καταξάω is used by St. Luke in his Gospel, xxiii. 35 (xxi. 36, T.R., but not W.H. or R.V.), and here; only found once elsewhere, 3 Thess. i. 5, in a passage where the thought of Christian suffering and inheritance is combined; 2 Macc. xiii. 12, 3 Macc. iii. 21, iv. 11, 4 Macc. xviii. 3. ἀτιμασθήναι only used once elsewhere by St. Luke, cf. Luke xx. Ir, where it is also found in connection with δέρω.—ὑπέρ τοῦ ονόμ. "the Name"—i.e. the Name κατὰ ἐξοχήν, cf. 3 John 7, and James v. 14 (ii. 7) (τοῦ Κ. doubtful), cf. also Clem. Rom., 2 Cor. (so called), xiii. 4, Ignat., Ephes., iii. 1, used here as the absolute use of ὑπέρ in Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, by which the Jews understood Jehovah. See Grimm, Mayor's St. James above, and Taylor, Pirke Aboth, p. 67, second edition; cf. τῆς οδού, "the Way," ix. 2, etc.—πάσιν τε ἁμαραν: the τε joins the imperfect ἑλπίζων closely to the preceding, indicating the continuance of the work of the Apostles in spite of threats and blows, and of their resolve to welcome suffering for Christ as an honour = κατὰ πάσιν ἁμαραν. This use of ταυτοθυσια with the participle almost entirely in Luke and Paul may be regarded as a remains of literary usage, Luke v. 4, Col. i. 9, Ephes. i. 16 (Heb. x. 2); Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 193 (1893).—ἐν τῷ λεῷ καὶ κατ’ οἶκον: the words may mark a contrast between the public preaching which was not discontinued, cf. ver. 21, and the teaching continued at home in a household assembly, or κατὰ may be taken distributively, and refer to the Christian assemblies met together in various houses in the city, as in ii. 46. See Zöckler's note, and Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, pp. 259, 260.—τὸν Χρ. Ἰ.: "Jesus as the Christ," R.V. The contents of the first Apostolic preaching, the sum and substance of the Apostles'
VI. i. "EN δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν, εὐγένετο γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους, ὅτι παρε-
message to their fellow-countrymen. This is allowed and insisted upon by Schwegler, Renan, and others, but in the statement what an intimate knowledge of the life of Jesus is presupposed, and how great must have been the impression made by Him upon His daily companions!

Chapter VI. — Ver. 1. §1; cf. i. 15, and see above in v. 41. There seems no occasion to regard δὲ as marking a contrast between v. 41 and the opening of this chapter, or as contrasting the outward victory of the Church with its inward dissensions (as Meyer, Holtzmann, Zechar, see Nösgen’s criticism in loco); simply introduces a new recital as in iii. 1. It may refer back to the notice in v. 14 of the increase of the disciples, and this would be in harmony with the context. On the expression ἐν ταῖς ἡμέρας ταύτ., as characteristic of Luke, see above, and Friedrich, Das Lucasævangelium, p. 9; in both his Gospel and the Acts expressions with ἡμέρα abound. Harnack admits that in passing to this sixth chapter “we at once enter on historical ground,” Expositor, v., p. 324 (3rd series). For views of the partition critics see Wendt’s summary in new edition (1899), p. 140, Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 390 ff. (1895), and also in commentary below. Wendt sees in vi. 1-7 the hand of the redactor, the author of Acts ii. 5; others suppose that we have in vi. the commencement of a new Hellenistic source; so Peine, J. Weiss, Hilgenfeld. Clemen refers vi. 7, 8 to his Historia Petri, whilst ver. 9 commences his Historia Hellenistarum (vv. 1-6 belong to a special source); others again see in chap. vi. the continuance of an earlier source or sources.—πληθυνόντων, when the number of the disciples was multiplying (present part.); verb frequent in LXX, sometimes intrans. as here, Exod. i. 20, etc., and see Psalms of Solomon, x., 1, and note in Ryle and James’ edition; cf. also its classical use in its more correct form, πληθύνω, in the Acts: vi. 7, vii. 17, ix. 31, xii. 24. On St. Luke’s fondness for this and similar words (Friedrich) see p. 73. Weiss calls it here a very modest word, introduced by one who knew nothing of the conversations in many of the preceding chapters. But the word, and especially its use in the present participle, rather denotes that the numbers went on increasing, and so rapidly that the Apostles found the work of relief too great for them.—μαθητῶν, the word occurs here for the first time in the Acts (surely an insufficient ground for maintaining with Hilgenfeld that we are dealing with a new source). The same word is found frequently in each of the Gospels, twenty-eight times in Acts (μαθητὴρια once, ix. 36), but never in the Epistles. It evidently passed into the ancient language of the early Church from the earthly days of the ministry of Jesus, and may fairly be regarded as the earliest designation of the Christians; but as the associations connected with it (the thought that Jesus was the διδάσκαλος and His followers His μαθηταῖ) passed into the background it quickly dropped out of use, although in the Acts the name is still the rule for the more ancient times and for the Jewish-Christian Churches; cf. xxi. 16. In the Acts we have the transition marked from μαθηταῖ to the bretien and saints of the Epistles. The reason for the change is obvious. During the lifetime of Jesus the disciples were called after their relationship to Him; after His departure the names given indicated their relation to each other and to the society (Dr. Sanday, Inspiration, p. 289). And as an evidential test of the date of the various N.T. writings this is just what we might expect: the Gospels have their own characteristic vocabulary, the Epistles have theirs, whilst Acts forms a kind of link between the two groups, Gospels and Epistles. It is, of course, to be remembered that both terms ἀδελφοί and ἀγιοι are also found in Acts, not to the exclusion of, but along side with, μαθηταί (cf., e.g., ix. 26, 30, xxi. 4, 7, 16, 17): the former in all parts of the book, and indeed more frequently than μαθηταί, as applied to Christians; the latter four times, ix. 13, 32, 41, xxxvi. 10. But if our Lord gave the charge to His disciples recorded in St. Matt. xxviii. 19, bidding them make disciples of all the nations, μαθητεύσατε (cf. also Acts xiv. 21 for the same word), then we can understand that the term would still be retained, as it was so closely associated with the last charge of the Master, whilst a mutual discipleship involved a mutual brotherhood (Matt. xxiii. 8). St. Paul in his Epistles would be addressing those who enjoyed through Christ a common share with himself in a holy fellowship and calling, and whom...
he would therefore address not as μαθηταί but as ἀδελφοὶ and άγιοι. They were still μαθηταί, yet not of man but of the Lord (only in one passage in Acts, and that a doubtful one, ix. 43, is the word μαθηταί or μαθητής used of any human teacher), and the word was still true of them with that significance, and is still used up to a period subsequent (we may well believe) to the writing of several of Paul’s Epistles, Acts xxi. 16. How the word left its impress upon the thought of the Church, in the claim of the disciple to be as his Master, is touchingly evidenced by the expressions of St. Ign., Ephes. i. 2; Magn., ix., 2; Rom. iv. 2; Tral., v., 2 (St. Polyc., Martyr, xvii., 3, where the word is applied to the martyrs as disciples of the Lord, and the prayer is offered: ἐν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνοῦς τα καὶ συμμαθητάς γίνεσθαι). — γογγυσμός and γογγύζειν are both used by St. Luke (cf. Luke v. 30), by St. John, and also by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 14, and 1 Cor. x. 10, the noun also by St. Peter, i. 4, 9. The noun is found seven times in the LXX of Israel in the wilderness (cf. 1 Cor. x. 10); so in Phil. ii. 14 it is probable that the same passage, Exod. xvi. 7, was in the Apostle’s mind, as in the next verse he quotes from the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. 5, LXX; so γογγύσ is also found in LXX with the same meaning, Numb. xiv. 27. γογγυσμός is also found in Wisd. i. 10, 11, with reference to Numb. xiv. 26, 27, and twice in Psalms of Solomon v. 15, xvi. 11. In Attic Greek τονθύρισμός would be used (so τονθύρισμος and τονθύρισμοι). Phrynichus brands the other forms as Ionic, but Dr. Kennedy maintains that γογγυσμός and γογγυσμική γογγυσμός from their frequent use in the LXX are rather to be classed amongst “vernacular terms” long continued in the speech of the people, from which the LXX drew. Both words are probably onomatopoetic.—Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, pp. 38-40, 72, 73, 76; see also Rutherford, New Phrynichus, p. 463; Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 106. Here the word refers rather to indignatio clandestina, not to an open murmuring. — Ἐβραῖοι—in W. H. with smooth breath-
πράξεις ἀποστόλων
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τοθεωρούντοἐντῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ ἀι χήραι αὐτῶν. 1 2. προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ ἵδε ἰδὼνεκα τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν, εἶπον, ὦ θείo

1 At end D adds ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῶν Ἑβραίων, according to Flor. οτι ἐν τ. καθ. διακ. αἰ χ. τῶν Ἑλλ. νῦν τῶν διακονῶν τῶν Ἑβρ. παρέθεσα. Blass in β reads simply after αἰ χ. αὐτῶν the words νῦν τῶν διακ. τῶν Ἑβραίων.


ing, see W. H., Introduction, p. 313, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 40; here those Jews in Palestine who spoke Aramaic; in the Church at Jerusalem they would probably form a considerable majority, cf. Phil. iii. 5, and Lightfoot's note. In the N. T. ἔρημοι is opposed to Ἑλλ. (Rom. i. 16), and Ἑβραῖοι to Ἑλληνιστὴς, Acts vi. 1. In the former case the contrast lies in the difference of race and religion; in the latter in the difference of customs and language. A man might be called ἄρημος, but he would not be Ἑβραῖος in the N. T. sense unless he retained in speech the Aramaic tongue; the distinction was therefore drawn on the side of language, a distinction which still survives in our way of speaking of the Jewish nation, but of the Hebrew tongue. See Trench, Synonyms, i., p. 156 ft. In the two other passages in which Ἑβρ. is used, Phil. iii. 5 and 2 Cor. xi. 22, whatever difficulties surround them, it is probable that the distinctive force of the word as explained above is implied. But as within the nation, the distinction is not recognised by later Christian writers, and that it finds no place at all in Jewish writers like Philo and Josephus, or in Greek authors like Plutarch and Pausanias (Trench, u. s.).—πρὸς, cf. St. Luke ν. 30, ἐγγύτατο πρὸς τ. μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ. The word χήρα occurs no less than nine times in St. Luke's Gospel, three times in the Acts, but elsewhere in the Evangelists only three times in St. Mark (Matt. xxiii. 14, omitted by W. H. and R. V.), and two
of these three in an incident which he and St. Luke alone record, Mark xii. 42, 43, and the other time in a passage also peculiar to him and St. Luke (if we are justified in omitting Matt. xxiii. 14), viz., Mark xii. 40.

Ver. 2. προσκαλεσάμενοι δε οι δώ δεκα: whatever may have been the irritation caused by the pride or neglect of the Hebrews, the Apostles recognised that there was ground for complaint, and thus showed not only their practical capacities, but also their freedom from any partiality. οι δώδ.: only here in Acts, but cf. I Cor. χν. 5, where St. Paul uses the title as if it were well and widely known, and required no explanation from him. It is found six times in St. Luke's Gospel, and no less than ten in St. Mark's. See also above i. 26, ii. 14.—το πλήθος = the whole Church, not the hundred-and-twenty, as J. Lightfoot. The expression is a general one, and need not imply that every single member of the Church obeyed the summons. For the word πλήθος and the illustration of its use in religious communities on the papyri by Deissmann, see p. 73. The passage has been quoted in support of the democratic constitution of the Apostolic Church, but the whole context shows that the government really lay with the Apostles. The Church as a whole is under their direction and counsel, and the Apostles alone determine what qualification those chosen should possess, the Apostles alone lay hands upon them after prayer: "The hand of man is laid upon the person, but the whole work is of God, and it is His hand which toucheth the head of the one ordained, if he be duly ordained" (Chrys., Hom., κίν.). The dignity of the Apostles, and their authority as leaders of the Church and ordinators of the Seven, is fully recognised by Feine, but he considers that their position is so altered, and the organisation of the Church so much more developed, that another source and not the Jerusalem Quellen-schrift must be supposed; but if, as Feine allows, such passages as iv. 34, v. 2, belong to the Jerusalem source, it would appear that the authority of the Apostles in the passage before us was a very plain and natural development.—καταλείψαντας: on the formation of the first aorist see Blass, Grammatik, p. 43, and also Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 18; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 109.—διακονία τραπέζαις: there seems to be an intentional antithesis between these words and τη διακονία του λόγου in ver. 3. The Twelve do not object to the work of ministering, but only to the neglect of ministering to the higher sustenance for the sake of the lower (Hort, Ecclesia, p. 206); thus Bengel speaks of the expression as used with indignation, "Antitheton, ministerium verbi". Σιακονία and διακονία are used for ministrations to man, although more usually of man to God; cf. Acts xix. 22, of service to St. Paul, διακονία, Acts xi. 29, xii. 25, of service to the brethren of Judæa in the famine, Rom. xv. 25, 31, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12, 13, of the Gentile collections for the same purpose, so too probably in Rom. xvi. 1 of the service rendered by Stephenas travelling Christians, cf. Heb. vi. 10, and its use of the verb in the Gospels of ministering to our Lord's earthly wants, Luke viii. 3, x. 40 (both noun and verb), John xii. 2; cf. also Luke xii. 37, xxii. 27, Matt. iv. 11, Luke iv. 39; see further on the use of the word in classical Greek, Hort, Ecclesia, p. 203. The word had a high dignity conferred upon it when, in contrast to the contemptuous associations which surrounded it for the most part in Greek society, Epictetus remarks that it is man's true honour to be a διάκονος of God (Diss. iii. 22, 69; 24, 65; iv. 7, 20; cf. iii. 26, 28), and a dignity immeasurably higher still, when the Son of Man could speak of Himself as in Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45; cf. Luke xxii. 27. "Every clergyman begins as a deacon. This is right. But he never ceases to be a deacon. The priest is a deacon still. The bishop is a deacon still. Christ came as a deacon, lived as a deacon, died as a deacon: μη διακονηθήναι, αλλά διακονήσαι" (Lightfoot, Ordination Sermons, p. 115). In the LXX the verb does not occur at all, but διάκονος is used four times in Esther i. 10, ii. 2, vi. 3, 5, of the king's chamberlains and of the servants that ministered to him, and once in 4 Macc. ix. 17; διακονία is also found in two of the passages in Esther just quoted, vi. 3 and 5, where in A we read οι εκ της διακονίας (ΒS διάκονοι), and once in 1 Macc. xi. 58, of the service of gold sent by Jonathan to Antiochus. What is meant by the expression here? does it refer to distribution of money or in kind? The word in itself might include either, but if we were to limit διακονία to alms, yet the use of the word remarked upon above renders the service higher than that of ordinary relief: "ministration," says St. Chrysostom (although he takes it of alms, Hom., xiv.), "extolling by this at once the doers, and
those to whom it was done." But ἀνθρωπογεία present a further difficulty; does it refer to the tables of exchange for money, a rendering which claims support from Matt. xxii. 12, xxv. 27, Luke xix. 23, John ii. 15, or to tables for food, Luke xvi. 21, xxii. 21, 30? Possibly the use of the word in some passages in the N.T., and also the fact that the διακονία was καθημερινή, may indicate the latter, and the phrase may refer to the actual serving and superintending at the tables at which the poor sat, or at all events to the supplying in a general way those things which were necessary for their bodily sustenance. Ζόεκler, Apostelgeschichte (second edition), refers the word to the ministration of the gifts of love offered at the Eucharist in the various Christian houses (so Scaliger understood the expression of the Αγαπη). Mr. Humphry reminds us that the words were quoted by Latimer (1548) in a sermon against some bishops of his time who were comptrollers of the mint.

Ver. 3. ἐπισκέψασθε οὖν: the verb, though frequently used by St. Luke in both his writings, is not elsewhere used in the sense of this verse, "look ye out," cf. σκέπτεσθαι in Gen. xli. 33. μαρτυρουμένου, cf. Heb. xi. 2, 39, and cf. 4, 5, and 1 Tim. v. 10, Acts x. 22, xxii. 12, also xvi. 2; cf. its use also in Clem. Rom., Cor., xvii., 1; xviii., 1, etc.; Ignat., Phil., xi., 1; Ephes., xii. 2. See also the interesting parallels in Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 93. In Jos., Ant., iii., 2, 5, and xv., 10, 5; it is used as here, but of hostile testimony in Matt. xxiii. 31, John xviii. 23. ἢνείπα: why was the number chosen? Various answers have been given to the question: (1) that the number was fixed upon because of the seven gifts of the Spirit, Isa. xi. 2, Rev. i. 4; (2) that the number was appointed with regard to the different elements of the Church: three Hellenists, three Hebrews, one Proselyte; (3) that the number was regulated by the fact that the Jerusalem of that day may have been divided into seven districts; (4) that the number was suggested by the Hebrew sacred number—seven; (5) Zöckler thinks that there is no hypothesis so probable as that the small Jerusalem ἡνείπα καὶ ἀρχιδιάκονοι were seven in number, each with its special worship, and its special business connected with alms-giving and distribu-

tion—alms-giving closely related to the Eucharist or to the Love-Feasts; (6) the derivation of the number from Roman usage on the analogy of the septemviri eubulones advocated by Dean Plumptre, officials no doubt well known to the Libertini (see also B.D. "Deacon," and the remarks of Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 375, on Roman organisation and its value). This is far more probable than that there should be any connection between the appointment of the Seven and the two heathen inscriptions quoted by Dr. Hatch (Bampton Lectures, p. 50, note 56), in which the word διάκονος is used of the assistants in the ritual of sacrificial and temple feasts at Anactorium in Acaia, and of Minucius Felix (see on the other hand, Hort, Ecclesia, p. 210), for in the incident before us the word διάκονος is not used at all, and later in the history, xxii. 8, Philip is described not by that title but as one of the Seven. Nor is there any real likeness to be found between the office assigned to the Seven and that of the Chazzan or officer of the Jewish synagogue (ὑπηρέτης, Luke iv. 20), who corresponded rather to our parish-clerk or verger, and whose duties were confined to the synagogue; a nearer Jewish parallel is to be found in the "τέρτον τρέχοντα, collectors of alms, but these officers would rather present a parallel to the tax-gatherers than to those who ministered to the poor (see "Deacon" in Hastings, B.D.). Whilst, however, these analogies in Jewish offices fail us, we stand on much higher ground if we may suppose that as our Lord's choice of the Twelve was practically the choice of a number sacred in its associations for every Israelite, so the number Seven may have been adopted from its sacredness in Jewish eyes, and thus side by side with the sacred Apostolic College there existed at this period another College, that of the Seven. What was the nature of the office? Was it the Diaconate in the modern sense of the term? But, as we have noted above, the Seven are never called Deacons, and therefore it has been thought that we have here a special office to meet a special need, and that the Seven were rather the prototypes of the later archdeacons, or corresponded to the elders who are mentioned in xi. 30 and xiv. 23. On the other hand St. Luke,
from the prominence given to the narrative, may fairly be regarded as viewing the institution of the office as establishing a new departure, and not as an isolated incident, and the emphasis is characteristic of an historian who was fond of recording "beginnings" of movements. The earliest Church tradition speaks of Stephen and Nicholas as appointed to the diaconate, Iren., Adv. Haer., i., 26; iv., 15, and the same writer speaks of Stephen as "the first deacon," iii., 12; cf. also the testimony of St. Cyprian, Epist., 3, 3, and the fact that for centuries the Roman Church continued to restrict the number of deacons to seven (Cornelius, ap. Euseb. H. E., vi., 43). It is quite true that the first mention of διάκονοι in the N.T. (although both διακονία and διακονείν are used in the passage before us) is not found until Phil. i. 1, but already a deaconess had been mentioned in writing to the Church at Rome (vii. 1, where Ρhabe is called διάκονος), in the Church at Philippi the office had evidently become established and familiar, and it is reasonable to assume that the institution of the Seven at Jerusalem would have been well known to St. Paul and to others outside Palestine. "and that analogous wants might well lead to analogous institutions" (Hort, and to the same effect, Gore, The Church and its Ministry, p. 403). But if the Seven were thus the prototypes of the deacons, we must remember that as the former office though primarily ordained for helping the Apostles in distribution of alms and in works of mercy was by no means confined to such duties, but that from the very first the Seven were occupied in essentially spiritual work, so the latter diaconate was engaged in something far different from mere charity organisation; there were doubtless qualifications demanded such as might be found in good business men of tact and discretion, but there were also moral and spiritual qualities which to a great extent were required of the διάκονοι no less than of the ἀρσενίτεροι and ἵπποιοι: there was the holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience, there was the moral and spiritual courage which would enable the διάκονοι to gain even in the pursuit of their διακονία "great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. iii. 13 (Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 138 ff.); see also on the whole subject, Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 139 ff.; Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 266 ff.; Lightfoot, Philippians, "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry," and Real-Encyclopaedie fur protest. Theol. und Kirche (Hauck), "Diakonen" (Heft 38, 1898).

—σοφίας: practical wisdom, prudentia, cf. I Cor. vi. 5 (Blass, so Grimm); in ver. 10 the use of the word is different, but in both places σοφία is referred to the Spirit, "it is not simply spiritual men, but full of the Spirit and of wisdom . . . for what profits it that the dispenser of alms speak not, if nevertheless he wastes all, or be harsh and easily provoked?" Chrys., Hom., xiv.—ός καταστήσωμεν (on the reading whom ye, which was exhibited in some few editions of A.V., see Speaker's Commentary, in loco): the appointment, the consecration, and the qualifications for it, depend upon the Apostles—the verb implies at all events an exercise of authority if it has no technical force, cf. Titus i. 5. The same shade of meaning is found in classical writers and in the LXX in the use of the verb with the genitive, with επί, sometimes with a dative, sometimes with an accusative: Gen. xxxix. 4, xl., Exod. ii. 14, xiii. 21, Num. iii. 10, Neh. xii. 44, Dan. ii. 48, 49, 1 Macc. xi. 14; cf. its use in Luke xii. 14, 42, 44. The opposite is expressed by μεταστήσασθαι από της χρ., Polyb., iv., 87, 9; 1 Macc. xi. 63 (Wendt).—χρείας: the word might mean need in the sense of necessity, Latin opus, want, 2 Chron. ii. 16, Wisdom xiii. 16, 1 Macc. iii. 28, or it might mean business, Latin negotium, officium. In the LXX it seems to be employed in both senses, as also in classical writers, but here both A. and R.V. render "business" (so in Polybius), cf. Judith xii. 10 AB., 1 Macc. x. 37, xi. 63, xii. 45 (χρέα is found no less than eight times in 1 Macc., seven times in 2 Macc., once in 3 Macc.); see Wetstein.
for uses of the word in Philo and Josephus.

Ver. 4. ἡμεῖς δὲ: in marked contrast to the service of tables, etc., but still every work in the Church, whether high or low, was a διακονία.—τη διακ, του λ., see above.—προσκαρτερήσομεν, "will continue steadfastly," R.V., see above on i. 14.—τη προσ., "the prayer" (Hort); the article seems to imply not only private prayer and intercession, but the public prayer of the Church.

Ver. 5. ἠρεσεν ενώπιον: phrase not usual in classical Greek, but ενώ. in this sense, so κατενώπιον έναντι κατέναν, derived from the LXX (εναντίον frequented in LXX, is also classical); cf., e.g., Deut. i. 23 A, 2 Sam. iii. 36, 1 Kings iii. 10, xx. (xxi.) 2, Jer. xviii. 4, Ju. vii. 16, xiii. 20, 1 Macc. vi. 60, viii. 21 (διακονίαν, S), where the whole phrase occurs. Blass, Grammatik, p. 125, and see on iv. 10.—πλήθους, cf. Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 60, and above on p. 73.—ἐξελέξαντο, see above, cf. xv. 22, 25, always in the middle in N.T. (Luke ix. 35 doubtful), so in LXX. Blass, Grammatik, p. 181, nearly always. On the importance of the step thus taken as marking a distinct stage in the organisation of the Church, and in the distribution of work amongst the members of what was now a true body politic, see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 372; Hort., Ecclesia, p. 52, and on its further importance in the emancipation of the Church, see Lightfoot's "Paul and the Three". The choice of the names has often been held to indicate the liberal spirit in which the complaint of the Hellenists was met, since the Seven bear purely Greek names, and we infer that the bearers were Hellenists, "elegerunt ergo Graecos non Hebraeos, ut magis satisfacerent murmuri Graecorum" Cornelius à Lapidé. But the inference is not altogether certain, however prob-
Gospel, and eight times in the Acts; on his fondness for such words, see p. 73.

πίστεως: not in the lower sense of honesty or truthfulness, but in the higher sense of religious faith, cf. xi. 24, "non modo fidelitate sed tute spirituali," Bengel.

Φίλιππον, cf. viii. 5, xxi. 8: we may probably trace his work also along the coasts of Palestine and Phœnicia, cf. vii. 40, xv. 3, xxi. 3, 7 (Plumptre's notes on these passages), and no doubt St. Luke would have learnt from him, when he met him at Caesarea, xxi. 8, much that relates to the early history of the Church, Introd. 17. It would appear both in his case and in that of St. Stephen that the duties of the Seven should not have been confined to service of the tables. In the deacons M. Renan saw a proclamation of the truth that social questions should be the first to occupy the attention of man, and the deacons were, for him, the best preachers of Christianity; but we must not forget that they did not preach merely by their method and works of charity, but by a proclamation of a Saviour and by the power of the Holy Ghost. In the reference to Philip in xxi. 8 as simply "one of the Seven" we may fairly see one of the many proofs of the unity of the authorship of Acts, see Salmon, Intro., chapter xiii., and Lightfoot, Acts, B.D., and see further, Salmon in the same chapter, on the proof which is afforded in the account of Philip of the antiquity of the Acts; see below also on xxi. 8. —Πρόχορος: tradition says that he was consecrated by St. Peter Bishop of Nicomedia, and a fabulous biography of John the Evangelist had his name attached to it, as a companion of the Apostle in Asia, and his biographer—but we cannot attach any credence to any such professed information: see Blass, in loco, Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., 1895, p. 426; B.D. i. sub ν. Of Simon, Parmenas, Nicanor, it cannot be said that anything is known, as is frankly admitted by the Romanist commentator Felten. —Νικολαίων προσήλυτον: that the name proselyte is given to him has been held by many to mark him out as the only proselyte among the Seven; otherwise it is difficult to see why he alone is so designated (so Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 375, Lightfoot, Hort, Weiss, Felten, and amongst earlier writers, De Wette and Ewald). No doubt he was a proselyte of the higher and more complete type (a "proselyte of the gate," the lower type—as distinct from a "proselyte of righteousness")—is always in Acts φιλοβουμένος or σεβόμενος τού θεού), but Ramsay sees in his election to office another distinct step in advance: "the Church is wider than the pure Jewish race, and the non-Jewish element is raised to official rank," although, as Ramsay himself points out, there was nothing in this step out of harmony with the principle of the extreme Judaistic party (St. Paul, p. 375, cf. 157). The case of Cornelius was of a different kind, see below on chap. x. But the notice is all the more interesting because it contains the first mention of the Church afterwards so important, the Mother Church of the Gentiles, Antioch in Syria, and this may point to the reason of the description of Nicolaus as a proselyte of Antioch. It was a notice of special interest to St. Luke if his own home was at Antioch, but we cannot say positively that the notice means that Nicolaus was the only proselyte among the Seven. That the Jews were numerous at Antioch and had made many proselytes we learn from Jos., B. J., vii. 3, of the supposed connection between this Nicolaus and the sect of the Nicolaitans, Rev. ii. 6, 14. We may hesitate to say with Blass that it is worthy of no more credit than the notice which attaches to Prochorus, although we may also well hesitate to accept it, but it has been advocated by Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 297, and recently by Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 199. Zöckler goes so far as to see in the list of the Seven a copy of the list of the Apostles, inasmuch as the most distinguished is placed first, the traitor last. But Nicolaus would be fitly placed last if he were the only proselyte. The Patristic evidence in support of the connection in question is by no means conclusive, see Ritschl, Altkatolische Kirche, p. 135 and note (second edition), Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 140, and Wendt, in loco, Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 425 (1895). Holtzmann on Rev. ii. 6 holds that the Nicolaitans, who are not to be connected with Nicolaus the deacon, may = symbolically, the Bileamites, ver. 14; so Grimm, sub ν. Νικολαϊτης, if we take the latter as coinciding with the Hebrew נאָלְתָנָה = destruction of the people.
Ver. 6. εστησαν, cf. i. 23; for ενώπιον, see above—καὶ προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χείρας: change of subject. This is the first mention of the laying on of hands in the Apostolic Church. No doubt the practice was customary in the Jewish Church, Num. xxvii. 18, Deut. xxxiv. 9; see also Ederheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 281, and *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 382, and Hamburger, *Real Encyclopædie*, ii., 6, pp. 882-886, "Ordinierung, Ordination"; Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 216; Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, pp. 187, 382; but the constant practice of it by our Lord Himself was sufficient to recommend it to His Apostles. It soon became the outward and visible sign of the bestowal of spiritual gifts in the Apostolic Church, cf. *Acts* viii. 15, xiii. 3, i Tim. iv. 14, v. 22, 2 Tim. i. 6, and every convert was instructed in its meaning as one of the elementary teachings of the faith, Heb. vi. 2. That the act was a means of grace is evident from St. Paul's words, for he reminds Timothy of the grace thus bestowed upon him, i Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6, and from the narrative of St. Luke in viii. 15, 17, and passages below. But that it was not a mere outward act dissociated from prayer is evident from St. Luke's words in the passage before us, in viii. 17, xiii. 3, and xix. 6. See especially Hooker, *v.*, lxvi., 1, 2; see below in vii. and xiii., and Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, especially note G. Holtzmann would draw a distinction between the laying on of hands here and in viii. 17, xix. 6. Here, he contends, it only corresponds to the customary usage at the ordination of a Rabbi, as the Seven had already received the Holy Ghost, ver. 3, 5, cf. xiii. 1. But ver. 8 undoubtedly justifies us in believing that an accession of power was granted after the laying on of hands, and now for the first time mention is made of St. Stephen's ἑράτη καὶ σημάτια μεγάλα (see St. Chrysostom's comment). Ver. 7. τῶν ἱερέων: the reading ἱουδαίων is advocated by Klostermann, *Probleme in Aposteltexte*, pp. 13, 14, but not only is the weight of critical evidence overwhelmingly against it, but we can scarcely doubt that St. Luke would have laid more stress upon the first penetration of the Christian faith into districts outside Jerusalem—this is represented as the result of the persecution about Stephen, viii. 4; cf. John xii. 42 (see also Wendt, 1899, p. 145, note). The whole verse shows that the γογγυσμός had not interfered with the growth of the Church. The conjecture that in the word ὄχλος reference is made to the priests of the plebs in contrast to the learned priests is in no way satisfactory; if this had been the meaning, the words would have been πολλοί τε ἱερέως τοῦ ὄχλου, and no such distinction of priests is anywhere noticed in the N.T., see further below.—ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ: Hilgenfeld (so Weiss) considers that, as this notice implies that there were disciples outside Jerusalem, such a remark is inconsistent with the statements of the after-spread of the Church in this chapter and in viii., and that therefore the words ἐν Ἰ. are to be referred to the "author to Theophilus". But so far from the words bearing the interpretation of Hilgenfeld, the historian may have introduced them to mark the fact that the growth of the Church continued in Jerusalem, in the capital where the hierarchical power was felt, and that the growth included the accession of priests no less than of laymen.—υπήκουον τῇ πίστει: the imperfect may denote petition—the priests kept joining the new community, Blass, *in loco*, cf. Rom. i. 5, vi. 16, 17, x. 16, 2 Thess. i. 8—the verb (very frequent in LXX) is only used in Acts in this place in the sense given, but often in St. Paul's Epistles. No doubt when the number of Jewish priests was so large (according to Josephus, twenty thousand) both poor and wealthy would have been included in the statement, and we cannot limit it to the Sadдуcees. It must be borne in mind that the obedience of these priests to the Christian faith need not of necessity have interfered with the continuance of their duties in the Temple (so Felten), especially when we remember the attitude of Peter and John; but the words certainly seem to mark their complete obedience to the
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8. ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ δε πληρός πίστεως και δυνάμεως ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ σημεία μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ. 9. ἀνέστησαν δὲ τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἑπετεῖον πλήρος πίστεως, καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ σημεία μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ.  


faith (see Grimm-Thayer, sub v. πίστις, i. b. a), and in face of the opposition of the Sadducees and the more wealthy priestly families, an open adherence to the disciples of Jesus may well have involved a break with their former profession (Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 49, and Ecclesia, p. 52). May there not have been many among the priests waiting for the consolation of Israel, men righteous and devout like the Pharisee priest or priests, to whom perhaps we owe that expression of the pious Jew in the Psalms of Solomon, which approach so nearly in style and character to the Hymns of the priest Zacharias and the devout Symeon in the early chapters of St. Luke's Gospel? see Ryle and James's edition, Psalms of Solomon. Intro.d., lix., lx. Spitta refers the whole verse to his source B, as a break in the narrative, without any connection with what follows or precedes. Clemens assigns vi. 1-6 to his special source, H(istoria) H(ellenistarum); vi. 7 to his H(istoria) Pr(etri); Jüngst assigns vi. 1-6, yb. c, to his source B, 7 to his R(edactor). The comment of Hilgenfeld on ver. 7 is suggestive (although he himself agrees with Spitta and regards the verse as an interpretation), "Clemen und Jüngst nicht einmal dieses Verstecken ungeteilt ".

Ver. 8. πλήρης πίστεως, but χάριτος, R.V. Vulgate, gratia = divine grace, xviii. 27, not merely favour with the people—the word might well include, as in the case of our Lord, the λογία χάριτος which fell from his lips (Luke iv. 22). On the word as characteristic of St. Luke and St. Paul, see Friederich, Das Lucasevangelium, pp. 28, 96; in the other Gospels it only occurs three times: cf. John i. 14, 16, 17. See Plummer's note on the word in St. Luke, L. c.—σύναπτος: not merely power in the sense of courage, heroism, but power to work miracles, supernatural power, cf. viii. 13 and Luke v. 17. That the word also means spiritual power is evident from ver. 10.—ἐποίει, "was doing." imperfect, during Stephen's career of grace and power the attack was made; notice imperfect combined with aorist, ἀνέστησαν, see Rendall's note. In ver. 8 Spitta sees one of the popular legendary notices of his source B. St. Stephen is introduced as the great miracle-worker, who is brought before the Sanhedrin, because in v. 17, a parallel incident in B, the Apostles were also represented as miracle-doers and brought before the same assembly; it would therefore seem that the criticism which can only see in the latter part of the Acts, in the miracles ascribed to St. Paul, a repetition in each case of the miracles assigned in the former part to St. Peter, must now be further utilised to account for any points of likeness between the career of St. Stephen and the other leaders of the Church. But nowhere is it said that Stephen was brought before the Sanhedrin on account of his miracles, and even if so, it was quite likely that the θῖοι of the Sanhedrin would be stirred by such manifestations as on the former occasion in chap. v.

Ver. 9. ἀνέστησαν: in a hostile sense, cf. Luke x. 25, Mark xiv. 57, and see above on v. 17.—συναγωγῆς: in Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome and the larger towns there was no doubt a considerable number of synagogues, but the tradition that assigned no less than four hundred and eighty to Jerusalem alone is characterised by Schürer as a Talmudic myth (Jewish Temple, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 73, E.T., so too Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, pp. 83, 252, but see also Renan, Apostles, p. 113, E.T.). The number four hundred and eighty was apparently fixed upon as the numerical equivalent of the Hebrew word for "full," in Isa. i. 21, a city "full of judgment." The names which follow have been variously classified, but they have always proved and still prove a difficulty. Ram-say considers that the bad form of the list is due to the fact that St. Luke is here dependent on an authority whose expressions he either translated verbatim or did not understand, Expositor (1895), p. 35. One thing seems certain, viz., that Ἀσπηρίου does not refer to any town Libertum in the neighbourhood of
Carthage, which has been urged as an explanation of the close juxtaposition of Cyrene, also in Africa. The existence of a town or region bearing any such name is merely conjectural, and even if its existence could be demonstrated, it is improbable that many Jews from such an obscure place should have been resident in Jerusalem. There is therefore much probability that St. Chrysostom was correct in referring the word to the Libertini, "Romanos apelathérwv. The Libertini here were probably Roman "freedmen" who were formerly captive Jews brought to Rome by Pompey, B.C. 63 (Suet., Tib., 36; Tac., Ann., ii., 85; Philo, Legat. ad Gamin, 23), and afterwards liberated by their Roman masters. These men and their descendants would enjoy the rights of Roman citizenship, and some of them appear to have returned to Jerusalem, where they had their own community and a synagogue called συναγωγή Ἰλίβερτίνων (according to Grimm-Thayer, sub v. Λίβερτινος, some evidence seems to have been discovered of a "synagogue of the Libertines" at Pompeii), see Schürer, Jewish Temples, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 57, 276, 277; O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 89, and Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 201 (second edition). But a further question arises as to the number of synagogues intended. Thus it has been maintained that they were five in number. This is Schürer's decided view, Weiss, Meyer (in earlier editions), so Hackett, so Matthies, Handbuch zum N. T., V. Apostelgeschichte, 1897. By other writers it is thought that reference is made to two synagogues. This is the view advocated by Wendt as against Meyer. Wendt admits that as in the places named there were undoubtedly large numbers of Jewish inhabitants, so it is possible that in Jerusalem itself they may have been sufficiently numerous to make up the five synagogues, but his own view is based upon the ground that τῶν before ἰπὸ Κ. καὶ Α. is parallel with the τῶν after τίνες (so Holtzmann, Fellen). So too Zöckler, who depends upon the simple καὶ before Κυρηναίων and 'Ἀλεξ., as pointing to one group with the Libertines; τῶν ἰπὸ Κ. καὶ Α. forming a second group. Dr. Sanday, Expositor, viii., p. 327 (third series), takes the same view of two synagogues only, as he considers that it is favoured by the Greeks (so too Dean Plumptre and Winer-Moulton, xix., 50, note, but see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 158; cf. critical note above). Mr. Page is inclined to think that three synagogues are intended: (1) i.e., of the Libertini, (2) another of the men of Alexandria and Cyrene, (3) another of the men of Cilicia and Asia; whilst many writers from Calvin, Bengel and others to O. Holtzmann and Rendell hold that only one synagogue is intended; so Dr. Hort maintains that the Greek suggests only the one synagogue of the Libertines, and that the other names are simply descriptive of origin—from the south, Cyrene, and Alexandria; from the north, Cilicia, and Proconsular Asia. On the whole the Greek seems to favour the view of Wendt as above; καὶ Κυρην. καὶ 'Ἀλεξ. seem to form, as Blass says, part of the same appellation with Λίβερτινος. Blass himself has recently, Philology of the Gospels, p. 49 ff., declared in favour of another reading, Λιβυστίνων, which he regards as the correct text, Λιβερτίνων being corrupt although differing only in two letters from the original. In the proposed reading he is following Occumenius and Beza amongst others; the same reading is apparently favoured also by Wetstein, who gives both the passages to which Blass refers, one from Catullus, lx., 1, "Leaena montibus Libystinis," and the other from the geographical Lexicon of Stephanus Byzantinus. Λιβυστίνων would mean Jews inhabitants of Libya, not Libyans, and the synagogue in question bore the name of Λιβυσ. καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ 'Ἀλεξ., thus specifying the African Jews in the geographical order of their original dwelling-places. — Κυρηναίων, see on ii. 9, and below, xi. 20, xii. 1. — 'Ἀλεξ.: probably there was no city, next to Jerusalem and Rome, in which the Jewish population was so numerous and influential as in Alexan-
Ο Ιωάννης διορίσκει τον στοιχείον τον σπούδα της πνεύματος και του πνεύματος της αληθείας. "Ο Ιωάννης διορίσκει τον στοιχείον τον σπούδα της πνεύματος και του πνεύματος της αληθείας."

1 After soφια DE, Flor. add τη σωτηρία ευ αντι, so Hilg., and after πνεύματι DE, Flor., Grg., Par. add τη ψυχή. (Harris regards as Montanist additions.)

2 At end of verse 10 D (Ε), Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor., Wern. add δια τη εκκλησία των αντιστήναι τη σοφία και τω πνεύματι ελάλει."

3 Both ουκ and τοτε are retained by Blass in β, but see Weiss, Codex D, p. 66, Flor. reads τοτε ουκ μη δυν.

In his new city Alexander the Great had assigned the Jews a place: their numbers rapidly grew, and, according to Philo, two of the five districts of the town, named after the first five letters of the alphabet, were called "the Jewish," from the number of Jews dwelling in them, one quarter, Delta, being entirely populated by them. Julius Caesar and Augustus confirmed their former privileges, and they retained them for the most part, with the important exception described by Philo, during subsequent reigns. For some time, until the reign of Augustus, they had their own official to represent them as ethnarch (alabarch), and Augustus appointed a council who should superintend their affairs according to their own laws, and the Romans evidently recognised the importance of a mercenary race like the Jews for the trade and commerce of the city. Here dwelt the famous teacher Philo, b.c. 20-40, and here Apollon was trained, possibly under the guidance of the famous philosopher, and here too St. Stephen may have belonged by birth and education (Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 253). St. Paul never visited Alexandria, and it is possible that the Apostle may have felt after his experience at Corinth, and the teaching of Apollon (1 Cor. i. 12), that the simplicity of his own message of Christ Crucified would not have been acceptable to hearers of the word of wisdom and the lovers of allegory. On the causes which tended to produce a distinct form of the Jewish character and faith in the city, see B.D.2 "Alexandria," and Hastings, B.D., sub α.; Stanley's Jewish Church, iii., xviii.; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, ii., i, 47. We know that Alexandria had, as was only likely, a synagogue at Jerusalem, specially gorgeous (Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 253); on the history of the place see, in addition to literature already mentioned, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 73, 228, 229, 244, E.T.; Jos., Ant., xiv., 7, 2; x., i; xix., 5, 2. - Κιλικία: of special interest because Saul of Tarsus would probably be prominent amongst "those of Cilicia," and there is no difficulty in supposing with Weiss and even Spitta (Apostelgeschichte, p. 115) that he belonged to the members of the Cilician synagogue who disputed with Stephen. To the considerable Jewish community settled in Tarsus, from the time of the Seleucidæ, Saul belonged. But whatever influence early associations may have had upon Stephen, Saul by his own confession was not merely the son of a Pharisee, but himself a Pharisee of the Pharisees in orthodoxy and zeal, Gal. i. 14, Phil. iii. 5. It would seem that there was a synagogue of the Tarsians at Jerusalem, Megilla, 26a (Hamburger, u. s., ii., i, 149); see also B.D.2 "Cilicia," Schürer, u. s., p. 222; O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 100. The "Jews from Asia" are those who at a later date, xxii. 27, are again prominent in their zeal for the sacredness of the Holy Place, and who hurl against Paul the same fatal charge which he now directs against Stephen (Plumptre, in loco, Sabatier, L'Apôtre Paul, p. 20). — συνζητούντες: not found in LXX or other Greek versions of the O.T., or Apocrypha, although it may occur, Neh. ii. 4, in the sense of request, but the reading is doubtful (see Hatch and Redpath). In the N.T. it is used six times by St. Mark and four times by St. Luke (twice in his Gospel), and always in the sense of questioning, generally in the sense of disputatious questioning. The words of Josephus in his preface (sect. 5), B. Τ., may help us to understand the characteristics of the Hellenists. The same verb is used by
St. Paul himself, as in this same Jerusalem, with the Hellenists on behalf of the faith which he was now seeking to destroy, Acts ix. 29. In modern Greek the verb has always the meaning to discuss, to dispute (Kennedy).

Ver. 10. καὶ οὐκ ἔχων ἀντιτίθεμα: the whole phrase is an exact fulfilment of Luke xii. 15; cf. 1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 6. πνεύμα, as Wendt points out, in this case the Holy Spirit with which Stephen was filled, cf. 3, 5. Vulgate renders “Spiritui Sancto qui loquebatur,” as if it read ο, see critical notes.

Ver. 11. ὑπέβαλον: only found here in N.T., not in LXX in this sense; subornaverunt; Vulgate, submiserunt (Suet., Ner., 28), cf. Appian, B. C., i., 74, ὑπεβαλήσαν κατηγοροῖς, and Jos., B. J., v., io, 41, μηνυτὴς τις ὑπόθεντος.—ῥήματα βλασφημίας = βλάσφημα, Hebraism, cf. Rev. xiii. 1, xvii. 3, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 266.—ἐἰς Μωϋσῆν καὶ τὸν Θεόν: Rendall draws a distinction between λαλῶν . . . εἰς and λαλούντος εἰς, Heb. vii. 14, it is doubtful whether this distinction can be maintained, cf. Luke xii. 10 and xxii. 65. The R.V. renders both prepositions against: cf. Dan., LXX, vii., 25, and iii. 29 (96; LXX and Theod.).

Ver. 12. συνεκίνησαν: not found in LXX or other Greek versions of O.T., or in the Apocrypha, cf. Polyb., xv., 17, 1, so too in Plutarch. As this word and συνήρπασαν are found only in St. Luke it is perhaps worth noting that they are both frequent in medical writers, see below.—τὸν λαόν: a crafty design to gain the people first, not only because they had hitherto favoured the Nazarenes, but because the Sanhedrim would be more inclined to take action if they felt that the people were with them, cf. iv. 12.—συνήρπασαν, “seized him,” R.V.: “caught.” A.V., signifies rather capture after pursuit than a sudden seizure (Humphry); only in St. Luke in the N.T., once in his Gospel, viii. 29, and Acts xix. 29, xxvii. 15. In the first passage it is used of the demoniac of the country of the Gerasenes; many times the evil spirit συνηρπάσκει αὐτὸν; see 2 Macc. vii. 27, Prov. vi. 25, 2 Macc. iv. 41, 4 Macc. v. 4. The word is also quite classical, see Hobart, Medical Language, pp. 204, 243; on the hostility against Stephen and its causes, see above. At this word συνήρπασαν, Hilgenfeld would stop, and the rest of the verse, ἤγαγον to vii. 2, is referred by him to his “author to Theophilus”. The leading Stephen before the Sanhedrim is thus excluded by Hilgenfeld, because nothing is said of the previous summoning of the Council as in iv. 5, 61 and the introduction of false witnesses and their accusation is something quite different from the charge of blasphemous words against Moses and God! In somewhat the same manner Spitta refers vi. 1-6, 9-12a, to his source A, and sees so far a most trustworthy narrative, no single point in which can fairly be assailed by criticism, Apostelgeschichte, p. 115, whilst vi. 7 f., 12b-15 constitute B, a worthless document on account of its legendary and fictitious character—inaugurating a parallel between the death of Stephen and that of Christ, and leaving nothing historical except the fact that Stephen was a conspicuous member of the early Church who died as a martyr by stoning. But whilst Hilgenfeld and Spitta treat the passage beginning with καὶ ἤγαγον in somewhat the same manner, Jüngst refers these verses and the rest of the chapter as far as ver. 14 to his source A, whilst the previous part of ver. 12, συνεκίνησαν—αὐτόν, is in his view an insertion of the Redactor. Clemen regards the whole incident of the bringing before the Sanhedrim as a later addition, and as forming part of his Historia Petri, the revolutionary nature of Stephen's teaching being placed in the mouth of false witnesses, and the fanaticism of the Jews being lessened by their susceptibility at any rate to the outward impression made by their opponents (ver. 15).
Ver. 13. **οὕτως**: here and in ver. 14 used contemptuously, _isf._, so Vulgate; cf. _vii._ 40, xviii. 18, xix. 26, _ὁ Παύλος_ **οὕτως**— _οὐ πιστεύει λαλόν_ : the words in themselves are sufficient to indicate the exaggerated and biased character of the testimony brought against Stephen—"invidiam facere contantur," Bengel, _blâ FAQs_ omitted, see above.— _μάρτυρας_ **ψευδεῖς**, "false," inasmuch as they perverted the meaning of Stephen's words, which were no blasphemy against Moses or against God, although no doubt he had taught the transitory nature of the Mosaic law, and that the true worship of God was not confined to the Temple (see Weizsäcker, _Apostolic Age_, i., 64, 83, E.T., and Wendt, _p._ 148 (1899)). So also in the very same manner Christ's words had been perverted (John ii. 21, cf. Mark xiv. 56, Matt. xxvii. 63), and it is likely enough that the spirit of His teaching as to the Sabbath, the laws of purifying, the fulfillment of the law, breathed again in the words of His disciples. But such utterances were blasphemous in the eyes of the Jewish legalists, and Stephen's own words, _νίκ_. 48, 49, _πηί_. 7 well seem to them an affirmation rather than a denial of the charges brought against him.— _κατά τοῦ τόπου τοῦ_ **αγίου τοῦτον** : if _τοῦτον_ is retained (W.H.), phrase could refer not only to the Temple as the holy place, but also to the place of assembly of the Sanhedrin, where according to ver. 15 the charge was brought, which was probably situated on the Temple Mount on the western side of the enclosing wall, Schurer, _Jewish People_, div. ii., vol. i., _p._ 190, E.T., so Hilgenfeld and Wendt, and also Blass, who adds " _itaque etiam τοῦτον_ (B. _cf._ 14) recte se habet," although he omits the word in his own text. Weiss thinks that the word dropped out because it could have no reference to a scene in the Sanhedrin.

Ver. 14. _ὁ Ναζ.**οὕτως**_ : not part of the words of Stephen, but of the witnesses—see however Blass, _in loco_.— _καὶ καταλύεται_ : the closest similarity to the words in Mark xiv. 58 (cf. Matt. xxvi. 61), and in both passages the same verb _καταλύειν_ is used. It is also found in all three Synoptists in our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of the Temple, Matt. xxiv. 2, Mark xiii. 2, Luke xxi. 6, and we find it again in the bitter scorn of the revilers who passed beneath the cross (Mark xv. 29, Matt. xxvii. 40). The prophecy, we cannot doubt, had made its impression not only upon the disciples, but also upon the enemies of Jesus, and if St. Stephen did not employ the actual words, we can easily understand how easily and plausibly they might be attributed to him.— _κατά τοῦ_ **θν.** _καταλύειν_ : cf. _Ezra_ vi. 11, _Isaiah_ xiv. 5. _θν._ is used by St. Luke seven times in Acts, three times in his Gospel, and it is only found twice elsewhere in the _N.T._, John xix. 40, Heb. x. 25; in the Books of the Maccabees it occurs three or four times, in Wisdom iv. 16 (but see Hatch and Redpath), in Bel and the Dragon v. 15, in the sense of custom, usage, as so often in the classics. Here it would doubtless include the whole system of the Mosaic law, which touched Jewish life at every turn, _cf._ xv. 1, xxvi. 21, xxvi. 3, xxviii. 17. For the dignity which attached to every word of the Pentateuch, and to Moses to whom the complete book of the law was declared to have been handed by God, see Schurer, _Jewish People_, div. ii., _p._ 307, E.T., and Weber, _Jüdische Theologie_, _p._ 378 (1897). We have moreover the testimony of Jewish literature contemporary with the _N.T._ books, cf., _e.g._, _Book of Jubilees_, placed by Edersheim about 50 A.D., with its ultra-legal spirit, and its glorification of Moses and the Torah, see too _Apocalypse of Baruch, e.g._, _xiv._ 5: _xlvi_. 22, 24; _III_. 3; _lxxiv._ 2, 5.

Ver. 15. _ἀτενίσαντες_, see above on i. 10.— _οὐτε πρόσωπον ἑγγύλοκα χεριν, ὡς ἐγεγένατο Θεότι_; in 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, the reference is not to outward appearance, but to inward discernment (see Wetstein,
τούτον, καὶ ἠλλάξει τὰ ἐσθή ἀ παρέδωκεν ἦμιν Μωϋσῆς. 15. καὶ ἀπενεάστατε εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπαντητι οἱ καθεξήμονεπι ἑν τῷ συνεδρίφι εἴδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὤσει πρόσωπον ἄγγελου. 2

1 ἀπενέστατε εἰς αὐτὸν, but in D ἦτεν ἐν αὐτῷ; and at the end of verse D, Flor. add εστώ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτὸν; cf. iv. 7, etc. (and see below).

2 On the words in Flor., "stantis inter illos," see esp. Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 70 ff. Blass regards the words as favourable to his theory and as part of Luke's own text. Hilg. retains them. Harris sees in them an instance (amongst many in D) of a wrongly inserted gloss from vii. 1; cf. Mark xiv. 60.

who refers also to Gen. xxxiii. 10, and quotes other instances from the Rabbis, e.g., Dixit R. Nathanael: parentes Mosis viderunt pulchritudinem ejus tanquam angeli Domini: and we have the same expression used by St. Paul in Acta Pauli et Thekiae, 2; ἄγγελον πρόσωπον εἶχεν. See too Schöttgen, in loco. R. Gedalja speaks of Moses and Aaron when they came to Pharaoh as angels ministering before God. At such a moment when Stephen was called upon to plead for the truth at the risk of his life, and when not only the calmness and strength of his convictions, but also the grace, the beauty of his Master, and the power of His spirit rested upon him, such a description was no exaggeration, cf. a striking passage in Dr. Liddon's Some Elements of Religion, p. 180. It was said of the aged Polycarp, as he faced a martyr's death: τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ τῆς δόξης ἐπληρούτο, and "to have lived in spirit on Mount Tabor during the years of a long life, is to have caught in its closing hours some rays of the glory of the Transfiguration". But if the brightness on the face of St. Stephen is represented by St. Luke as supernatural (as Wendt admits), we are not called upon to conclude that such a description is due to the glorification of the Saint in Christian legend: "the occasion was worthy of the miracle," the ministration of the Spirit, ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος, in which St. Stephen had shared, might well exceed in glory; and a brightness like that on the face of Moses, above the brightness of the sun, might well have shone upon one who like the angels beheld the face of the Father in heaven, and to whom the glory of the Lord had been revealed: "As if in refutation of the charge made against him, Stephen receives the same mark of divine favour which had been granted to Moses" (Humphry). St. Chrysostom speaks of the face of Stephen as being terrible to the Jews, but lovable and wonderful to the Christians (cf. Theophylact, in loco). But although St. Stephen's words must afterwards have proved terrible to his opponents, we scarcely associate the thought of terror with the verse before us; we may speak of such faces as that of the proto-martyr as ἀδέσποτα but scarcely as φοβερά. It is possible that the representation of St. Stephen in sacred art as a young man may be due to this comparison of his face to that of an angel, angels being always represented as in the bloom of youth (Dr. Moore, Studies in Dante, first series, p. 84).}

CHAPTER VII.—Ver. 1. The question of the high priest breaks in upon the silence (Holtzmann). St. Chrysostom, Hom., xv., thought that the mildness of the inquiry showed that the assembly was overawed by St. Stephen's presence, but the question was probably a usual interrogation on such occasions (Felten, Farrar).—On εἰ see i. 6, and Blass, Grammatik, p. 254.

Ver. 2. Ἀνδρεὶς ἀδελφοί καὶ πατέρες, cf. St. Paul's address, xxii. 1, and also note on xxiii. 1. On St. Stephen's speech see additional note at the end of chapter.—ὁ Θεός τῆς δόξης: lit., "the God of the glory," i.e., the glory peculiar to Him, not simply ἄνθιστος, a reference to the Shechinah, Exod. xxiv. 16, 17, Ps. xix. 3, Isa. vi. 3, and in the N.T. cf. i Cor. ii. 8, and James ii. 1 (John i. 14). The appearances to Abraham and Moses were similar to those later ones to which the term Shechinah was applied. Such words were in themselves an answer to the charge of blasphemy; but Stephen proceeds to show that this same God who dwelt in the Tabernacle was not confined to it, but that He appeared to Abraham in a distant heathen land. ἔφη: there was therefore no need of a Temple that God might appear to His own (Chrys., Hom., xv.; see Blass, in loco).—τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν: emphatic, cf. vv. 19, 38, 39, 44, 45; St. Stephen
VII. 1-2. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

VII. 1. Εἰπε δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, Εἶ ἁρά ταῦτα οὖν ἔχει; 2. δὲ εἶπεν Ἀνδρεῖς ἀδελφοί καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε. ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὁφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἄβραμ. 1 οὕτω εἰ ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ, πρὶν ἡ κατοικήσαι

1 vii. 2-4. For T.R. Blass reads (2) οὕτω εἰ ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ εἰς Χαρραν μετὰ τοῦ αποθανεῖν τοῦ πατέρα αὐτού; (3) καὶ εἰπεν πρὸς αὐτούν "Εξελθε ἀπὸ . . . δειξα." (4) καὶ μετωκισεν αὐτον. In Par. we read "cum esset in Mesopotamia in Charran postquam mortuus est pater ipsis, et dixit . . . monstravero, et inde transitut eum," etc. This reading agrees almost entirely with that adopted by Blass, but it contains the word bracketed by him in ver. 2, and also apparently κακεθεν (et inde) (see below). The difficulties in these verses are attributed by Blass and Belser to Alexandrian copyists. An explanatory note was added very early to ver. 2. οτα Α. εξελθεν εἰς τὴν Χαλδαίαν καὶ κατωκησεν εἰς Χαρραν κακεθεν τὴν μετά τοῦ αποθανεῖν τοῦ πατέρα αὐτούν. These words (which may easily have been derived from the narrative in Genesis) were thought by the Alexandrian copyists to be the additional words of Luke himself, and they inserted them (inserentur in ver. 4, Blass) in ver. 4 as they could not add them at the end of ver. 2, οτα being changed into τοτε, Άβρααμ being omitted, and κακεθεν being substituted for κακεθεν, whilst the words μετα τοῦ αποθανεῖν τοῦ πατέρα αὐτοῦ, originally belonging to ver. 2 (so Par. above), were then omitted altogether and added in the text after κακεθεν; then between the words Μεσοπ. and εἰς Χαρραν, which are joined together in Par., these copyists (audacissimim, Blass) inserted πρὶν ἡ κατοικησαι αὐτον, no doubt with the view of showing that Stephen referred not only to the later injunction from Haran to Canaan but to the earlier one from Ur to Haran. But there is no need to suppose that the text was thus tampered with (see Wendt's note, p. 154, edit. 1899), and whatever difficulties this part of the speech contains, they may be easily explained on the supposition that Stephen in these verses, as elsewhere, was expressing himself in accordance with well-known traditions. In support of his view Blass (so Belser) appeals to Irenæus, iii. 12, who quotes the whole passage from vii. 2, ὁ θεὸς τῆς δ., to ver. 8, τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, omitting what Par. omits, and thus being in agreement with it on the whole in Belser's judgment. But Blass admits that Irenæus (who apparently leaves out all not in LXX) also omits words which occur in ver. 2, partly in all authorities and partly in Par. (Gig.): οὕτω εἰ ἐν τῇ Μ. εἰς Χαρραν μετα τοῦ αποθανεῖν τοῦ πατέρα αὐτοῦ: "delendaigitur haec quoque" (see above) "neque ea quidquam desiderabit," Blass, Praef. xv. (Acta Apost. secundum formam quae vulgaturo Romanam). Belser is not prepared to go so far as this, but he sees in the original text of Luke a much simpler version of Stephen's speech, no reference is made to the original dwelling place of Abraham in Ur, and only the call given to him in Mesopotamia (in Haran) is specified. According to Belser the original text reads thus: (Ver. 2) ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὁφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Α. οὕτω εἰ ἐν τῇ Μ. μετα τοῦ αποθανεῖν τοῦ πατέρα αὐτοῦ, (Ver. 3) καὶ εἰπεν πρὸς αὐτον: ἐξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ τῆς συγγενείας σου καὶ δευροεις την γην, ἣν αὐτῷ δειξα. (Ver. 4) καὶ μετακισατ' αὐτον εἰς τὴν γην ταύτην, etc. (Beitrage zur Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte, p. 48). See further on Gen. xii. 1-3 and the quotation here, in the passages in Philo, and in Clem. Rom., Cor., x., 2, Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 154.


Μεσοποταμίᾳ: a difficulty at once arises in comparing this statement with the Book of Genesis. Here the call of Abraham is said to have come to him before he dwell in Haran, but in Gen. xii. 1, after he removed thither. But, at the same time Gen. xv. 7, cf. Josh. xxiv. 3, Neh. ix. 7, distinctly intimates that Abraham left "Ur of the Chaldees" (see "Abraham," Hastings' B.D., p. 14, and Sayce, Patriarchal Palestine, pp. 169-160, as to its site) in accordance with the choice and guidance of God. St. Stephen applies the language of what we may describe as the second to the first call, and in so doing he was really following on the lines of Jewish literature, e.g., Philo, De Abr. ii., 11, 16, Mang., paraphrases the divine counsel,
and then adds διὰ τοῦτο τὴν πρῶτην ἀνοικίαν ἀπὸ τῆς Χαλδαίας γῆς εἰς τὴν Χαβραίων λέγεται ποιείσθαι. Moreover the manner of St. Stephen’s quotation seems to mark the difference between the call in Ur and the call in Haran (R.V., not Charran, Greek form, as in A.V.). In Gen. xii. 1 we have the call to Abraham in Haran given as follows: ἐξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οίκου τοῦ πατέρα σου. But the call in Ur, according to St. Stephen’s wording, is one which did not involve the sacrifice of his family, for Abraham was accompanied by them to Haran, and so the clause ἐκ τοῦ οίκου κ.τ.λ. is omitted because inappropriate. Of course if we omit ἐκ before τῆς συγγενείας (see critical notes), St. Stephen’s words become more suitable still to the position of Abraham in Ur, for we should then translate the words, “from thy land and the land of thy kindred” (Rendall, cf. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.). St. Stephen may naturally have referred back to Abraham’s first migration from Ur to Haran, as desiring to emphasise more plainly the fact that since the call of God came to him before he had taken even the first step towards the Holy Land by settling in Haran, that divine revelation was evidently not bound up with any one spot, however holy.—Χαρβάν, Gen. xi. 31, xii. 5, xxvii. 43, LXX, in the old language of Chaldea = road (see Sayce, u. s., pp. 166, 167, and “Haran” Hastings B.D., and B.D.3, i. (Pinches)), in Mesopotamia; little doubt that it should be identified with the Carra of the Greeks and Romans, near the scene of the defeat of Crassus by the Parthians, B.C. 53, and of his death, Lucan, i., 104; Pliny, N.H., v., 24; Strabo, xvi., p. 747. In the fourth century Carra was the seat of a Christian bishopric, with a magnificent cathedral. It is remarkable that the people of the place retained until a late date the Chaldean language and the worship of the Chaldean deities, B.D.4, “Haran,” and see Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i. 4, p. 499, and references cited by him for identification with Carra (cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 57).

Ver. 4. μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν: St. Stephen apparently falls into the same chronologi-
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1 Ημείς νῦν κατοικεῖτε. 5. καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ, οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδὸς. καὶ ἐπηγείλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι εἰς κατάχωσιν αὐτήν, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ πέντε. 6. διὰ αὐτοῦ οἴκωθε ὁ θεὸς. "Οτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ, καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ κακώσουσιν,"

1 After κατοικεῖτε DE, Syr. Harcl. mg., Aug. add καὶ οἱ πατέρες ὶμων (ἵμων) τρο ὶμων (ἵμων); Weiss (Codex D, p. 67) points out that the addition demands εκτενεύει; the words might have been easily added, cf. O.T. phraseology.

2 For καὶ εὐθύνη. D, Gig., Vulg. read ἀλλ' εὐθύνη, so Hilg.

3 εὐθύνη; D, Gig., Vulg. read εὐθύνη, so Hilg.; cf. LXX, Gen. xv. 13.

ham's departure, cf. Gen. xi. 32, and xii. 1. One other solution has been attempted by maintaining that μετώκισεν does not refer to the removal, but only to the quiet and abiding settlement which Abraham gained after his father's death, but this view, although supported by Augustine and Bengel, amongst others, is justly condemned by Alford and Wendt. The Samaritan Pentateuch reads in Gen. xi. 32, 145 instead of 205, probably an alteration to meet the apparent contradiction. But it is quite possible that here, as elsewhere in the speech, Stephen followed some special tradition (so Zöckler).—μετά with infinitive as a temporal proposition frequent in Luke (analogous construction in Hebrew), cf. Luke xii. 5, xxii. 20, etc., cf. LXX, Baruch i. 9; Viteau, Le Grec Φι:Ν. Τ., p. 165 (1893).—μετήκουσιν, subject of Θεός: cf. for a similar quick change of subject vi. 6. Weiss sees in this the hand of a reviser, but the fact that Stephen was speaking under such circumstances would easily account for a rapid change of subject, which would easily be supplied by his hearers; verb only in ver. 43 elsewhere, in a quotation—found several times in LXX, and also in use in classical Greek.

Ver. 5. ἀλλοποιαί: the field which Abraham bought, Gen. xxiii. 9-17, could not come under this title—the field was Abraham's purchase, not God's gift as ἀλλοποιαί (see Meyer -Wendt, and Westcott, Heb. vi. 12, additional note, also Bengel, in loco); ver. 16 sufficiently shows that Stephen was fully acquainted with Abraham's purchase of the field.—οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδὸς, cf. Deut. ii. 5, xi. 24, same Hebrew (cf. Heb. xi. 9), "spatium quod planta pedis calcatur" (Grimm); cf. also its use in Xen. It may have been a kind of proverbial expression, cf. Gen. viii. 9 (Schöttgen).—καὶ ἐπηγείλατο, cf. Gen. xii. 7 (xvii. 8, xviii. 4), so that here again God appeared unto Abraham in what was a strange and heathen land. See also for verb, James i. 12, ii. 5. On the force of the word see p. 54.—εἰς κατάχωσιν: "in possession," R.V., the A.V. renders the word in its secondary or derivative sense, which is found in ver. 45.—οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ πέντε: the faith of Abraham "tectesignificatur" (Blass), first because nothing was given—there was only a promise—and secondly because the promise was made while yet he had no child.

Ver. 6. δέ: not in contrast to the fact just mentioned that Abraham had no child, but introducing a fuller account of God's promise. The quotation is from LXX, Gen. xv. 13, with a few alterations; in LXX and Heb., the second person, not the third, is used; instead of οὐκ ιδία in LXX, αλλοτρία, cf. Heb. xi. 9; and instead of αὐτούς, αὐτό corresponding to σπέρμα. Wendt takes δι as "recitantis," and not with Meyer as a constituent part of the quotation itself, LXX: Γιγνώσκων γνώση δι' ἀλλοτρία, cf. Gen. xxi. 23, 34, xxvi. 3, and in N.T. cf. this passage and ver. 29. In Eph. ii. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 11, the word is also used, but metaphorically, although the usage may be said to be based on that of the LXX; cf. Epist. ad Diognet., v., 5, and Polycarp, Phil., inscript. See Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 102. —τότε τεταρκεύοντο: so too Gen. xv. 13. The period named belongs not only to κακώσουσιν but also to ἐσται, as Meyer rightly observes. But in Exod. xii. 40 four hundred and thirty years are mentioned as the sojourning which Israel sojourned in Egypt, and in both passages the whole space of time is so occupied; or, at all events it may be fairly said that this is implied in the Hebrew text in both Gen. xv. 13 and Exod. xii. 40:
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έτη τετρακόσια. 7. και τὸ ἑδυνόμενον φησίν 1 δουλεύσωσι, κρυμὼ γέων,
εἶπεν ο Θεὸς· "καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται, καὶ ἐλατρεύσωσι μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ.
8. καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην περιτομῆς καὶ
οὕτως ἔγνυσεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ, καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἀγάθῳ.

1 εν ΝΑΣΕΦ, so Tisch., W. H. alt., Weiss; αν BD, so W. H. Βουλευσωσι
ΝΒΕΗΡ, d, Vulg., Chrys., Lach., Weiss, Wendt, so in LXX, Gen. xv. 14:
δουλεύσωσιν AC 26, 96, Sah., Ir., so Tisch., Alford, W. H., R. V., so Blass in β
(see his Proleg. to Acta Apost., p. 35, and Grammatik, p. 212). In vii. 3 on the
contrary the LXX has ἦν αὐτῷ δεῖξαί; only δεν reads δεν, perhaps anticipating the
reading in vv. before us (Weiss). Winer-Schmiedel, p. 52, points out that δουλευ
σωσιν, though well attested, is open to suspicion.

cf. also for the same mode of reckoning
Philo, Quis rer. div. her., 54, p. 511, Mang. But neither here nor in Gal.
iii. 17 is the argument in the least degree affected by the precise period, or by the
adoption of one of the two chronological systems in preference to the other, and
in a speech round numbers would be quite sufficient to mark the progressive
stages in the history of the nation and of God’s dealings with them. For an
explanation of the point see Lightfoot, Gal. iii. 17, who regards the number in
Genesis as given in round numbers, but in Exodus with historical exactness (to
the same effect Wendt, Felten, Zöckler). But in the LXX version, Exod. xii. 40,
the four hundred and thirty years cover the sojourn both in Egypt and in Canaan,
thus including the sojourn of the Patriarchs in Canaan before the migration,
and reducing the actual residence in Egypt to about half this period, the
Vatican MS. reading four hundred and thirty-five years after adding καὶ εν
γῇ Χαναάν (the word πέντε, however, πέντε,
being erased), and the Alexandrian MS.
reading after εν Χαναάν the words αὐτῷ καὶ
οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν, making the re
vision in the chronology more decisive.
This is the chronology adopted in Gal.
iii. 17, and by Josephus, Ant., ii., 15, 2; but the latter writer in other passages,
Ant., ii., 9, 1, and B. Β. v., 9, 4, adopts the same reckoning as we find here in

Ver. 7. The oratio recta is introduced by the words εἰτεν ὁ Θεὸς . . . κρυμ gehört emphatic, cf. Rom. xii. 19. In this verse the quotation is a free rendering of
Gen. xv. 14, the words εἰς μετὰ ἀποστολῆς ταλλῆς being omitted after ἦλ.,
and the latter part of the verse being apparently introduced from Exod. iii. 12.
And so at length, after so long a time, God appointed for Himself a “holy
place,” cf. vi. 13 (Blass).—εἰν δουλεύ
σωσι, cf. LXX, Gen. xiv. 14, and see
critical note above, cf. also Burton, N. T.
Moods and Tenses, p. 123.

Ver. 8. διαθήκην, fadus (Grimm,
Blass), the same word is used in LXX,
Gen. xvii. το, and with two or three
exceptions uniformly in LXX for “cove
nant,” so too in the Apocrypha with
apparently two exceptions. The ordinary
word for “covenant,” συνθήκη, is very
rare in LXX (though used by the later
translators, Aquila, Sym., Theod., for
Γάμος, but see also Ramsay, Expositor,
ii., pp. 322, 323 (1898)). But the word διαθ.
would be suitably employed to express a divine covenant, because it could not be
said that in such a case the contractors are in any degree of equal standing
(συνθήκη). In the N.T. the sense of “covenant” is correct (except in Gal.
iii. 15 and Heb. ix. 16). But in classical
writers from the time of Plato διαθήκη
generally has the meaning of a will, a
testament, a disposition of property, and
in the Latin renderings of the word in
the N.T. we find uniformly testamentum
in cases where the sense of “covenant” is beyond dispute (Luke i. 72, Acts iii.
d. dispositionis; and here d. has dis
positionem, also in Rom. xi. 27), cf., e.g.,
in this verse, Vulgate and Par. No
doubt the early translators would render
διαθήκη by its ordinary equivalent, al
though in the common language it is quite possible that testamentum had a
wider meaning than the classical sense of will, see Westcott, Hebrews, additional
note on ix. 16; Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 15;
A. B. Davidson, Hebrews, p. 161; and
“Covenant” in Hastings’ B. D. and
Grimm-Thayer, sub ν.; Hatch, Essays
in Biblical Greek, pp. 47, 48; and more
recently Ramsay, Expositor, ii., pp. 300
and 321 ff. (1898).

καὶ ὁ Ἰσαχάκ τῷ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ὁ Ἰακώβ τοὺς δώδεκα πατριάρχας. 9. καὶ οἱ πατριάρχαι  ἦλθασιν  τῶν ἰωσήφ ἀπέδοντο εἰς Ἅγιοντον. 10. καὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέλειτο αὐτὸν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν μὴρεφῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ σοφίαν ἐναντίον Φαραώ, βασιλέως Ἅγιοντος, καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἥγουμενον ἐπ' Ἅγιοντος καὶ δὸλων τῶν οἰκῶν αὐτοῦ. 11. ἦλθε δὲ λιμός ἐφ' ἅλη τῆν γῆν Ἅγιοντος καὶ Χανάν, καὶ θλίψεις μεγάλης καὶ οὐκ εὐρίσκον χορτάσματα οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. 12. ἀκούσας δὲ Ἰακώβ ὁ πατήρ οὗτος ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ, ἐξαπέστειλε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν πρῶτον καὶ ἐν τῷ δεύτερῳ ἀνεγνώρισθη ἱωσήφ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ φανερῶν ἐγένετο τῷ
184
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Φαραώ τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ. 14. ἀποστείλας δὲ Ἰωσήφ μετεκαλέσατο
τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ, καὶ πάσαν τὴν συγγένειαν αὐτοῦ, ἐν ψυχαῖς
ἐβομμενοτεῦτα. 15. κατέβη δὲ Ἰακώβ ἐις Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ετε-

1 τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ΔΗΡ, Chrys., so Hilg.; om. Ἰωσήφ BC 47, so Lach., W.H.,
Wendt, Weiss. τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ ΝΑΕ 49, Vulg., Arm., so Tisch., Blass; τὴν τυχ.
αὐτοῦ—αὐτοῦ om. ΝΑΒΧΡ, Vulg. (am. fu.demid.), Syr. Harem., Arm., Chrys., so

2 DH, Gig. read ἐν ψυχαῖς εν θεμελοτεῦτα (cf. Deut. x. 22), so Blass and Hilg.

3 εἰς Ἀἴγυπτον om. B (W.H. in brackets)—Wendt regards as an addition from
LXX—but retained in MACDEHP, Vulg., Syrr. (P.H.), etc.; so Weiss and Hilg.

had been only mentioned incidentally
"became manifest" when Joseph's
brethren came, and he revealed himself
to them, so that Pharaoh and his house-
hold were aware of it, ver. 16. It was
not until later that five of Joseph's
brethren were actually presented to
Pharaoh, xlvi. I ft. (Hackett).

Ver. 14, μετεκαλέσατο: fourtimes in
Acts, and nowhere else in N.T., cf. x.
33, xx. 17, xxiv. 25, only once in LXX,
H. and R., cf. Hosea xi. 2, A; so εἰσ-
κλέομαι, only once in N.T., cf. Acts x. 23;
not in LXX or Apocrypha. Both com-
ounds are peculiar to St. Luke in N.T.,
and are frequent in medical writers, to
"send for" or "call in" (although Polyb.
in middle voice, xxii. 5, 2, in same sense)
a physician, Hobart, Medical Language,
etc., p. 219. In Attic Greek we should
have μεταπέμπεσθαι.—ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐβομ-
x. 22, in (consisting in) so many souls,
εἰς Ἀἴγυπτον καὶ ετεῦτα Ἰωσήφ

Ver. 15. The frequent mention of
Egypt may perhaps indicate that Stephen
meant to emphasise the fact that there,
far away from the land of promise, God's
Presence was with the chosen race (who
were now all in a strange land) and His
worship was observed.—μετετέθησαν:
only here in this sense in N.T. Some
have supposed that only οἱ πατέρες and
not αὐτοῖς is the subject; this would no
doubt avoid the first difficulty of the
verse, εἰς, that Jacob was buried in
Shechem, whereas according to Gen. 1.
13 he was laid to rest in the cave of
Machpelah. But a further difficulty
must be met. Joseph is the only son of
the Patriarch who is expressly stated to
have been buried in Shechem, Josh. xxiv.
32, and of the removal of the bodies from
Egypt nothing is said. But the silence
as to the latter fact need not trouble us,
as whether we accept the tradition men-
tioned by Josephus or by St. Jerome,
they both presuppose the removal of the
bodies of the Patriarchs to the promised
land, cf. the discussion on Exod. xiii. 19,
Mechilta (Lumbry, p. 164), Wetstein, in
loco, and see also the tradition in the
Book of Jubilees, chap. xiv., that the
children carried up the bones of the sons
of Jacob, and buried them in Machpelah,
except those of Joseph. But another
tradition is implied in Sot. 7 b. Accord-
ing to Josephus, who probably repeats a
local tradition, Ant., ii., 8, 2, they were
buried at Hebron. But according to
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ηδέ τὸν Ἰωσήφ. ουτος1 κατασοφισάμενος τὸ γένος ἡμῶν, ἐκάκωσε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, τοῦ ποιεῖ ἐκβαίνα τὰ βρέφη αὐτῶν, εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογονεῖσθαι. 20. Ἐν καρπῷ ἐγεννήθη ἦμων, καὶ ἦν ἀπειρόν τῇ

1 ουτος, D reads καὶ, so Hilg.
2 Μωσῆς AEP; Μωσῆς N BCDH, W.H., Weiss.

above. ήδέ not άλλος, probably meaning the native sovereign after the expulsion of the Shepherd Kings, "Joseph," B.D.2; "Egypt," B.D.2, pp. 886, 887; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 5, pp. 759, 760; Sayce, Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 237. —δρας τοῦ: only in Luke amongst the Evangelists, Luke xxi. 24, Acts vii. 18, xxvii. 33. Sayce, following Dr. Naville, argues in favour of Ramses II. as the Pharaoh of the Oppression, see u.s. and Expository Times, January and April, 1899, but see on the other hand the number of February, p. 210 (Prof. Hamond), and Expositor, March, 1897, Prof. Orr on the Exodus. Joseph settled under the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings, but the words "who knew not Joseph" should apparently refer, according to Dr. Sayce, not to the immediately succeeding dynasty, i.e., the eighteenth, in which a Canaanite might still have occupied a place of honour, but rather to the nineteenth, which led to the overthrow of the stranger, and to a day of reckoning against the Hebrews. But it becomes difficult to speak with absolute confidence in the present state of Egyptological research, see Expositor, u.s., p. 177. οίς ήδει: in Robinson's Gesenius, p. 380, the word is taken literally, or it may mean "who does not know Joseph's history or services"; others take it "who had no regard for his memory or services". Hamburger understands by it that Joseph was quite forgotten under the new national dynasty, whilst Nøsgen refers to the use of άλλος in Matt. xxvi. 12.

Ver. 19. κατασοφισάμενος: in Exod. i. 10 we have the same verb "let us deal wisely with them" here translated "deal subtly"; Vulgate, "circuitumveniens," cf. Rhenish version: "circumventing our stock" (γόνος, as in iv. 36); cf. Judith v. 11, x. 19, in both passages the same verb is used, translated (R.V.), v. 11, "dealt subtly"—the Syriac, probably nearest to the Hebrew, "dealt wisely with them," i.e., the Egyptians dealt so with the Hebrews. In the second passage, R.V., word is rendered "might deceive"; same verb in Syriac as in Exod. i. 10, Heb.; Speaker's Commentary, "Apocrypha," i., p. 290. Josephus and Philo use verb in same sense as in text; see for the force and meaning of κατά here, Page and Rendall. —δεξίως, cf. Exod. i. 11, where the same word is used of task-masters afflicting the people with burdens. For other ways in which Pharaoh is said to have afflicted the people, see Ηos., Αnt., ii., 9, 1.—τοῦ τοιείν κ.τ.λ., "that they [or he, margin] should cast out their babes," R.V. But a comparison with Exod. i. 22 (LXX) justifies us in taking these words, as in R.V. margin, as describing the tyranny of Pharaoh, not as declaring that the parents themselves exposed their children. For the construction see Blass, Grammatik, p. 231; cf. 1 Kings xviii. 20, etc., genitive of result, see Page on iii. 12, and in loco, and Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 157.—ιεβητα: only here in N.T. and not in LXX, but used with γόνος in Eur., Andr., 70.—εἰς τὸ: expressing the purpose, cf. Luke v. 17.—ζωογονεῖσθαι: in the active the verb is used three times, in Exod. i., of the midwives saving the Hebrew children alive, ver. 17, 18, 22 (cf. Judg. viii. 19, etc.), vivum conservare. In the N.T. the word is only used by St. Luke here and in his Gospel, chap. xvii. 33, and once by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 13 (see R.V. margin). St. Chrysostom comments on the thought that where man's help was despaired of, and the child was cast forth, then God's benefit did shine forth conspicuous, Hom., xvi.

Ver. 20. Ἐν καρπῷ, cf. i. 7, iii. 19, characterising the time, comp. Bengel, tristi, opportuno: on the name Μωσῆς see Blass, Grammatik, p. 10, and Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 5, p. 768, and critical notes.—ἄντις τῷ Θεῷ: if we render the expression as in A. and R.V., "exceeding fair," the dative τῷ Θεῷ is used as an equivalent of the Hebrew expression employed almost in a superlative sense, πόλις μεγ. τῷ Θεῷ, Jonah iii. 3. τοῖς μεγ. τῷ Θεῷ. Or the expression may be rendered "fair to God," i.e., in the judgment of God; cf. θυσία τῷ Θεῷ, 2 Cor. x. 4 and James ii. 5. τοῖς πτωχοῖς τῷ κόσμῳ. Page and Wendt.
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Θεώ, δε ανετράφη μήνας τρεις ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. 21. ἐκτεθέντα δὲ αὐτῶν, ἅνεκιθεταύτων ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραώ, καὶ ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτῶν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν. 22. καὶ ἐπαιδεύθη ὁ μωσῆς πάση σοφία.

1 DE, Syr. Harcl. mg. add παρά (E εἰς) τον ποταμον after εκτ. . . . αὐτον, Blass in β, so Hilg. anavelo; but -ατο in ΝΑΒΚΌΔΕ (H) 61, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg., Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112.

The word is used in classical Greek, as in Wisdom vii. 4 and here, of a child nourished to promote its growth (although sometimes with the idea of improving the mind, cf. Acts xx. 3). In the N.T. it is peculiar to St. Luke, and it is just the word which a medical man would use, frequently found in medical writings, opposed to ἀργαλία; see L. and S., sub ν. v., and Hobart, Medical Language, p. 207.

Ver. 21. ἐκτεθ.: the regular word for exposure of children in classical Greek; see also Wisdom xvii. 4, and here in the same sense; cf. Exod. ii. 3, and β critical note above. ἀνετράφ.: same word in Exod. ii. 5. The verb, though very frequent in Luke in the sense of to kill, is only used here in the sense of A. and R.V., Vulgate, sustulit—but cf. Aristoph., Nub., 531: Epict., Diss., i. 23, 7. ἑαυτῇ: as in contrast to the child's own mother. According to tradition, Pharaoh's daughter designed him for the throne, as the king had no son, Jos., Ant., ii., 9, 7. — εἰς υἱόν, Exod. ii. 10; cf. xiii. 22, 47: Simcox, Language of N. T., p. 80.

Ver. 22. ἐπαιδεύθη, cf. xxii. 3 here with instrumental dative, or, better, dative of respect or manner; not mentioned in Exodus, but see Philo, Vita Mosis, ii., 83, Mang., and also Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 343, E.T.; cf. the knowledge of magic ascribed to Pharaoh's wise men in Exod. vii. 11, and "Jannes and Jambres," B.D., and also 1 Kings iv. 30, and Isa. xix. 2, 11, 12; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums "Zauberer," i., 7, 1068, and references in Wetstein, in loco. παιδεύω, both in LXX and N.T., used in the sense of training; cf. Prov. v. 13 (Jos., C. Apion, i., 4), 1 Tim. i. 20, Titus ii. 12, and also in the sense of chastising, so often in LXX and in N.T., and also similarly used in classical Greek. The passage is also important because it helped to fix the attention of cultivated early Christian writers upon the wisdom of Greek poets and philosophers, and to give a kind of precedent for the right pursuit of such studies; cf. Clem. Alex., Strom., i., 5, 28; vi., 5, 42; Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph., c., 1-4; see Dean Plumptre's note, in loco.—ὑπὸ διανωτος, cf. xviii. 24, and especially Luke xxiv. 19; see also Ecclus. xxii. 7, 8, 10, 11. If αὐτοῦ is retained, the mode of expression is Hephastic (Blass). There is no contradiction with Exod. iv. 10, and no need to explain the expression of Moses' writings, for Stephen has in his thoughts not so much, as we may believe, the oratorical form as the powerful contents of Moses' words (e.g., his prophetic teaching, Hamburger, "Moses," Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 5, 772). Josephus speaks of him as παλαιός δαίμον τῶν ἡμῶν τιθημένων, Ant., iii., 1, 4 (see also Jos., Ant., ii., 10, 1, for the traditional exploits of Moses, and Hamburger, u. s., p. 771).

Ver. 23. ἑαυτῷ, cf. i. 10, Lucan. The exact age is not mentioned in O.T., but it was traditional (Weiss refers its mention to the reviser, perhaps introduced as a parallel to ver. 30). According to the tradition, which Stephen apparently followed, Moses lived forty years in Pharaoh's palace, but some accounts
give twenty years; his dwelling in Midian occupied forty years, and he governed Israel for the same period, xxxiii. 18. See Midrash Tanchuma on Exod. ii. 6 (Weinstein, with other references, so too Lumby).—ἐπληρούτο, "but when he was well-nigh," etc., R.V., lit. "when the age of forty years was being fulfilled to him" (imperf. tense), cf. Luke xxi. 24, Acts ii. 1, ix. 23, xxiv. 27, and ver. 30 below; so repeatedly in LXX.—ἀνέβη επί τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9 for the expression, probably taken from LXX, Isa. lxv. 17, cf. Jer. iii. 16, xxviii. 35, Ezek. xxxviii. 10, and 2 Kings xii. 4. The phrase is an imitation of the Hebrew. Gesenius compares the phrase before us with Heb., Ezek. xiv. 3, 4; see also Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 66 (1896)—ἐπισκέψασθαι, cf. Luke i. 68, 78, and vii. 16, cf. Exod. iv. 31, of God visiting His people by Moses and Aaron (Acts xv. 14). In each of these passages the verb is used of a divine visitation, and it is so used by St. Luke only amongst N.T. writers, except Heb. ii. 6 = Ps. viii. 5. It is used elsewhere in Matt. xxv. 36, 43, James i. 27, Acts vi. 3, xv. 36 (cf. Judg. xv. 1). The word is used of visits paid to the sick, cf. Ecclus. vii. 35, and so in classical Greek (see Mayor on James i. 27), often in medical writings and in Plutarch (Grimm, sub v., and Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 105); mostly in the LXX, as always in the N.T., in good sense (Gen. xxi.-1, Ps. viii. 4, lxxix. 14, Ecclus. xvi. 14, Judith viii. 33, but also with reference to divine punishment, Ps. lxxviii. 31, 32, Jer. ix. 9, 25, xi. 22, xxxiv. (xxvii.) 8, etc.), cf. its use in Psalms of Solomon, where it is generally employed with reference to divine visitation, either for purposes of punishment or deliverance. In modern Greek = to visit, same sense as in LXX and N.T.; Kennedy, u. s., p. 155. For its old English sense of visit, as looking upon with kindness, Lumby compares Shaks, Rich. II., i., 3, 275: "All places that the eye of heaven visits".—τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ: though in a king's palace, and far removed in one sense from his people, Moses remembers that he is an Israelite, and that he has brethren; while others forgot their brotherhood he reminded them of it: "motivum amoris quod Μoses etiam aliis adhibuit ver. 26," Bengel, cf. Exod. ii. 10, and Heb. xi. 24, 25.

Ver. 24. ἀδικούμενον, "wronged," i.e., by blows, Exod. ii. 11.—καταπονουμένοι: only here in N.T. (sc., τον ἀδικούντα); in active the verb means to defend, "debebat scribere ἰάμων," says Blasis, but in the middle it means defence of oneself, or of a friend, with the collateral notion of requital or retaliation on an enemy (see Rendall). In the middle it has also the meaning of avenging, and therefore might mean here "he took vengeance on" or "he repulsed" (cf. Josh. x. 13, 2 Macc. x. 17, Wisdom xi. 3, and Jos., Ant., i., 1, 2), although this is expressed in the next words.—ἐκτούγενους αὐτοῦ, cf. Luke xvii. 7, 8, xxi. 22; lit., "wrought an avenging," Rom. xii. 22 (cf. Heb. x. 30), 2 Coexvii. 11, 12, and 2 Pet. ii. 14. This and similar expressions are common in LXX, Judg. xi. 36, Ps. cxxix. 7, Ezek. xxv. 17, 1 Macc. iii. 15, vii. 9, 24, 38; ἐκ in Polybius with τοιαύτης, iii., 8, 10.—καταπονοῦμενος: only here and in 2 Pet. ii. 7; cf. 2 Macc. vii. 2 (R has καταπονοομενος; the Jews oppressed, trodden down, in the days of Judas Maccabaeus), 3 Macc. ii. 2, 13; used in Polyb. and Josephus, etc. The exact word is found in Didache, v., 2.—παρῆκας: lit., to strike, hence to kill, in Biblical language only, cf. Exod. ii. 12 and 14, and ver. 28 below; so also in Matt. xxvi. 31, Mark iv. 27 (Zech. xiii. 7, LXX). The verb is very frequent in LXX. "Smiting the Egyptian," R.V.—τὸν Αἰγ.: not previously mentioned, but implied in ἀδικόν, which involves an oppressor; as in ver. 26 the facts are regarded by St. Stephen as known to his audience.

Ver. 25. ἄνομες 81: a comment by St. Stephen, but we are not told upon
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

23-27.

25. ενώμιζε δὲ συνήνεα τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς διὰ χειρός αὐτοῦ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίαν. οἱ δὲ οὐ συνήκαν.
26. τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὡφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένος, καὶ συνῆλθασεν αὐτοῖς εἰς εἰρήνην, εἰπών, "Ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἄστε ὑμεῖς· ἵνα ἀδικεῖτε ἄλληλους;" 27. ὁ δὲ ἀκωκὸν τῶν πλησίον ἀπόστασιν αὐτῶν, εἰπών, "Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἁρχοντα καὶ

1 After Αἰγυπτιον, D (Wer.) add καὶ εκρυψεν αυτόν στῇ ομμῇ; cf. Exodus ii. 12 (Blass rejects, Hilg. retains).
2 συνήλασεν AE, Chrys., some verss., so Meyer, Alford; συνῆλθασεν ΝBCDE e, Vulg., Syrr. (P. and H.), Sah., so Tisch., W. H., R. V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After μαχομενος D adds εἰδεν αὐτοὺς αδικοῦντας (not retained by Blass but by Hilg.).
3 οἱ δὲ οὐ συνήκαν: Mr. Page notes the rhetorical power in these words, cf. ver. 53 καὶ οὐκ ἔφυλαξατο.
4 Ver. 26. ἀφθ: Wendt commends Bengel, who sees in the word the thought that he appeared ulter, ex improviso, cf. ii. 3, vii. 2, Heb. ix. 28. —συνῆλθασεν: but if we read συνηλάσασθαι, see critical note = imperfect, de conatu, cf. Matt. iii. 14, Luke i. 59, xv. 14, Acts xxvi. 11, see Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 12, from συναλλάσσω, only found here in N. T., not in LXX or Apocrypha, but in classical Greek, cf. Thuc., i., 24. —συνῆλθασεν = συνῆλθασεν τῇ γέφυρᾳ; cf. iv. 25, and Luke xiii. 7 (Matt. ix. 4, xxvii. 46, 1 Cor. x. 29), and with the words ἵνα ἀδικεῖτε ἄλληλους; Exod. ii. 13 (Moulton and Geden): used several times in LXX, also by Aristoph. and Plato. Like the Latin ut quid? see Grimm, sub υ., and for spelling; and comp. also Blass, Gram., p. 14, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 36. —ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοὶ ἄστε: the fact of their brotherhood aggravated their offence; it was no longer a matter between an Egyptian and a Hebrew as on the previous day, but between brother and brother — community of suffering should have cemented and not destroyed their sense of brotherhood. Hackett and Alford take ἄνδρες as belonging to ἀδελφοὶ (not as = κύριοι, "Sirs" in A. and R. V.), men related as brethren are ye, cf. Gen. xiii. 8.
5 Ver. 27. ἀπώσατο for Attic ἀπεώσατο (see also ver. 45), not found in the O. T. parallel, but added by Stephen, cf. ver. 38, compare LXX, Jer. iv. 30. The word may be introduced to emphasize the contumaciousness of the people, which in Stephen's narrative is the motive of the flight of Moses; in Exodus, Moses flees from fear of Pharaoh, and the answer of the Hebrew demonstrates to him that his deed of yesterday was known—but there is no contradiction in the two narratives. The matter would become known to Pharaoh, as the words of the Hebrew intimated; it could not be hidden; and in spite of the attempt at concealment on the part of Moses by hiding the body in the sand, his life was no longer safe, and so he fled because he had nothing to hope for from his people. Stephen's words would be quite consistent with the narrative in Exodus (Nössen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 163, as against Überbeck).
δικασθήν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς 1; 28. μὴ ανελείν με οὐθέν, αὐτὸ ν ἐν τρόπον ἀνέλεης χάβες 2 τῶν Ἀγίων τίτων; " 29. ἐγινον δὲ Μωυσῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτω, καὶ ἐγένετο πάροικος ἐν τῇ Μαδιὰμ, οὐ γινόμενος οὐδὲς δύο. 30. Καὶ πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα, ὀδή αὐτῶ ἐν τῇ φρίμη τοῦ δρόμου

2 χαβε AEHEP, Chrys; χαβε ΝΒ*CD 34, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss (Winerschmiedel, p. 54).
3 D reads οὐτος καί εὐφυγαδευσεν Μωυσῆς (καί οὗτος δ), so Hilg.; E reads εὐφυγα
dευσεν δε Μωυσῆν ; Gig. has fugatus est antem M.; and Par. effugavit antem se M. Weiss (Codex D, p. 67) inclines to consider εὐφυγαδ. as the original reading (so Zöckler), and to take it trans., understanding ό αδικων as the nom. εὐφυγαδέυω nowhere else in Ν.Τ. : in LXX found both trans. and intrans. but gen. the latter; commoner εὐφυγεν may be corruption of it here; εὐφυγαδεύω frequent in Letters of Pseudo-Heraclitus.

Ver. 29. ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦτω: Weiss points out that Moses fled on account of this word, because he saw that his people would not protect him against the vengeance of Pharaoh. Jos., Αντ., ii., 11, 1, makes the cause of the flight of Moses not the words which told him that his deed was known, but the jealousy of the Egyptians, who represented to the king that he would prove a seditious person. — Μαδιὰμ: generally taken to mean or to include the peninsula of Sinai (Εxod. ii.15, and iii.1), and thus agrees with the natural supposition that his flight did not carry Moses far beyond the territory of Egypt (cf. Εxod. xviii.1-27). The name Midianites would be applied to the descendants of Abraham's fourth son by Keturah, who in various clans, some nomadic, some mercantile (e.g., those to whom Joseph was sold), may be described as Northern Arabs. (Dr. Sayce, u. s., p. 270, maintains that Moses to get beyond Egyptian territory must have travelled further than to the S. peninsula of our modern maps, and places Sinai in the region of Seir, with Midian in its close neighbourhood.) Amongst one of these tribes Moses found a home in his flight, Hamburger, "Midian," Real-Encyclopedia des Ιudentums, i., 5, 755. Hackett, Acts, p. 104. "Midian," B.D.1. —οβ εὐγνων, cf. Εxod. ii. 22, iv. 20, xviii. 3. Weiss thinks the notice due to a reviser, who wished to show that Moses had given up his people, and made himself a home in a strange land.

Ver. 30. πληρωθέντων, see ver. 23, cf. Εxod. vii. 7, "fulfilled," R.V. οθη, ver. 2, so the second fundamental re-

velation of God to Israel took place in the wilderness far away from the Promised Land (Weiss), see also ver. 33.—τεσσαράκοντα, cf. i. 3. —Σινα: there is no contradiction between this and Εxod. iii. 1, where the appearance is said to take place in Horeb, for whilst in the N.T. and Josephus Sinai only is named for the place of the law-giving, in the O.T. the two names are interchanged, cf. also Ecclus. xviii. 7. According to Hamburger the two names are identical, signifying in a narrower sense only one mountain, the historical mountain of the giving of the law, but in a wider sense given to a whole group of mountains. Thus Hamburger declines to accept the view that Horeb was the name of the whole ridge of mountain-cluster, whilst Sinai specially denotes the mountain of the law-giving, since Horeb is also used for the same event (cf. Εxod. iii. 1, xvii. 6, xxxiii. 6), Real-Encyclopedia des Ιudentums, i., 7, 940. See also B.D.1. "Sinai," Wendt, edition (1899), in loco; Schaff-Hertzog, Encyclopædia, iv., "Sinai" (also for literature); and Grimm-Thayer, sub v. According to Sayce, Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 263 ff., Sinai is a mountain of Seir, rather than the Sinaic peninsula so called. The same writer lays stress upon the fact that Sinai is associated with Seir and Edom, Deut. xxxiii. 2. Judg. v. 4, 5, and maintains that it is nowhere in the O.T. transported to the Sinaic peninsula of our modern maps. The word Σινα is an indeclinable noun τό (sc., ὅρος); Josephus τὸ Σιναῖον and τὸ Σιναῖον ὅρος; Grimm-Thayer, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 91. Blass, Gram., 8, 32; and see also Sayce, u. s., p. 268, 259, and Patriarchal Palestine, p. 259, who renders as adjective "(the mountain)
Σινά αγγέλου Κυρίου 1 εν φλογι πυρός 2 βάτου. 31. ο δε Μωσής ἰδὼν
εὐαίμαυτον το δραμα· προσερχόμενον δε αὐτοῦ κατανοῆσαι, ἐγένετο
φωνή Κυρίου πρὸς αὐτόν, 32. "Εγώ ο Θεός τῶν πατέρων σου, ο
Θεός Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ο Θεός Ιακώβ." ἐντρομός δε γενόμενος Μωσής ὁδὸς ἑτοίμα κατανοῆσαι. 33. εἶπε δε αὐτῷ ο
Κύριος, "Αὐτὸν τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου· ο γὰρ τόπος ἐν φλογι

1 Κυρίου om. NAB 61, 81, Vulg., Sah., Boh.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass (a
and β, although found in D), Weiss, Wendt (prob. added from Exod. iii. 2); Hilg.
retains.

2 εν φλογι πυρός NBDHP, Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aeth., Chrys., so
W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, and Hilg.; εν πυρι πυρος Α, Εχοδ., Πesh.,
εν πυρι φλογος Α, Εχοδ., Πesh., Βlass (α and β, although found in D), Weiss,
and β, although found in Exod. iii. 2); Weiss, Wendt, and Hilg.

3 εὐαίμαυτον NDEHP 1, 31, 61, Aug., so Tisch., Weiss (Wendt doubtful), Hilg.
both read αἰμαυτον (D) for αἰμαυτοσ; cf. Exod. iii. 7.

which belongs to Sin," i.e., like desert which it overlooked, to the worship of
the Babylonian Moon-God Sin in that
region.—Εγγελος: in Exod. iii. 2 "the
angel of the Lord," but in ver. 7 "the
angel of the Lord said," so here in ver. 31 "the voice
of the Lord said," cf. ver. 33. For the
23 with xxiii. 11. In this Angel, the
Angel of the Lord, cf. Exod. iii. 2 with
vv. 6, 14, and Gen. xxii. 11 with ver. 12;
the Angel of the Presence, Exod. xxxiii.
11. cf. Isa. lxiii. 9 (ver. 38 below),
although Jewish interpreters varied,
the Fathers saw the Logos, the Eternal
Word of the Father. See references in
Felten, in loco, and Liddon, Bapt.,
1. εθαυμάσει: in Exod. iii. 7.
"εθαυμάσεν" DΕΗΡ, 31, 6τ, Αug., so
Τisch., Weiss, Wendt, and
Hilg.; εθαυμάσεν εν πυρι φλογος
in B, εθαυμάσεν εν φλογι πυρος
so LXX, Exod. iii. 2, varies: εν πυρι
φλογος in B; εν πυρι πυρος ΑΦ.

Ver. 31. κατανοῆσαι: this careful ob-
serving is implied in the narrative of
Exodus though the word is not employed.
It is a favourite word with St. Luke, and
is used by him four times in his Gospel
and four times in Acts, elsewhere in
Gospels only in Matt. viii. 25 (five times
in Epistles). On its force see Westcott on
Heb. iii. 1: "oculos vel mentem de
figere in aliquo" Grimm; properly =
to take notice of, so in classical Greek;
it is used also in the sense of ob-
serving, looking at, cf. James i. 27; and
in a general sense, to see, cf. LXX, Ps.
xxiii. 9, cf. xc. 8; and also, to consider,
Heb. x. 24 (Mayor, note on James
i. 27). In the LXX, where it is frequent,
it is used with both shades of
meaning.

Ver. 32. ἐντρομός γεν.; (cf. x. 4, έμφο-
βος γενω), xvi. 20, 29, cf. Exod. iii. 6.
expression used only in Acts in these two
passages (Heb. xii. 21, quotation from
LXX). έμφοβος is found five times in
4, xxiv. 25 (only once elsewhere, in Rev.
xiii. 33, with έγένοτο), and in each pas-
sage with γενόμενος. ἐντρομός, Dan.
(Thed.) x. 11, Wisdom xvi. 10, 1 Macc.
xii. 2, and in Ps. xviii. (xxvii.) 7, lxxvi.
(-vii.) 18, ἐντρομός έγενθη τη γη—
the word is also used by Philochs.

Ver. 33. λύσον, cf. Josh. v. 15, λύσον
Α., cf. Exod. iii. 5; in classical Greek,
lύσον, omitting σου. On the custom of
worshipping bare-footed, as the priests
when actually engaged in the Temple.
or as the Arabs enter their mosques with
bare feet, or the Samaritan the holiest
place on Gerizim, see instances, both
classical, Juvenal, Sat., vi., 158, and from
Josephus and others, Wetstein and
Wendt, in loco. The latter refers to an
Egyptian custom the order of Pytha-
goras ἀνυπόδητος θυε και προσκύνει,
Jamblich., Vit. Pyth., 23, and cf. 18 in
Wetstein.—το υπόδημα, cf. xiii. 25, and
John i. 27, where in each passage the
singular is used. Both Weiss and Wendt
note the significance of the verse—a
strange land is consecrated (cf. vi. 13,
tότος οἰκος) by the presence of God—
the Jews thought that the Temple was
the only holy place, cf. add. note for
significance in connection with the aim
34. ἔστης γῆ αγία εστίν. 35. ιδών είδον τὴν κάκωσιν του λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἥκουσα: καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτῶν: καὶ νῦν δεύο, ἀποστέλω ἵνα εἰς Ἀἰγύπτον." 35. τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὑπὲρ ἡρήσατο εἰπόντες, "Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν;" τούτον ὁ Θεὸς ἀρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπόστειλεν εἰς τὴν βάτων. 36. οὗτος εξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς, ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεία εἰς τῇ Ἀγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἄραβι ἐθάλασσῃ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτησομάκρονα.

of St. Stephen's speech, and St. Chrysostom's comment in loco.

Ver. 34. ἔστης γῆ αγία εστίν: Hebraism, so LXX, Exod. iii. 7, and so frequently, e.g., Ps. xl. 1, cf. Matt. xiii. 14, Heb. vi. 14 (Gen. xxii. 17), the participle with the verb emphasising the assurance. But similar collocations are not wanting in classical Greek, see Page, in loco, and Wendt, who compares 1 Cor. ii. 1. The phrase ἔστης γῆ αγία εστίν occurs in Lucian, Dial. Mar., iv. 3 (Wetstein). "I have surely seen," R.V., so in A. and R.V., Exod. iii. 7, see Simcox, Language of N. T., p. 130, and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 217 (1896).—καὶ νῦν δεύο ἀποστέλω, but cf. Exod. iii. 10; ἀποστέλω; see critical notes. On the hortatory subj. in first person singular with δεύο or δέος prefixed, see Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 74, cf. Matt. vii. 4, Luke vi. 42, but translated by the revisers, "I will send," with an imperative force as of a divine command (see Rendall's note, in loco). For classical instances cf. Wendt, in loco.

Ver. 35. τούτον: followed by the triple οὗτος, a significant and oratorical repetition—anaphora or repetition of the pronoun, cf. ii. 23, v. 31 (so Bengel, Blass, Viteau, see also Simcox, Language of the N. T., pp. 65, 66). It plainly appears to be one of the purposes, although we cannot positively say the chief purpose, of the speech to place Moses in typical comparison to Jesus and the behaviour of the Jews towards Him, ver. 25.—(καὶ) ἀρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτῆς: Moses was made by God a ruler and even more than a judge—not δικαστής but λυτρωτής. But just as the denial of the Christ is compared with the denial of Moses, cf. ἠρήσασθε in Acts iii. 13, so in the same way the λύτρωσις wrought by Christ is compared with that wrought by Moses, cf. Luke i. 68, ii. 38, Heb. ix. 12, Tit. ii. 14 (so Wendt, in loco) "omnia quae negaverant Judaei Deus attribuit Moysi" (Blass). λυτρωτῆς in LXX and in Philo, but not in classical Greek. In the Sept. the word is used of God Himself, Ps. xix. 14, lxxviii. 35 (cf. Deut. xiii. 5, and Psalms of Solomon, ix. 1).—ἐν χειρὶ, cf. xx. 31, but σύν is closer to the classical σύν θεοῖς with the helping and protecting hand, ἐν χειρὶ = ἐν θεοῖς, cf. Gal. iii. 19.—τῇ βάτῳ: 0 Attic, Hellenistic, but in N. T. it varies, in Luke xx. 37 feminine, in Mark xii. 26 (and in LXX) masculine (W.H.); Blass, Gram., p. 26; Grimm-Thayer, sub v.

Ver. 36. οὗτος see ver. 35.—ἐξήγαγεν, Exod. iii. 10, καὶ δεύο τοῖς λαὸν μου.—Ἐρυθρὰ θαλάσσῃ in LXX frequent, ἐν θαλάσσῃ sometimes with, sometimes without the article, here as in the Heb. without: cf. the parallel in Assumption of Moses, iii., 11 (ed. Charles), and see below on ver. 38.
34-38. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

37. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ο ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, "Προφήτην ὑμῶν ἀνατίθησε Κύριος ὁ θεός ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν αδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς ἀμετάκτως αὐτοῦ." 38. Οὗτός ἐστιν Ῥεβεκκίαν ἡν ἐκκλησία ἐν Χαρίλαον ἐν ὑμῖν μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ 3 λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι ἐνα καὶ Συριακῷ.


Ver. 37. οὗτος, cf. ver. 35, cf. Deut. xviii. 15, and iii. 22, above. The introduction of the prophecy may mean that St. Stephen wished in this as in the preceding and following verse to emphasize the position and the work of Moses, and to mark more strongly the disobedience of the people. Blass regards οὗτος εἶστιν ὁ Μ. κ.τ.λ. as intended to show that Moses, whom the Jews accused Stephen of injuring, was himself by his own words a supporter of the claims of Christ: " hic est illā M. quidixit". Ver. 38. οὗτος: again emphatic use. — ἐκκλησία: " in the congregation," R.V. margin: held in the wilderness for the giving of the law, although the word does not occur in Exod. xix., but cf. Deut. xxxi. 30, Josh. viii. 35 (ix. 2). By Wycliffe the word was translated " Church " here, but afterwards " congregation," so in Tynd., Cranm., Gen., until A.V. again rendered " Church," cf. Heb. ii. 2, and Jos., Ant., xv., 5, 3; the latter passage represents Herod as saying that the Jews learned all that was most holy in their law δι' αγγέλων παρά του Θεου (see Westcott Hebrews, and Wetstein on Gal. iii. 19). On the title μεσίτης as given to Moses, see further Assumption of Moses, i., 14, and Charles' note and introd. ixiii., but it does not follow that the inference is justified that the Apocryphal Book in question was known to the writer of St. Stephen's speech. Dr. Charles maintains this on the ground of three passages, but of (1) it may be said that the term μεσίτης evidently could have been known from other sources than Acts, (2) the parallel between ver. 36 and Assumption of Moses, iii., 11, is, as Dr. Charles admits, an agreement verbally " for the most part," but the words " Egypt, the Red Sea, and the wilderness for forty years" might often be used as a summary of the history of Israel at a particular period, whilst the context with which the words are here associated is quite different from that in Assumption of Moses, i.c., and (3) there is no close resemblance between the prophecy from Amos quoted in ver. 43 below and the prophecy in Assumption of Moses, ii., 13; in both the phraseology is quite general. Perhaps the omission of the word μετὰ before τῶν πατέρων gives emphasis to the privilege of " our fathers," when one can speak of being with the angel and with them, Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 159. Thus Moses prefigures the Mediator of the new covenant, cf. Heb. viii. 15, ix. 15, xii. 24, and the mention of this honour bestowed upon Moses emphasises still more fully the indignity which he received from his countrymen, cf. St. Chrysostom on the force of οὗτος in this verse.— λόγια, cf. Rom. iii. 2, as in LXX.
of the words of God, cf. Numb. xxiv. 4, 16, and chiefly for any utterance of God whether precept or promise, only once of human words (Ps. xviii. (xix.) 14); so Philo speaks of the decalogue as τά δέκα λόγια, and Jos., B. ὁ., vi. 5, 4, of the prophecies of God in the O.T., and Philo writes τά λόγια τοῦ προφήτου (i.e., Moses), Vit. Mōys., iii. 35, see Grimm-Thayer, sub τ., λόγιον, lit., a little word, from the brevity of oracular responses.—ζώντα: "vim vitalem habentia," Blass, cf. Heb. iv. 12, 1 Pet. i. 23, cf. Deut. xxiii. 47. The words again show how far St. Stephen was from despising the Law of Moses, cf. Heb. iv. 12, "living," R.V. ("quick," A.V.); 1 Pet. i. 3, and ii. 5, where R.V. has "living" instead of "lively"; in Ps. xxxviii. 19 "lively" is retained in R.V. (see also in Exod. i. 19, in contrast to feeble, languid), cf. Spenser, Faërie Queene, iii. 8, 5. Here the word has the sense of living, i.e., enduring, abiding, cf. "thy true and lively [living] word" 1 in prayer for the Church Militant, cf. 1 Pet. i. 23, R.V.

Ver. 39. οὐστράφθησαν, i.e., in their desires after the Egyptian gods, cf. ver. 40, not "turned back again," but simply "turned" (Rendall, in loco). The words cannot be taken literally (as Corn. à Lap. and others), or we should have to render "who may go before us in our return to Egypt," which not only is unsupported by the Greek, but cf. Exod. xxxii. 4, 1 Kings xii. 28; see also on this verse, Exod. xvi. 3, Num. xi. 4, 5, but the desires there expressed marked a later date.

1 ημίν; but ΝB read υμίν, so W.H. text, Weiss.
2 αλλ'; but αλλα in δSΑΒCDΕΗ, so Τisch., W.Η., Weiss, Hilig.
κοντα εν τη έρήμω, οίκος Ισραήλ; 43. και ανελάβετε την σκηνήν του Μολόχ, και το δοστρον του θεού ύμων 'Ρεμφάν,1 τους τύπους ους ἐνυπάτετα προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς· και μετοικιώ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα.2


2 τετείχον; D1, Gig., Par. read στι τα μερη, so Blass in a and β, so Hilg., cf. LXX; originality of Western reading not imposs., or στι τα μερη may have been substituted for a phrase unique in N.T. (see also Wendt, p. 163, edit. 1899).

stein "Deus se ab iis avertit," and cf. LXX, Isa. xiii. 10.—παριδεκατεν, cf. Rom. i. 24, and ελαιον in xiv. 16; Ephes. iv. 19, "gave themselves up." ολους παριδεκατεν, from the side of man.—ἀπρεπες τη στρατεια του θεου, cf. Deut. xvii. 16, 2 Kings xvii. 16, xxii. 3, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 3, 5, Jer. viii. 2, xix. 13, a still grosser idolatry: "antiquissima idolatria, ceteris specio t' Bengel. The created host was worshipped in place of Jehovah Sabaoth, "the Lord of Hosts." The word, though used always in the N.T. of religious service, is sometimes applied to the worship of idols, as well as of the One God; cf. Rom. i. 25 (LXX, Exod. xx. 5, xxii. 24, Ezek. xx. 32), so λατρεια is used of the worship of idols in 1 Macc. i. 43; see Trench, Synonyms, i., p. 142 ff.—ἐν βίβλῳ των προφ.: here part of the Hebrew Scriptures which the Jews summed up under the title of "the Prophets," as a separate part, the other two parts being the Law and the Hagiographa (the Psalms, Luke xxiv. 44); or Twelve Minor Prophets which probably formed one book.—Μη σφαγια κ.τ.λ.: a quotation from Amos v. 25-27, with little variation—the quotation in ver. 42 is really answered by the following verse. The question does not mean literally that no sacrifices were ever offered in the wilderness, which would be directly contrary to such passages as Exod. xxiv. 4, Num. vii. 9. The sacrifices no doubt were offered, but how could they have been real and effectual and acceptable to God while in their hearts the people's affections were far from Him, and were given to idol deities? μη, expecting a negative answer = συμ (see Zöckler's note, in loco).—ολος: nominative for vocative, as often, as if in apposition to the άνθρωπος contained in προσκυνατε (Blass). Some emphasise μοι = mihi soli, or suppose with Nösgen that the question is ironical.

Ver. 43. The answer of God to His own question: και should be explained "ye actually took up" ("yea," R.V., in Amos v. 26); ανελάβετε, "ye took up," i.e., to carry in procession from one halting place to another. την σκηνην, properly σκηνη = παραηγη, which has sometimes been explained as the tent or tabernacle made by the idolatrous Israelites in honour of an idol, like the tabernacle of the covenant in honour of Jehovah, but R.V. renders "Siccuth your king" (margin, "the tabernacle of your king"), Amos v. 26, see below.—του Μολοχ: οικ, in LXX, but in Hebrew, 2 Και λοχ, i.e., your king (as A.V. in margin, Amos v. 26). The LXX, either as explanatory, or perhaps through another reading 2 Και λοχ, 2 Kings xxiii. 13, here render by the name of the idol. Sayce also (Patriarchal Palestine, p. 258) renders "Sikkuth your Malik," i.e., the Babylonian god Sikkuth also represents "Malik," the king, another Babylonian deity (= Moloch of the O.T.). Most commentators maintain that ver. 26 (Amos v.) is not in the original connected with ver. 25 as the LXX render, referring the latter verse back to Mosaic times. The LXX may have followed some tradition, but not only does the fact that the worship of Moloch was forbidden in the wilderness seem to indicate that its practice was a possibility, but there is also evidence that long before the Exodus Babylonian influence had made itself felt in the West, and the statement of Amos may therefore mean that the Babylonian god was actually worshipped by the Israelites in the wilderness (Sayce, u.s., p. 259). In margin of R.V. we have "shall take up." i.e.,
carry away with you into exile (as a threat), while others take the verb not in a future but in a perfect sense, as referring to the practice of the contemporaries of the prophet: "de suo tempore hab dicit Amos" (Blass). Saccuth or rather Saccuth is probably a proper name (a name given to Nin-ip, the warlike sun god of Babylonia (Sayce)), and both it and Keowan (Kaivan), represent Babylonono-Assyrian deities (or a deity), see Schrader, Cun. Inspect. and the O. T., ii., 141, 142, E.T.; Sayce, u. s., Art. "Chium" in Hastings B.D., and Felten and Wendt, in loco. For the thought expressed here that their gods should go into captivity with the people, cf. Isa. xlv. 2.—καὶ τὸ ἄστρον ... Ρεφάν, T.R.—but R.V. "Rephar", on the reading see critical notes, and Wendt, p. 177.

For the Hebrew (Amos v. 26) Χιον, the LXX has "Ῥαφάν." How can we account for this? Probably LXX read the word not Chiun but Keowan (in Syr. Pesh., Keowan = Saturn your idol), of which "Ῥαφάν" is a corruption through "Καφάν" (cf. similar change of ס into כ in Nah. i. 6, שִּׁנָּה in LXX ἔρμες as if שׁינא, Robinson's Gesenius, p. 463). Keowan = Ka-ai-va-nu, an Assyrian name for the planet Saturn, called by the same name in Arabic and Persian (Hamburger, Real-Encyclopadie des Judentums, i., 2, 216, and Art. "Chium," u. s.); and this falls in perfectly with the Hebrew, "the star of your god" (your star-god) — Μαρκιάν, the previous word, the Hebrew "your images," being placed after the two Hebrew words just quoted, cf. LXX (but see also Sayce, u. s., who renders "Chium, your Ζελόμ," Ζελόμ denoting another Babylonian deity = the image or disc of the sun). It seems plain at all events that both in the Hebrew and in the LXX reference is made to the divine honours paid to the god Saturn. In the words "ye took up the star," etc., the meaning is that they took up the star or image which represented the god Saturn—your god with some authorities (so in LXX, see Blass, in loco). ᾿Ιωάν, i.e., the deity whom these Israelites thus placed on a level with Jehovah. If we take τοὺς Χιον = the litter, or pedestal, of your gods, i.e., on which they were carried in procession, as if from τοὺς (a meaning advocated by Dr. Robertson Smith), and not as a proper name at all: "the shrines of your images, the star of your God," R.V. margin, Amos v. 26, we may still infer from the mention of a star that the reference is to the debasement of planet worship (so Jerome conjectured Venus or Lucifer). It is to be noted that the vocalisation of Saccuth and Chiun is the same, and it has been recently suggested that for the form of these two names in our present text we are indebted to the misplaced zeal of the Massoretes, by the familiar trick of fitting the pointing of one word to the consonant skeleton of another—here the pointing is taken from the word τοὺς, "abomination," see Art., "Chium," u. s.—τοὺς τύπους, simulacra: in LXX, in opposition to σκηνή and άστρον. If the σκηνή is to be taken as meaning the tent or tabernacle containing the image of the god, it might be so described. τύπουs is used, Jos., Art., i., 10, 11; xv. 9, 5. Lightfoot. It may be that St. Stephen thus closes one part of his speech, that which shows how Israel, all through their History, had been rebellious, and how punishment had followed. If this conjecture is correct, we pass now to the way in which Stephen deals with the charge of blasphemy against the temple.

Ver. 44. Here again we notice that the first sanctuary of the fathers was not the temple, nor was it erected on holy ground, but ἐν τῷ ἵλημι according to
44-46.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

αὐτὴν κατὰ τὸν τόπον ὑπεράκειν. 45. ἦν καὶ εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν μετὰ ἱστού, στῇ κατασχέσει τῶν θεών ἐν εἴσοδεν ὁ θεὸς ἄπο προσώπου τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἐς τῶν ἡμερῶν Δαβίδ. 46. ὁ δὲ εὐρέων ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν θεότητα, καὶ γῆσατο εὐφέρειν σκήνωμα


God's direct command.—ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ πατρὸς: it is possible that there was in the speaker's mind a contrast to the σκηνὴ in ver. 43, but the connection is not clearly drawn out, διαφέρειτε, "ut in oratione concitatiore" (Blass).—ἡ σ. τοῦ μαρτυρίου, "the tabernacle of the testimony". The same phrase in LXX is used (incorrectly as Meyer noted) to translate the Hebrew tabernacle of the congregation or tabernacle of meeting, i.e., of God with His people, cf. Exod. xvii. 21. But the tabernacle was justly called μαρτυρίου, because it contained "the ark of the testimony," LXX, Exod. xv. 9 (10), κατά τὴν σκηνὴν τῆς ἁγίας ἡν προητοίμασας: "according to the figure," R.V., i.e., pattern, likeness, cf. ver. 43 and Rom. v. 14. Again we see how far Stephen was from denying the divine sanction given to Moses for the tabernacle. In the thought thus implied lies the germ of Hooker's great argument, Eccles. Pol., iii., 11 (Plumptre).

Ver. 45. διαδεξάμενοι: having received in their turn, i.e., from Moses, only here in N.T., cf. 4 Macc. iv. 15; so also in classical Greek, in Dem. and in Polyb., cf. διαδικαῖος, "in their turn," Herod., viii., 142: (on the technical meaning of διαδέχεσθαι, to which in the LXX διαδέχεσθαι is akin to the term of a deputy, or of one next to the king, see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, pp. 111, 112.)—μετὰ ἱστού, cf. Heb. iv. 8, where Syr. Pesh. has "Jesus the son of Nun" (but not here).—ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει τῶν θεών: "when they entered on the possession of the nations," R.V., lit., in the taking possession of the nations, i.e., of the land inhabited by the nations (Wendt). A.V. follows Vulgate; frequent in LXX, cf. Jos., Ant., ix., 1, 2, and Test. xii. Patr., x., used by Philo in the sense of a portion given to keep (Grimm-Thayer).—όν: Attic attraction, cf. i. 1.—κατὰ προσώπον: for a similar phrase cf. Deut. xi. 23, xii, 29, 30, etc., and frequently in LXX, Hebrew ἄνα: ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμ. Δ.: to be connected with the first part of the verse, "which also our fathers brought in . . . unto the days of David" (inclusively), see Wendt, in loco, i.e., "et mansit tabernaculum usque ad tempora Davidis" (Blass). Rendall takes the words as closely joined to οὐ εξώσεν, but the clause οὐ εξώσεν . . . ἡμῶν is rather subordinate.

Ver. 46. δὲ εὑρεχάριν, cf. Luke i. 30, Hebraistic, cf. Gen. vi. 8; it may be tacitly implied that had the temple been so important as the Jew maintained, God would have allowed the man who found favour before him to build it; on the phrase ἐνώπιον Κ. or Θεοῦ see above on iv. 10.—ἠτήσατο εὐρείν, i.e., σκήνωμα, cf. iii. 3: ἄρα λαβείν, and instances in Wetstein, "asked to find," not only "desired," LXX, 2 Sam. vii. 2 ft., 1 Chron. xxii. 7, Ps. lxxi. 5.—σκήνωμα: perhaps used by David (as in the Psalm quoted) in his humility (Meyer); used of the temple in 1 Esdras i. 50. David of course desired to build not a σκηνή, which already existed.—τῷ Θεῷ ἵκεσθαι, see critical notes.

Ver. 47. Σολομῶν, see above on iii. 11.—οὗ: "But" or "And"—οὗ, adversative as in A. and R.V., cf. 2 Chron. vii. 7-9, where Solomon is represented as claiming God's promise that he should build the house—a favour denied to his father David.

Ver. 48. ἄλλος: But the presence of the Most High (in contrast to the
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

VII.

το Θεός Ἰακώβ. 47. Σολομών δὲ οἰκοδόμησεν αὐτῷ οἶκον. 48. Ἀλλ' οὐχ οὗ τοῦ ἤμετρον κυρίου θεοσ τοὐ Κατουκεί, καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει. 49. "Ο οὐρανός μου θρόνος, ἡ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου· ποίον οἰκονομόκετε μου; λέγει Κύριος· ἡ τῆς τῶν τής

1 θεός ΝΑΕΠ, Vulg., Syrr. (P. and H.), Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys.; οἰκος ΝBDH, so Weiss (Apostelgeschichte, p. 7), so also Hilg. W. H. (Appendix, 92) think that although θεός is a very ancient correction of οἰκος the latter can hardly be genuine and that there is apparently a primitive error, and with this judgment Wendt agrees. Hort suggests κυριος, and concludes that τοιούτος may have come from τοικον (so too Wendt), and refers to LXX, Ps. cxxxi. 5; but we have still to ask if the expression “Lord of Jacob” ever occurred, whilst no doubt “God of Jacob,” “House of Jacob” are familiar expressions. In LXX, Ps. cxxxi. 3, we have οἰκονομήσαμεν οἰκον, and a similar expression may have been the orig. reading here; again, in Ps. xxiv. 6, Heb., we have “Jacob = “the God of Jacob” (see LXX), and it has been suggested that some such abbreviation or mode of speech lies at the bottom of the difficulty here. Blass holds that οἰκος comes from the next verse “corrupte” (orig. a gloss on οἰκήματα).

2 Σολομῶν BDEHP, so Blass in β, Weiss; Σολομῶν W., Hilg.; Σαλομων AC, so Tisch.; Σαλωμον Ν. (See Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93; Blass, Gram., p. 29.)

3 οἰκοδομησεν DABCEHP, so Tisch.; οἰκοδομησεν BD, so W., Weiss, Blass in β, Hilg., but see W., App., 170. (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 100; Blass, Gram., p. 37.)

4 τις; D, Flor. read τοιος, so Blass in β, and Hilg.—assim. either to preceding τοιον or to LXX.

smallness of any building made by hands) was not so confined—the previous words must not be misunderstood by Stephen’s hearers. Solomon’s οἰκος might have given the idea of greater permanency, but still Isaiah had taught, lxvi. 1, 2, and even the builder of the temple, Solomon himself, had acknowledged that God was not confined to any single place of worship, 1 King viii. 27, 2 Chron. vi. 18 (Hackett), cf. also David’s prayer, 1 Chron. xxix. 10-15. in χειροποιητος νοιος κατοικει—omit νοιος, probably an exegetical addition, cf. xvii. 24, where the word is found. The omission makes the contrast with οἰκος still more emphatic. “But Solomon . . . a house, howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands” (R.V.). For χειροποιητος and δεχερ, see Westcott on Heb. ix. 11, 24. Both words occur in Mark xiv. 58, in the charge of the false witness against our Lord. In the LXX χειροποιητος is used several times of idols made with hands, and occasionally found in classical Greek. Weiss compares as a parallel with its use here Isa. xvi. 12 (see R.V.), but the meaning is doubtful. — δε ψυφος, emphatic—Solomon’s building a house must not be misunderstood—see too ver. 49. δε ψυφος, xvi. 17, used here absolutely (cf. Luke i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35, without the article), so often in LXX, 2 Sam. xxii. 14, Ps. xvii. 13, and often in Psalms, Isa. xiv. 14, Ecclus. xii. 6, etc. R.V. writes “Most High,” instead of A.V. “most High,” thus making the proper name of God more emphatic, cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 172—so in classical Greek Ζεύς θεός; ο ύψιστος θεός in Greek inscriptions of Asia Minor; for the Hebrew equivalents, see Grimm-Thayer, sub ν. St. Stephen’s words apparently impressed at least one of his hearers, for the same thought is reproduced in the words of St. Paul at Athens, where he asserts the same truth, and makes St. Stephen’s words as it were his text to emphasise the real power and worship of God: “atque similiter hic Judaei atque illic Graeci castigantur” (Blass), cf. the teaching of our Lord in John iv. 21 (and see Plumptre’s note on this passage in Acts). —καθως ο προφ., Isa. xvi. 1, 2 (LXX). The quotation is almost identical with few slight changes, as ε.ε.

Ver. 49. τοιον τοιον τοιανται και αυτοι δεχερ introducing the conclusion instead of γαρ. Although Solomon had expressed the
same truth in the dedicatory prayer of his temple, St. Stephen appeals to the great Messianic prophet. It is not, as some have thought, the worthlessness of the temple, but rather its relative value upon which Stephen insists. Those who take the former view of the words must suppose that St. Stephen had forgotten that Solomon had given utterance to the same thought at the moment when he was consecrating the temple (so Wendt, Felten, McGiffert, in loco). Weiss sees in the question another proof of the thought running through the whole address, that God's presence, with the blessings which He confers and the revelations which He imparts, is not confined to the temple: cf. the use of the same quotation as here against the Jews, Epist. Barn., xvi., 2, after the destruction of the temple.

Ver. 51. σκληροτράχηλοι και απερίτμητοι τη καρδία, cf. Exod. xxxiii. 3, 5, xxxiv. 9, Deut. ix. 6, Baruch ii. 30, etc., Ecclus. xvi. 11 (cf. Cicero, Verr., iii., 95, "tantis cervicibus est"). Both adjectives had been used to describe the sins of Israel in former days. On this reading see above and Wendt, critical note, p. 190, cf. Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 116. For the expression ἐπεριτμητός cf. Deut. x. 16, Jer. iv. 4, and ἐπεριτμητός τὰ ἑτέρα, Jer. vi. 10. In the N. T. cf. Rom. iii. 25, 29 (which sounds like another echo of St. Stephen's teaching), cf. also Epist. Barn., ix. (Jer. iv. 4). Similar expressions occur in Philo and the Rabbis, and also in Macc. i. 48, ii. 46, and see further Deissmann, Bibelstudien, pp. 150, 151.

Many writers have maintained that St. Stephen's sharp and abrupt declaration marks the increasing impatience of his hearers at this point, as if the speaker felt that the murmurs of his audience would not allow him much more speech. But on the other hand St. Stephen's whole speech led up to this point, and his words were not so much an interuption, but a continuance and a summary of what had gone before. No doubt the speech was left unfinished: "cujus cursus ad Iesum tendebat" (Blass); since in His rejection the obstinacy of the people which had marked and marred their history had reached its climax; and the indignant words of St. Stephen bring to mind the indignation of a greater than He against the hypocrisy and wilfulness of the nation—"the wrath of the Lamb" against the Pharisees and the oppressors (Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, p. 68).


Ver. 52. τίνα τῶν προφ.—ἀνωτέρως, to mark the vehemence of the speech, as above, verse 51: cf. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16 for the general statement, and for individual cases, Jeremiah, Amos, and probably Isaiah, the prophet just quoted. We may compare the words of our Lord, Matt. v. 12, Luke xiii. 34, and also Luke xi. 49, Matt. xxiii. 29-37 where the same words ἐδίωξαν and ἀπέκτειναν are used of the treatment of the prophets.—καὶ ἀπέκ.: "they even slew"—perhaps the force of καί (Wendt), "they slew them also" (Rendall).—ἀλογοφορία: only here in the N. T., not in LXX or Apocrypha, or
οὐ νῦν ὃμεις προδόται καὶ φονεῖς γεγένητε. 53. οἵτινες ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἄγγελων, καὶ ὁδὲ ἐφιλάβατε. 54. Ἀκοῦστες δὲ ταῦτα, διεπρίοντο τοις καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔβρυχον τοὺς ὀδόντας


in classical writers, but found in Acta Thoma 28, and in Iren., i., 10, in plural, of the first and second advent of Christ (see also Dion. Hal., iii., 59).—τοῦ δικαίου, see Acts iii., 14 and note. It has been suggested that it is used here and elsewhere of our Lord from His own employment of the same word in Matt. xxiii. 29, where He speaks of the tombs τῶν δικαίων whom the fathers had slain whilst the children adorned their sepulchres. But it is more probable that the word was applied to our Lord from the LXX use of it, cf. Isa. liii. 11. Even those Jews who rejected the idea of an atoning Messiah acknowledged that His personal righteousness was His real claim to the Messianic dignity, Weber, 'Judische Theologie,' p. 362; Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, p. 185, second edition. We cannot forget that one of those present who heard St. Stephen's burning words was himself to see the Just One and to carry on the martyr's work, cf. xxii. τ.Α, ἰδείν τὸν δίκαιον κ.τ.λ. —νῦν ἐγένεσθε: "of whom ye have now become," R.V., the spirit of their fathers was still alive, and they had acted as their fathers had done; υμεῖς again emphatic.

Ver. 53. οἵτινες, quippe qui ("ye who," R.V.), as often in Acts and Epistles not simply for identification, but when as here the conduct of the persons already mentioned is further enlarged upon (Alford), cf. viii. 15, ix. 35, x. 41, 47, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 235, but see also Blass, Grammatik, p. 169.—εἰς διαταγάς ἄγγελων: "as it was ordained by angels," R.V. εἰς: at the appointment of, cf. its use in Matt. xii. 41, or better εἰς as in ver. 21 = received the law as ordinances of angels (νόμον being regarded as an aggregate of single acts and so with plural "ordinances"), so Rendall, who takes εἰς = εἰς, and Page, cf. Heb. xi. 8, i.e., it was no human ordinance. But see on the other hand Wendt's note, p. 192, where he points out that the law was not received as commands given by angels but by God. This was undoubtedly the case, but St. Stephen was here probably referring to the current tradition in Philo and Josephus, and LXX, Deut. xxxiii. 2. Εἰ δὲ θείου εὐτυχεῖ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, cf. Ps. lxvii. 17; Philo, De Somn., p. 642 Mang., so Jos., Ant., xv., 5, 3, and also Book of Jubilees, chap. 1 (see Weststein and Lightfoot (J. B.) on Gal. iii. 19). Others again take εἰς = εἰς, "acceptis legem angelis promulgatam" = διαταγῆς ἄγγελων, so Blass. Certainly it does not seem possible to take διαταγῆς = διάταξις = agmen dispositum (cf. Judith i. 4, viii. 36), and to render "præsentibus angelorum ordibus," so that here also εἰς = εἰς (Meyer and others). Lightfoot (J.) takes the "angels" as = Moses and the Prophets; Surenhusius as = the elders of the people, whilst St. Chrysostom sees a reference to the angel of the burning bush. It must not be thought that St. Stephen is here depreciating the Law. From a Christian standpoint it might of course be urged that as Christ was superior to the angels, so the introduction of angels showed the inferiority of the Law to the Gospel (cf. Heb. ii. 2, Gal. iii. 19), but St. Stephen's point is that although the Law had been given with such notable sanctions, yet his hearers had not kept it, and that therefore they, not he, were the real law-breakers.—οὐκ ἐφύλαξατε: "cum omnibus phylyacteriis vestris," Bengel. Note the rhetorical power of the words cf. ver. 25 (Page).

Ver. 54. No charge could have been more hateful to such an audience, cf. our Lord's words, John vii. 19; see Schürer, 'Jewish People,' vol. ii., div. ii., p. 90 ff., E.T. Schürer twice quotes St. Paul's words, pp. 96, 124, ζήλον Θεοῦ έχουσιν ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' επίγνωσιν; no words could better characterise the entire tendency of the Judaism of the period.—Βιετροπός, cf. v. 33.—Βρύχων: not elsewhere in N.T., in LXX, Job xvi. 10 (g), Ps. xxxiv. (v.), 16, xxxvi. (vii.) 12, cf. cxi. (xii.) 10; Lam. ii. 16, cf. Plutarch, Pericles, 33 (without ὀδόντας, intransitive). The noun βρύχη is found in the same sense, Ap. Rh., ii., 83, of brute passion, not the despair so often associated with the cognate noun; cf. Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 42, etc.
53-57.
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54. μετάρχων ἡ πλήρες Πνεύματος Ἀγίου, οἰκείον αει τοῦ υἱοῦ, εἶδε δόξαν Θεοῦ, καὶ ἤπνων. 2 ἑστώτα ἐκ δεινίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3 καὶ εἶπεν, ἵνα, θεωρῶ τοὺς υἱοὺς θεοῦ αἰνημένους, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ αθρόπου ἑκ δεινίας ἑστώτα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

55. κράξαντες δὲ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, συνέσχον τὰ ἓτα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔρμησαν ὁμοθυμάδων ἐπ’ αὐτῶν.

1 νεράχων ἡ πλήρες Π. Α., Flor. represents ὁ δὲ νεράχων (or ὁν) ἐν πνεύματι εὐγ.; possibly assim. to Ἀποκ. i. το, ἐν ἰν.2, as it has been thoughtfully suggested that to be “in the spirit” would account for his vision, whereas the expression in T.R. would not seem to account for it.

2 ἤπνων; D, Flor., Gig. add τον Κυριον, so Hilg.


Ver. 55. ἀτενίσας, cf. i. 10, εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, cf. John xvii. 1, “ubi enim est oculus, ibi est cor et amor”. In the power of the Holy Ghost, with which Stephen is represented as being full, as in life so in death, he saw δόξαν Θεοῦ, in which he had appeared to Abraham, cf. ver. 2, πλήρης, "crescens et robor spiritus," Bengel.—ἡγοῦν δόξαν: elsewhere he is represented as sitting, ii. 34. If St. Luke had placed this saying in the mouth of St. Stephen in imitation of the words of Jesus, Matt. xxi. 64, Mark xvi. 19, Luke xii. 60, he would, without doubt, have described him as sitting, cf. also the expression "Son of Man," only here outside the Gospels, and never in the Epistles (Rev. i. 13, a doubtful instance), a noteworthy indication of the primitive date and truthfulness of the expression and the report. See especially Wendt's note on p. 194 (1888). Standing, as if to succour and to receive his servant, cf. διὰ τὴν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν (Oecum., and so Chrys.); "quasi obivium Stephano," Bengel, so Zöckler, and see Alford's note and Collect for St. Stephen's day. St. Augustine represents Christ as standing: "ut Stephano stanti, patienti, et reo, ipse quoque stans, quasi patiens et reus compatiatu". Alford supposes reference in the vision to that of Zech. iii. 1.—ἐκ δεινίας: as the place of honour, cf. 1 Kings ii. 19, Matt. xx. 21. The Sanhedrin would recall the words "the Son of Man," as they had been spoken by One Who was Himself the Son of Man, and in Whom, as in His follower, they had seen only a blasphemer. On the expression "Son of Man" cf. Charles, Book of Enoch, Appendix B, p. 312 ff., and Witness of the Epistles, p. 286 (1892).

Ver. 57. κράξαντες: so as to silence him.—συνέσχον τὰ ἓτα αὐτῶν: in order that the words which they regarded as so impious should not be heard, cf. Matt. xxvi. 65. Blass compares the phrase LXX, Isa. lii. 15, καὶ συνέξοιυσι βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν. —ἔρμησαν . . . ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, cf. 2 Macc. x. 16, and in several places in 2 Macc. the verb is found with the same construction (although not quite in the same sense).

Ver. 58. ἕξω τῆς πόλεως: according to the law, Lev. xxvi. 14, so in Luke iv. 29, our Lord is cast out of Nazareth to be stoned.—ἐλιθοῦν: as guilty of blasphemy. St. Stephen's closing remarks were in the eyes of his judges a justification of the charge; imperf. as in ver. 59, see note below. The judicial forms were evidently observed, at least to some extent (Weiss attributes the introduction of the witnesses to a reviser), and whilst the scene was a tumultuous one, it was quite possible that it was not wholly bereft of judicial appearances.—μάρτυρες: whose part it was to throw the first stone, cf. Deut. xvii. 7 (John viii. 7).—ἀπέθεντο τα ιμάτια αὐτῶν: to perform their cruel task with greater ease and freedom, cf. xxii. 20.—νεανίου: only used in Acts, where it occurs three or four times, xx. 9, xxiii. 17 (18), several times in LXX. It has been thought (Wendt) that the term could not have been used of Saul if he had been married, or if he was at this time a widower, but if νεανίας might be used to denote any man of an age between twenty-four and forty, like Latin adulescens and the Hebrew יְבִלָּה, Gen. xii. 12 (Grimm-Thayer), Saul might be so described. Josephus applies the term to Agrippa I. when he was at least forty. Jos., Ant., xviii., 6, 7. See further on
58. καὶ ἐκβαλόντες ἐξ τῆς πόλεως, ἐλιθοβόλου. καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες
ἀπεθανοῦ τα ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἕτερα τοὺς πόρους καλούμενοι

1 μάρτυρες, Gig., Par. falsi testes; cf. vi. 12. Blass rejects in β.
2 αὐτῶν; B has αὐτῶν, so Weiss, but W.H. as in T.R.

xxvi. 10.—Σαῦλος: "If the Acts are the composition of a second-century writer to whom Paul was only a name, then the introduction of this silent figure in such a scene is a masterpiece of dramatic invention" (Page, Acts, Introd., xxxi.); for the name see below on xiii. 9, and also on its genuineness, Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., ii., 49, as against Krenkel. Of Saul's earlier life we gather something from his own personal notices, see notes on xxi. 3, xxxii. 6, xxiv. 14, xxv. 4, and cf. ix. 13. He was a Hebrew sprung from Hebrews, Phil. iii. 5; he was a Roman citizen, and not only so, but a Tarsian, a citizen of no mean city; cf. for the two citizenships, xxi. 39 (ix. 11) and xxvii. 27, "Citizenship," Hastings' B.D.; Zahn, u. s., p. 48; Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 30. Zahn, u. s., pp. 35, 49, maintains that Saul's family had only recently settled in Tarsus (but see Ramsay, u. s.), and defends the tradition that his parents had come there from Gischala, their son being born to them in Tarsus. On Saul's family and means see notes on xxiii. 16 and xxiv. 26. But whatever his Roman and Tarsian citizenship may have contributed to his mental development, St. Paul's own words clearly lead us to attach the highest and most significant influence to the Jewish side of his nature and character. Paul's Pharisaism was the result not only of his training under Gamaliel, but also of the inheritance which he claimed from his father and his ancestors (xiii. 6, Φαρισαίος not Φαρίσαιος, cf. Gal. i. 14). His early years were passed away from Jerusalem, xxvi. 4 (the force of το (R.V.) and the expression τῷ Φαρισαίῳ, Zahn, u. s., p. 48), but his home-training could not have been neglected (cf. 2 Tim. i. 3), and when he went up to the Holy City at an early stage to study under Gamaliel (xxii. 3, ἀνεπεριπτέρεται, on its force see Sabatier L'Apôtre Paul, p. 30) he "lived a Pharisee," and nothing else than his well-known zeal is needed to account for his selection to his dreadful and solemn office at St. Stephen's martyrdom. As a Pharisee he had been "a separated one," and had borne the same with pride, not suspecting that a day was at hand when he would speak of himself as ἄφωρισμένος in a far higher and fuller sense, Rom. i. 1, Gal. i. 15 (Zahn, u. s., p. 48); as a Pharisee he was "separated from all filthiness of heathenism" around (Nivdal), but he was to learn that the Christian life was that of the true "Chasid," and that in contrast to all Pharisaic legalism and externalism there was a cleansing ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, a perfecting holiness in the fear of God—God Who chooseth before all temples the upright heart and pure (Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 231). On the question whether St. Paul ever saw our Lord in the flesh, see Keim, Geschichte Jesu, i., 35, 36, and references, and for the views of more recent writers, Witnesses of the Epistles (Longmans), chaps. i. and ii.

Ver. 59. καὶ εἰλ. τὸν Σ. ἐπικ.: im perf., as in ver. 58, "quia res morte de- minus [6ο] perficitur," Blass. ἐπικ., present participle, denoting, it would seem, the continuous appeal of the martyr to his Lord. Zeller, Overbeck and Baur throw doubt upon the historical truth of the narrative on account of the manner in which the Sanhedrists' action is divided between an utter absence of formal proceedings and a punctilious observance of correct formalities; but on the other hand Wendt, note, p. 195 (1888), points out with much force that an excited and tumultuous crowd, even in the midst of a high-handed and illegal act, might observe some legal forms, and the description given by St. Luke, so far from proceeding from one who through ignorance was unable to distinguish between a legal execution and a massacre, impresses us rather with a sense of truthfulness from the very fact that no attempt is made to draw such a distinction of nicely balanced justice, less or more. The real difficulty lies in the relations which the scene presupposes between the Roman Government and the Sanhedrim. No doubt at this period the latter did not possess the power to inflict capital punishment (Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 187, E.T.), as is evident from the trial of our Lord. But it may well be that at the time of Stephen's murder Roman authority was
somewhat relaxed in Judaea. Pilate had just been suspended from his functions, or was on the point of being so, and he may well have been tired of refusing the madness and violence of the Jews, as Renan supposes, or at all events he may well have refrained, owing to his bad odour with them, from calling them to account for their illegal action in the case before us (see McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 91). It is of course possible that the stoning took place with the connivance of the Jewish authorities, as Weizsacker allows, or that there was an interval longer than Acts supposes between the trial of Stephen and his actual execution, during which the sanction of the Romans was obtained. In the absence of exact dates it is difficult to see why the events before us should not have been transacted during the interregnum between the departure of Pontius Pilate, to answer before Tiberius for his misgovernment, and the arrival of Marcellus, the next Procurator. If this was so, we have an exact historical parallel in the illegal murder of James the Just, who was tried before the high priest, and stoned to death, since Ananias thought that he had a good opportunity for his violence when Festus was dead, and Albinus was still upon his road (Jos., Ant., xviii., 4, 2-5). But if this suggestion of an interregnum is not free from difficulties, we may further take into consideration the fact that the same Roman officer, Vitellius, prefect of Syria, who had caused Pilate to be sent to Rome in disgrace, was anxious at the same time to receive Jewish support, and determined to effect his object by every means in his power. Josephus, Ant., xviii., 4, 2-5, tells us that Vitellius sent a friend of his own, Marcellus, to manage the affairs of Judaea, and that, not content with this, he went up to Jerusalem himself to conciliate the Jews by open regard for their religion, as well as by the remission of taxation. It is therefore not difficult to conceive that both the murder of Stephen and the persecution which followed were connived at by the Roman government; see, in addition to the above references, Rendall's Acts, Introd., p. 19 ff.; Farrar, St. Paul, i., p. 648 ff., and note, p. 649. But this solution of the difficulty places the date of Saul's conversion somewhat late—A.D. 37—and is entirely at variance with the earlier chronology adopted not only by Harnack (so too by McGiffert), but here by Ramsay, St. Paul, 376, 377, who places St. Stephen's martyrdom in A.D. 33 at the latest. In the account of the death of Stephen, Wendt, following Weiss, Sorof, Clemen, Hilgenfeld, regards vii. 58b, viii. 14, 3, as evidently additions of the redactor, although he declines to follow Weiss and Hilgenfeld in passing the same judgment on ver. 55 (and 56, according to H.), and on the last words of Stephen in ver. 59b. The second ἀθεὸςδὲ τα γόνατα in 59b, which Hilgenfeld assigns to his redactor, and Wendt now refers to the action of the witnesses, as distinct from that of the whole crowd, is repeated with dramatic effect, heightened by the present participle, ἐπικ., "ruthless violence on the one side, answered by continuous appeals to heaven on the other"; see Rendall's note, in loco.—ἐπικ.: "calling upon the Lord," R.V. ("calling upon God," A.V.), the former seems undoubtedly to be rightly suggested by the words of the prayer which follow—on the force of the word see above, ii. 21.—Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, θείςδὲ τα γόνατα: a direct prayer to our Lord, cf. for its significance and reality, Zahn, "Die Anbetung Jesu" (Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche, pp. 9, 288), Liddon, Our Lord's Divinity, lect. vii.; cf. Luke xxiii. 46. (Weiss can only see an imitation of Luke, and an interpolation here, because the kneeling, and also another word follow before the surrender of the spirit; but see on the other hand the remarks of Wende, note, p. 196.)

Ver. 60. ἦλθεν ἐκ της γονατείας: a phrase not used in classical writers, but Blass compares Ovid, Fasti, ii., 438; five times in St. Luke's writings, Luke xxii. 41, Acts ix. 40, xx. 36, xxxi. 5; only once elsewhere in N.T., Mark xv. 19. The attitude of kneeling in prayer would no doubt commend itself to the early believers from the example of their Lord. Standing would seem to have been the more common attitude among the Jews, but cf. instances in the O.T. of kneeling in prayer, LXX, 1 Kings viii. 54, Ezra ix. 5, Dan. vi. 10, and also the expression used twice by St. Paul, κατέχεθην τα γόνατα, 1 Chron. xxix. 20, 1 Esdras viii. 73. Isa. xlv. 23, etc., Ephes. iii. 14, and Phil. ii. 10 (Rom. xi. 4, xiv. 11). See Friedrich, Das Lucasevangelium, p. 42.—μεγάλη φωνή, cf. Luke xxiii. 46. The last final effort of the strong love which showed itself also in the martyr's bended knees (see Wende, in loco). Eusebius, H. E., v., 2, tells us how the martyrs of Vienne and Lyons took up St. Stephen's words in their own prayer for their persecutors (cf. the famous instance of the last words of Sir Thomas More before
his judges, and Dante, Purgatorio, xv., 106 ff., on the dying Stephen): μη στηριξη
αυτοις την αμαρτιαν ταυτην: the negative expression best corresponds to the
positive ἀφιέναι την αμαρτιαν (Wendt), cf. i Macc. xiii. 38, 39, xv. 5, 8, where
the contrast marked between λοτάναι and ἀφιέναι seems to favour this explanation.
Blass takes it as marking a contrast like that between λοτάναι and ἀφιέναι, cf.
Heb. x. 9. Weiss lays stress upon ταυτην, and regards the prayer as asking
that their present sin might not be weighed out to them in an equivalent
punishment, cf. Grotius on the Hebrew
τοις, i Kings xx. 39, whilst De Wette
(so Felten) takes it as simply "reckon it not," i.e., "weigh it not," cf. Zech. xi. 12.
Schöttgen sees a reference to the Rabbinical notion "si quis bonum aut malum
opus facit, hoc sequitur eum, et stat juxta eum in mundo futuro," Rev. xiv. 13,
and cf. a similar view quoted by Farrar,
St. Paul, i., 167. Rendall regards it as
a judicial term, as if Stephen appealed
to Christ as Judge not to impute their
sin to the murderers in condemnation
(Rom. x. 3). The words of St. Stephen
again recall the words of his Master,
Luke xxiii. 34, words which (Eusebius,
H. E., cf. ii., 20) also formed the dying
prayer of James, "the Lord's brother".
In James as in Stephen we may see
how the true Christian character, whilst
expressing itself in righteous indignation
against hypocrisy and wrong, never failed
to exhibit as its counterpart the meekness
and gentleness of Christ.—κοιμήθη (cf.
i Cor. xv. 18), a picture-word of rest and
calmness which stands in dramatic con-
trast to the rage and violence of the scene.
The word is used of death both in LXX
and in classical Greek, cf., e.g., Isa. xiv.
8, 18, xiii. 17, i Kings xi. 43, 2 Macc.
xii. 45, etc.; Homer, Il., xi., 241; Soph.,
Elect., 509. Blass well says of this word,
"sed nullo loco equa mirandum," and
describes the reference in Homer,
κοιμηθοτο κάλκεον ἐπον, as "et simile et
dissimile"; Christians sleep in death, but
not" brazen sleep"; they sleep in Χριστότο;
simple words which formed the epitaph
on many a Christian grave—in Him,
Who is Himself "the Resurrection and
the Life". Page notes the cadence of
the word expressing rest and repose,
cf. Farrar, St. Paul, i., 167, note, and
σπαλινὸς, xxviii. 31. St. Stephen's Speech.— Many and
varied explanations have been given of
the drift and purpose of St. Stephen's
address. But the various explanations
need not be mutually exclusive, and St.
Stephen, like a wise scribe instructed
unto the kingdom, might well bring out
of his treasury things new and old. It is
often said, e.g., that the address is no
reply to the charges alleged, that it would
be more intelligible how the charges
were framed from a perversion of the
speech, than how the speech could be
framed out of the charges; whilst, on the
other hand, it is possible to see from the
opening to the closing words an implicit
reputation of the charges of blasphemy
against God and contempt of the law.
The speech opens with a declaration of
the divine majesty of Jehovah; it closes
with a reference to the divine sanction of
the law, and with the condemnation of
those who had not kept it. This im-
plicit repudiation by Stephen of the
charges brought against him is also con-
tained in St. Chrysostom's view of the
purpose of the martyr, vi., that he
designed to show that the covenant and
promises were before the law, and sacri-
fice and the law before the temple.
This view, which was adopted by Grotius
and Calvin, is in some degree retained by
Wendt (so also Felten), who sums up the
chief aim of the speech as a demonstra-
tion that the presence of God is not con-
fined to the holy place, the temple, but
that long before the temple was built,
and before the people had settled in the
promised land, God had given to the
fathers a share in the proofs of this re-
velation, and that too in strange countries
(although there is no reason to suppose
that Stephen went so far as to contend
that Jew and Gentile were on a precisely
equal footing). But Wendt is conscious
that this view does not account for the
whole of the speech, and that it does not
explain the prominence given in it to the
obstinacy of Israel against the revelation
of God vouchsafed to Moses, with which
the counter accusation against Stephen
is so closely connected (see Spitta's severe
criticism, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 111, 112,
and Weizsäcker's evident failure to main-
tain the position that the climax of the
whole address is to be found in the de-
claration about Solomon's temple, which
he is obliged to explain as a later thought
belonging to a later time, Apostolic Age,
Thus in his last edition, p. 151 (1899), he points out that in section vv. 35-43, as also in vv. 25 and 27, the obstinacy of the people against Moses, sent to be their deliverer, is evidently compared with their obstinacy in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah, and in vv. 51-53 the murder of Jesus is condemned as a fresh proof of the opposition of the people to God's revelation to them: here is a point of view which in Wendt's judgment evidently had a share in the composition of the address. Wendt urges his view against the older one of Meyer and to some extent at all events that of Baur, Zeller and Overbeck, that the central point of the speech is to be found in ver. 51, to which the whole preceding sketch of the history of the people led up: however great had been the benefits bestowed by God upon His people, on their part there had been from the beginning nothing in return but a corresponding thanklessness and resistance to this purpose. McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 87, 88, also recognises that the theme of the address is to be found in vv. 51-53, but he also admits the double purpose of St. Stephen, viz., not only to show (as Meyer and others) that at all stages of their history Israel had been stiff-necked and disobedient, but also (as Wendt) to draw a parallel between their conduct and the treatment of Jesus by those whom he is addressing.

This leads us to a consideration of the view of Spitta as to the main purpose of St. Stephen's speech. Whatever may be thought of its merits, it gives a unity to the speech which is wanting in many earlier and more recent expositions of it, as Hilgenfeld recognises, although he himself holds a different view, and one essentially similar to that of Baur. According to Spitta, in vv. 2-16 we have an introduction to the chief section of the address which begins with ver. 17, καθὼς δὲ ήγγιζεν ο χρόνος τῆς επαγ. Moses, ver. 20, was the person through whom God would save His people, and lead them to His true service in the promised land, vv. 7, 35, 36, 44. If we ask why Moses occupies this important place in the speech, the answer is found in ver. 37, which forms the central point of the description of Moses, and divides it into two parts (a verse in which Clemens and Hilgenfeld can only see an interpolation of a redactor, and in which Weiss finds something suspicious, see Zöckler's note, in loco). In the first part, 17-36, we are told how Moses by divine and miraculous guidance grows up to be the deliverer of Israel. But when he would commence his work of deliverance his brethren will not understand his aim and reject him, 23-28. In the wilderness he receives a fresh commission from God to undertake the delivery of the people, 29-34. But this Moses (οὗτος) who was thus repulsed God had sent to be a ruler and deliverer—this man was he who led these people forth—and it was this Moses who said to the children: "A prophet" etc., v. 37. Why is this prophecy introduced except to support the inference that as Moses, a type of the Messiah, was thus repulsed, and afterwards raised to be a ruler and deliverer, so must, according to Moses' own words, the Messiah of Israel be first rejected by His people? In the next division, vv. 38-50, the same parallel is again instituted between Moses and the Messiah. The former had delivered a law which consisted of "living oracles," but instead of receiving it, Israel had given themselves up to the worship of idols, 35-43; instead of establishing a worship well-pleasing to God, those who came after Moses, not content with the tabernacle, which was not confined to one place, and which represented the heavenly archetype, had built a temple which called forth the cutting words of the prophet, 47-50. In his explanation of these last verses there lies at least one weakness of Spitta's explanation, for he does not seem in his disapproval of the temple to allow that it had even a relative value, and that Solomon was well aware that God did not dwell only in temples made with hands. But Spitta's main point is to trace again a connection with the verse which forms his centre, ver. 37 (Deut. xviii. 15). As Moses in vain communicated a spiritual law and a corresponding worship to a people whose heart turned after idols and the service of a temple, so the Messiah must also experience that the carnal mind of the people would oppose His revelation of the divine will in relation to a rightful service. Thus the whole speech becomes a proof of the Messiahship of Jesus as against those who appealed to the authority of Moses, and saw in Jesus a twofold cause of offence: (1) that He was rejected by His people and crucified; (2) that He had treated with impiety that which they held most sacred—the law and the temple.

In all this Spitta sees no direct answer to the false witnesses; but the speech, he maintains, is much rather an answer to the two causes of offence which must
have been discussed in every synagogue, and which the infant Church must have been obliged to face from the first, especially as it took its stand upon the proof that Jesus was the Christ. Stephen in his disputations, vi. 9, must have often faced opponents who thus sought to invalidate the Messianic claims of Jesus; what more natural than that he should now repeat before the whole assembly the proofs which he had before given in the synagogue, where no one could resist the spirit and the wisdom with which he spake? In this way Spitta maintains that the charges in vv. 52, 53 occupy their proper place; the Jews had rejected the prophets—Moses and his successors—finally they rejected the Messiah, whom the prophets had foretold (Apostelgeschichte, p. 105 ff.). Whatever structures we may be inclined to pass upon Spitta (see, e.g., Wendt in new edition, 1899, pp. 150, 151), it is not unlikely that he has at all events grasped what others have failed to see, viz., that in the nature of the case, Stephen in his ἀπολογία, or counter-accusation—whichever it was—could not have been unmindful of the Prophet like unto Moses, whom Moses had foretold: his dying prayer revealed the Name, not uttered in the speech, which was enshrined in his inmost heart; Jesus was the Christ—He came of καταλύσαι ἄλλα πληρώσου, whether that fulfilment was made by a spiritual temple or a spiritual law. In thus keeping the thought of Jesus of Nazareth prominent throughout the speech, whilst not actually uttering His Name, in thus comparing Moses and Christ, Stephen was answering the charges made against him. “This Nazarene” (so it was said in the charge made against Stephen) “would destroy this place and change the customs,” etc. —the prophet Moses had given the people living oracles, not a law which should stifle the spirit in the letter; the prophet Isaiah had spoken of a presence of God far transcending that which filled any earthly temple; and if these prophets had pointed on to the Messiah, and if the Nazarene were indeed the Christ thus foretold, what wonder that He should reveal a commandment unto life, and a worship of the Father in spirit and in truth? Nor must it be forgotten that if Stephen was interrupted before his speech was concluded, he may well have intended to drive home more closely the manifest fulfilment in Christ of the deliverance dimly foreshadowed in the work of Moses and in the freedom from Egyptian bondage. This was the true parallel between Moses and the Messiah on which the Rabbis were wont to dwell. Thus the Messiah, in comparison with Moses, was the second, but in comparison with all others the great, deliverer; as Moses led Israel out of Egypt, so would the Messiah accomplish the final deliverance, and restore Israel to their own land (Weber, ᾿Ιουδική Θεολογία, pp. 359, 364 (1897)). It is to be observed that Spitta warmly supports the historical character of the speech, which he ascribes without interpolation to his source Α, although in vv. 55-60 he refers some “insertions” to Β. His criticism as against the tendency critics, especially Overbeck, is well worth consulting (pp. 110-123), and he quotes with approval the judgment of Gfrörer—“I consider this speech unreservedly as the oldest monument of Gospel history”. So too Clemen, pp. 97, 288, allows that the speech is essentially derived, with the exception of ver. 37, as also the whole chapter with the exception of ver. 60, from an old written source, H.H., Historia Hellenistarum; and amongst more recent writers, McGiffert holds that whilst many maintain that the author of the Acts composed the speech and put it into the mouth of Stephen, its contents are against such a supposition, and that Luke undoubtedly got the substance of the discourse from an early source, and reproduced it with approximate accuracy (p. 89 and note). So Weiss refers the speech to his Jewish-Christian source, and refuses to admit that with its profound knowledge of the O.T. it could have been composed by the author of
the book. The attempt of Feine (so also Holtzmann and Jüngst) to split up the speech into two distinct parts is based upon the idea that in one part an answer is made to the charge that Stephen had spoken against God, and that the other part contains an answer to the charge that he had spoken against the temple. The first part is contained in vii. 2-21, 29-34, 44-50, and the second part in vii. 22-28, 35-43, 51-53. The latter sections are taken from Feine’s Jerusalem source; they are then added to those which belong to a new source, and finally combined by the canonical Luke. Hilgenfeld may well ask how it is possible to break up in this manner the narrative part of the speech relating to Moses, so as to regard νν. 22-28 as a section alien from what precedes and what follows!(see especially Hilgenfeld’s criticisms on Feine, Zeitsschrift für Bibelsch. Theol., p. 396 (1895) and Knabenbauer, p. 120); on the truthful record of the speech see Lightfoot’s striking remarks “Acts,” B.D. i., p. 33. Whatever may be said as to the various difficulties which the speech contains, two things are apparent: (1) that these difficulties do not touch the main drift of the argument; (2) that the fact of their presence, where their removal was easy, bears witness to the accuracy of the report.

Chapter VIII.—Ver. 1. Σαῦλος δὲ κ.τ.λ., R.V. joins these words to the conclusion of the previous chapter, and thus brings them into a close and fitting connection with vii. 58. So too Wendt, Blass, Nösgen, Zöckler.—καὶ εὐθαὐσκότας: for this characteristic Lucan use of the imperfect of the substantive verb with a participle, see chap. i. 10. The formula here indicates the lasting and enduring nature of Saul’s “consent”. The verb εὐθαὐσκότας is peculiar to St. Luke and St. Paul, and is used by the former in his Gospel as well as in Acts, cf. Luke xi. 48, Acts xxii. 20 (by St. Paul himself with reference to his share in the murder of St. Stephen), Rom. i. 32, 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13. The word is also found in 1 Macc. i. 57 (iv. 28), 2 Macc. xi. 24, 35, signifying entire approval; it is also twice used by St. Clement, Cor., xxxv., 6; xlvii., 3: “consent” does not express the force of the word—“was approving of his death” (Rendall).—ἐκπόνητα: used only here in N.T. (on St. Luke’s favourite word ἀναπόδοτα, see Friedrich, Das Lucasevangelium, p. 22); both verb and noun were frequent in medical language (Hobart, Zahn), see below on ix. 29, but the noun in LXX, Num. xi. 15; Judith xv. 4, 2 Macc. v. 13, and in classical Greek, e.g., Xen., Hell., vi., 3, 5.—εγένετο δὲ: another characteristic formula in St. Luke, Friedrich, u. s., p. 13; here introduces a new section of the history.—ἐν εκείνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: R.V. “on that day” (A.V. “at that time”), cf. ii. 41; the persecution broke out at once, “on that very day” (so Wendt, Rendall, Hort, Hackett, Felten, Zöckler, Holtzmann), the signal for it being given by the tumultuous stoning of the first martyr (but see on the other hand Alford, in loco). Weiss draws attention to the emphatic position of εκείνη before τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.—ἐνεκείνη τῇ εκκλησίᾳ τῆς ἔν Ι.: hitherto as, e.g., v. 11, the Church has been thought of as one, because limited in fact to the one city Jerusalem, but here we have a hint that soon there would be new Ecclesiae in the one Ecclesia, as it spread throughout the Holy Land (Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 53-56, 227, and Ramsay, St. Paul, etc., pp. 41, 127, 377).—πάντες τε: “ridiculum est hoc mathematica ratione accipere” (Blass)—it is evident from ver. 3 that there were some left for Saul to persecute. In ix. 26 we have mention of a company of disciples in Jerusalem, but there is no reason to suppose (Schneckenburger, Zeller, Overbeck) that Luke has made a mistake in the passage before us, for there is nothing in the text against the supposition that some at least of those who had fled returned again later.—διεσπάρησαν: only in St. Luke in N.T., here and in ver. 4, and in xi. 19. This use of the word is quite classical, and frequent in LXX, e.g., Gen. ix. 19, Lev. xxvi. 33, 1 Macc. xi. 47. Feine remarks that even Holtzmann allows that the spread of Christianity throughout Judaea and Samaria may be regarded as historical.—ἐλθοπρέπον: only in St. Luke in N.T., here and in ver. 4, and in xi. 19. This use of the word is quite classical, and frequent in LXX, e.g., Gen. ix. 19, Lev. xxvi. 33, 1 Macc. xi. 47. Feine remarks that even Holtzmann allows that the spread of Christianity throughout Judaea and Samaria may be regarded as historical.—χώρας: here rendered “regions”; Blass takes the word as almost = κώμας, and see also Plummer on Luke xxi. 21, ἐν ταῖς χώραις “in the country,” R.V. The word is characteristic of St. Luke, being used in his Gospel nine times, and in Acts eight; it is used thrice by St. Matthew and by St. John, four times by St. Mark, but elsewhere in N.T. only once, James v. 4.
χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας, πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων. 1. 2ο8 συνεκόμισαν δὲ τὸν Ἐσφαλόν ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς, καὶ ἐπώνυμον 


It is found frequently in LXX and in 1, 2, 3 Macc.—τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας: thus the historian makes another step in the fulfilment of the Lord's command, i. 8, and see also Ramsay, St. Paul, etc., p. 41. St. Chrysostom remarks ὅτι ἡ οἰκονομίας ὁ διώγμος ἦν, since the persecution became the means of spreading the Gospel, and thus early the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the Church.—πλην τῶν ἀποστόλων: a preposition with genitive as here and in xν. 28, xxvii. 22; elsewhere it is only found once as a preposition with genitive in Mark xii. 32, although very frequent in LXX. The word occurs at least thirteen times in the Gospel, four times in Acts, in St. Matthew five times, in St. Mark once, and in John viii. 10; see Friedrich, Das Lucassevangelium, pp. 16, 91. This mention of the Apostles seems unlikely to Schneckenburger, Schleiermacher, and others, but, as Wendt points out, it is quite consistent with the greater steadfastness of men who felt themselves to be πρωταγωνισταί, as Οἰκομενικος calls them, in that which concerned their Lord. Their position too may well have been more secure than that of the Hellenists, who were identified with Stephen, as they were held in favour by the people, v. 13, and as regular attendants at the temple services would not have been exposed to the same charges as those directed against the proto-martyr. There was, too, a tradition (very old and well attested according to Harnack, Chronologie, i., 243) to the effect that the Apostles were commanded by Christ not to depart from Jerusalem for twelve years, so that none should say that he had not heard the message, Euseb., H. E., v., 18, 14; nor is there anything inconsistent with this tradition in the visit of St. Peter and St. John to Samaria, since this and other journeys are simply missionary excursions, from which the Apostles always returned to Jerusalem (Harnack). The passage in Clem. Alex., Strom., vi., 5, 43, limited the Apostles' preaching for the time specified not to Jerusalem, but to Israel.—Σαμαρείας: our Lord had recognised the barrier between the Samaritan and the Jew, Matt. x. 5; but now in obedience to His command (i. 8) both Samaritan and Jew were admitted to the Church, for although the Apostles had not originated this preaching they very plainly endorsed it, ver. 14 ff. (cf. Hort, Judaisctic Christianity, p. 54). Possibly the very fact that Philip and others were fleeing from the persecution of the Jewish hierarchy would have secured their welcome in the Samaritan towns.

Ver. 2. Spitta connects ver. 2 with xi. 19-21, and all the intermediate section, viii. 5-xi. 19; forms part of his source B (so also Sorof, Clemens, who joins his H. H., vii. 1 to xi. 19; but on the other hand see Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 501 (1895), and Jüngst, Apostelgeschichte, p. 79). According to Spitta the whole narrative of Philip's ministry in viii. ought not to be connected so closely with the death of Stephen, but should fall after ix. 31. The only reason for its earlier insertion is the desire to connect the second deacon with the first (but Hilgenfeld, u. s., pp. 413, 414 (1895), as against both Spitta and Clemens, regards the account of Philip and that of Stephen as inseparable). Spitta strongly maintains that Philip the Apostle, and not the deacon, is meant; and if this be so, he would no doubt help us to answer the objection that in viii. 14-17 leads him, whilst he admits that the meeting with Simon Magus is historical, to regard the conversion of the sorcerer as doubtful, because the whole passage presupposes
κοπετόν μέγαν ἐν' αὐτῷ. 3. Σαῦλος δὲ ἀλμαίνετο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατὰ τῶν οικῶν εἰσπορεύομεν, σύρων τε ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας (vv. 18-24) that the laying on of the Apostles' hands bestowed the Spirit; so Clemen refers the whole representation in its present form of the communication of the Spirit, not through Baptism, but through the laying on of the Apostles' hands, to his Redactor Antijudaicus (cf. xix. 6), and to the same hand he attributes the πλην τῶν ἀποστόλων, ver. 1, and cf. ver. 25, introduced for the purpose of showing that the Apostles Peter and John sanctioned the Samaritan mission from the central home of the Christian Church.—συνεκόμισαν: in its primary sense the verb means to carry or bring together, of harvest; to gather in, to house it, so also in LXX, Job v. 26; in a secondary sense, to help in burying; so Soph., Ajax, 1048; Plut., Sull., 38. The meaning is not "carried to his burial," as in A.V., but rather as R.V., "buried," for, although the Greek is properly "joining in carrying," the word includes the whole ceremony of burial—it is used only here in the N.T., and in LXX only in l. c.—εὐλαβείς: only found in St. Luke in N.T., and used by him four times, once in Luke ii. 25, and in Acts ii. 5, xxi. 12 (ἅπαξ τ. Τ.). The primary thought underlying the word is that of one who handles carefully and cautiously, and so it bears the meaning of cautious, circumspect. Although εὐλαβεία and εὐλαβείται are both used in the sense of caution and reverence towards the gods in classical Greek, the adjective is never expressly so used. But Plato connects it closely with δίκαιος (cf. Luke ii. 25), Polit. 311 A and 311 B (so εὐσεβείς and εὐλαβείς are used together by Demosthenes). In the LXX all three words are found to express reverent fear of, or piety towards, God; εὐλαβείται, frequently, εὐλαβεία in Prov. xxviii. 14, where σκληρὸς την καρδίαν in the second part of the verse seems to point to the religious character of the εὐλαβεία, whilst εὐλαβεία is found in Micah vii. 2 as a rendering of ἀγάπη (cf. Psalms of Solomon, p. 36, Ryle and James' edition); cf. also Ecclus. xi. 17 (but see for both passages, Hatch and Redpath); in Lev. xv. 31 we find the word εὐλαβεία ποιήσετε τοὺς νιώτας ἵνα ἄκαθαρσιών αὐτῶν, ἵνα εἰς τὸν ἄκαθαρσιν αὐτῶν ἂν γίνησθι. The adverb εὐλαβεῖς is found once, 2 Macc. vi. 11. St. Luke uses the word chiefly at all events of O.T. piety. In Luke ii. 45 it is used of Simeon, in Acts ii. 5 of the Jews who came up to worship at the feasts in Jerusalem, and in xxii. 12, although Ananias was a Christian, yet the qualifying words εὐλαβεῖς κατὰ τῶν νόμων point again to a devout observance of the Jewish law. Trench, N. T. Synonyms, i., pp. 38, 198 ff.; Westcott, Hebrews, on v. 7; Grimm-Thayer, sub v., and sub v. διελθα,—ἀνδρεῖς εὐλαβεῖς: much discussion has arisen as to whether they were Jews or Christians. They may have been Christians who like the Apostles themselves were still Jews, attending the temple services and hours of prayer, some of whom were doubtless left in the city. But these would have been described more probably as ἄμελοι or μαθηταὶ (so Felten, Page, Hackett). Or they may have been devout Jews like Nicodemus, or Joseph of Arimathea, who would show their respect for Stephen, as Nicodemus and Joseph for Jesus (so Holtzmann, Zöckler). Wetstein (so too Renan and Blass) explains of Gentile proselytes, men like Cornelius, who rendered the last offices to Stephen out of natural respect for the dead, and who stood outside the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin, so that the funeral rites need not have been performed in secret. But St. Luke as a rule uses other words to denote Gentile proselytes, and the Sanhedrin would probably not have interfered with the burial, not only on account of the known Jewish care for the dead, but also because devout Jews would not have been obnoxious in their eyes to the charges brought against Stephen, vi. 14 (so Nösgen). The word might therefore include both devout Jews and Jewish Christians who joined together in burying Stephen.—κοπετόν μέγαν, from κόπτω, κόπτομαι, cf. planctus from plango, to beat the breast or head in lamentation. Not used elsewhere in N.T., but frequent in LXX; cf., e.g., Gen. 1. το, το Macc. ii. 70, iv. 39, ix. 20, xiii. 26, for the same allocation as here, and for ποιήσαι κοπετόν, Jer. vi. 26, Misc. i. 8, and cf. also Zech. xii. 10. In classical Greek κομμός is found, but see Plut., Fab., 17, and Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 74, for reference to the comic poet Eupolis (cf. also Blass), and Grimm-Thayer, sub ν. For the Jewish customs of mourning cf. Matt. ix. 23, Hamburger, Real-Encyclo-
παρεδίδουεις φυλακήν. 4. οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες διήλθον, εὐαγγελίζομεν τὸν λόγον. 1

1 διήλθον; for this word Gig., Par., Wern. seem to have read ἑσταυρώντο, ibant. After λόγον Par., Wern. and other Latin authorities add "circa (per) civitates et castella Judææ," κατὰ τὰς πόλεις καὶ κυρίας τῆς Ι. Blass in β, evidently for the sake of clearness, as also in previous ἑσταυρ., cf. Wendt. After λόγον E, Vulg., Par², Wern. add τοῦ θεοῦ, again addition apparently for clearness (if not omission). Blass rejects in β; where ὁ λόγος is used in Acts in this sense we almost always have this addition οὗ τοῦ Κυρίου.

pādie des Judentums, i., 7, 996, "Trauer"; Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, i., p. 616, and Sketches of Jewish Social Life, p. 172 ff. If the mourners included Jews as well as Jewish Christians, it may well have been that the lamentation was not only a token of sorrow and respect, but also in the nature of a protest on the part of the more moderate section of the Pharisees (see also Trench's remarks, u. s., p. 106). According to the tradition accepted by St. Augustine, it is said that both Gamaliel and Nicodemus took part in the burial of Stephen, and were afterwards laid in the same grave (Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 167, and Plumptre in loco).

Ver. 3. έλυμαίνετο: deponent verb, used in classical Greek of personal outrage (λύμη), of scourging and torturing, of outraging the dead, of the ruin and devastation caused by an army (Wetstein). In the LXX it is found several times, cf. especially Ps. lxxix. (Ιxxx.) 13, of a wild boar ravaging a vineyard, and cf. also Ecclus. xxviii. 23. As the word is used only by St. Luke it is possible that it may have been suggested by its frequent employment in medical language, where it is employed not only of injury by wrong treatment, but also of the ravages of disease, Hobart, Medical Language, pp. 211, 212. R.V. renders "laid waste," A.V. (so Tyndale) "made havoc of," but the revisers have rendered πορτίῳ by the latter, cf. Acts ix. 21, Gal. i. 3. St. Paul's description of himself as ἀμφιθεατρικός, i Tim. i. 13, may well refer to the infliction of personal insults and injuries, as expressed here by λυμαίνομαι (cf. Paley, Hora Paulina, xi., 5).—τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, i.e., the Church just mentioned at Jerusalem—Saul's further persecution, even to Damascus, probably came later (Hort, Ecclesia, p. 53).—κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους έλυμαίνετο: the expression may denote "entering into every house," R. and A.V., or perhaps, more specifically, the houses known as places of Christian assembly, the ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἴκον, see on ii. 46. In any case the words, as also those which follow, show the thoroughness and relentlessness of Saul's persecuting zeal. —σφένον: halting, i.e., halting, dragging (schlappend), cf. James ii. 6. The word is used by St. Luke three times in Acts (only twice elsewhere in N.T.), and he alone uses κατασφενόν, Luke xii, 58, in the same sense as the single verb (where St. Matthew has παραδέχομαι). For its employment in the Comic Poets see Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 76, and also Arrian, Epict., i. 29, 22, and other instances in Wetstein; cf. LXX, 2 Sam. xvii. 13, 4 Macc. vi. 1, ἔσυραν επὶ τὰ βασανιστήρια τοῦ Ἐλ.—γυναῖκας: repeated also in ix. 2, and xxii. 4, as indicating the relentless nature of the persecution. Some of the devout and ministering women may well have been included, Luke vii. 2, 3, Acts i. 14.

Ver. 4. οἱ μὲν οὖν διήλθον: the word is constantly used of missionary journeys in Acts, cf. v. 40, xi. 19, ix. 32 (Luke ix. 6), cf. xiii. 6, note.—εὐαγγελίζομεν: it is a suggestive fact that this word is only used once in the other Gospels (Matt. xi. 5 by our Lord), but no less than ten times in St. Luke's Gospel, fifteen in Acts, and chiefly elsewhere by St. Paul; truly "a missionary word," see ver. τg. Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 79, speaks of its introduction into the N.T. with "such a novel force as to be felt like a new word." It is used several times in LXX, and is also found in Psalms of Solomon, xi., 2 (cf. Isa. xl. 9, lii. 7, and Nah. i. 15). On its construction see Simcox, u. s., p. 79, and Vogel, p. 24.

Ver. 5. Φίλιππος δε: the Evangelist, cf. xxi. 8, and note on vi. 5.—εἰς πόλιν: if we insert the article (see above on critical notes), the expression means "the city of Samaria," i.e., the capital of the district (so Weiss, Wendt,
5. ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ δὲ καταλήγων εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας, εὐήχρυσον αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν. 6. προσείχον τε οἱ ὄχλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου ὁμοθυμαίον, ἐν τῷ ἄκουεν αὐτοὺς καὶ βλέπειν τὰ σημεία ἐ ἐποίει. 7. πολλὸν γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα βοῶντα μεγάλη ὕφος ἐξήρχετο; πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ

1 εἰς Σ. την πόλιν. Par. ("Samaria in civitate," again for clearness (Wendt)), so Blass in B; Σαμαρείας ΑΒΗΡ, so Tisch., W. H., see on ver. 1. (See on the reading Winer-Schmiedel, p. 266.)

2 προσείχον τοῖς λεγομένοις, but δὲ ΝΑΒΚΔΕΙ61, c, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl., so Tisch., W. H., R. V., Blass, Wendt, Weiss. In D this verse begins we bezs παν των τοις λεγ., but Blass rejects; Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, expresses surprise at this rejection by Blass, as the reading is not more superfluous than countless additions in D; the words already lay in the following εν τω ακοούειν αὐτοὺς. Chase refers to Syriac with considerable probability.

3 πολλῶν γαρ κ.τ.λ.: if we accept reading in R.V. (see critical notes above), we must suppose that St. Luke passes in thought from the possessed to the unclean spirits by which they were possessed, and so introduces the verb εξήρχοντο as if the unclean spirits were themselves the subject, whereas we should have expected that θεραπεύθησαν would have followed after the first πολλοῖ, as after the second, in the second clause of the verse. Blass conjectures that έ should be read before βοῶντα, which thus enables him, while retaining ἐξήρχοντο, to make πολλοί in each clause of the verse the subject of θεραπ. One of the most striking phenomena in the demonised was that they lost at least temporarily their own self-consciousness, and became identified with the demon or demons, and this may account for St. Luke's way of writing, as if he also identified the two in thought, Eder-sheim, Jesus the Messiah, i., 479. 647. ff. As a physician St. Luke must have often come into contact with those who had unclean spirits, and he would naturally have studied closely the nature of their disease. It is also to be noted that πολλοί with the genitive, τῶν ἐχόντων (not πολλοί ἐχόντες), shows that not all the possessed were healed, and if so, it is an indication of the truthfulness of the narrative. Moreover, St. Luke not only shows himself acquainted with the characteristics of demoniacal possession, cf. his description in Luke viii. 27, ix. 38, 39, but he constantly, as in the passage before us, distinguishes it from disease itself, and that more frequently than the other Evangelists. Hobart draws special attention to Luke vi. 17, viii. 4, xii. 32, which have no parallels in the other Gospels, and Acts xix. 12. To which we may add Luke iv. 40, Acts v. 16 (Wendt); see further on xix. 12.—σοφοῦσα, cf. Mark i. 26, Luke iv. 33.—παραλελυμένος: St. Luke alone of the Evangelists uses the participle of παρα-
8. καὶ ἔγενε ἡραμέγαλή ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.
9. Λέθεραπεύθησαν; D reads θεραπευσαντο, so Hilg., perhaps assim. to θεραξευτο, Blass in β rejects.


9. Άνήρ δέ τινι ὀνόματι Σίμων προύπαρχεν; D reads προύπαρχων, Σαμαρειας, see on ver. 1. μεγαν, "delevi," so Blass on the authority of some codices of Ιren. see comment. below.

λύειν, instead of παραλυτικός, the more popular word; and here again his usage is exactly what we should expect from a medical man acquainted with technical terms (Hobart, Zahn, Salmon), cf. ix. 33 and Luke v. 18, 24 (παραλυτικός, W.Η. margin). Dr. Plummer, St. Luke, Introd., lxxv., points out that Aristotle, a physician's son, has also this use of παραλυτικός (Eth. Nic., i., 13, 15), but he adds that its use in St. Luke may have come from the LXX, as in Heb. xii. 12, where we have the word in a quotation from Isa. xxxv. 3 (cf. also Ecclesiast. xxv. 23). It may be added that the participle is also found in 3 Macc. ii. 22, καὶ τοῖς μέλει παραλυτικοῖς, and cf. 1 Macc. ix. 15, where it is said of Alcimus, καὶ παρελύθη. But the most remarkable feature in St. Luke's employment of the word is surely this, that in parallel passages in which St. Matthew and St. Mark have παραλυτικός he has παραλυτικόν, cf. Luke v. 18, Matt. ix. 12, Mark ii. 3; in Luke v. 24 this same distinction is also found in the Revisers' text (but see W.Η. above), when this verse is compared with Mark ii. 10.

Ver. 8. This detail, and indeed the whole narrative, may have been derived by St. Luke from the information of St. Philip himself, cf. xxii. 8, xxiv. 27, or from St. Paul as he travelled through Samaria, xv. 3.

Ver. 9. Σίμων: very few of the most advanced critics now dismiss Simon as an unhistorical character, or deny that the account before us contains at least some historical data; see McGiffert's note, Apostolic Age, p. 100. Hilgenfeld and Lipsius may be reckoned amongst those who once refused to admit that Simon Magus was an historical personage, but who afterwards retracted their opinion. But it still remains almost unaccountable that so many critics should have more or less endorsed, or developed, the theory first advocated by Baur that the Simon Magus of the Clementine Homilies is none other than the Apostle Paul. It is sufficient to refer for an exposition of the absurdity of this identification to Dr. Salmon " Clementine Literature" (Dict. of Christian Biog., iii., pp. 575, 576; see also Ritschl's note, Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche, p. 228 (second edition)). This ingenuity outdid itself in asking us to see in Simon's request to buy the power of conferring the Holy Ghost a travesty of the rejection of Paul's apostolic claims by the older Apostles, in spite of the gift of money which he had collected for the poor Saints in Jerusalem (Overbeck). No wonder that Spitta should describe such an explanation as "a perfect absurdity" (Apostelgeschichte, p. 149). Before we can believe that the author of the Acts would make any use of the pseudo-Clementine literature in his account of Simon, we must account for the extraordinary fact that an author who so prominently represents his hero as triumphant over the powers of magic, xiii. 6-12, xix. 11-12, should have recourse to a tradition in which this same hero is identified with a magician (see Spitta, u. s., p. 151; Salmon, "The Simon of Modern Criticism," Dict. of Christian Biog., iv., p. 687; Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 212, and Wendt's note, p. 201). In Acts xxii. 8 we read that St. Luke spent several days in the house of Philip the Evangelist, and if we bear in mind that this same Philip is so prominent in chap. viii., there is nothing impossible in the belief that St. Luke should have received his narrative from St. Philip's lips, and included it in his history as an early and remarkable instance of the triumph of the Gospel—we need not search for any more occult reason on the part of the historian (see Salmon, u. s., p. 688). Simon then is an historical personage, and it is not too much to say that to all the stories which have gathered round his name the narrative of Simon Magus of the Clementine Homilies is none other than the Apostle Paul.
Acts always stands in a relation of priority—the two facts mentioned in Acts, that Simon was a magician, and that he came into personal antagonism with St. Peter, always recur elsewhere—but Acts tells us nothing of the details of Simon’s heretical preaching, and it draws the veil entirely over his subsequent history. But “the hero of the romance of heresy” comes into prominence under the name of Simon in Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i., 26, Irenæus, i., 23 (who speaks of Simon the Samaritan, from whom all heresies had their being), and in the Clementine literature. But there is good reason for thinking that St. Irenæus, whilst he gives us a fuller account, is still giving us an account dependent on Justin, and there is every reason to believe that the Clementine writers also followed the same authority; see further, Salmon, “Simon Magus,” *s. s., iv., p. 681 ff., and for a summary of the legends which gathered round the name of the Samaritan magician Plumptre’s note, *in loco*, may be consulted. To the vexed question as to the identification of the Simon of Justin with the Simon of the Acts Dr. Salmon returns a decided negative answer, *s. s.,* p. 683, and certainly the Simon described by Justin seems to note rather the inheritor and teacher of a Gnostic system already developed than to have been in his own person the father of Gnosticism. Simon, however, was no uncommon name, e.g., Josephus, *Ant.*, xx., 7, 2, speaks of a Simon of Cyprus, whom there is no valid reason to identify with the Simon of the Acts (although famous critical authorities may be quoted in favour of such an identification). On the mistake made by Justin with reference to the statue on the Tiberine island with the words Semont Sanco Deo Fido inscribed (cf. the account of the marble fragment, apparently the base of a statue, dug up in 1574, marked with a similar inscription, in Lanciani’s *Pagan and Christian Rome*) in referring it to Simon Magus, *Apol.*, i., 26, 56, Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. xiii., and Irenæus, i., 23, whilst in reality it referred to a Sabine god, Semo Sancus, the Sabine Hercules, see further, Salmon, *s. s.,* p. 682, Rendall. *Acts*, p. 220. (Van Manen, followed by Feine, claims to discover two presentations of Simon in Acts—one as an ordinary magician, viii. 9, 11, the other as a supposed incarnation of the deity, ver. 10—so too Jungst, who refers the words from *μαγεύων* to *Σαμαρίας* to his Redactor; but on the other hand Hilgenfeld and Spitta see no contradiction, and regard the narrative as a complete whole.)—*μαγεύων* only here in N.T., not found in LXX (but cf. *μάγος* in Dan. i. 20, ii. 2), though used in classical Greek. The word *μάγος* was used frequently by Herodotus of the priests and wise men in Persia who interpreted dreams, and hence the word came to denote any enchanter or wizard, and in a bad sense, a juggler, a quack like *γόης* (see instances in Wetstein). Here (cf. xiii. 6) it is used of the evil exercise of magic and sorcery by Simon, who practised the charms and incantations so extensively employed at the time in the East by quacks claiming supernatural powers (Baur, *Paulus*, i., p. 107; Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, cf. i., 84, 85 (fifth edit.); Wendt, *Apostelgesichte*, p. 202; Blass, *in loco*; Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 19, and see below on xiii. 6.—*εξιστών* from *εξιστάω* (*εξίστημι*); so *εξεστακέναι*, ver. 11, perfect active, hel lenistic form, also transitive; see Blass, *Grammatik*, pp. 48, 49, transitive in present, future, first aorist active, cf. Luke xxiv. 22—so *εξιστακόνω*, ver. 11, perfect active, hel lenistic form, also transitive; see Blass, *u. s.* (also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 118, and Grimm-Thayer, sub *ν.*) in 3 Mac. i. 25 *εξιστανέω* also occurs.)—*τοτεμαλ*, intransitive, ver. 13, Blass, *u. s.*, p. 49—the revisers have consistently rendered the verb by the same English word in the three verses 9, 11, 13, thus giving point and force to the narrative, see on ver. 13.—*λέγων κ.τ.λ.*, cf. v. 36. Blas s, *Grammatik*, p. 174, regards *μάγος* as an interpolation, and it is not found in the similar phrase in v. 36 (so too Winer-Schmiedel, p. 243), cf. Gal. ii. 6, and vi. 3, and the use of the Latin *aliquis*, Cicero, *Att.*, iii., 15, so too vii. 3, etc. It may be that Simon set himself up for a Messiah (see Ritschl’s note, p. 228, *Die Entwicklung der altkatholischen Kirche*, second edition), or a Prophet, Jos.,
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11. προσέχον δε αυτῳ, δια το ικανω χρόνω τας μαγειας εξεστακεναι αυτως. 12. "Οτε δε

ἡ δύναμις του Θεου ἡ μεγάλη. 11. προσέχον δε αυτῳ, δια το ικανω χρόνω τας μαγειας εξεστακεναι αυτως.


2. μαγεια BLP, so Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; μαγεια ΝΑCDΕΗ, so Tisch., W.H. (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 44).

Ant., xviii., 4, 1, but ver. 14 points to a definite title, and it is likely enough that the people would repeat what Simon had told them of himself. His later followers went further and made him say, "Ego sum sermo Dei, ego sum speciosus, ego paracritis, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei." Jerome, Commentar. in Matt., c. xx., 24 (Neander, Geschichte der Pflanzung, cf. i., 85, note.)—διαρκέων: contrast Philip's attitude; he preached Christ, not himself (cf. Rev. ii. 20).

Ver. 10. ἡ δύναμις του Θεου ἡ μεγάλη: in R.V. the power of God which is called (καλουμενη) Great, see above, critical notes. T.R. may have omitted the word because it appeared unsuitable to the context, but it could not have been used in a depreciatory sense by the Samaritans, as if to intimate that the person claimed was the so-called "Great," since they also gave heed to Simon. On the other hand it has been argued that the title "Great" is meaningless in this relation, for every divine power might be described by the same epithet (so Wendt, in loco; and Blass: "mirum maxime ἡ καλ. quasi δύναμις Θ. μακρός quoque esse posuit"). This difficulty leads Blass in his notes to introduce the solution proposed by Klostermann, Probleme im Aposteltexte, pp. 15-20 (1883), and approved by Wendt, Zöckler, Spitta, and recently by Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., ii. 420; see also Salmon's remarks in Hermathena, xxi., p. 232, vis., that μεγάλη is not a translation of the attribute "great" בר, but rather a transcription of the Samaritan word מגלות or מגלות, meaning qui revelat (cf. Hebrew רל, Chaldean מגלות, to reveal). The explanation would then be that in contrast to the hidden essence of the Godhead, Simon was known as its revealing power. Nestle however (see Knabenbauer in loco) objects on the ground that καλουμενη is not read at all in many MSS. But apart from Klostermann's explanation the revised text might fairly mean that amongst the "powers" of God (cf. the N.T. use of the word δυνάμεις in Rom. viii. 38, 1 Peter iii. 22, and cf. Book of Enoch lxi. 10) Simon was emphatically the one which is called great, i.e., the one prominently great or divine.

The same title was assigned to him in later accounts, cf. Irenæus, i., 23 (Clem. Hom., ii., 22; Clem. Recog., i., 72; ii., 7; Tertullian, De Præscr., xlvi.; Origen, c. Celsum, v.). But whatever the claims made by Simon himself, or attributed to him by his followers, we need not read them into the words before us. The expression might mean nothing more than that Simon called himself a great (or revealing) angel of God, since by the Samaritans the angels were regarded as δυνάμεις, powers of God (cf. Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, i., 402, note 4, and De Wette, Apostelgeschichte, p. 122, fourth edition). Such an explanation is far more probable than the attribution to the Samaritans of later Gnostic and philosophical beliefs, while it is a complete answer to Overbeck, who argues that as the patristic literature about Simon presupposes the emanation theories of the Gnostics so the expression in the verse before us must be explained in the same way, and that thus we have a direct proof that the narrative is influenced by the Simon legend. We may however readily admit that Simon's teaching may have been a starting-point for the later Gnostic developments, and so far from ver. 10 demanding a Gnostic system as a background, we may rather see in it a glimpse of the genesis of the beliefs which afterwards figure so prominently in the Gnostic schools (Nögen, Apostelgeschichte, in loco, and p. 186, and see McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 99, and "Gnosticism," Dict. of Christ. Biog., ii., 680). On the close connection between the Samaritans and Egypt and the widespread study of sorcery amongst the Egyptian Samaritans see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, pp. 18, 19. In Hadrian's letter to Servianus we find the Samaritans in Egypt described, like the Jews and Christians there, as all astrologers, sooth-
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

επίστευσαν τῷ Φίλιππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ τά 1 περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ δόματος τοῦ Ἱσού Χριστοῦ, ἐβαπτίζοντο ανδρεὶς τε καὶ γυναῖκες. 13. ο δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς επίστευσεν καὶ βαπτίσθη ἐν προσκαρτηρῶν τῷ Φίλιππῳ θεωρῶν τε σημεία καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας γινομένας, ἔξιστατο. 14. Ακούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἐν ἱεροσολύμοις ἀπόστολοι, ὡς βλέποντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπόστειλαν


sayers and quacks (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 230 E.T.): no doubt an exaggeration, as Deissmann says, but still a proof that amongst these Egyptian Samaritans magic and its kindred arts were widely known. In a note on p. 19 Deissmann gives an interesting parallel to Acts viii. 10, ἐν τῷ σφάλματι δύναμιν τῷ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (Ἑλλ. τῇ ἐν τῇ αἰρέσει ἔντον Κυρίων Θεοῦ τατοποιηθήν (Pap. Par. Bibl. nat., 1275 ff.; Wessely, i., 76) (and he also compares *Gospel of Peter*, ver. 19, ἐν δύναμις μοι (2)). The expression according to him will thus have passed from its use amongst the Samaritans into the *Zauber*-literature of Egypt.

Ver. 11. λέων χάρων: dative for accusative, cf. xiii. 20; and perhaps Luke vii. 29, Rom. xvi. 25—the usage is not classical, Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 118, but see also Winer-Moulton, xxxi. 9 a. St. Luke alone uses λέων with χάρων, both in his Gospel and in Acts (Vogel, Klostermann).—παρείπησις: only here in N.T., not found in LXX or Apocryphal books, but used in Theophrastus and Plutarch, also in Josephus. It is found in a striking passage in St. Ignatius (*Ephes.*, xix., 3) in reference to the shining forth of the star at the Incarnation, ἀπύγνησις περὶ τοῦ παρείπησιν, and it is also mentioned, *Didache*, v., 1, amongst the things comprised under "the way of death," and so in ii. 1 we read σοὶ παναγίωτα σοὶ παρακλήσουσί.—ἡ συντροφεύσει, see above on ver. 9.


Ver. 13. καὶ αὐτὸς: characteristic of St. Luke, see Friedrich, *Das Lucas-evangelium*, p. 37.—βαπτίσθης—βαπτίζοντο έξεστεί τό συμφωνεῖ (St. Cyril).—ἡν προσκαρτηρο—or ἔν τῇ ἐν προσκαρτήσῃ, see above on ver. 9. and perhaps Luke vii. 29, Rom. xvi. 25—the usage is not classical, Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 118, but see also Winer-Moulton, xxxi. 9 a. St. Luke alone uses ἔξιστατο, see above on ver. 9. and Friedrich, u. s., p. 12; on προσκαρτήσῃ. see on i. 14. Here with dative of the person (cf. x. 7); the whole expression shows how assiduously Simon attached himself to Philip.—θεωρῶν: the faith of Simon rested on the outward miracles and signs, a faith which ended in amazement, ἐξεστατο—but it was no permanent abiding faith, just as the amazement which he had himself inspired in others gave way before a higher and more convincing belief. The expression δυνάμεις μεγάλας may have been purposely chosen; hitherto men had seen in Simon, and he himself had claimed to be, ἡ δύν. ἡ μεγάλη (Weiss).—ἐξεστατο: "Simon qui alias obstupefaciebat, jam ipse obstupevit," Wetstein. ἐξεστατομαι, intransitive, Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 49. Irenaeus speaks of him as one who pretended faith, i. 23 (so 100 St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose): he may have believed in the Messianic dignity of Christ, and in His Death and Resurrection, constrained by the miracles which Philip wrought in attestation of his preaching, but it was a belief about the facts, and not a belief in Him whom the facts made known, a belief in the power of the new faith, but not an acceptance of its holiness, ver. 18 (see further, Rendall's note in loco, and on the Baptism of Simon, "Baptism," in Hastings' B.D.).

Ver. 14. Ἡ Σαμ.: here the district; Weiss traces the revising hand of St. Luke (but see on the other hand Wendt, *in loco*). There is nothing surprising in the fact that the preaching of the Gospel in the town should be regarded by the Apostles at Jerusalem as a proof that the
good news had penetrated throughout the district, or that the people of the town should themselves have spread the Gospel amongst their countrymen (cf. John iv. 28).—διδάχθηκαί τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θ.: the phrase is characteristic of St. Luke, as it is used by him, Luke viii. 13, Acts xi. 1, xvii. ii., but not by the other Evangelists—it is found once in St. Paul, 1 Thess. i. 6 (cf. ii. 13 and James i. 21). In the mention of John here, as in iii. 4, Weiss can only see the hand of a reviser, since the beloved disciple is mentioned with Peter in a way for which, as Weiss alleges, no reason can be assigned, iii. 4, 11, iv. 13; but nothing was more likely than that Peter and John should be associated together here as previously in the Gospels, see Plumtre’s note on Acts iii. 1.

Ver. 15. οίτινες: on this form of the relative see Rendall, in loco; Blass however regards it as simply = οί, Grammatik, p. 160, cf. xii. 10.—καταβάντες, cf. xxiv. 1 (Luke ii. 42), xi. 2, xxi. 12, 15. Wendt defends the historical character of this journey to Samaria as against Zeller and Overbeck.—προσηύξαντο περί; the verb is characteristic of St. Luke, and he alone has the construction used in this verse, cf. Luke vi. 28, W. H. The exact phrase is found in St. Paul’s Epistles four or five times (and once in Hebrews), but often in LXX, and cf. Baruch i. 11, 13; 2 Macc. i. 6, xv. 14. The laying on of hands, as in vi. 7 and xiii. 3, is here preceded by prayer, see Hooker, Eccles. Pol., v., chap. lxvi., 1-4.—οί τε Λαβώντες Πν. “Αγιον: the words express the chief and highest object of the Apostles’ visit: it was not only to ascertain the genuineness of the conversions, or to form a connecting link between the Church of Samaria and that of Jerusalem, although such objects might not have been excluded in dealing with an entirely new and strange state of things—the recognition of the Samaritans in a common faith. It has been argued with great force that the expression Holy Ghost is not meant here in its dogmatic Pauline sense; Luke only means to include in it the ecstatic gifts of speaking with tongues and prophecy. This view is held to be supported by ἤσον in ver. 18, intimating that outward manifestations which meet the eye must have shown themselves, and by the fact that the same verb, ἐπέπεσε, is used in cases where the results which follow plainly show that the reception of the Holy Ghost meant a manifestation of the outward marvellous signs such as marked the day of Pentecost, x. 44, 46, xi. 15 (cf. xix. 6). In the case of these Samaritans no such signs from heaven had followed their baptism, and the Apostles prayed for a conspicuous divine sanction on the reception of the new converts (Wendt, Zöckler, Holtzmann, and see also Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 54, 55). But even supposing that the reception of the Holy Ghost could be thus limited, the gift of tongues was no mere magical power, but the direct result of a supernatural Presence and of a special grace—of that Presence speaking with tongues, prophecies, and various gifts, 1 Cor. xiv. 1, 14, 37, were no doubt the outward manifestations, but they could not have been manifested apart from that Presence, and they were outward visible signs of an inward spiritual grace. In a book so marked by the working of the Holy Spirit that it has received the name of the “Gospel of the Spirit” it is difficult to believe that St. Luke can mean to limit the expression λαμβάνειν here and in the following verse to anything less than a bestowal of that divine indwelling of the spirit which makes the Christian the temple of God, and which St. Paul speaks of in the very same terms as a permanent possession, Gal. iii. 2, Rom. viii. 15 (Gore, Church and the Ministry, p. 258). St. Paul’s language, 1 Cor. xii. 30, makes it plain that the advent of the Holy Spirit was not of necessity attested by any peculiar manifestations, nor were these manifestations essential accompaniments of it: “Do all speak with tongues?” he asks, “Are all prophets?” See further on ver. 17.

Ver. 16. ἐπιπέπτωκός: the verb is characteristic of St. Luke, and used by him both in his Gospel and in Acts of the occurrence of extraordinary conditions, e.g., the sudden influence of the Spirit, cf. Luke i. 12, Acts x. 44, xi. 15, xiii. 17, cf. Rev. xi. 11 (Acts x. 10 cannot be supported, and in xiii. 11 read ἐπέπεσεν). Similar usage in LXX, Exod. xv. 16, 1 Sam. xxvi. 12, Ps. liv. 4, Judith ii. 28, xi. 11, etc., Friedrich, Das Lucasevangelium, p. 41.
For the word as used by St. Luke in another sense also characteristic of him, see below on xx. 37, and Plummer on xv. 20. On the formula of baptism see above p. 91, and "Baptism," B.D. 3, p. 352, and Hastings' B.D.—όπηρχον here perhaps = "made a beginning," took the first step (Lumby).

Ver. 17. There cannot be any reason to doubt the validity of St. Philip's baptism, and it is therefore evident that the laying on of hands (cf. xix. 6) is here distinct from baptism, and also from the appointment to any Church office (as in vi. 6, xiii. 3), or the bestowal of any special power of healing as in the person of Ananias, ix. 12, 17, although gifts of healing might no doubt accompany it. But both here and in xix. 6 (cf. Heb. vi. 2) it follows closely upon baptism, and is performed by Apostles, to whom alone the function belongs, although it is reasonable to suppose that the prophets and teachers who were associated with them in their Apostolic office, and who could lay on hands in Acts xiii. 1-3, could do so in other cases also for the reception of the Holy Ghost (Gore, Church and the Ministry, p. 258). The question why St. Philip did not himself "lay hands" upon his converts has been variously discussed, but the narrative of Acts supplies the answer, inasmuch as in the only two parallel cases, i.e., the verse before us and xix. 6, the higher officers alone exercise this power, and also justifies the usual custom of the Church in so limiting its exercise ("Confirmation," Dict. of Christian Antiq. (Smith & Cheetham), i. p. 425; B.D., iii, App.; and Hooker, Eccles. Pol., v., ch. lxi. 5, and passage cited; Jerome, Advers. Lucif., c. 4, and St. Cyprian, Epis. 73, ad Jubaianum (reference to the passage before us)). Undoubtedly there are cases of baptism, Acts iii. 41, xvi. 15, 33, where no reference is made to the subsequent performance of this rite, but in these cases it must be remembered that the baptiser was an Apostle, and that when this was the case its observance might fairly be assumed. For the special case of Cornelius see below on x. 44, see further "Confirmation," B.D. 2, i., 640. Weizsacker contrasts this account in viii., v. 16, which he describes as this crude conception of the communication of the Spirit solely by the imposition of the Apostles' hands (Apostolic Age, ii. 254 and 299, E.T.), and which represents baptism as being thus completed, with the account of baptism given us by St. Paul in 1 Cor. i. 14-17. But in the first place we should remember that Acts does not describe baptism as being completed by the laying on of hands; the baptism was not invalid, the Samarian converts became by its administration members of the Church; and the laying on of hands was not so much a completion of baptism as an addition to it. And, in the next place, Heb. vi. 2 certainly indicates that this addition must have been known at a very early period (see Westcott, in loco). It may also be borne in mind that 2 Cor. i. 21 is interpreted of confirmation by many of the Fathers (cf. too Westcott's interpretation of 1 John ii. 20, 27), and that St. Paul is writing a letter and not describing a ritual.—δέλμαβων: Dr. Hort, who holds that the reception of the Holy Spirit is here explained as in x. 44 by reference to the manifestation of the gift of tongues, etc., points out that the verb is not δέλμαβων, but imperfect δέλμαβων, and he therefore renders it "showed a succession of signs of the Spirit" (see also above). But this interpretation need not conflict with the belief in the gift of the Spirit as a permanent possession, and it is well to remember that ἐπετίθουν (ἐπετίθουν) is also imperfect. Both verbs may therefore simply indicate the continuous administration of the laying on of hands by the Apostles, and the continuous supernatural result (not necessarily external manifestation) which followed upon this action; cf. ἐβαπτίζοντο in ver. 12, imperfect, and so in xviii. 8.

Ver. 18. Δεσάμενος: the word would seem to point on (so λῆν, see critical notes) to some outward manifestation of
the inward grace of the Spirit, so Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler; so Felten, although he does not of course limit the reception of the Holy Spirit to such outward evidences of His Presence. The word may further give us an insight into Simon's character and belief—the gift of the Spirit was valuable to him in its external manifestation, in so far, that is, as it presented itself to ocular demonstration as a higher power than his own magic.—διὰ τῆς ἐπιθ. τῶν χ. τῶν ἁπτώσεως, see above on ver. 17, cf. Βιβλία, "the laying on of hands" was the instrument by which the Holy Ghost was given in this instance: "Church," Hastings' B.D., i., 426.—προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα: Simon was right in so far as he regarded the gift of the Spirit as an ἐξουσία to be bestowed, but entirely wrong in supposing that such a power could be obtained without an inward disposition of the heart, as anything might be bought for gold in external commerce. So De Wette, Apostelgeschichte, p. 124 (fourth edition), and he adds: "This is the fundamental error in 'Simony,' which is closely connected with unbelief in the power and meaning of the Spirit, and with materialism" (see also Alford in loco). (See further on "Simony," Luckock, "The prints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke," i., 208.) Probably Simon, after the manner of the time, cf. xix. 19, may already have purchased secrets from other masters of the magical arts, and thought that a similar purchase could now be effected.

Ver. 19. ίνα ώ εάν επιθ.: "that on whomsoever I lay my hands," i.e., quite apart from any profession of faith; test of character; no words could more plainly show how completely Simon mistook the essential source and meaning of the power which he coveted.

Ver. 20. τὸ ἄργυριόν σου κ.τ.λ.: the words are no curse or imprecation, as is evident from ver. 22, but rather a νεμέονον, an expression of horror on the part of St. Peter, an expression which would warn Simon that he was on the way to destruction. Rendall considers that the real form of the prayer is not that Simon may perish, but that as he is already on the way to destruction, so the silver may be dragged him down, to the intent that Simon himself may repent and be forgiven: so Page, "thy money perish, even as thou art now perishing," cf. Óeumenius, in loco (and to the same effect St. Chrys.): ούκ ἐγείρεται ταύτα ἀλλὰ παῖδεύοντος, ὡς ἐν τῷ εἶπο: 'τὸ ἄργυριόν σου συνάπτολον καὶ μετὰ τῷ προφανέστησον. But see also on the optative of wishing, Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 79, where he speaks of Mark xi. 14 and Acts vii. 20 as peculiar, being imprecatory of evil, and cf. also Blass, Grammar, p. 215.—εἰς τών ἁπτώσεων: a frequent construction, "go to destruction and remain there," see Felten, Wendt, Page, and cf. ver. 23, εἰς τὸ καθά. The noun occurs no less than five times in St. Peter's Second Epistle, cf. also 1 Peter i. 7. εἰς ἁπτώσεως occurs five times elsewhere, Rom. ix. 22, r Tim. vi. 9, Heb. x. 39, Rev. xvii. 8, 11, and it is frequent in LXX; cf. i Chron. xxii, Isa. xiv. 23, liv. 16, Dan. iii. 29, and ii. 5, Theod., etc.; 1 Macc. iii. 40, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 20, and several times in Ecclus.—τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ: and so, not to be bought, cf. Matt. x. 8, and our Lord's own words in Samaria, John iv. 10, εἰς τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.: "because thou hast thought to obtain," to acquire, gain possession of, κτάσθαι, deponent verb, so in classical Greek, not passive as in A.V., see Matt. x. 9, and elsewhere twice in St. Luke's Gospel, xviii. 12, xxii. 19, and three times in Acts, i. 18, viii. 20, xxii. 28, and once in St. Paul, 1 These. iv. 4, frequent in LXX, and in same sense as here of acquiring by money.—ἐνόμισας διὰ χ. κτάσθαι: "because thou hast thought to obtain," to acquire, gain possession of, κτάσθαι, deponent verb, so in classical Greek, not passive as in A.V., see Matt. x. 9, and elsewhere twice in St. Luke's Gospel, xviii. 12, xxii. 19, and three times in Acts, i. 18, viii. 20, xxii. 28, and once in St. Paul, 1 These. iv. 4, frequent in LXX, and in same sense as here of acquiring by money.—ἐνόμισας: it was not a mere error of judgment, but a sinful intention, which
χρημάτων κτάσθαι. 21. οδὸν ἐστὶν τιες οὐδὲ κλῆρος ἐν τῇ λόγῳ τούτῳ: ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οδὸν δεῖν εὐθεία ἐνώπιον 1 τοῦ θεοῦ. 22. μετανοήσον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης, καὶ δεήθητι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐλεηθῆται σοι ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου. 23. εἰς 3 γὰρ χολὴν

1 σωτηρίων EHL P; ευαγγελία ΝABD 15, 36, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Hilg. (cf. Luke i. 8, a rarer word). 2 Θεοῦ HLP, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Irint., Blass in β (prob. after ver. 21); Κυρίου ΝABCDE, Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Const. apost., Bas., so Tisch., W.H., K.V., Weiss, Wendt, so Hilg. 3 D1 has τὴν (=εν (!)) γαρ πικρῆς χολῆ καὶ συνδέσμου αἰδιν (so Blass and Hilg., prob. caused by the difficult εἰς. oμι—DE read θεωρω, so Const. apost., Chrys.; "recte" Blass, so in a and β, and Hilg.; but there seems no real reason why oμι should not occur here.

had come from a heart not right before God, ver. 21; cf. Matt. xv. 19.

Ver. 21. μετανοήσον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου... ἐτικέττασοι. 2 Ιουκέστισεν ἐνώπιον τού Θεοῦ. 22. μετανόησον τούτῃ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης, καὶ δεήθητι τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ αὐτὴ αφεθήσεται. εἰς γάρ χολήν ενώπιον Θεοῦ, εναντι ΣΑΒ 15, 36, so Τisch., W.Η., R.V., Βlass, Ηilg. (cf. Luke i. 8, a rarer word). "Θεοῦ ΗLP, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Irint., Βlass in β (prob. after ver. 21); Κυριου ΝΑΒCDΕ, Sah., Βoh., Syτ.Ηarcl., Αrm., Const. apost., Βas., so Τisch., W.Η., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, so Hilg. " D' has ην (=εν (2)) γαρ πικριας χολη και συνδεσμω αδικ., so Βlass and Ηilg., prob. caused by the difficult εις. εω-DΕ read θεωρω, so Const. apost., Chrys.; "recte" Βlass, so in α and β, and Ηilg., but there seems no real reason why oω should not occur here.

Ver. 22. εἰσ γὰρ χολήν: The passages in LXX generally referred to as containing somewhat similar phraseology are Deut. xxix. 18, xxxii. 32, Lam. iii. 15. But the word χολή is found in LXX several times, and not always as the equivalent of the same Hebrew. In Deut. xxix. 18, xxxii. 32, Ps. lix. 21, Jer. viii. 14, ix. 15, Lam. iii. 19, it is used to translate ἀρσενοῦ (ἀρσ., Deut. xxxii. 32), a poisonous plant of intense bitterness and of quick growth (coupled with wormwood, cf. Deut. xxix. 27, Lam. iii. 19, Jer. ix. 19). In Job xvi. 14 (where, however, AS read χολήν for χολήν) it is used to translate γηνεία, bile, gall; in xx. 14 of the same book it is the equivalent of γηνεία in the sense of the gall of vipers, i.e., the poison of vipers, which the ancients supposed to lie in the gall. In Prov. v. 4 and Lam. iii. 15 it is the rendering of ὅνυγρα,
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πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἁμαρτίας ὧν σε ὄντα. 24. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ
Σίμων εἶπεν, Δεήθητε ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, ὅτες
μὴ ἔπληθε ἡ ἑκάτερον ἐναὶ ἐν ἀπήρκειᾳ. 25. Οἱ μὲν οὖν διαμαρτυράμενοι καὶ
λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, ὑπεστρεφαν ἐστὶν ἔρωσιμον,
pολλὰς τὰ κόμιας τῶν Σαμαρείτων εὐηγγέλισαν.

Before Βεθήθητε D, Gig., Syr. Harcl. mg., Const. apost, prefix παρακαλεῖ; cf.
ver. 19, so Hilig. For οὐν D has τοῦτων τῶν κακῶν, and adds καὶ after εἰρήκατε, so
Hilig. At end of verse D adds ὡς τσόλα κλαίων οὐ διαλαμπάνει, so Syr. H. mg.
without οὐν—so Blass, but καὶ for οὐν—Hilig. follows D; see Belser, Βιτράοπ., p. 4,
who refers to xx. 27, xvi. 13, for διαλαμπάνει, διαλείπει, constr. with partici-
ple as here, instances which he regards as beyond doubt Lucan; cf. Luke vii. 45,
where διαλείπω, used only by Luke, is found with a similar constr., διαλαμπαν only
found elsewhere in Tobit x. 7 (but S al.), but also in Galen, cf. Grimm, sub υ., and L.
and S. But in spite of the Lucan phraseology it seems difficult to suppose that Luke
would himself have struck out the words, unless, indeed, he had gained further in-
formation about Simon which led him to conclude that the repentance was not
sincere. Such an omission could scarcely be made for the sake of brevity. Weiss,
Codex D, p. 68, evidently regards the words as added by a later hand, not as omitted
by Luke himself; see also Wendt, edit. 1899, p. 177, note.

υπεστρεφαν CΕΗ LP, several verses, Chrys.; υπεστρεφον ΝΑΒD τ5,6τ5,6
Vulg., so Tisch., W. Η., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilig. Σαμαρείτων ΑΒCDΗLP, so
W. Η. (and see App., p. 161), Hilig.: Σαμαριτών δSΕ, so Tisch., Blass.
σαντο ΗLP, Βoh., Syr. Pesh., Αθ., Chrys.; ευηγγελιζοντο ΝΑΕCD, Vulg., Sah.,

wormwood; and in the former passage we have πικρότερον χολής. If we take
the most usual signification of χολή in the LXX, υίγ., that of the gall plant (see
R. V., margin, in loco, gall, or a gall root), the thought of bitterness would
naturally be associated with it (in the passage which presents the closest paral-
lel to the verse before us, Deut xxix. 18, ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ, πικρία is a transla-
ing of the Hebrew word for wormwood); ἐν χολῇ πικρίας might therefore denote
the intense malignity which filled the heart of Simon. (On the word χολή in its
sense here, and in Matt. xxvii. 34, see Meyer-Weiss, Matth., p. 546.) The pre-
position εἰς is generally taken as = ἐν in this passage; but Rendall suggests
that here, as is sometimes elsewhere, it is οὕτως, and he therefore renders: “I see
that thou art as gall of bitterness,” denoting the evil function which Simon
would fulfil in the Church if he continued what he was. Westcott’s note on Heb.
xxi. 15 should also be consulted.—συνδέσμον δικαίας: R. V. translates thou
art . . . in the bond of iniquity.” But
it the passage means that Simon “will
become. . . a bond of iniquity,” R. V.,
margin, or that he is now as a bond of
iniquity (Rendall), the expression denotes,
not that Simon is bound, but that he
binds others in iniquity. Blass refers to
 Isa. lviii. 6, where a similar phrase occurs,
συν-δίκαια, and explains: “improbate quasi vincus es;” so Grimm, while
pointing out that the phrase in Isa. lviii.
6 is used in a different sense from here,
explains “vinculum improbitatis, i.e.,
quod ab improbitate nectitur ad con-
stringendos animos.” Others again
take the expression to denote a bundle,
bündel (Wetstein) (cf. Hidian., iv., 12, 11), Simon being regarded “quasi ex
improbate concretum,” cf. especially
Cicero, in Pison., ix., 21; but such a ren-
dering is rejected by Grimm, as no ex-
amples can be adduced of this tropical
use of the noun, and by Wendt, on the
ground that δικαία is not in the plural,
but in the singular. Combinations with
dikai are characteristic of St. Luke;
cf. Luke xiiii. 27, xvi. 8, 9, xviii. 6; cf.
Act i. 18; the word only occurs once
elsewhere in the Gospels, John vii. 18;
Friedrich, Das Lucasevangelium, p. 23.

Ver. 24. Δεήθητε: the verse is often
taken (as by Meyer and others) as a
further proof of the hollowness of Simon’s
belief, and his ignorance of the way of
true repentance—he will not pray for
himself, and he only asks for deliverance
from fear of the penalty and not from
hatred of the sin (so Bengal). But on
the other hand Wendt, in criticising
Meyer, objects to this further condemna-

So far as the petition for the Apostles' prayers is concerned, it is of course possible that it may have been prompted by the belief that such prayers would be more efficacious than his own (so Blass, Wendt, see also conclusion of the story in D); he does not ask them to pray instead of himself but υπερ, on his behalf. — έναν έρημον: not used by the other Evangelists, but three times in St. Luke's Gospel and four times in Acts, with κατα and accusative both in Gospel (i. 35, cf. xxi. 35) and Acts.

Ver. 25. οι μεν ουν: the μεν ουν and δε in ver. 26 may connect the return of the party to Jerusalem and the following instruction to Philip for his journey, and so enable us to gather for a certainty that Philip returned to Jerusalem with the Apostles, and received there his further directions from the Lord, see Rendall's Appendix on μεν ουν, Acts, p. 64, but cf. on the other hand, Belser, Beiträge, pp. 51, 52. On the frequent and characteristic use of μεν ουν in Luke, see above on i. 6, etc. — έναν έρημον: if we read the imperfect, we have the two verbs in the verse in the same tense, and the sense would be that the Apostles did not return at once to Jerusalem, but started on their return (imperfect), and preached to the Samaritan villages on the way (as Belser also allows)—the τε closely unites the two verbs (Weiss). The verb is characteristic of St. Luke: in his Gospel twenty-one or twenty-two times; in Acts, eleven or twelve times; in the other Evangelists, only once, Mark xvi. 40, and this doubtful; only three times in rest of N.T. (Lekebusch, Friedrich).

Ver. 26. άγγελος: on the frequency of angelic appearances, another characteristic of St. Luke, see Friedrich, Das Lukacevangelium, pp. 45 and 52 (so Zeller, Acts, ii., 224, E.T.). cf. Luke ii. 9 and Acts xii. 7. Luke i. 38 and Acts x. 7. Luke xxiv. 4 and Acts i. 10, x. 30. There can be no doubt, as Wendt points out, that St. Luke means that the communication was made to Philip by an angel, and that therefore all attempts to explain his words as meaning that Philip felt a sudden inward impulse, or that he had a vision in a dream, are unsatisfactory.— άναστηθι, as Wendt remarks, does not support the latter supposition. cf. v. 17, and its frequent use in Acts and in O.T. see below.— θειος: may be taken as above, see ver. 25, or as simply marking the return of the narrative from the chief Apostles to the history of Philip. As in vv. 29, 39, Πενθυμα and not άγγελος occurs; the alteration has been attributed to a reviser, but even Spitta, Apostelgeschichte, p. 153, can find no reason for this, and sees in the use of Πενθυμα and άγγελος here nothing more strange than their close collocation Matt. iv. 1, 11.— άναστηθι και πορευου, words often similarly joined together in LXX.— κατα μεσημβριαν: towards the south, i.e., he was to proceed "with his face to the south," cf. xxvii. 12 (Page). — επι την οδον (not προς), on, i.e., along the road (not "unto," A.V.). R.V. margin renders κατα μεσ. "at noon"; so Rendall, cf. xxii. 6, as we have κατα not προς; so Nestle, Studien und Kritiken, p. 335 (1892) (see Felten's note, Apostelgeschichte, p. 177; but as he points out, the heat of the day at twelve o'clock would not be a likely time for travelling, see also Belser, Beiträge, p. 52, as against Nestle). Wendt, edition 1896, p. 177, gives in his adhesion to Nestle's view on the ground that in LXX, cf. Gen. xviii., 1 etc., the word μεσημβριαν is always so used, and because the time of the day for the meeting was an important factor, whilst there would be no need to mention the direction, when the town was definitely named (see also O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 88). — αυτη εστιν έρημος: opinion is still divided as to whether the adjective is to be referred to the town or the road. Amongst recent writers, Wendt, edition 1896, p. 178; Zahn, Einleitung in das N.T., ii., 438 (1899); Belser, Rendall, O. Holtzmann, u.s., p. 88, Knabenbauer (so too Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 79; Conder in B.D. 3 "Gaza," and Grimm-Thayer) may be added to the large number who see a reference to the route (in Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 71, E.T., it is stated that this view is the more probable). But, on the other hand, some of the older commentators (Calvin, Grotius, etc.) take the former view, and they have recently received a strong supporter in Prof. G. A. Smith, Historical Geog. of the Holy Land, pp. 186-188. O. Holtzmann, although referring αυτη το θειος, points out that both Strabo, xvi., 2, 30, and the Anonymous Geographical Fragment (Geogr. Graec. Minores, Hudson, iv., p. 39) designate Gaza as θειος. Dr.
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Ιερουσαλήμεις Γάζαν ἀυτή ἐστίν ἕρμος. 27. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνήρ Ἀιθιοπὸς εὐνοῦχος δυνάτης Κανδάκης τῆς βασιλείας Ἀιθιοπίας, ὅπως ἐν ἐπί πάσης τῆς γαζῆς ἀυτῆς, ὑπεκλῆθη·

Smith strengthens these references, not only by Jos., Ant., xiv., 4, 4, and Diodorus Siculus, xix., 80, but by maintaining that the New Gaza mentioned in the Anonymous Fragment was on the coast, and that if so, it lay off the road to Egypt, which still passed by the desert Gaza; the latter place need not have been absolutely deserted in Philip's time; its site and the vicinity of the great road would soon attract people back, but it was not unlikely that the name "Ἐρημός" might still stick to it (see also ver. 36 below). If we take the adjective as referring to the road, its exact force is still doubtful; does it refer to one route, specially lonely, as distinguished from others, or to the ordinary aspect of a route leading through waste places, or to the fact that at the hour mentioned, noon-day (see above), it would be deserted? Wendt confesses himself unable to decide, and perhaps he goes as far as one can expect to go in adding that at least this characterisation of the route so far prepares us for the sequel, in that it explains the fact that the eunuch would read aloud, and that Philip could converse with him uninterrupted. Hackett and others regard the words before us as a parenthetical remark by St. Luke himself to acquaint the reader with the region of this memorable occurrence, and αὐτή is used in a somewhat similar explanatory way in 2 Chron. ν. 2, LXX, but this does not enable us to decide as to whether the explanation is St. Luke's or the angel's. Hilgenfeld and Schmiedel dismiss the words as an explanatory gloss. The argument sometimes drawn for the late date of Acts by referring ἔρμος to the supposed demolition of Gaza in a.d. 66 cannot be maintained, since this destruction so called was evidently very partial, see G. A. Smith, καὶ ἰδοὺ, see on i. 11; cf. Hort, Ecclesia, p. 179, on the force of the phrase; used characteristically by St. Luke of sudden and as it were providential interpositions, i. 10, x. 17, xii. 7, and see note on xvi. 1. —εὐνοῦχος: the word can be taken literally, for there is no contradiction involved in Deut. xxiii. 1, as he would be simply "a proselyte of the gate" (Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 54). The instances sometimes referred to as showing that the exclusion of eunuchs from the congregation of the Lord was relaxed in the later period of Jewish history can scarcely hold good, since Isa. lvi. 3 refers to the Messianic future in which even the heathen and the eunuchs should share, and in Jer. xxxviii. 7, xxxix. 15 nothing is said which could lead us to describe Ebed Melech, another Ethiopian eunuch, as a Jew in the full sense. On the position and influence of eunuchs in the East, both in ancient and modern times, see "Eunuch," B.D. and Hastings' B.D. St. Luke's mention that he was a eunuch is quite in accordance with the "universalism" of the Acts; gradually the barriers of a narrow Judaism were broken down, first in the case of the Samaritans, and now in the case of the eunuch. Eusebius, H. E., ii., 1, speaks of him as πρῶτος ἐξ ἑθνῶν, who was converted to Christ, and even as a "proselyte of the gate" he might be so described, for the gulf which lay between a born Gentile and a genuine descendant of Abraham could never be bridged over (Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 326, E.T.). Moreover, in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, descended from the accursed race of Ham, this separation from Israel must have been intensified to the utmost (cf. Amos ix. 7). No doubt St. Luke may also have desired to instance the way in which thus early the Gospel spread to a land far distant from the place of its birth (McGirt, Apostolic Age, p. 100). —δυνάτης: noun in apposition to ἀνήρ Αἰθ., only used by St. Luke here and in
27-29.
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προσκυνήσων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. 28. Ἰν τε ὄστρεφώς καὶ καθήμενος εἰς τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκε τὸν προφήτην Ἰσαίαν. 29. καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ φίλττου, Πρόσελθε καὶ κολλήθητι τῷ ἄρματι τινὶ προσκυνήσωνεις Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἦν τε υποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος επὶ τούτου ἀρμάτου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκε τὸν προφήτην Ἰσαίαν.


his Gospel, i. 52, and once again by St. Paul, i Tim. vi. 15. In LXX frequent (used of God, Ecclus. xlvi. 2, 5, 2 Macc. xv. 3, 23, etc.; so too of Zeus by Soph.), for its meaning here cf. Gen. i. 4, Latin, auctius.—Κανδάκης: not a personal name, but said to be a name often given to queens of Ethiopia (cf. Pharaoh, and later Ptolemy, in Egypt), Pliny, N. H., vii., 35, 7. In the time of Eusebius, H. E., ii., 1, Ethiopia is said to be still ruled by queens, Strabo, xviii., 1, 54; Bion of Soli, Εθιοπικα (Müller, Φραγμ. Hist. Grac., iv., p. 351). According to Brugsch the spelling would be Kanta-ki: cf. "Candace," B.D. and "Ethiopia," Hastings' B.D.—γάζης: a Persian word found both in Greek and Latin (cf. Cicero, De Off., ii., 22; Virg., Εen., i., 119; and see Wetstein, in loco). In LXX, Ezra vi. 1 (Esth. iv. 7), treasures; v. 17, vii. 20, treasury; vii. 21, treasurers; cf. also Isa. xxxix. 2, and γαζοφυλάκιον in LXX, and in N.T., Luke xxi. 1, Mark xii. 41 (2), 43, John viii. 20. "Observat Lucas, et locum, ubi praefectus Gazae Philippo factus est obviam, Gazamuisse vocatum" Wetstein; see also on the nomen et omen Felten and Plumptre, and compare on the word Jerome, Epist., xviii., 11. If the second δσ is retained (R.V.) it emphasises the fact that the eunuch was of royal blood (Hackett). The eunuch was, as well as foreign Jews, allowed to carry on Jewish worship. We cannot say whether he had gone up to Jerusalem to one of the feasts; St. Chrysostom places it to his credit that he had gone up at an unusual time.

Ver. 28. ἄρα γε—the γε strengthens the ἄρα, dost thou really understand? num igitur? ἄρα without γε is only found elsewhere in Luke xviii. 8, and in Gal. ii. 17 (W.H., and also Lightfoot, Galatians, l.c.), see Blass, in reading from the LXX, and the widespread knowledge of this translation in Egypt would make it probable a priori (Wendt), cf. Professor Margoliouth, "Ethiopian Eunuch," Hastings' B.D. It may be that the eunuch had bought the roll in Jerusalem "a pearl of great price," and that he was reading it for the first time; ver. 34 is not quite consistent with the supposition that he had heard in Jerusalem rumours of the Apostles' preaching, and of their reference of the prophecies to Jesus of Nazareth: Philip is represented as preaching to him Jesus, and that too as good news. "The eunuch came to worship—great was also his studiousness—observe again his piety, but though he did not understand he read, and after reading, examined," Chrys., Ηom., xix., and Jerome, Epist., liii., 5. See also Corn. à Lapide, in loco, on the diligence and devotion of the eunuch.

Ver. 29. τὸ πνεῦμα εἰπεν: nothing inconsistent with the previous statement that an angel had spoken to him, as Weiss supposes by referring the angel visit to a reviser. There was no reason why the angel should accompany Philip, or reappear to him, whilst the inward guidance of the Spirit would be always present, as our Lord had promised.—κολλήθητι, cf. v. 13, in Acts five times, and in each case of joining or attaching oneself closely to a person, of social or religious communion with a person, twice in Luke's Gospel, cf. xv. 15 for its sense here, and elsewhere only once in the Evangelists, Matt. xix. 5, and that in a quotation, Gen. ii. 24. cf. its use three times in St. Paul, Rom. xii. 9, 1 Cor. vi. 16, 17. In classical Greek similar usage, and cf. LXX, Ruth ii. 8, Ecclus. ii. 3, xix. 2, 1 Macc. iii. 2, vi. 21, etc. Hebrew בּ, see Wetstein on x. 28.

Ver. 30. τροσκόμων 81: rightly taken to indicate the eagerness with which Philip obeyed.—Ἄπα γε—thec γε strengthens the ἄρα, dost thou really understand? num igitur? ἄρα without γε is only found elsewhere in Luke xviii. 8, and in Gal. ii. 17 (W.H., and also Lightfoot, Galatians, l.c.), see Blass, in
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τούτων. 30. προσδραμὼν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἥκουσεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἄρα γε γινώσκεις καὶ ἀναγινώσκεις; 31. ὁ δὲ εἶπε, Πῶς γάρ ἂν δυναμὴν, ἡν μὴ τις ἀναγινώσκῃ; παρεκάλεσε τὸν Φίλιππον ἀναβάντα καθίσαι σὺν αὐτῷ. 32. ή δὲ περί τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀναγινώσκειν ἦν, ἡν καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ἡς ἔμεθος, καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐπαντὸς τοῦ κειροῦς ἀνοίγετο στόμα αὐτοῦ. 33. εν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη, την δὲ γενέαν αὐτοῦ τις διηγήσεται; ὃτι αἵτην

1 ὁδηγήσῃ AB3HL, Chrys., so Blass, Weiss; ὁδηγήσῃ ΝB1CE 13, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Hilg.

2 κειροῦς BP, Orig., so Lach., W.H. text, Blass, Weiss; κειράντος ΝACEHL, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H. marg., Hilg. But as Wendt points out, readings vary as in LXX.

loco, and Grammatik, p. 254. In LXX very rare, see Hatch and Redpath, sub v., and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 22 (1893).—γραφή: for paronomasia, see Blass, Gram., p. 292, where other instances in N.T. are given, and also Wetstein, in loco. Julian's well-known saying with reference to the Christian writings, and the famous retort, are quoted by Alford, Plumptre, Fage, Meyer-Wendt, in loco.

Ver. 31. γὰρ: "elegans particula hoc sensu quid quaeris?" implies, Why do you ask? for how should I be able? (cf. Matt. xxvii. 23, Mark xv. 14, Luke xxiii. 22); see Simcox, Language of N. T. Greek, p. 172; Grimm-Thayer, sub v., I. —ἐν δυναμήν: optative with ἐν; occurs only in Luke, both in his Gospel and Acts, expressing what would happen on the fulfilment of some supposed condition: see, for a full list of passages, Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 80; Simcox, u. s., p. 112: twice in direct questions, here and in xvii. 18, but only in this passage is the condition expressed, cf. also Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., pp. 33 and 66 (1893).—ὁδηγήσῃ, see critical notes, and Blass, Grammatik, p. 210; if we read future indicative it will be an instance of a future supposition thus expressed with more probability, Burton, u. s., pp. 104, 105, 109, and see also Simcox, note on the passage, u. s., p. 112. Burton compares Luke xix. 40 (W.H.), see also Viteau, u. s., pp. 4, 111, 226, whilst Blass maintains that there is no one certain example of this usage of ἐν with future indicative. The word used here ("insignis modestia eunuchi," Calvin) is used also by our Lord Himself for the Holy Spirit's leading and guidance, John xvi. 13, and also in the LXX, as in the Psalms, of divine guidance. —παρεκάλεσέν: "he besought," R.V. ("desired," A.V.), the word is rightly taken to denote both the humility and the earnestness of the eunuch (Bengel): a verb frequent both in St. Luke and St. Paul, six or seven times in Gospel, twenty-two or twenty-three times in Acts. —τε: note the closing connecting particle, showing the necessary result of the question (Weiss).

Ver. 32. περιεχὴ τῆς γραφῆς the contents of the passage of Scripture," i.e., the one particular passage, Isa. lii. 7, 8 (so Meyer-Wendt, Holtzmann, Hackett), cf. i. 16, and 1 Pet. ii. 6: περιεχὴ εἰς τὴν γραφὴν καὶ τούτης in ver. 35 below; περιεχὴ has been taken to mean a section, as in Cicero, Epist. ad Att., xiii., 25 (so in Codex A, before the Gospel of St. Mark, its περιοχαί, i.e., sections, are prefixed), but in Cicero also Meyer-Wendt take the word to mean the contents of a passage, cf. notes, edit. 1888 and 1899; see also Felten and Plumptre, in loco. St. Chrysostom apparently takes γραφὴ here as αἱ γραφαί, "totum corpus scripturae sacrae," see Blass, in loco, but if so, the plural would be used as always; see above references and Lightfoot on Gal., iii., 22. The fact that the eunuch was reading Isaiah is mentioned by St. Chrysostom as another indication
of character, since he had in hand the prophet which is more sublime than all others, 

Ver. 33. Μετατονομαζομενοι κ.τ.λ., cf. 

Isa. liii. 7, 8, “in his humiliation his judgment was taken away” (LXX), so A. and R.V., generally taken to mean by his humbling himself his judgment was cancelled, cf. Phil. ii. 6, 7, so Wendt in seventh and eighth editions: cf. Grimm-Thayer, sub v., κρίσις, the punishment appointed for him was taken away, i.e., ended, and so sub v., αἴρεσαι = to cause to cease, Col. ii. 14. But the words “in his humiliation” etc., may also fairly mean that in the violence and injustice done to him his judgment, i.e., the fair trial due to him, was withheld, and thus they conform more closely to the Hebrew “by oppression and by (unjust) judgment he was taken away,” so Hitzig, Ewald, Cheyne and R.V. So to the same effect Delitzsch takes the words to mean that hostile oppression and judicial persecution befell him, and out of them he was removed by death (cf. R.V. margin). (The words have been taken to mean that by oppression and judgment he was hurried off and punished, raptus est ad supplicium.)—την (δὲ) γενέσεως αὐτοῦ τὰς διηγήσεις (LXX), “his generation who shall declare?” R.V., the words may mean “who shall declare the wickedness of the generation in which he lived?” (see Grimm-Thayer, sub v., γενέσεως)—their wickedness, i.e., in their treatment of him; so De Wette (and Meyer in early editions), and to the same effect, Lumby, Rendall, cf. our Lord’s own words, Matt. xii. 39–42, etc. In Meyer-Wendt (seventh and eighth edition) the words are taken to mean “who can fitly declare the number of those who share his life?” i.e., his posterity, his disciples, so Felten (but see on the other hand, Delitzsch, in loco). The Hebrew seems to mean, as in R.V. text, “and as for his generation who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living? for the transgression of my people” etc., see Cheyne, in loco; Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, p. 358, and Delitzsch, Jesus, pp. 523, 524, fourth edition (see also Page’s note, and Wendt, edition 1899). The references by the Fathers (cf. Bede and Wordsworth) to the eternal generation of the Son, and the mystery of His Incarnation, do not seem to find support in the Hebrew or in the Greek rendering. On the oldest Jewish interpretations of Isaiah liii., see Dalman’s Der leidende und der sterbende Messias, pp. 21–23, 27–35, 80, 91; and see also in connection with the passage before us, Athanasius, Four Discourses against the Arians, i., 13, 54, and Dr. Robertson’s note; see also above on St. Peter’s Discourses in chap. iii., and below on xxvi. 23.—εἰπεται από τῆς γῆς: “is taken,” i.e., with violence (here = Hebrew הַיוֹרָה, cf. use of αἴρεσαι, LXX, Acts xxii. 22, xxi. 36, Matt. xxiv. 39, Luke xxiii. 18, John xix. 15.

Ver. 34. ἀποκριθεὶς, see above iii. τ. 8. It has been sometimes supposed that the eunuch was acquainted with the tradition that Isaiah had been sawn asunder by Manasseh—Felten, see Wettstein on Heb. xi. 37.

Ver. 35. ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ: the phrase is used to introduce some weighty and important utterance, cf. x. 34, xviii. 14, and Luke i. 64, so too Matt. v. 2, 2 Cor. vi. 11, also frequent in LXX: “aperireos in Scriptura est ordinis longum sermonem de re gravi et seria. Significat ergo Lucas coepisse Philippum pleno ore disserere de Christo,” Calvin, cf. Hebrew phrase יריבא יבש יבש, in various senses.—ἀφέσαι, see on i. 22, cf. Luke xxiv. 27.—ταυτής, see above on ver. 32.—εὐηγγελίσατο: used with an accusative both of the person addressed, as in vv. 25, 40, and of the message delivered, cf. Luke viii. i. Acts v. 42, viii. 4, 12, etc., but when the two are combined the person is always expressed by the dative, cf. Luke i. 19, ii. 10 (Acts xvii. 18), Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 79. From the sequel it is evident that Philip not only preached the glad tidings of the fulfilment of the prophecies in Jesus as the ideal and divine Sufferer, but that he also pointed out to the eunuch the door of admission into the Church of Jesus; cf. Jerome, Epist., i. ii., 9.

Ver. 36. Ιδοὺ ὕδωρ: “intus fides, foris aqua præsto erat” Bengel. According
τῶν Ἰησοῦν. 36. ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ· καὶ φησὶν ὁ εὐνούχος, Ἰδοὺ ὕδωρ· τι κολύη με βαπτισθῆναι; 37. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος, Ἐι πιστεύεις ἓς ἡλικίας τῆς καρδίας, ἐξετάζων· ἀποκριθεῖς δὲ ἐπεί, Πιστεύεις τὸν ιδίον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. 38. καὶ ἐκλευσεν στῆναι τὸ ἄρμα· καὶ κατέβησαν ἄμφοτέρους ἐλεῖ τὸ ὕδωρ· ὃ τε Φίλιππος καὶ ὁ εὐνούχος ταῦτα λέγειν καὶ βαπτιστεύειν.
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αυτόν. 39. οτε δὲ ἀνεβησεν εἰς τοῦ Ἰδασ, Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἤρπασε τὸν Φιλίππον 1. καὶ οὐκ εἶδον αὐτὸν οὖκ ἐνεῴκη εὔνοιῶς, ἐπορεύετο γάρ

Πνεῦμα Κ. ἤρπασε τὸν Φ.; instead of this Α2, Par., Wern., Syr. H. mg., Jer., Aug. read πνεῦμα αὐγίν ἐπεσεν εἰς τοῦ εὐνουχον, ἀγγέλος δὲ Κ. ἤρπασεν τὸν Φ. Wendt regards as interpolation partly according to ver. 26 and partly according to ver. 44. Hilg. retains and Belser, p. 51, defends as Lucan. It is hitting that in Scripture the Holy Ghost is not represented as given after Philip’s Baptism, because his work was to be completed by the advent of Peter and John; but in the case before us no Apostle was present, and so the Holy Spirit came down miraculously after Philip had baptised the eunuch. So, too, Hilgenfeld leans towards the reading l.c., and regards it as just possible that the ordinary text is a set-off against the contradiction involved with viii. 15–18, in accordance with which the Holy Spirit was only bestowed through the laying on of the hands of the Apostles. Blass rejects, and follows T.R. (see below). After Φιλίππον Par., Syr. H. mg. (no other authorities) add “ab eo”; so Hilg., and so Blass in β, επορεύετο γάρ κ.τ.λ.

Μηδὲν δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸν Ἰδασ, Πνεῦμα Κ. ἤρπασε τὸν Φ., επορεύετο γάρ κ.τ.λ. instead of this Α2, Par., Wern., Syr. H. mg., Jer., Aug. read πνεῦμα αὐγίν ἐπεσεν εἰς τοῦ εὐνουχον, ἀγγέλος δὲ Κ. ἤρπασεν τὸν Φ. Wendt regards as interpolation partly according to ver. 26 and partly according to ver. 44. Hilg. retains and Belser, p. 51, defends as Lucan. It is fitting that in Scripture the Holy Ghost is not represented as given after Philip’s Baptism, because his work was to be completed by the advent of Peter and John; but in the case before us no Apostle was present, and so the Holy Spirit came down miraculously after Philip had baptised the eunuch. So, too, Hilgenfeld leans towards the reading l.c., and regards it as just possible that the ordinary text is a set-off against the contradiction involved with viii. 15–18, in accordance with which the Holy Spirit was only bestowed through the laying on of the hands of the Apostles. Blass rejects, and follows T.R. (see below). After Φιλίππον Par., Syr. H. mg. (no other authorities) add “ab eo”; so Hilg., and so Blass in β, επορεύετο γάρ κ.τ.λ., which seems somewhat strange in the case of the latter writer.

cannot therefore conclude anything from its omission here. ἤρπασε, abripuit, the disappearance, as the context shows, was regarded as supernatural, cf. LXX, Kings xviii. 12, 2 Kings ii. 16 (Ezek. iii. 14, Hebrew only מַעַל). Thus Hilgenfeld recognises not only a likeness here to the O.T. passages quoted, but that a miraculous transference of Philip to another place is implied. No doubt, as Hilgenfeld points out, πνεῦμα may mean wind, John iii. 8, but this by no means justifies exclusion of all reference here to the Holy Spirit. No doubt we may see with Blass a likeness in the language of the narrative to the O.T. passages just cited, and St. Luke’s informants may have been the daughters of Philip, who were themselves προφῆται (see Blass, in loco); but there is no reason why he should not have heard the narrative from St. Philip himself, and the rendering πνεῦμα by τεντός is not satisfactory, although Blass fully recognises that Philip departed by the same divine impulse as that by which he had come. Holtzmann endorses the reference to the O.T. passages above, but specially draws attention to the parallel which he supposes in Bel and the Dragon, ver. 34 ff. But this passage should be contrasted rather than compared with the simple narrative of the text, so free from any fantastic embellishment, while plainly implying a supernatural element: cf. for the verb ἄρπασα, 1 Thess. iv. 17, 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4 (a reference to which as explaining Philip’s withdrawal is not to the point, since the narrative cannot imply that Philip was ἀρπάσα τῷ σώματος), Rev. xii. 5, used of a snatching or taking up due to divine agency, cf. Wisdom iv. 11, where it is said of Enoch ἢρπαγη. Both in classical Greek and in the LXX the word implies forcible or sudden seizure (John vi. 15).

—καὶ οὐκ εἶδον . . . επορεύετο γάρ κ.τ.λ.

If these two clauses are closely connected as by R.V., they do not simply state that the eunuch went on his own way (Rendall), (in contrast with Philip who went his way), rejoicing in the good news which he had heard, and in the baptism which he had received; and R.V. punctuation surely need not prevent the disappearance of Philip from being viewed as mysterious, even if the words καὶ οὐκ εἶδον αὐτὸν οὖκ ἐνεῴκη do not imply this. Moreover αὐτὸς may rather emphasise the fact that the eunuch went his way, which he would not have done had he seen Philip, but would perhaps have followed him who had thus enlightened his path (so Weiss, in loco, reading αὐτοῦ τὴν ὁδόν—αὐτοῦ emphatic: see also St. Chrysostom’s comment in loco).—χαίρων: “the fruit of the Spirit is . . . joy,” Gal. v. 22 (the word at the end of a clause is characteristic of Luke; Luke xv. 5, xix. 6, see Vogel, p. 45). Eusebius describes the eunuch, to whom he gives the name of Indich, as the first preacher to his countrymen of the tidings of great joy, and on the possible reception in the earliest Christian times of the Gospel message in the island of Meroë at least, see “Ethiopian Church,” Dict. of Christ. Biog., ii., 234 (Smith & Wace). In the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch men have seen the first fulfilment of the ancient prophecy, Ps. lxviii. 31 (Luckock, Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St Luke, i., 219, and G. and H., p. 66).

Ver. 40. εὑρέθη εἰς “Α.: εἰσαγωγή = was borne to and found at,
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VIII. 40.

τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων. 40. Φίλιππος δὲ εὑρίσκει εἰς Ἀζωτον· καὶ διερχόμενος εὐγγέλιζετο τὰς πόλεις πάσας, ἐν τοῦ δὲ εὐθείαν αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν. 1


cf. xxv. 13: or, as εἰς means more than ἐν, implying that he had come into the city and was staying there, cf. Esth. i. 5; marg. Hebrew "found," A.V., εὑρίσκω. Νάταν, is very often found in the LXX in similar phrases, e.g., 1 Chron. xxix. 17, 2 Chron. xxxxi. 1, 1 Sam. xiii. 15, etc. The word may imply, however, much more than the fact that Philip was present at Azotus, and Alford sees in it a probable reference to 2 Kings ii. 17 (cf. passages in O.T. above), where the same word is used, εὑρίσκω. Blass takes it to mean "vento quasi ibidejectus," but see above on ver. 39.—Ἀζωτον, τὴν ὁδὸν: only mentioned here in N.T., but in LXX Ashdod, Josh. xi. 22, xiii. 3, xv. 46, 1 Sam. v. 2, Chron. xxvi. 6, Neh. iv. 7, xiii. 20, Jer. xx. 20, xlvii. 5, Amos i. 8, Zeph. ii. 4, Zech. ix. 6; Azotus in 1 Macc. v. 15, x. 84; Herod., iii., 157; Herod. speaks of the siege of the twenty-nine years under Psmetichus as the longest in history (I = σφ, as in Ἀρωμάζης, Ahuramazda, Blass, in loco). An old Philistine town, and one of the five chief cities—it might be regarded as the half-way station on the great road between Gaza and Joppa. Schürer holds that the population was Jewish to a considerable extent, as we find that Vespasian was obliged to place a garrison there (Jos., Ant., xvi., 5, 1); it is now a mere village of no importance, and still bearing the name Αshdod.

Schürer, θετυία Ρεύμα, διν. ii., vol. i., pp. 62, 67 ft., Ε.Τ.; G. A. Smith, Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land, pp. 192, 193; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 1, 124, "Ashdod," B.D., "Azotus," and also Col. Conder sub v., Hastings' B.D.—διερχόμενος εὐγγελλεῖ, see above on ver. 4 and also xii. 6, and cf. Luke ix. 6 for a similar combination of the two verbs.—τὰς πόλεις πάσας: from their position between Azotus and Caesarea, Lydda and Joppa may well have been included, cf. ix. 32, 36, in which we may see something of the effects of St. Philip's preaching, "hic quoque, uti in urbe Samariae, Apostolii audiatores preparavit," Bengel. —Καὶσάρειαν (mentioned no less than fifteen times in Acts): its full name was Καὶσάρεια Σεβαστή, so named by Herod the Great in honour of Augustus (Jos., Ant., xvi., 5, 1); sometimes also παράλιος or ἐπὶ θαλάττη (Jos., B. θ', iii., 9, i., viii., i., 3); it was also called "Stratton's Tower" (cf. K. ἩΣτράτωνος, Apost. Const., vi., 12), although it was virtually a fresh site. Schürer derives this latter name from Stratton, the name of one or more of the last kings of Sidon, who towards the end of the Persian period were probably in possession of the strip of coast upon which the tower was built (Blass, u. s., div. ii., vol. i., p. 84 ff.). Herod's lavish expenditure and enlargement gave it such importance that it came to be called Caput Judeaeum, Tacitus, Hist., ii., 79, i.e., of the Roman Province, for it never could be called truly Judean. For its magnificence, see Jos., Ant., xv., 9; B. θ., i., 21, cf. Ant., xvi., 5. It was a seaport suited to his taste, which Herod wanted, and in Caesarea he found it—"Joppa, Jerusalem's port, was Jewish, national, patriotic; Caesarea, Herodian, Roman in obedience, Greek in culture." The buildings were magnificent—a temple with its two statues of Augustus and of Rome, a theatre, an amphitheatre; but above all, the haven was the chief work of art, Sebastos Limen, so large and important that the name of the city was even dwarfed beside it (see especially Dr. G. A. Smith, u. s., p. 140). Here the Roman procurators had their abode, both before and after Agrippa's reign; here, too, was the chief garrison of the troops of the province. The population was chiefly heathen, but with a considerable mixture of Jews, and so both Gentile and Jew had equal rights, while each claimed exclusive powers. In the time of Felix things came to such a pass that bloodshed ensued, and Felix exasperated the Jews by leaving the sole direction of the town in the hands of the heathen party. It was this which in the first place provoked the great rising of the Jews, A.D. 66 (Jos., Ant., xx., 8, 7, 9; B. θ., ii., 13, 7; 14, 4, 5). The war broke out, and, according to Josephus, all the Jewish in—
IX. 1. 'Ο ΔΕ Σαύλος ἐπὶ ἐμπνέων ἀπειλησι καὶ φόνου εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς τοῦ Κυρίου, προσελθόντας πάρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολάς εἰς Δαμασκόν πρὸς τὸς συναγωγάς, δύο εἶν τινας εὐρη τῆς ὀδοῦ ὄντας ἀνδρὰς τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγε ἐκ

habitants, twenty thousand in number, were massacred in an hour. Here the famous Rabbi Akiba met a martyr’s death, here Eusebius of Caesarea and Procopius were born, and hither Origen fled. See Schürer, u.s.; Hamburger, Real-Encyklopädie des Judentums, ii., 1, 123; G. A. Smith, u.s., pp. 138, 143 ff., B. D. 4; Eder-}

sheim, History of the Jewish Nation, pp. 21, 23, 156, 199, 251, 265, etc. Among the Jews Caesarea was called by the same name by which we know it, but sometimes from its fortifications, Migdal Shur, or after its harbour, Migdal Shina, or after both, and sometimes by a new name, “Straton’s Tower” (cf. also Strabo, xvi., p. 758), but as the seat of the Roman power, and for its preponderating heathen population, it was specially hated, and so it was designated “the daughter of Edom,” although the district, so rich and fertile, was still called “the land of life”. Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, pp. 24, 72, 202, and Hamburger, u.s. Caesarea is mentioned in the verse before us not because of its political and commercial importance, but because it became the afterhome of Philip, χxi. 8. But it also might be named here as marking a further and interesting stage in the progress of the Gospel (see also below on chap. χ.). We cannot say whether at the time of the narrative in chap. χ. Philip had already settled and worked in Caesarea.

CHAPTER IX.—Ver. 1. 'Ο Σαύλος: takes up and continues the narrative from viii. 3; the resumptive use of ὃδε.—ἐμπνεὼν: ‘Sic in summo fervore peccandi creptus et conversus est” Bengel.—ἐμπνεύσις: only here in N.T., not “breathing out,” A.V., but rather “breathing of,” lit., “in” (R.V. simply “breathing”), cf. LXX. Josh. x. 40; τὸν ἐπιστολάς, (cf. Ps. xvii. 15) —threating and murdering were as it were the atmosphere which he breathed, and in and by which he lived, cf. Stobæus, Flor., 85, 19, ὅποις ἐπιστολάς, L. and S. and Blass, in loco (cf. also Aristoph., Eg., 437, ὅποις δέδεκας καὶ συμφωνίαις τντοι, and Winer-Moulton, xxx., 9).—τὸν ἐρυμέρας: probably Joseph Caiphas, who continues thus to persecute the Church, see on iv. 6 (v. 17); he held office until 36 A.D., see Zöckler’s note, in loco, and


Ver. 2. ἥτησατο, see on iii. 2, with παρά, in iii. 3, we have the imperfect, but “inestina oristo quod etiam accepit,” Blass; on the use of the verb in N.T., see also Blass, Gram., p. 182, and Grimm-}

Thayer, sub ν.—ἹΣΤΟΡΙΑ, cf. xxii. 5, xxvi. 12; on the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim, see above on iv. 5; Weber, judische Theol., p. 141 (1897); O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, pp. 174, 175; and Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 185, L.T. only within the limits of Judaea had the Sanhedrim any direct authority, although its orders were regarded as binding over every Jewish community. But the extent to which this obligation prevailed depended on the disposition of the Jewish communities towards the Sanhedrim. —Δα-}

masκόν: “In the history of religion,” writes Dr. G. A. Smith, “Damascus was the stage of two great crises. She was the scene of the conversion of the first Apostle of Christianity to the Gentiles; she was the first Christian city to be taken by Islam. It was fit that Paul’s conversion, with his first sense of a mission to the Gentiles, should not take place till his journey had brought him to Jewish soil.” If Damascus was not the oldest, it may at all events be called the most enduring city in the world. According to Josephus, Ant., i., 6, 4, it was founded by Uz, the grandson of Shem, whilst a Moslem tradition makes Eliezer its founder, and Abraham its king (see also Jos., Ant., i., 7, 2). Here, too, was the traditional scene of the murder of Abel (Shakespeare, 1 King Henry VI., i., 3). Damascus was situated some seventy miles from the seaboard (about six or eight days’ journey from Jerusalem), to the east of Anti-Lebanon in a great plain, watered by the river Abana with her seven streams, to which the city owes her beauty and her charm. Travellers of every age and of every nationality have celebrated the gardens and orchards, the running waters and the fountains of Damascus, and as the Arab passes from the burning desert to its cool streams and rich verdure, it is not surprising that he hails it as an earthly paradise. From
3. en de tê pòrèusebain, égêneto autôn éphigízein tê Damaskû, kai ébaîphèîs 1 periôstropávèi autôn fôs ándon tò oudravòu -

1 ébaîphès—in NßICE 13 ébaîphèîs, so W.H., but see xxii. 6.; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 47.

a commercial point of view Damascus has been called the meeting-place and mart of the nations, and whilst the armies of the ancient world passed through her streets, she was also the great avenue of communication for the wealth of north and south, east and west (cf. the significant passage, Ezek. xxvii. 16, 18, and Amos iii. 12, R.V., from which it seems that the city was known at an early date for her own manufactures, although the passing trade of the caravans would be its chief source of income). For its political position at the period of Acts, see below on ver. 24, and for its history in the O.T., its after struggles, and its present position as still the chief city of Syria, see G. A. Smith, Hist. Geog., p. 641 ff.; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 2, p. 220, B.D.; and Hastings' B.D., Conybeare and Howson (smaller edition, p. 67 ff.); Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 96, E.T.—πρὸς τὰς συναγωγὰς, cf. vii. 9, as at Jerusalem—the number of Jews dwelling in Damascus was so numerous that in a tumult under Nero ten thousand were put to death, Jos., B. Ῥ., vii., 8, 7; ii., 20, 2; as at Jerusalem, the Christians of Damascus may not as yet have formally separated from their Jewish brethren; cf. the description of Ananias in xxii. 12; but as communication between Damascus and the capital was very frequent, refugees from Jerusalem would no doubt have fled to Damascus, and it is difficult to believe that the views advocated by Stephen had in him their sole representative. There is no reason to question with Overbeck the existence in Damascus of a community of believers in the claims of Jesus at this early date; but whilst those Christians who devoutly observed the law would not have aroused hostility hitherto, Saul came armed with a commission against all who called on the name of Christ, and so probably his object was not only to bring back the refugees to Jerusalem, but also to stir up the synagogue at Damascus against their own fellow-worshippers who acknowledged that Jesus was the Christ.—διὰ τόνας κατηγοροῦν: the phrase does not mean that the existence of Christians was doubtful, but whether Saul would succeed in finding them out (Weiss).—ὅταν τὴν δοῦν: the genitive with εἶναι or γίγνεσθαι, very common in N.T. (as in classical Greek); may be explained as the genitive of the class to which a man belongs, or as the genitive of the property in which any one participates, expressed by the genitive singular of an abstract noun, and also, as here, of a concrete noun, Winer-Moulton, xxx., 5. c. (and Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 269, 270). "The Way," R.V., all E.V., "this way," except Wycliff, who has "of this life," apparently reading viâ instead of via in the Vulgate; see Humphry on the R.V., in loco. (In xviii. 25 we have την δοῦν τοῦ K. of the instruction given to Apollos, cf. the common metaphorical use of the word in LXX.) In the text (as in xix. 9, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14, 22) the noun is used absolutely, and this use is peculiar to St. Luke (cf. ὁ λόγος, etc., τοῦ Β., x. 44, xiv. 25, etc., and το ῥοημα, v. 41). The term may have originated amongst the Jews who saw in the Christians those who adopted a special way or mode of life, or a special form of their own national belief, but if so, the Christians would see in it nomen et omen—in Christ they had found the Way, the Truth, the Life, John xiv. 6 (so Holtzmann points out the parallel in St. John, and thus accounts for the article τῆς δοῦν—there is only one way of salvation, viâ, Christ). Chrysostom (so Theophylact) thinks that the believers were probably so called because of their taking the direct way that leads to heaven (Hom., xix.): see also Dean Plumptre's interesting note. The expression seems to point to the early date of Acts. As it is used thus, absolutely, and with no explanation in the context, Hilgenfeld sees in chap. ix. the commencement of a third source C (see Intr. p. 29).—γυναῖκας, see above on viii. 3. Although no doubt the women referred to were Jewesses, yet it is of interest to note the remark of Josephus, B. Ῥ., ii., 20, 2, viâ, that the women of Damascus were addicted to the Jewish religion. Their mention also indicates the violence of Saul: "quod nullum sexus respectum habuit,
4. καὶ πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἡμοῦς φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ, Σαῦλ, Σαῦλ, τι με διώκεις; 5. εἶπεν δὲ, Τίς εἶ, Κύριε; ὁ δὲ Κύριος εἶπεν,

1 After γῆν Par. (Flor.) add "cum magna mentis alienatione"; μετὰ μεγάλης εκστασιας, so Blass; cf. rendering of εκστασιας in x. 10. Hilg. adds the words ἀληθῶς καὶ after γην. After διώκεις E. Syr. Harcl. mg. add σκληρον σοι κ.τ.λ., but cf. xxvi. 14—Blass rejects.


cui etiam arma hostes in medio belli adore parasite solent " Calvin.

Ver. 3. εἰς δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι, ἐγένετο: on the frequency of the infinitive as here, and of ἐγένετο in St. Luke, see Friedrich, Das Lukasæangelium, p. 13, but whilst St. Luke, even more than the other Evangelists, connects his narratives by more or less Hebraistic formulae, so he often tones down the Hebraism by changes of order or other modifications, cf. Luke i. 8, 9, v. 17, vi. 1. Acts iv. 5, and ix. 3, etc., see especially Simcox, Writers of the N. T., p. 19, cf. also Blass, Gram., pp. 232, 234.—ἐγένετο εἰς τῇ Α.: for a recent description of the three roads which lead from Jerusalem to Damascus, see Luckock, Footprintsof the Apostles as traced by St. Luke, i., pp. 223, 224. We may well believe that Saul in his haste and passion would choose the quickest and best frequented route which ran straight to Shechem, and after inclining to the east, by the shores of the lake of Galilee, leads straight to Damascus, with an entrance on the south; possibly he may have been stirred to "exceeding madness" by seeing in the Samaritan villages indications of the spread of the faith which it was his purpose to destroy (Plumptre, Expositor, p. 28 (1878)). Ramsay, Expositor, p. 28 (1898).—ἐξαίφνης: the word is used by St. Luke twice in his Gospel and twice in the Αcts—only once elsewhere, Mark xii. 36. Hobart and Zahn claim it as a medical term, and it was no doubt frequent amongst medical writers, as in Hippocrates and Galen (Hobart, Medical Language of St. Luke, pp. 19, 20), but the word is also used in LXX several times in same sense as here.——περιήστραψεν: only twice in N.T.—not found at all in classical Greek, but see 4 Macc. iv. 10. The simple verb occurs in Luke xvii. 24, xxiv. 4. The word is used in St. Paul's own account of the event (xxii. 6), and περιλάμψαν in his second account xxvi. 13; noun in classical Greek of flashing like lightning. In xxii. 6 the time is fixed "about noon," and in xxvi. 13 it is said that the light was "above the brightness of the sun," and shone round about those who journeyed with Paul. But St. Luke states the general fact, and St. Paul, as was natural, is more explicit in his own account. But St. Paul's mention of the time of day, when an Eastern sun was at its brightest, and of the exceeding glory of the light, evidently indicates that no natural phenomenon was implied.

Ver. 4. καὶ πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν, cf. xxii. 7, both expressions show the overwhelming impression made by the sudden bright light. In xxvi. 14 all fall to the ground, but there is no contradiction with ix. 7, see below on verse 7. Lewin, Farrar (so Hackett, and some early interpreters).
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6. τρέμων τε και θαμβών εἰς, Κύριε, τι με θέλεις ποιήσαι; καὶ ὁ


After διωκεῖς Flor., Gig., Par., Wern., Vulg. (fu. demid.), Syr. Harcl. mg. read κληρον σοι Ι. κτ.λ. So, too, the same authorities (+ Gig., Wer. + Hil.) read also "ο δε τρεμώντε και θαμβών εἰπε, Κύριε... αὐτον"—Blass receives, so too Hilg. For all this between διωκεῖς and αναστήθη the true reading appears to be ἀλλὰ (all else omitted), ΝΑΒΧΕΙΛΠ, Vulg. (am.), Syr. P. and H. text, Sah., Boh., Arm., Tisch., Chrys.; evidence for insertions purely Western—insered under influence of xxii. and xxvi. After θαμβῶν all these Western authorities except Vulg. add επὶ τὸ γεγονὸς αὐτῷ; this is a clear case of assimilation to iii. 10. There seems no Greek authority for the whole insertion; apparently a retranslation by Erasmus from the Latin.

have held that Saul and some at least of his companions were mounted, since Saul was the emissary of the high priest, and the journey would occupy some days. On the other hand Felten (following Corn. a Lapide) holds that the text makes no suggestion of this, and that the expression "they led him by the hand" and the command "rise and enter into the city" are against it; but the near neighbourhood of Damascus might easily account for the fact that his companions led Saul by the hand for the remaining distance, which could not have been long, although the immediate proximity of the traditional site cannot be maintained (see above on ver. 3). As the strict Jews, like the Pharisees, seldom used horses, Felten may be right in conjecturing that Saul rode upon an ass or a mule (p. 186, note).—Πάνων φωνήν λέγοντας, in St. Paul's own account we have same λέγοντας, xxii. 7, and Πάνων φωνήν λέγ., as here, in xxvi. 14. It would seem therefore that the distinction between ἄκουεν with (1) accusative, and (2) genitive; (1) to hear and understand, (2) to hear, merely, cannot be pressed (so Alford, in loco, and Simcox, Language of N. T., p. 90, and Weiss on xxii. 7; but see on the other hand Rendall on ix., ver. 7). Thus in the passage before us it has been usual to explain ἄκουεν with φωνήν, ver. 4, as indicating that Saul not only heard but understood the voice, cf. xxii. 14, whilst ἄκουεν with φωνήσει, ver. 7, has been taken to show that his comrades heard, but did not understand (so Weiss, in loco, and also on xxii. 9). But there is (1) no contradiction with xxii. 9, for there it is said of Paul's companions: τὴν φωνήν οὐχ ἄκουεν τοῦ λαλοῦσας μοι—they heard the utterance, ix. 7, xxii. 7, but did not hear definitely, or understand who it was that spoke, μὴ γνωρίσας. But (2) on comparing the passages together, it appears that in ix. 4 and 7 a distinction is drawn between the contents of the utterance and the mere sound of the voice, a distinction drawn by the accusative and genitive; in xxii. 7 the same distinction is really maintained, and by the same cases, since in xxii. 7 Paul, in speaking of himself, says that he heard a voice, i.e., was conscious of a voice speaking to him (genitive, φωνῆς), (Simcox, u. s., p. 85), whilst in ver. 9 (accusative φωνῆσει) the contents of the utterance are referred to, cf. ver. 14 in the same chapter; in xxvi. 14 the accusative is rightly used for the contents of the utterance which are given there more fully than elsewhere.—Σαῦλ, Σαῦλ: in each of the three narratives of the Conversion it is significant that the Hebrew form is thus given, and it is also found in the address of Ανανία, probably himself a Hebrew, ver. 17, to the new convert. On the emphatic and solemn repetition of the name cf. Gen. xxii. 11, and in the N.T., Luke x. 41, xxii. 51, Matt. xxiii. 37, and on the frequency of this repetition of a name as characteristic of Luke in Gospel and Acts see Friedrich, pp. 75, 76, cf. Luke viii. 24, x. 41, xxii. 31, cf. xxii. 21 (see also Deissmann's note Bibelstudien, p. 184, on the introduction of the Hebrew name).—γέμισα δὲ διώκεσθαι; cf. vii. 52, and 1 Cor. xv. 9, Gal. i. 13. "Saul's first lesson was the mystical union between Christ and His Church" cf. Matt. x. 40, xxv. 40, 45, John x. 16, etc. No wonder that Felten sees "an ineffable pathos" in the words; Wendt quotes St. Augustine: "caput pro membris clamabat," cf. also Corn. a Lapide: "corpus enim mysti-
Κύριος πρὸς αὐτὸν, Ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἰσελθεὶς εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ λαληθε-
σται σοι τι σε δει ποιεῖν. 7. οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ
eἰσητίκευσαν ἑννοεῖ, 1 ἐκούσατε μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦτες.
8. ἡγέρθη δὲ ο Σαύλος ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς: ἀνεφγένων δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν
αὐτοῦ, οὐδένα ἔβλεπε, χειραγωγοῦτες δὲ αὐτὸν εἰσήγαγον εἰς

1 ἑννοεί L; but ἑννοεί Ν ἌΒΕΣΗΡ 61, Syr. Harel. mg., so Tisch., W.H., Blas,
Hilg.; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 55. Blass reconstructs the conclusion of ver. 7 and
the first half of ver. 8; Flor. (and partly Gig., Par., Wern.) μηδένα δε θεωρ. μεθ’ον
ἐλαλεί: ἐφ’ ἐπὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς· εἰγερτεὶς μὲν απὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ εἰγερτεὶς
δὲ αὐτὸν οὐδὲν εβλ. ἐννοεῖ. τ. ὀφθ. χειραγωγ. τε—probably these additions arose partly from
the wish to explain the μηδένα standing absolutely in ver. 7 (cf. xxii. 9), partly to repre-
sent the blindness as coming on Saul at once (and not after he had risen), and thus
making him need immediate help.

cum Christi est ecclesia, membra sunt

Ver. 5. Τίς εί, Κύριε, the title is here
used in reverent and awestruck response
to the question of a speaker, in whose
voice, accompanied as it was by the
supernatural light, Saul recognised a
divine utterance—it is therefore more
than a mere word of respect, as in xxν. 30, xxv. 26; it indicates, as St. Chry-
sostom noted, a purpose to follow the
voice, whether it was that of an angel
or of God Himself (Felten), "Jam parat
se ad obediendum, qui prius insaniebat ad
persequendum," Augustine.—Εγώ . . .
σύ: both pronouns are emphatic, and
contrasted: Ιησούς, cf. xx. 8, and note.
For rest of verse see critical notes.

Ver. 6. For this verse see critical
notes and also xxii. το. Ἀνάστηθι: verb
characteristic of St. Luke, see on ν. 7.
Here, if we compare xxvi. 16 (xv. 10), it
is evidently used in a literal sense.—και
λαληθήσεταί σοι, see note on xxvi. 15.

Ver. 7. οἱ συνοδεύοντες: probably
riding in company with him; not found
in classical Greek, but used in the same
sense as here in Plutarch—not elsewhere
in N. T.; but see Wisdom vi. 23, and Tobit
v. 16 S (AB al.), so according to S in
Zech. viii. 21 (ABS3 al.), cf. also Symm.
in Gen. xxxii. 12.—ἐλοιπὸν ἑννοεῖ.
The form ἑννοεῖ is incorrect, see critical
to, Epist. of Jer. 41 (Symm. in Hos. ix. 7); see critical notes. It is frivolous to find
a contradiction here with xxvi. 14. No
stress is laid upon ἑννοεῖ, which may be
used like εἴπα, and even if there is, it
does not preclude a previous falling. We
have merely to suppose that the sight
and sound had affected Saul's compan-
inians in a less degree than Saul, and that
they rose from the ground before
him, to make the narratives quite con-
sistent (see Felten, p. 193, Hackett, in
locu: B.D.1, iv., "Paul" p. 733). Or it is
quite possible, as Weiss points out on
xxvi. 14, that here the narrative em-
phasises the impression made by the
hearing of the voice, and in xxvi. 14 the
immediate result produced by the light,
and that the narrator is quite unconscio-
sous of any contradiction in his recital (see
notes below on xxii., xxvi.).—μηδένα
δὲ θεωρ. τε—there is no contradiction be-
 tween this statement and xxii. 9, where
it is said that they saw the light—here it
is not denied that they saw a light, but
only that they saw no person. Holtz-
mann apparently forgets this, and says
that whilst in xxix. 9 they see the light,
in ix. 7 they see nothing; but the pro-
noun is not neuter, but masculine; μηδένα
(see critical notes and reading in β). The
inference is that Saul saw Jesus, but al-
though this is not stated in so many
words here, it is also to be inferred from
the words of Anania in ver. 17, and xxii.
14, and from St. Paul's own statement in
1 Cor. xv. 8, and ix. 1. St. Chrysostom
refers ἐκούσατε μὲν τῆς φ. to the words
of Saul, but this is certainly not natural,
tο τῆς φ. evidentely refers back to ἥκουσα
φωνή in ver. 4.

Ver. 8. ἀνεφγένων; see critical notes.
—οὐδένα ἔβλεπε: his eyes, which he
had closed mechanically, as he fell over-
whelmed with the dazzling brightness
of the light, and of the appearance of
Jesus, he now opens, but only to find
that he saw nothing (οὐδέν) (see critical
note)—he had become blind (so Weiss
and Wendt, cf. xxii. 11). This blind-
ness was the clearest proof that the
appearances vouchsafed to him had been
a reality (Felten), see also ver. 18.—
χειραγωγοῦτες: the necessary result of
his blindness, cf. Judg. xvi. 26 and Tob. xi. 16, but in each case the reading is varied (see H. and R.); in N.T. only in Acts, cf. xxi. 11 (and see xiii. 11); it is also found in the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter, x. (ver. 40 in Harnack's edition). "He who would strike others was himself struck, and the proud Pharisee became a deeply humbled penitent—a guide of the blind" he was himself to be guided by others (Felten).

Ver. 9. ήν . . . μη βλέπων: on ήν with participle, characteristic, see above on chap. i. 10. Wendt (in seventh edition, not in eighth), and so Felten, Alford, Hackett, distinguish between μη and ου with έφαγεν and έπιεν, and see especially Winer-Moulton, lv. 5. ου β. would have simply meant blind; μη β. is not seeing (not able to see)—said of one who had been, and might appear to be again, possessed of sight; the not eating and not drinking are related simply as matters of fact; see the whole section. Blass regards μη with participle as simply = ου, so in ver. 7 μηδένα with participle = ουδένα, ut alias (see also Lumby's note).—ουκέφαγ. κ.τ.λ.: there is no reason why the words should not be taken literally, in spite of Wendt's objection as against Meyer in loco, as an expression of penitential sorrow and contrition for his perversity (so Weiss and Holtzmann, no less than Felten): "with what fervour must he then have prayed for 'more light'" (Felten). On Saul's blindness and its possibly lasting effects, see Plumptre, in loco, Felten, p. 106, and on the other hand Lightfoot on Gal. vi. 11, and Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, etc., pp. 38, 39.

Ver. 10. 'Anavías: nomen et omen, "Jehovah is gracious" (cf. xxii. 12). No doubt a Jewish Christian (he is supposed by some, as by St. Augustine, to have been the presbyter to whose care the Church at Damascus was committed). For more details and traditions concerning him, see Dr. James, "Anania," Hastings B.D., and Felten, in loco. The objections raised against the historical character of the meeting between Ananias and Saul, by Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, are considered by Wendt as quite insufficient. Weizsacker regards the narrative of the blindness and its cure by Ananias as transparently symbolical, and adds that in any case it is suggestive that Paul, Gal. iv. 15, seems, at least in later days, to have had a severe ailment in his eyes (see however on this point ver. 9 above). But the weakness, if it existed, might have been caused by the previous blindness at Damascus, and this suggestion, if it is needed, has at all events more probability than the supposition that the narrative in the text was due to the fact that in after years Saul's eyes were affected! (so Weizsacker, Apostolic Age, i., 72). Zeller indeed admits, Acts, i., 289, E.T., that the connection of Saul with Ananias, "irrespective of the visions and miracles," may have been historical, and he falls back upon Schneckenburger's theory that the author of Acts had a special aim in view in introducing a man so avowedly pious in the law (xxii. 12) to introduce Paul to Christianity. But Schneckenburger does not seem to deny the main fact of the meeting between the two men (Ueber den Zucker der Apostelgeschichte, pp. 168, 169), and St. Paul would scarcely have spoken as he did later (xxii. 12) before a Jewish crowd, in a speech delivered when the capital was full of pilgrims from all parts, and at a time when the constant communication between Damascus and Jerusalem would have exposed him to instant refutation, had his statements with regard to Ananias been incorrect. It is evident that the supernatural element in the narrative is what really lay at the root of Zeller's objections. —ο Κύριος, i.e., Jesus, as is evident from a comparison of vv. 13, 14, 17.—εν δράματι: critical objections have been raised by Baur and others against the double vision narrated here of Saul and Ananias, as against the double vision of Cornelius and St. Peter in x. 3 and xi., but see Lumby's note, in loco, and reference to Conybeare and Howson, quoted also by Felten. The idea of the older rationalists that Saul and Ananias had previously been friends, and that thus the coincidence of their visions may be accounted for, is justly regarded by Wendt as entirely arbitrary. The vision, as narrated by Luke, is evidently regarded as something objective, cf. vv. 10, 13.

Ver. 11. ἀναστάς: the word as has been previously remarked is characteristic of Luke (cf. its use in O.T.), and does
1. Ἄναστας ἦκε οὖν Κύριε. Ἡ δὲ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτὸν, Ἄναστας ἁρπαζόντι εἰς τὴν βουλήν τὴν καλομένην Εὐθείαν, καὶ Ξητήσαν ἐν οἰκίᾳ Ιουδα Σαῦλον ὑπόματι, Ταρσία. ἵδον γὰρ προσεύχεται, 12. καὶ εἶδεν ἐν ὑπάρχει ἀνδρὰ ὑπόματι Ἄναστας εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χείρα.

2. Εὐθείαν: "the street called Straight" may be traced from the eastern to the western gate, and it still bears the name, Derb εί-Μιτακίμ, Schneller, Αποστέιφαρτα, pp. 254, 255, "Damascus," Hastings' B.D. The "house of Judas," also that of Ananias, are still pointed out, but considerable uncertainty attaches to the attempts at identification, see "Damascus," u. s., also Felten, in loco.—Ταρσία: Ταρσός was the capital of the Roman Province of Cilicia. Curtius has called it the Athens of Asia Minor, and Strabo emphasises its celebrity for the production of men famous in all branches of science and art. As a celebrated university town it may have ranked amongst its students not only St. Paul but his companion St. Luke, attracted it may be by the renown of its medical school; and if this be so, the acquaintance of the two men may date from their student days. To Tarso, moreover, and to a country where Stoicism was cradled, St. Paul may have been indebted for his evident familiarity with the ideas and tenets of the Stoic philosophy. From Cyprus came Ζενο and Περσαύς, from Σολι, Χρυσίππος and Αρατος, whilst Anazarbo in Cilicia was the birthplace of the physician Dioscorides, contemporary of St. Luke as of St. Paul. It is indeed possible to enumerate at least six Stoic teachers whose home was Ταρσός. See notes on St. Paul at Athens and at Ephesus, and see J. Lightfoot, Ηορ. Ηεθ., on Acts νί. 9; Curtius, Gesammelte Abhandlungen, ii., p. 538 ff.; Zahn, Einleitung i., pp. 37, 50; Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 303 ff.; Salmon, Ιntrod., p. 317.—ἴδον γὰρ προσεύχετα: "orantes videt Jesus" Bengel; present tense, continuous prayer, 1 Θεσσ. v. 17.

Ver. 12. ἐν ὑπάρχει, see critical notes.

—Εὑρα Ἀν. ὑπόμ.: the words would certainly indicate, as Wendt points out (seventh edition, not eighth), that Saul was previously unacquainted with Ananias. Jesus communicates the contents of the vision, and speaks as it were from the standpoint of Saul (see Felten's note, p. 190).—Προσεύχεται κ.τ.λ., see above on viii. 17.
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όπως ἀναβλέψῃ. 13. Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Ἀνανίας, Κύριε, ἀκήκοα ἀπὸ πολλῶν περὶ τοῦ ἄνδρος τούτου, ὅσα κακὰ ἐποίησε τοῖς ἁγίοις σου ἐν Ἱεροσολύμων. 14. καὶ ὥσπερ ἔξοντον παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων, δῆσαι πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλομένους τὸ ὄνομά σου. 15. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τρός αὐτῶν ὁ Κύριος, Πορεύου, ὅτι σκέψει ἐκλογής μοι ἔστιν αὐτός, τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἑνών καὶ βασιλέων, οὗ τε Ἰσραήλ.


2 ἑνών, but art. τῶν prefixed in BC*, so Lach., R.V. (W.H.), Weiss, Wendt (probably); but τῶν apparently does not suit the context.

Ver. 13. Ananias naturally hesitates to go to a man who had undoubtedly inflicted harm upon the Christians, and had come to Damascus with the same intent. But there is nothing inconsistent in the fact that Ananias should not be acquainted with Saul personally, whilst he knew of his persecuting zeal.—τοῖς ἁγίοις σου: used here for the first time as a name for the Christians; cf. νν.32, 41, κκ. το. Εν every Israelite was ἁγιός by the mere fact of his membership in the holy Ecclesia of Israel, and Ananias, himself a Jew, does not hesitate to employ the same term of the members of the Christian Ecclesia (see Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 56, 57, and Grimm, sub ν., 2). Its use has therefore a deep significance: “Christus habet sanctos, ut suos: ergo est Deus,” says Bengel. The force of the words can be more fully appreciated in connection with the significance of the phrase in ver. 14, τοῖς ἐπικ. τὸ ὄνομά σου. In xxvi. 10 it is noticeable that the word occurs on St. Paul's own lips as he stood before Agrippa “in the bitterness of his self-accusation for his acts of persecution, probably in intentional repetition of Ananias's language respecting those same acts of his. It was a phrase that was likely to burn itself into his memory on that occasion.” And so we find St. Paul addressing at least six of his Epistles to those who were "called to be Saints," indicating that every Christian as such had this high calling. If Christians individually had realised it, the prophetic vision of the Psalms of Solomon (xvii. 36) would have been fulfilled in the early Church of Christ: ὅτι πάντες ἄγιοι, καὶ βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν Χριστὸς Κύριος (see Ryle and James' edition, p. 141).—ἐν Ἱερ. belongs to ἐπικαλέσοντες, and so points back to viii. 3, and to Saul as the soul of the persecution which broke out in Jerusalem, cf. Paul's own language before Agrippa, xxvi. 10.

Ver. 14. ὤδε hic et hoc (Blass), ver. 21. —τοῖς ἐπικ. τὸ ὄνομά σου—note the repeated pronoun and compare I Cor. i. 2, where ἐπικ. is closely joined with ἡγιασμένοι, and on the whole phrase see above ii. 21.

Ver. 15. σκέψεως ἐκλογής, cf. St. Paul's own language in Gal. i. 15, genitive of quality; common Hebraistic mode of expression (cf. viii. 23) = ἐκλεκτόν, see Blass, Gram., p. 96; cf. Luke xvi. 8, xviii. 6, etc. For σκέψεως similarly used see Jer. xxii. 28, Hosea viii. 8, and Schöttgen, Hora Hebraica, in loco; and in N.T. Rom. ix. 22, 23, 1 Thess. iv. 4. Grimm and Blass both compare σκ. de homine in Polyb., xiii., 5, 7; xv., 25, 1. Vas electionis: the words are written over what is said to be St. Paul's tomb in the church dedicated to him near the city of Rome.—τοῦ βαστάσαι, genitive of purpose; verb as used here continues the metaphor of σκέψεως; may mean simply to bear, to carry, or it may denote to bear as a burden; cf. 2 Kings xviii. 14, Eccles. vi. 25; cf. Luke xiv. 10, Acts xv. 10, Rom. xv. 1, etc.—ἐθνών καὶ βασιλέων — ἑνών, placed first because Saul's special mission is thus indicated.—βασιλ., cf. xxvi. 12, 2 Tim. i. 16; also before the governors of Cyprus, Achaia, Judea.—ὁ ἐφ' ἑνών, see critical notes above, again the closely connecting τε, all three nouns being comprehended under the one article τῶν—the Apostle's work was to include, not to exclude, his brethren according to the flesh, whilst mission to the Gentiles is always emphasised; cf. xxii. 15 and 21, xxvi. 17; cf. Rom. i. 13, 14.

Ver. 16. ἑνῶν γὰρ he is a chosen vessel unto me, and therefore ὑπακοή. Wendt disagrees with Meyer, who finds the showing in the experiences of the sufferings (so Hackett and Felten), and
13-19. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

16. ἄν γὰρ ὁποδείξη αὐτῷ, δόσα δεὶ αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅνομάτος μου ποιεῖν.

17. Ἀπῆλθε δὲ Ἀνανίας καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ ἐπιδείχθη ἐν αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἀδελφόν, καὶ ἐπήρθη ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅνομάτος Ἰησοῦς· ἀπεστάλη με, διότι ἄν αὐτὸν ἔδειξεν τῷ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐμπεθεῖν, καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς χείρας ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἀπέπεσεν ὡσεὶ λεπίδες, ἀνέβλεψε τε παραχρήμα, καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐβαπτίσθη, καὶ λαβὼν τρόφιμον ἐνίσχυσεν.¹ 19. Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ ἡ Σαύλος μετά τῶν ἐν

¹ Blass, following Flor., reconstructs (so very simil. Hilg.) τοῖς επερεθέν (as if the vision came in sleep; cf. Corssen, G. G. A., p. 437 (1896), who thinks that the expression is an interpolation and compares β text in xvi. 9 ff., p. 436, u. s.) Αν. επεθῆκε αὐτῶν τὴν χειρὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, so again Flor. has επεθῆκε αὐτῷ τὴν χείραν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, as if the vision came in sleep; cf. Corssen, G. G. A., p. 437 (1896), who thinks that the expression is an interpolation and compares β text in xvi. 9 ff., p. 436, u. s.) Αν. επεθῆκε αὐτῶν τὴν χειρὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, so again Flor. has επεθῆκε αὐτῷ τὴν χειρὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, as if the vision came in sleep; cf. Corssen, G. G. A., p. 437 (1896), who thinks that the expression is an interpolation and compares β text in xvi. 9 ff., p. 436, u. s.) Αν. επεθῆκε αὐτῶν τὴν χειρὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, so again Flor. has επεθῆκε αὐτῷ τὴν χειρὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, as if the vision came in sleep; cf. Corssen, G. G. A., p. 437 (1896), who thinks that the expression is an interpolation and compares β text in xvi. 9 ff., p. 436, u. s.) Αν. επεθῆκε αὐτῶν τὴν χειρὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, so again Flor. has επεθῆκε αὐτῷ τὴν χειρὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, as if the vision came in sleep; cf. Corssen, G. G. A., p. 437 (1896), who thinks that the expression is an interpolation and compares β text in xvi. 9 ff., p. 436, u. s.)
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ΙΧ.

Δαμασκά, μαθητών ἡμέρας τινάς. 20. καὶ εὐθέως ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ἐκήρυσε τὸν Χριστόν, 21. ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες καὶ ἔλεγον, ὦς οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας ἐν ἱερουσαλήμ τοὺς ἐπικαλούμενους τὸ ὅνομα τοῦτο, καὶ δὲς εἰς τοῦτο ἐλθόντες οἱ δεδεμένοι αὐτοὺς ἀγάγῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς; 22. Ἐμφασε δὲ ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος ἐνδεδειγμένῳ, καὶ συνέχευε τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Δαμασκά, συμβιβάζων ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός.

1 Flor., Par., Wern. read καὶ εὐθέως εἰς ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τοῦ Ι., cf. xiii. 5, xiv. 1, xix. 8, so Hilg. The phrase "synagogue of the Jews" usually implies contrast between Jews and Gentiles, which is hardly the case here, but the writer might wish to emphasise the boldness of Saul: Flor., Iren. read μετα πασης παρρησιας, so Hilg. ο Χριστός after εστι 68, Flor., Irenat. (Irenski after Θεου), retained by Blass and by Hilg., perhaps from ver. 22 (cf. John xx. 31).

2 Χριστόν HLP, Chrys.; Ἰησοῦν ΝABCE 61, Iren., Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; Hilg. has τον κυριον Ἰησοῦν with Flor.; ευθέως in ver. 22 seems to demand a preceding Ιησοῦν.

3 συνέχευε ΑΒHLP, so Blass; συνεχείτω ΝΒ*C, Tisch., W.H., App., p. 172, and see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 111; Hilg. has συνεχείτω, τον λοιπον, but τον om. by ΝΒ, so W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. At end of verse Flor., Gig., Par. add εἰς εὐθείαν o Θεος—retained by Blass and Hilg.

Blass draws attention to the coincidence between this passage and the use of the word in Gal., and adds: "ut a Ραυλο hoc ipsum verbum scriptore maccepisse dicis". Wendt (1899) dismisses the point of connection in the use of the word by the two authors Luke and Paul as accidental. He bases his objection, p. 35, upon the view that St. Paul's Epistles and Acts are independent of each other; but this would not prevent St. Luke from receiving the narrative of the events at Damascus from the lips of Paul himself. —τοις εἰς την εὐθείαν, see above on ver. 14.—αὐλαίων, pluperfect: "inest indicatio voluntatis mulctae," Blass, cf. also Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 44, and Blass, Gramm., p. 197. On the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim and their commissions to their officers see iv. 5, and Lewin, St. Paul, i., 52 (smaller edition). For εἰς followed by the conjunctive after a past tense in preference to the optative cf. v. 26, xxv. 26, in Winer-Moulton, xii. 6. 1 a.

Ver. 22. ἐνδεδειγμένῳ: only used here by St. Luke, and elsewhere only by St. Paul (five or six times), and always of religious and spiritual strength; used also three times in the LXX; twice with reference to the power of the Spirit, Judg. vi. 34, 1 Chron. xii. 18; in Psalm lii. 7, perhaps the simple verb ἐνδειγμόν, —συνεχέω: "confounded," so A. and R.V., or rather, "continued to confound," imperfect active, cf. ii. 6, "were con-

retained by Weiss. We have the verb, in the N.T. peculiar to St. Luke, used in the transitive sense (cf. Luke xxii. 43 and 45, W. H., App., 67, and Plummer, in loco), and in this sense its use outside the LXX is confined to Hippocrates and St. Luke, Hobart, p. 86 (cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 40, Ecclus. i. 4); but cf. Psalms of Solomon, xvi. 2. The reading here to which Wendt apparently inclines is ἐνδειγμένοι (see critical notes), as this would be in accordance with the transitive use of the verb in Luke xxii. 43, and other instances.

Ver. 19. ἡμέρας τινάς: used here apparently, as in x. 48, xvi. 12, xxiv. 24, etc., of a short period; see note on ver. 23, and cf. critical notes, Blass in β, and see ver. 23.

Ver. 20. ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς—publicly in the Jewish Assemblies: οὔτε ἡσυχώτερον (Chrys.).—ὁ οὖς τοῦ Θεοῦ: only here in Acts. As the preaching was in the synagogue the term would be used in its Messianic sense (cf. John i. 49), according to the early Messianic interpretation of Psalm ii. 7; cf. xii. 33 and St. Paul's reference to the Psalm in another address to Jews, in the Pisidian Antioch. For the use of the term as applied to the Messiah by the Jews see further Book of Enoch, cv., 2, and Dr. Charles' note.

Ver. 21. πορθήσας: same word used by St. Paul of himself in Gal. i. 13, 23; nowhere else in N.T., but see 4 Macc. iv. 23, xi. 4; used often in classical Greek.
founded," passive, see also xix. 32, xxi. 31 (critical notes above): from συνχύνων (συνχύνων), nowhere except in Acts, as above (see Moulton and Geden). συνχύνων: not found in classical Greek nor in LXX, a later form of συνχέω, συνχέω T. W. H. (cf. ἐκχύνομαι from ἐκχέω, three times in Luke's Gospel; in Matthew twice, in Mark once, also Rom. v. 5, Jude ver. 11; not found in LXX, but see Theod., 2 Sam. xiv. 14); in Acts, xxi. 27. συνέχεον from συνχέω (but see in loco), Moulton and Geden. According to the best MS., Tisch., W. H., read the double ν, but elsewhere we have only one ν, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 132, Blass, Gram., p. 41.—συμβιβάζων: only used by St. Luke and St. Paul, cf. xvi. 10, xix. 33, see especially for this last passage, Grimm-Thayer, sub v., cf. 1 Cor. ii. 16. In the LXX the word is used in the sense of teaching, instructing, Exod. iv. 13, 15, xviii. 16, Isa. xi. 13, etc., this usage is purely Biblical (in Attic Greek rather προσβ. in this sense): lit., (1) to bring together; (2) then like συμβάλλω, to put together, to compare, to examine closely; (3) so to deduce, to prove; thus here the word may well imply that Saul compared Messianic passages of the O.T. with the events of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, and hence deduced the proof that He was the Christ, cf. παρατιθέμενοι out of the Scriptures which the Jews themselves knew.

Ver. 23. ἡμέρας ικανάς: whether the period thus described was meant to cover the definite period in Gal. i. 16, i.e., as including St. Paul's visit to Arabia, it is difficult to decide. Lightfoot holds that the Hebrew phrase לברא כותב out of the Scriptures which the Jews themselves knew.

Ver. 24. επιβουλή: "plot"; N.T. only used in Acts; in three other passages, xx. 3, 19, xxiii. 30. It is used in the same sense in LXX, Esth. ii. 22 (for other instances of the word see H. and R.), and frequently in classical Greek.—τε: if we add και R.V., see critical notes, the two words τε και signify that they not only laid wait for him, but also watched the city gates day and night, to secure the success of their design; "and they watched the gates also," R.V. In 2 Cor. xi. 32, according to Paul's own statement, the ethnarch under Aretas the king guarded the walls to prevent his escape. But this seems
24ο ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

1 ΤΕΡΟΙ ΤΙΣ ΠΥΛΑΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΝΥΚΤΟΣ, ΩΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΑΝΕΛΙΧΤΩ.

25. ΛΑΒΟΝΤΕΣ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΝΥΚΤΟΣ, ΚΑΘΗΚΑΝ ΒΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΤΕΙΧΟΥΣ,

1 παρετρονον HLP, Chrys.; παρετρονονον ΝΑΒCEFα 61, Vulg., Or., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Instead of τε ΝΑΒCEFα 61, Vulg., Or., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Hilg. read δε και—Alford supposes that τε in παρετρονον became mistaken for τε, and then δε και was struck out, no other copula being wanted.

2 οι μαθηται, after these words ΝΑΒCFα 61, Vulg. (am. fu. demid. tol.), Or. read αυτον, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler, Holtzmann; perhaps omitted because in vv. 19 and 26 μαθηται is used absolutely. ουριδι—but in ΝC σφυρ., so W.H. (but not Weiss, who follows ΑΒ, etc.), although with ουρ. as alternative, App., pp. 155, 156, and Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 59, 60; see also Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 157, and Neue Bibelstudien, p. 13.

strange, as Damascus was part of the Roman province of Syria. The difficulty is met by a large number of modern writers by the assumption that Caligula, whose reign began in 37 A.D., gave Damascus to Aretas, to whose predecessors it had belonged (Jos., Ant., xiii., 5, 2). On the accession of Caligula a great change of policy occurred—Antipas, the old foe of Aretas, who was indignant with him for the divorce of his daughter, was shortly after deposed, and his kingdom was added to that of Herod Agrippa, who had already received from the emperor the tetrarchy of Philip and Lysanias (Jos., Ant., xviii., 6, 10). But this latter grant was one of the first acts of Caligula's reign, and there is nothing improbable in the supposition that the new ruler should also bestow some gift of territory on the great foe of the Herodian house, who apparently reigned until 40 A.D. Added to this there is the fact that we have no coins of Damascus with the imperial superscription from 34-62 A.D. In 62-63 the image of Nero begins, but there are no coins marked with that of Caligula or Claudius. The latter emperor died in 54 A.D., and in a few years Damascus must have passed again into Roman hands, if the above theory is correct. Certainly this theory is more feasible than that which supposes that Aretas had actually seized Damascus himself in 37 A.D., when upon the death of Tiberius (who had supported Antipas), Vitellius, the governor of Syria, had withdrawn his troops and the expedition which the emperor had despatched against Aretas. But whether this forcible taking possession of the city is placed before, during, or after the expedition of Vitellius, we should expect that it would have met with energetic punishment at the hands of the governor of Syria, but of this there is no mention or trace (P. Ewald). McGiffert, who favours an earlier chronology, and dates Paul's conversion in 31 or 32 A.D., contends that the flight from Damascus may have occurred as well in the year 33, i.e., in the reign of Tiberius, as in 38, when no change had taken place in the status of Damascus; the city was subject to Rome, but Aretas may have had control over it, just as Herod had control over Jerusalem. There is at all events no ground for supposing that the term ethnarch denotes that Aretas was only head of the Arabian colony in Damascus (so O. Holtzmann, following Keim, Nösgen, etc.), or that he was only a chance visitor who exercised his authority to the detriment of Paul (Anger); any such suggestion utterly fails to account for the fact that he is represented as guarding Damascus. It has been suggested that the wife of Aretas may well have been a proselyte, but the fact that the Jews of Damascus were both numerous and powerful is quite sufficient to explain the attitude of the governor, Jos., B. T., ii., 20; vii., 8, 7. See “Aretas” in Hastings' B.D., and B.D. McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 164, 165; G. A. Smith, Hist. Geog., pp. 619, 620; O. Holtzmann, Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 97; Schäfer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 356, and div. ii., vol. i., p. 98, E.T.; Real-Encyclopädie für protestant. Theol. (Hauck), i., pp. 795-797, by P. Ewald. See further on the title διοράχης Schürer, Studien und Kritiken, 1890 (1), which he explains by the conditions of the Nabatean kingdom, in which tribes not cities were concerned—the head of such a tribe being actually so called in more than one inscription.

Ver. 25. οι μαθηται—if we add αυτον, see critical notes, the words would apparently refer to Jews converted by Saul, so Chrysostom: “but his disciples” R.V. Alford, who reads αυτοι, supposes that we have here an unusual government of
γλασάντες ἐν στυρίῳ. 26. Ἡ παραγενόμενος δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος εἰς ἱεροσολύμων, ἐπείρατο ἀυτὸν, μὴ πιστεύοντές ὑμῖν, δι' αὑτὸν μαθητὰς τοῖς μαθηταῖς. 27. Βαρνάβας δὲ ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτὸν, ὑγιεὶς πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ διηγήσατο αὐτοῦ τῆς ὑδατοῦ ἐδεί τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ὑπαίθριον αὐτῷ. καὶ

1 επείρατο—but ΝABCDE 61, 81 read επειράζειν, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (against Meyer); latter verb much more common in N.T., but elsewhere is used in a different sense from this passage, and so επείρατο introduced. Hilg. has this latter verb here.

the genitive by λαβόντες, and compares Luke viii. 34 and classical instances, see in loco.—διὰ τοῦ τείχους: "through the wall," R.V., cf. 2 Cor. xi. 33, where we read & διὰ τοῦ τείχους. Blass perhaps a window in the external face of the wall opening into the house on the inside, rather than simply a window of a house overhanging the wall; cf. Josh. ii. 16, 1 Sam. xix. 12. Blass takes it of a window made "in ipso muro scil. ad tormenta mittenda," but there is no need for this explanation; see Hackett's note on his own observations at Damascus of two or three windows built in the wall as above.—χαλάσαντες ἐν στυρίῳ: "lowering him," R.V., not expressed in A.V.; on spelling of στυρ. see critical note. In 2 Cor. xi. 33 Paul uses the word σαργάνη, a basket of wickerwork, στυρ. a basket larger than the κόφινος, the small hand-basket of the Jew, iv., iii., 14; vi., 54, probably a provision basket of considerable size, used as by the Paeanians for fishing, Herod., v., 16. σαργάνη too is used of a fish basket by Timokles, ἀνθ., i., see further, "Basket," Hastings' B.D., and Plummer on Luke ix. 17. Neither word is met with in the LXX or Apocrypha. For the naturalness of the incident according to the present customs of the country see Hackett, in loco. The traditional spot of its occurrence is still shown, but we can only say of it as of the "house of Judas," see above on ver. ii. Wendt, p. 35 (1890), thinks that here we have a coincidence with the account in 2 Cor., which cannot be accounted for except by the acquaintance of the author of Acts with the Epistle.

Ver. 26. παραγενόμενος: on its frequency in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts see v. 21; apparently presupposes that Saul betook himself immediately to Jerusalem, so that the stay in Arabia cannot be inserted here (Weiss, in loco), a stay which Weiss holds was unknown to the author of Acts, see his note on ver. 19. παραγ. is found four times in Acts with εἰς, c. acc. loci, elsewhere only in Matt. i. (cf. John viii. 2).—επείρατο: the verb πείραζε only found once in N.T., viz., xxvi. 21, and the true reading here is επείραζε, which is used in a similar sense in xvi. 7, xxiv. 6, only in the active in this sense = Attic πείρωμαι, according to Blass, in loco, and Gram., 56, 221; "he assayed," R.V. = to essay, attempt, try, Deut. iv. 34, 2 Macc. ii. 23.—κολλάσθαι, cf. v. 13, x. 28, and also Matt. xix. 5, Luke xv. 5, 1 Cor. vi. 16—evidently means that he sought to join himself to them intimately.—καὶ πάντες ἐφόβοι αὐτόν. The reading of A.V. is "and," R.V., not "but." A.V.; it is not adversative, but simply introduces the unfavourable result of Saul's endeavour. This does not necessarily require that the conversion should have been recent, as Weiss maintains. If three years had elapsed, Gal. i. 16, during a portion of which at all events Saul had been in retirement, the Christians in Jerusalem might very naturally still feel apprehensive when their former persecutor was thus for the first time since his conversion actually present amongst them, and the memory of his former fierce hatred could not have been effaced. If it seems unlikely that this should have been their attitude had they known of Saul's profession of faith at Damascus, there are critics who would have expressed great surprise if the Apostle had been received with open arms, and without any credentials: "credo si contrarium exstaret, hoc rursus mirarentur" (Blass).

Ver. 27. Βαρνάβας, cf. iv. 36. Saul and Barnabas may have been previously acquainted, see J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., and note on iv. 36. St. Chrysostom, Hom., xxii. (so Theophylact and Occumenius), sees here a proof of the kindly
nature of Barnabas, so truly called "Son of Consolation." For an appreciative notice of the goodness and generosity of Barnabas, from a very different standpoint, see Renan, Apostles, p. 191 E.T.—ἐπιλ., cf. xxiii. 19; so as to disarm fear: on the force of this characteristic word of St. Luke see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 245, Friedrich, p. 27, and below xvii. 19; generally constructed with genitive, but here αὐτὸν is probably governed by Ἰησοῦς; cf. xvi. 19, and xviii. 17, where also the accusative is found in cases of a finite transitive verb following the participle, ἐπιλ. Blass, Gram., p. 100, note 2, refers αὐτὸν to Ἰησοῦς, and understands αὐτοῦ with ἐπιλ.—προς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, cf. Gal. i. 19; there is no contradiction, although St. Paul's own narrative confines Saul's introduction to Peter and James: "though most of the Apostles were absent, yet the two real leaders were present" (Ramsay), and this was the point which St. Luke would emphasise. Wendt (1899) rejects the narrative of Acts as indistinct when compared with Gal. i., but see Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 91, and Drummond, Galatians, p. 67; see below on ver. 30 also.—διηγήσατο, exposuit, i.e., Barnabas (but Beza and Meyer make Saul the subject, although unlikely from construction and context); verb twice in Luke's Gospel, viii. 39, ix. 10, and three times in Acts, viii. 33 (quotation), xii. 17; cf. Heb. xi. 32, and Mark v. 16, ix. 9, and nowhere else in N.T.; frequent in LXX to recount, narrate, declare, cf. 1 Macc. v. 25, viii. 2, x. 15, xi. 5, and several times in Ecclesiasticus. Similarly used in classical Greek; Grimm compares figurative use of German durchführen.—τῶν υἱῶν Κ.: while it is not said in any part of the three accounts of the Conversion that Saul saw Jesus, it is distinctly asserted here in a statement which Barnabas may well have received from Saul himself, and also in the two expressions of Ananias, cf. ver. 17, xxiii. 14; cf. also the Apostle's own words, 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8.—ἐπιλαθόμενος, cf. the verb with the expression μετὰ παραπτώματα λαλεῖν, see above on iv. 13, and of the preaching of the other Apostles and of the Church, cf. xxviii. 31 (of Paul). Verb only used by Luke and Paul, and always of speaking boldly the truths of the Gospel; so seven times in Acts, and also in 1 Thess. ii. 2, Ephes. vi. 20. Ver. 28. ἦν . . . ἐπὶ: for characteristic construction see i. 10, etc. εἰς καὶ ἐκπ., cf. i. 21. Hebraistic formula to express the daily confidential intercourse with the Apostles; cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 13, 2 Chron. xxiii. 7 (1 Macc. xxxii. 49, xv. 14, 25, for somewhat similar expressions, but see H. and R.).—ἐπι: if we read εἰς, see critical note. Weiss connects closely with ἐκπ. and takes it to signify that Saul was not only associated with the Apostles privately, but openly in the town, so Wendt and Holtzmann, privatim and publice. Page connects ἦν εἰς together, and thinks εἰς probably due to the intervention of the verbs expressing motion. Zöckler compares xxvi. 20, and takes εἰς as referring to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood (but see critical notes). Ver. 29. ἐπεχείρουν, cf. vi. 9.—πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήν., of whom Saul himself was one; see critical notes. Saul's visit was a short one (Gal. i. 18), and although we must not limit his opportunities of disputation to the two Sabbaths with Blass (note the two imperfects), yet it is evident that the Hellenists were at once enraged against the deserter from their ranks. There is no contradiction with xxii. 17, as Zeller and Overbeck maintained—it is rather a mark of truth that Luke gives the outward impulse, and Paul the inner ground (Hackett, Lightfoot, Lumby); but see on the other hand Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 62, against the identification of xxii. 17 with Paul's first visit; according to Ramsay, xxii. 17, 18 refer to the close of the Apostle's second visit. Wendt (1899) still identifies xxii. 18 with the passage before us, ix. 29; in seventh edition he speaks more fully of the fulfilment of the negative prophecy in xxii. 18, by the positive fact here narrated.—ἐπείσδος: only used by St. Luke; St. Luke i. 1, Acts xix. 13; it is used in same sense in
3ο, επιγνόντες δὲ οἱ αδελφοὶ κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Κανάρειαν, καὶ

1 Ἐλληνοτα ἘΔΒΕΗΛΡ; but A has Ἐλληνς, and Vulg. (not am. demid.) has "loquebatur quoque gentibus et disputabat cum Græcis," see Felten's note, in loco.

classical Greek; and it also occurs in Esther ix. 25, 1 Esd. i. 28, 2 Macc. ii. 29, vii. 19, ix. 2, etc., and 3 Macc. vii. 5, where it occurs as here with ἀνελείν (see also below), and for other instances cf. Hatch and Redpath. The word was frequently employed in medical language, sometimes in its literal sense "to apply the hand to," but generally as in N.T. Both Hippocrates and Galen use the verb as St. Luke does, with γράφειν—ἐπειχείρησαν γράφειν. Leibert, pp. 87 and 210, points out that Galen also employs the verb with ἀνελείν, as here. It is true that the word is also used in the same sense by Josephus, c. Apion, ii., with ἐγγραφάζεσθαι, but the medical use of the term is so striking in Hippocrates that its use here is noted by J. Weiss, Evangelium des Lukas, p. 1, as a probable reminiscence by the writer, and still more positively so by Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., ii., p. 384 (1899).

Ver. 3ο. επιγνόντες: the preposition may signify here as elsewhere accurate and certain knowledge or information—a favourite word with St. Luke, in the Gospel seven times, in Acts thirteen times; it was also a favourite word with St. Paul, cf., e.g., 1 Cor. xiii. 12, 2 Cor. vi. 9; frequent in LXX, or it may simply mean to find out, to ascertain (Grimm); see Blass in loco on its force in LXX.

5.—οὶ δὲ ἄδελφοι: the expression seems expressly used to imply that the disciples at Jerusalem recognised Saul as a brother. Wendt (τ899) rejects all the narrative in Acts as unhistorical, and compares with Gal. i. 22, but there mention is only made of the "Churches of Judæa," whilst the reference that Paul could scarcely fail to have been known to the members of the Church in Jerusalem seems quite justifiable, Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 86.—κατῆγαγον, i.e., brought him down to the sea coast, ad mare desurreunt, word used only by Luke and Paul; but by St. Luke only as a nautical expression, cf. xxvii. 3, xxviii. 12 (xxii. 3), and Luke v. 11; cf. in classical writers.—de C. as in viii. 40 (not Caesarea Philippi which is always so called); if he found Philip there (xxi. 8), the friend and the accuser of the proto-martyr would meet face to face as brethren (Plumptre).—ἐξαπέστειλαν: the word might mean by sea or by land, but the former is supported amongst recent commentators by Blass, so too Page (cf. Lightfoot on Gal. i. 21, p. 85), Knabenbauer, p. 174. But if so, there is no contradiction with Gal. i. 21, where Paul speaks of coming into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, as if he went to the latter through the former. The expressions in Galatians have sometimes been explained on the supposition that the two countries, Syria and Cilicia, are named there as elsewhere in that order, Acts xv. 23, 41, as a kind of general geographical expression (Felten), the most important country being mentioned first, so Lightfoot, Nosgen, Conybeare and Howson; or that as Paul would remain at Syrian ports on the way to Cilicia, he might fairly speak as he does, or that he went first to Tarsus, and thence made missionary excursions into Syria. If neither of these or similar explanations are satisfactory, we can scarcely conclude with Blass that Gal. i. 21 is accounted for "inverso per incuriam ordine." Ramsay has lately argued with much force that here as elsewhere Paul thinks and speaks of the Roman divisions of the empire (cf. Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., i., p. 124 (1897)), and that here the two great divisions, Syria and Cilicia, of the Roman province are spoken of; and he accordingly reads, with the original text of SS, τα κλίματα της Σ. και Κ., the article used once, and thus embracing the two parts of the one province (sometimes three parts are enumerated, Phœnicia being distinguished from Syria). There is apparently no example of the expression Prov. Syria et Cilicia, but Ramsay points to the analogy of Bithynia-Pontus; see Expositor, p. 29 ff., 1898, and "Cilicia" and "Bithynia" (Ramsay) in Hastings' B.D. Ramsay therefore concludes that Gal. i. 21 simply implies that Paul spent the following period of his life in various parts of the province Syria-Cilicia.—Ταρσόν, see above, ver. 11; on the years of quiet work at Tarsus and in its neighbourhood, see Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 46, 47, and below on xi. 25.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

31. Αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι εἰς Ταρσόν ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν. Ταρσὸς καὶ Σαμαρείας ἠγέρθησαν, οἰκοδομοῦμεναί καὶ πορευόμεναι τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ Αγίου Πνεύματος ἐπληθύνοντο.


2 καὶ Γαλιλαίας, Blass brackets in β because om. by Chrys., Cassiod., perhaps because nothing has been said of the Church in Galilee, but it obviously must have existed there, though never actually mentioned in Acts (see Plumptre's note, in loco), see also below.

Ver. 31.  ἡ ἐκκλησία; if we read the singular ἡ ἐκκλ. with the great MS. the word shows us that the Church, though manifestly assuming a wider range, is still one: Hort, Ecclesia, p. 55, thinks that here the term in the singular corresponds by the three modern representative districts named, viz., Judea, Galilee, Samaria, to the ancient Ecclesia, which had its home in the whole land of Israel; but however this may be, the term is used here markedly of the unified Church, and in accordance with St. Paul's own later usage of the word; see especially Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 126, 127, and also p. 124.—καθ' όλης: the genitive in this sense is peculiar to St. Luke, and always with the adjective όλος; Luke iv. τ. Α, xxiii. 5, Αcts ix. 42, x. 37, the phrase, although not the best classically, seeming to "sound right," because καθόλου, only in Αcts iν. τ. Ν. Τ., had come into common use since Aristotle (Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 148; Vogel, p. 45).—οἱκοδ.: may refer to the inward spiritual growth, ἐπληθ.: to the outward growth in numbers; a growth attributed not to human agency but to the power of the Παράκλητος. παράκλησις only here in Αcts of the Παράκλητος. Hort renders "and walking by the fear of the Lord and by the invocation [παρακ.] of the Holy Spirit [probably invoking His guidance as Paraclete to the Ecclesia] was multiplied" (Ecclesia, p. 55), and it is not strange that the working of the Παράκλητος should be so described; while others connect the word with the divine counsel or exhortation of the prophets in opening hearts and minds; others again attach παράκλησις to ἐπληθύνοντο. Βut if we desire a good illustration of the labyrinth (as Hilgenfeld calls it) through which we have to tread, if we would see our way to any coherent meaning in ix. 31-xii. 25, it is sufficient to note the analysis of the sources of the modern critics given us by Hilgenfeld himself, Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol. pp. 481, 482; 1895.)—οικοδ.: may refer to the inward spiritual growth, ἐπληθ.: to the outward growth in numbers; a growth attributed not to human agency but to the power of the Holy Ghost. παράκλης only here in Acts of the Holy Ghost. Hort renders "and walking by the fear of the Lord and by the invocation [παρακ.] of the Holy Spirit [probably invoking His guidance as Paraclete to the Ecclesia] was multiplied" (Ecclesia, p. 55), and it is not strange that the working of the Παράκλητος should be so described; while others connect the word with the divine counsel or exhortation of the prophets in opening hearts and minds; others again attach παρακλησις to ἐπληθύνοντο. On the verb and its frequency in Acts see p. 73.

Vv. 32-35. Healing of Aeneas.—Ver. 32.

ἐγένετο δὲ Π. Διώρης: on the formula and its frequency in Luke see Friedrich, p. 13, and above on p. 124. We have here a note of what may fairly be
32. **ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ Πέτρον διερχόμενον διά πάντων,** κατελθείν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς κατοικούντας λύδδαν. 33. εὗρε δὲ εἶκει ἀνθρώπον τυχάν ἄνδρα, εἴ ἐτῶν ὁκτώ κατακεφάλεσθαι.

1 *dia pantov,* instead of this Par. and Wern. read "per omnes civitates et regiones," accepted by Blass; no doubt to explain *dia pantov,* which is difficult, see below.

taken as a specimen of many similar missionary journeys, or rather journeys of progress and inspection, mentioned here perhaps more in detail because of the development which followed upon it, cf. with chap. x. New congregations had been formed, and just as Peter and John had gone down to Samaria to the Christians converted by Philip, so it became necessary that the congregations which had grown up in many towns (viii. 14, 25, 40) should be visited and kept in touch with the centre at Jerusalem (see Ramsay, *St. Paul,* pp. 41, 42; Felten and Plumptre, *in loco*).—*διερχ. dia pantov,* see note on xiii. 6, and for the construction Luke ix. 6, xi. 24.—*κατελθείν,* i.e., probably from Jerusalem, cf. viii. 5. Luke iv. 31 *devenire,* cf. Plummer’s note on Luke iv. 31. On the frequent use of *διέρχομαι* and *κατέρχομαι* in Luke, see Friedrich, p. 7.—*διά πάντων,* so Meyer-Wendt, Weiss, Alford, Hackett, De Wette, Holtzmann: cf. for similar construction 2 Cor. i. τέλος, and cf. Acts xx. 25, Rom. xi. 28, or it may mean "through all parts," R.V., so Belser, *Beiträge,* p. 58 (see critical notes). Hort seems to take it of the whole land (*Ecclesia,* p. 56).—*αγίους,* see on ver. 13. —*Lūddān,* Hebrew יְלַדָּא, Lod, perpetuated in the modern Ludd; on the word see critical notes, cf. 1 Chron. viii. 2, Ezra ii. 23, Neh. vii. 37, xi. 35; Macc. xi. 34; "a village not less than a city" Jos., Ant., xx., 6, 2; three hours from Joppa in the plain of Sharon; its frontier position often involved it in battle, and rendered it a subject of treaty between Jews and Syrians, and Jews and Romans. At this period not only Jerusalem but Joppa and Lydda were centres of Jewish national feeling, and were singled out by Cestius Gallus as the centres of the national revolt. On its importance as a place of refuge and a seat of learning after the destruction of Jerusalem, see Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums,* i., 5, p. 721; Edersheim, *History of the Jewish People,* pp. 155, 215, 479, 512, and also *Jewish Social Life,* pp. 75-78; G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land,* pp. 141, 160 (and his interesting remarks on the connection of St. George of England with Lydda); Schurer, *Jewish People,* div. ii., vol. i., p. 159, E.T. As the place lay on the route from Azotus to Cæsarea the planting or at any rate the strengthening of its Christianity may be referred to Philip the Evangelist, viii. 40. But on the other hand the close proximity to Jerusalem, within an easy day’s journey, may induce us to believe that Lydda had its congregation of "saints" almost from the first, Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life,* p. 75. On the curious Talmudical notices with reference to our Lord and the Virgin Mother, e.g., that He was condemned at Lydda, see Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life,* p. 76. Such passages perhaps indicate a close connection between Lydda and the founding of Christianity.

Ver. 33. **Ἀινέαν,** the name in this form is found in Thuc., Xen., Pindar, and is not to be identified with that of the Trojan *Ἀινέας,* although in a fragment of Sophocles we have for the sake of the verse *Ἀινεία* instead of *Ἀινέα;* see Wendt, seventh edition, and Wetstein, *in loco.* The name is also used of a Jew, Jos., Ant., xiv., 10, 22. Probably a Hellenistic Jew; but although he is not expressly named a disciple (as in the case of Tabitha), yet as Peter visited him, and he knew the name of Jesus Christ, he may have become a Christian (so Blass); the fact that Peter went to the "saints" may imply this; but see Alford’s note, and so too Hilgenfeld.—*εξ ετῶν οκτώ:* characteristic of Luke as a medical man; in the cases of disease which he alone mentions, St. Luke frequently gives their duration, e.g., xiii. 11, Acts iii. 2, iv. 22, xiv. 8, see Hobart, p. 40, Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T. II,* p. 427.—*κραββάτω,* see above on v. 15, and spelling.—*παραλελυμένος,* see above on viii. 7, and cf. also Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.,* ii., p. 436 (1899).

Ver. 34. *Iaithai se I.*: perhaps a *paronomasia,* iv. 30 (see Page, *in loco*); present tense, indicating that the healing was immediately effected, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses,* p. 9; Blass, *Gram.,* p. 183; verb much more frequent in St. Luke than in the other N.T. writers; in Gospel eleven times, in Acts three times,
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καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος, ἀλήθεια, ἵνα ἐπιστρέφῃς ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον.

καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη. 35. καὶ εἶδον αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικούντες Λυδδαν καὶ τὸν Σάρωναν, οἵτινες ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπι τὸν Κύριον.

36. Ἐν Ἰακώββῃ δὲ τῷ μαθητρὶ Ραββί, ὁ διερμηνευόμενος ἔλεγεν Δορκᾶς, αὐτὴ ἦν πλήρης ἀγαθῶν καὶ ελπισμῶν

1 Λυδδαν: but in ΝAB, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Λυδδα; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93, Blass, Gram., pp. 25, 31 (so for ver. 25). Σαρωνα ΝABCE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg., but with varying accent; Blass, Gram., p. 31. Σ has Σαρωνα.

2 Ταβιθα; but BC Ταβειθα, so W.H., Weiss, but in W.H., alt., see App., p. 162.

and one quotation; in St. Matthew three times, and same quotation; in St. John twice, and same quotation; in St. Mark only once; in Epistles three times, but perhaps only figuratively; so in Deut. xxx. 3, of the diseases of the soul. The term is used by St. Luke in a passage where a similar statement is made by St. Matthew and St. Mark, in which they employ another verb, less precise, σῴζειν, διασώζειν, and not so strictly medical, cf. Matt. xiv. 36, Mark vi. 56, Luke vi. 19, Hobart, p. 9. ιάσις: the cognate noun, only in St. Luke, Luke xiii. 32, Acts iv. 32, and see further also Hobart, pp. 23, 24. Both noun and verb are also frequent in LXX, and cf. Plummer on Luke v. 19, who points out that ιάσθαι in its active significance is peculiar to St. Luke, except in the quotations from LXX (Matt. xiii. 15, John xii. 40, both figurative), and in John iv. 47.—στρώσον σεαυτῷ, cf. xxii. 12, where, as here, the context must be supplied. The aorist denotes performance without delay—now and at once make thy bed for thyself—an act which hitherto others have done for thee.—καὶ εὐθ. ανέστη corresponds to ἀνάστηθι and indicates the completeness of the healing.

Ver. 35. τὸν Σάρωναν, on accentuation see critical notes: "at Lydda and in Sharon," R.V. In Sharon, because it was not a town as Lydda, but rather a level tract, the maritime plain between Carmel and Joppa, so called in Hebrew (with article), meaning "the Level"; in Greek, the Forest, δρυμός, LXX, because it was once covered by a great oak forest; full of quiet but rich beauty; cf. I Chron. xxvii. 29, Isa. xxxiii. 9, xxxv. 2, xxvii. 24, lv. 10, celebrated for its pasturage, Cant. ii. 1. "The masculine article doth show that it is not named of a city, and so doth the LXX article in Isa. 33, 9." J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. There is no ground for supposing that it meant a village in the neighbourhood, as no place bearing the name Saron can be satisfactorily cited, but cf. Nösgen, in loco; see G. A. Smith, Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land, pp. 52, 147, 148; Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 74; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 6, p. 897.—πάντες: the expression may be taken to mean that a general conversion of the inhabitants followed. Rendall renders "and all that dwelt, etc., who had turned to the Lord, saw Him," i.e., attested the reality of the miracle, Acts, pp. 72 and 232. But it might fairly be urged that many would see the man besides those who had become Christians. It helps us to understand the passage if we remember with Nösgen (so Bengel) that the expression οίτινες τον Κ. applies not to God the Father, but to Jesus Christ, so that we learn that a conversion of the Jewish population at Lydda to the claims of Jesus as the Messiah was the result of the miracle (see also Hackett's useful note). On the use of οίτινες see Alford's note on vii. 53, quoted by Page (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 273.). For the phrase επί τὸν Κ. cf. xiv. 15.

Vv. 36-43. Tabitha raised from the dead.—Ver. 36. Ἰακώββῃ, on the spelling, see critical notes. "at Lydda and in Sharon," R.V. In Sharon, because it was not a town as Lydda, but rather a level tract, the maritime plain between Carmel and Joppa, so called in Hebrew (with article), meaning "the Level"; in Greek, the Forest, δρυμός, LXX, because it was once covered by a great oak forest; full of quiet but rich beauty; cf. I Chron. xxvii. 29, Isa. xxxiii. 9, xxxv. 2, xxvii. 24, lv. 10, celebrated for its pasturage, Cant. ii. 1. "The masculine article doth show that it is not named of a city, and so doth the LXX article in Isa. 33, 9." J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. There is no ground for supposing that it meant a village in the neighbourhood, as no place bearing the name Saron can be satisfactorily cited, but cf. Nösgen, in loco; see G. A. Smith, Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land, pp. 52, 147, 148; Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 74; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 6, p. 897.—πάντες: the expression may be taken to mean that a general conversion of the inhabitants followed. Rendall renders "and all that dwelt, etc., who had turned to the Lord, saw Him," i.e., attested the reality of the miracle, Acts, pp. 72 and 232. But it might fairly be urged that many would see the man besides those who had become Christians. It helps us to understand the passage if we remember with Nösgen (so Bengel) that the expression οίτινες τον Κ. applies not to God the Father, but to Jesus Christ, so that we learn that a conversion of the Jewish population at Lydda to the claims of Jesus as the Messiah was the result of the miracle (see also Hackett's useful note). On the use of οίτινες see Alford's note on vii. 53, quoted by Page (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 273.). For the phrase επί τὸν Κ. cf. xiv. 15.

Vv. 36-43. Tabitha raised from the dead.—Ver. 36. Ἰακώββῃ, on the spelling, see critical notes. "at Lydda and in Sharon," R.V. In Sharon, because it was not a town as Lydda, but rather a level tract, the maritime plain between Carmel and Joppa, so called in Hebrew (with article), meaning "the Level"; in Greek, the Forest, δρυμός, LXX, because it was once covered by a great oak forest; full of quiet but rich beauty; cf. I Chron. xxvii. 29, Isa. xxxiii. 9, xxxv. 2, xxvii. 24, lv. 10, celebrated for its pasturage, Cant. ii. 1. "The masculine article doth show that it is not named of a city, and so doth the LXX article in Isa. 33, 9." J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. There is no ground for supposing that it meant a village in the neighbourhood, as no place bearing the name Saron can be satisfactorily cited, but cf. Nösgen, in loco; see G. A. Smith, Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land, pp. 52, 147, 148; Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 74; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 6, p. 897.—πάντες: the expression may be taken to mean that a general conversion of the inhabitants followed. Rendall renders "and all that dwelt, etc., who had turned to the Lord, saw Him," i.e., attested the reality of the miracle, Acts, pp. 72 and 232. But it might fairly be urged that many would see the man besides those who had become Christians. It helps us to understand the passage if we remember with Nösgen (so Bengel) that the expression οίτινες τον Κ. applies not to God the Father, but to Jesus Christ, so that we learn that a conversion of the Jewish population at Lydda to the claims of Jesus as the Messiah was the result of the miracle (see also Hackett's useful note). On the use of οίτινες see Alford's note on vii. 53, quoted by Page (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 273.). For the phrase επί τὸν Κ. cf. xiv. 15.
34–39. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

37. εγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἑκείναις αὐθενθήσας
αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν· λούσαντες δὲ αὐτὴν ἐθηκαν ἐν ὑπερώῳ. 38. εἴσηκ
δὲ οὖσας Λυδῆς 1 τῇ ἱστηῇ, οἱ μαθηταὶ ἀκούοντες διὶ Πέτρος ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῇ, ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἀνδρας πρὸς αὐτόν, παρακαλοῦντες μὴ
dιελθείν ἐσω αὐτῶν. 39. ἀναστὰς δὲ Πέτρος συνήλθεν αὐτοῖς· ἐν παραγεγυμνῷ ἄργγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερώον, καὶ παρεστῆσαι αὐτῷ πάσιν ἀι χήραι κλαίουσαι καὶ ἐπιδεικτοῖσαι χιτώνας καὶ

1 Λυδῆς; but Tisch., Blass, W.H. -cc, see on ver. 35, and W.H., App., p. 163.

the Orientals for its elegance, Cant. ii. 9.—so called from the large bright
eyes of the animal (ἐφεκτα). The name was found as a feminine name amongst both Greek and Jews, see instances in Wetstein (e.g., Jos. B. T., iv., 3, 5), Plumptre, Wendt, seventh edition, sub v., and more recently Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudiuen, p. 17. This Greek equivalent (found several times in LXX) may not have been actually borne by Tabitha as a name, for St. Luke may only mean to interpret the Aramaic word for his Gentile readers: but she may have been known by both names. Like ΑΕneas, she may have been an Hellenist. There is nothing to indicate that she should be called a deaconess, nor can we tell from the narrative what was the state of this true Sister of Charity, whether she was a widow, whether married or unmarried (Weiss); see further, "Dorcas," Hastings' B.D., and Eder.


... ἐνὑπερώῳ: burial did not take place until the danger of an apparent death was considered past; in uncertain cases a delay as above might be allowed, or for other special reasons, and children were forbidden to hasten the burial of their parents, Hamburger, u. s., p. 161; and further for burial and mourning customs, Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 168, and History of the Jewish Nation, p. 311. —ἐθηκαν: the body was usually laid in an upper chamber when burial was delayed; see Hackett's note and also on ver. 39, and Alford on the article.

Ver. 38. Aυδῆς, on the form see above on ver. 35; nine miles from Joppa.—παρακαλοῦντες; the only passage in which the oratio νεατα follows if we read μὴ οκν., see critical notes: this also Ρ.V. μὴ οκν... "hides non tollit civilitatem verborum," Bengel. Verb only here in N.T., εf. ΛΧΧ, Num. xxii.16, of Βαλακ to Βαλαμ, a phrase almost identically similar.—διελθεῖν, cf. Luke ii.15, and ver. 32 above, and below xi. 15. Like other compounds of ἔρχομαι very frequent in Luke, as compared with other writers (Friedrich, p. 7).—ἐς αὐτῶν: use of ἐς locally, common in St. Luke (Friedrich, p. 20); ἐς with genitive of the person as here, cf. Luke iv. 42, 1 Mac. iii. 26; not so used in classical writers (Plummer).

Ver. 39. It is not said that they sent for St. Peter to work a miracle, but his near presence at Lydda would naturally make them turn to him in a time of sorrow.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ιμάτα ἐση ἐποίει μετ’ αὐτῶν οὖσα ἡ Δορκᾶς. 40. ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἐξε ἐκπάντας ὁ Πέτρος, θείς τὰ γόνατα προσκύνατο καὶ ἐπιστρέφας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα, εἶπε, Ταβίθα, ἀνάστηθι. ἦ δὲ ἴμισε τοῖς φρατιλώμασιν

1 After ἰμάτια Par., Ps.-Aug. add διηγούντο αὐτῷ, accepted by Blass. Belser supports, pp. 58, 59, as being clearer, and showing that the widows not only pointed to the garments with them in proof of the charity of Dorcas, but also showed how much good work she had done besides.

2 After ἀνάστηθι Syr. Harcl., Sah., Gg., Par., Cypr., Ps.-Aug., Cassiod. add “in nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi”. Cypr. and Cassiod. omit “domini nostri”. Blass accepts this latter form, Hilg. the former. Belser, u. a., thinks that the words might easily be omitted on revision by an author who was not afraid of any obscurity arising after ver. 34.

—παραγενόμενον: a characteristic Lucan expression (Weiss), see above v. 21.—

τὸ ὑπερ.: here the article would naturally be used on referring to the chamber, cf. ver. 37, in which the body lay.—ὁι εἰμαί: they may have been the poor of the Church, vi. 1, whom Dorcas had befriended, or those who had been associated with her in good works (see also Plumptre’s suggestive note). In connection with St. Luke’s marked sympathy with women, we may note that the word εἰμαί is used by him no less than nine times in his Gospel, three in Acts.—

κλαίοντας, cf. Luke vii. 13, viii. 52, Hamburger, u. s. (ver. 37).—ἐνεπιθεῖκα: only here in middle voice, perhaps as pointing to the garments which they were themselves wearing (so Blass, Wendt, Felten, Grimm-Thayer), which Dorcas had given them.—χιτώνας: “coats,” close-fitting undergarments; the word was used in classical Greek of men and women, more perhaps like a dressing-gown or cassock; “Coat,” “Dress,” Hastings’ B.D.—ἰμάτια, the long flowing outer robes.—δῶσα: “all which,” i.e., so many (Blass, Page, Hackett, Knabenbauer); see reading in B (Blass), critical notes.—ἐπιθεῖκα: imperfect as denoting her customary mode of action.

Ver. 40. ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἐξε πάντας: nothing could be more natural than this action of St. Peter as a reminiscence of his Master’s action, when He was about to perform a similar miracle, cf. Matt. ix. 25, Mark v. 40 (cf. 2 Kings iv. 33, and vv. 4, 5 in same chapter), but in Luke viii. 54 it is noteworthy that the similar words are omitted by W.H. and the revisers, see above. In St. Matthew the multitude ὁ δ θλος is put out, but in St. Mark (and St. Luke), whilst all are described as put out (the same verb), Peter, James and John, with the parents, are allowed to be present at the miracle. Weiss points out the reminiscence of Mark v. 40, but this we might expect if St. Mark’s Gospel comes to us through St. Peter. St. Chrysostom marks the action of St. Peter as showing how entirely free he was from any attempt at display.—ὅς τὰ γόνατα, see note on vii. 60, “hoc Dominus ipse non fecerat” Blass. St. Peter had been present on each of the three occasions recorded in the Gospels when his Master had raised the dead, but he does not venture at once to speak the word of power, but like Elijah or Elisha kneels down in prayer (see Rendall’s note).—

Τ. ἀνάστηθι, cf. Mark ν. 4. Here again we note the close agreement with St. Mark’s narrative—the words to the damsel are not given at all by St. Matthew ix. 25, and by St. Luke in Greek, viii. 54, not in Aramaic as by Mark. On the absurdity of identifying the Ταβίθα here with the Ταλιθά of Mark ν. 41 see Nösgen and Zöckler, in loco. It may suffice to note with Lumby that in each case an interpretation of the word used is given.—ἐνεκάθισε: not found in LXX, and used only by St. Luke in this passage and in his Gospel, vii. 15 (but B has ἐκάθισεν, which W.H. reads only in margin), in both cases of a person restored to life and sitting up. In this intransitive sense it is almost entirely confined to medical writers, to describe patients sitting up in bed. It occurs in Plato, Phædo, 60 B, but in the middle voice, and with the words ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ expressed: in Xen., Cyr., v., 7, it is also used, but in a different sense (to sit down again), cf. Hobart, pp. 11, 40, 41, who also notices that the circumstantial details of the gradual recovery of Tabitha are quite in the style of medical description. τὸ σῶμα, Luke xvii. 37, the word is quite
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αὐτῆς καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον, ἀνακάθισε. 41. δοῦς δὲ αὐτῇ χείρα, ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν ἵνα τοὺς ἄγιους καὶ τὰς χήρας, παρέστησεν αὐτὴν ἱζον. 42. γνωστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ιοππῆς, ἵνα τὸν Κύριον ἐπιστεύσασθαι, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπιστεύσαν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον. 43. γνωστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ιοππῆς, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν επί τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ἐστήσαν τὸν Κύριον ἐν Ἰοππῇ παρὰ τινὶ Σίμωνι βυρσεῖ.

1 τῆς Ιοππῆς, on spelling see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56. Art. om. by W. H. after BC, but retained here by Weiss.

2 αὐτον om. N1 B, so Tisch., W. H. (Weiss); and there are various other readings but none possessing such strong support.

classical for a dead body, so too in LXX, cf. Deut. xxi. 23, 1 Kings xiii. 24, 1 Macc. xi. 4, 2 Macc. ix. 29. Everything, as Wendt admits (1888), points to the fact that no apparent death, or a raising by natural means, is thought of by the narrator. Holtzmann and Pfeiderer can only find a parallel here with xx. 9-12, but none can read the two narratives without seeing their independence, except in the main fact that both narrate a similar miracle.—ηποττε τοὺς ὄφθ.: to this there is nothing corresponding in the details given by the Gospel narratives, as Blass points out.

Ver. 44. δοὺς δὲ αὐτῇ χ.: here for help to her to rise, after she had been restored to life, but in the Gospels Christ takes the damsel by the hand before she is restored, Mark v. 41, Luke viii. 54. Thus, while retaining a close resemblance, as we might surely expect, to our Lord's action in St. Mark's narrative, there is yet sufficient independence of detail to show that one description is not a slavish imitation of the other.—τὰς χήρας: Rendall sees in the words reference to an organisod body, v. Tim. v. 11-16, engaged in the service of the Church, but the context only points to the widows who had been previously mentioned, species post genus, as in ver. 36 (Blass).

Ver. 45. καθ' ὅλης, see above on ver. 31. Plummer, St. Luke, p. 45, on the use of καθ' ὅλης. The phrase also marks (as often in Luke) a transition to the following narrative (Nössen).—ἡμέρας ἱζον, see on viii. 11, and xxvii. 7. Kennedy speaks of the adjective as used in the vernacular sense of "long," "many," Aristoph., Παξ., 354. —βυρσεῖ, in classics βυρσοδέψα: it is difficult to suppose that the common estimate of the work of a tanner amongst the Jews as unclean, on account of their constant contact with dead animals, has here no significance. At least the mention of the trade seems to show that St. Peter was already in a state of mind which would fit him for the further revelation of the next chapter, and for the instructions to go and baptize the Gentile Cornelius. On the detestation in which this trade was held by the Jews, see Wetstein, in loco; Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 158; cf. Mishna, Khethuboth, vii., 10. It does not in any way militate against the historical character of the narrative, as Overbeck maintains, to admit that the description is meant to introduce the "universalism" of the following incident. Both Chrysostom and Theophylact (so too Erasmus) dwell upon this incident in St. Peter's life as illustrating his unassuming conduct.—Ἰοππῆ, see on ver. 36. Heb. יַפוּ, "beauty," Jaffa; see for references Josh. xix. 46, 2 Chron. ii. 16, Jonah i. 3, Ezra iii. 7; the port of Jerusalem from the days of Solomon (from which it was distant some thirty-five miles), situated on a hill so high that people affirmed, as Strabo mentions, that the capital was visible from its summit. It was comparatively (Schurer) the best harbour on the coast of Palestine, although Josephus, B. J., iii., 9, correctly describes it as dangerous), and in this lay its chief importance. The Maccabees were well aware of this, and it is of Simon that the historian writes: "With all his glory he took Joppa for an haven, and made an entrance to the isles of the sea." 1 Macc. xiv. 5 (about 144 B.C.). The Judaising of the city was the natural result of the Maccabean occupation, although the Syrians twice retook Joppa, and twice Hyrcanus regained it for the Jews. Taken by Pompey B.C. 63, restored to the Jews by Caesar 47, Jos., Ant., xiv., 4, 4; B. J., i., 7, 7; and Ant., xiv., 10, 6, and at length added to the kingdom of Herod the Great, Ant., xv., 7, 3; B. J., i., 20, 3, Joppa remained Jewish, imbued with all the fanatic patriotism of the mother-city, and in


Ver. 2. ἑκατοντάρχης: form general in N.T., and so in later Greek, although χιλιάρχος is always retained in N.T., and ἑκατοντάρχης is also found, Matt. viii. 5, 8 (W. H.), Luke vii. 2, Acts xxii. 25 (W. H.); so παιρόγραφη, πολιτάρχης, ἱδράρχης, see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 82, and note on forms employed in Josephus and LXX; W. H., Appendix, p. 163; Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 28, 68, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, for various authorities.—ἐκ σπείρης τῆς: the word σπέρνη here = cohors, although used in the N.T. in a more general way as of the band which arrested Jesus, and so also of Jewish troops in Josephus; in N.T. it is found only once, and then with the adjective good, cf. Josephus; in LXX it is found four times in Isaiah, three as a equivalent of πνεύμα, ἐκκλ., xxvi. 7 (2), righteous, upright, *cf. also* Prov. xii. 12, once as an equivalent of πιστεῖς, liberal, generous, *see on viii. 2 above; frequent in Ecclus. and Macc., *see also* Trench, *N.T. Synonyms*, i., p. 196. Taken by itself the word might denote goodness such as might characterise a Gentile, *cf. xvii. 23*, and its classical use (like the Latin pietas); but construed with ψ. τὸν Θεόν it certainly seems to indicate that Cornelius was "a God-fearing proselyte" (not to
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πολλάς τῷ ἐβ. καὶ δεόμενος τῷ Θεῷ διὰ παντός. 3. εἰδεν ἐν ὕθειάν ἐνατην τῆς ζωῆς, ἀνγέλου τῷ Θεῷ.

I-3. 25 ΙΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ πολλάς τω λαώ, και δεόμενος του Θεου δια παντός. 3. ειδενεν οράματι φανερώς, ὥσει οραματιφαν. om. by Iren.; Blass brackets, and see Pref. to β text, p. xviii.

εν αντικ. Φει. om. by Iren.; Blass brackets, and see Pref. to β text, p. xviii.

ςΑΒCΕ, many min., Syr. (Ρ. and Η.), Boh., Iran., Dam., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; Blass omits in Β; evidence for the addition seems conclusive, and περι may have dropped out as superfluous after ωσει. 

ενατην; δςΑΒCΕΡ have ενατην, and Schmiedel, p. 55.

be identified it would seem with "proselytes of the gate," although the confusion is common (Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 316 E.T.). In Acts this class of proselyte is always so described (or σεβόμενοι τον Θ.) "they that fear God," i.e., the God of the Jews, cf. x. 22, 35, xii. 16, 26, etc. All the incidents of the story seem to point to the fact that Cornelius had come into relations with the synagogue, and had learned the name and the fear of the God of Israel, cf. x. 2, 22, 25, without accepting circumcision, see especially Ramsay, Expositor, p. 200 (1896), where he corrects his former remarks in St. Paul, p. 43; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopædie des judenums, "Fremder," i., 3, p. 382; Hort, Ecclesia, p. 58; O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitschichtete, pp. 184, 185; Weizsäcker, Apostolic Age, i., 103 E.T.; McGriflet, Apostolic Age, p. 101, note, and for a further explanation of the distinction between the σεβόμενοι and the "proselytes of the gate" cf. Muirhead Times of Christ (T. & T. Clark), pp. 105, 106.

συν παντὶ τω οίκω αυτού: the centurions of the N.T. are always favourably represented, cf. Matt. viii. 5. Luke vii. 9. xxiii. 47. Acts xxvii. 3. olos here includes not only the family but the whole household, cf. vii. 10. xi. 14. xvi. 31. xviii. 8. etc.; Luke i. 27. x. 5. xix. 9. thus the soldier "who waited on him continually" is also called εὐσεβής olos (cf. τὸς ὁκ. ὁκ. ὁκ. ὁκ.), favourite word with St. Luke in the sense of "family" (Lekebusch, Friedrich) as compared with the other Evangelists, but often found in St. Paul (cf. Hebrews), so also LXX, Gen. vii. i. xvi. 12. St. Peter uses the word so in xi. 14. and in i Peter ii. 18. we have оκλητην. St. Chrysostom well says: "Let us take heed as many of us as neglect those of our own house" (Hom., xxii.). Cf. too Calvin, in loco...

τοίνυπ θερ. τῷ θαρ., see note on ix. 36; the word occurs frequently in Ecclus. and Tobit, and its occurrence here and elsewhere in Acts illustrates the Jewish use of the term; but although it is true to say that it does not occur in Acts in any Christian precept, St. Paul applies the word to the collection made from the Christian Churches for his nation at Jerusalem, xxiv. 17, a collection to which he attached so much importance as the true outcome of Christian love and brotherhood, see Le. How highly almsgiving was estimated amongst the Jews we may see from the passages referred to in Hastings' B.D. and B.D. 2; Uhlhorn's Christian Charity in the Ancient Church, p. 52 ff. E.T.; but it should be remembered that both in Ecclus. and Tobit there are passages in which both almsgiving and fasting are also closely connected with prayer, Ecclus. vii. 10. Tob. xii. 8. τῷ λ., i.e., Israel, as always in Luke, see above on iv. 25. Both this and his continuous prayer to God, ver. 36. characterise him as half a Jew (Weiss).—διὰ ταρτάρων: Luke xxiv. 53, and three times in Acts (once in a quotation, ii. 25), but only used once in Matthew and Mark, and not at all by St. John; on St. Luke's predilection for τάς and its compounds see Friedrich, pp. 5, 6.

The description of the centurion no doubt reminds us of the description of another centurion in Luke vii. 5 (so Weiss), but we are not obliged to conclude that the centurion here is merely pictured after the prototype there, but the likeness may possibly point to the same source for both narratives, as in some respects the language in the two cases is verbally alike, see Feine.—σεβόμενος: "precēs et liberalitas commendantur hic; accedet jejunium, ver. 30"; so Bengal, and he adds, "Benefici faciant, quod Deus vult: precipent idem quod volunt, Deus facit".

Ver. 3. εἰδεν: there is no ground for explaining away the force of the words by assuming that Cornelius had formerly a longing to see Peter. —φανερ.: Vulgate. The words plainly are meant to exclude any illusion of the senses, not in a trance as in ver. 10. cf. xxii. 17; only here in Luke's writings, cf. 2 Macc. iii. 28.—οῖς
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εἰσελθόντα πρὸς αὐτῶν, 4. καὶ εἰπόντα αὐτῷ, Κορνήλιε. ὁ δὲ ἄτενίσας
αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμφοβος γενόμενος εἶπε, Τί ἐστι, Κύριε; εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ, Αἱ
προσευχαίσου καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἀνέβησαν εἰς μνήμωνον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 5. καὶ νῦν πέμψον εἰς ἱόπην ἄνδρα, και μετὰ πέμψαι Σίμωνα ὁ δὲ ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος ὁ οὗτος εξειτεται παρὰ τίνι Σίμωνι βυρσεί, ὃς ἐστιν οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν ὁ οὗτος λαλήσει σοι τί σε δειποιείν. 7. ὡς δὲ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ λαλῶν τῷ Κορνηλίῳ, φωνήσας δύο τῶν ὁτικῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ στρατιώτην εὐσεβῆ

1 After Σιμωνα add τινα W., H., R.V., Blass, Weiss.

2 οὗτος λαλητεί . . . δε οἱ ποιεῖν, whole clause om. \[ABCELP 13, 61, Vulg. (am. fu. tol.), Syr., P. and H., etc., so W., H., R.V., Hilg., retained by Blass in \( \beta \) on the authority of Vulg\( \text{cl., Par.}^{3} \), and a few min., evidently case of insertion, cf. ix. 6, xi. 14. (περὶ): the ὦν, as Blass points out, intimates the same as περὶ—the dative which is sometimes confused with the accusative in the sense of duration of time, see Blass on ver. 30, and viii. 11 (for the accusative see John iv. 52, Rev. iii. 3), and Gram., p. 93. Cornelius observed without doubt the Jewish hours of prayer, and the vision is represented as following upon, or whilst he was engaged in, prayer, and in answer to it.

Ver. 4. Κορνήλίς, cf. ix. 10 (1 Sam. iii.). Of Cornelius the words of the Evangelical Prophet were true, xlii. 1, “Fear not, for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine”.—ἐτένισας, see above on i. το. —ἐμφοβος: four times in St. Luke, twice in Gospel, twice in Acts, and always with second aorist participle of γίγνομαι as here, only once elsewhere in N.T., Rev. xi. 13 (with ἐγένοντο): cf. Ecclus. xix. 24 (21), of the fear of God; and in 1 Macc. xiii. 2 both ἐπρομεσος and ἐμφοβος are apparently found together, cf. Acts vii. 32 and xvi. 29, but in classical Greek the word is used properly actively, formidolos.—τί εστι, Κύριε, the words, similar to those used by Paul at his conversion, reveal the humility and the attentive attitude and readiness of Cornelius.—ἐλ προφ., cf. ii. 22, with article: of regular prayers.

Ver. 5. μετάπεμψαι: middle, his messengers were to perform his wishes; only in Acts in N.T., where it occurs nine times, but found twice in LXX and in Maccabees; so too mostly in the middle in classical writers, although the active is also found in same sense.—Σιμωνα (viva), see critical notes; as unknown to Cornelius, marked out by his surname as the one of the many who were called Simon.

Ver. 6. ἐνείτεται, see ver. 33.—παρὰ θάλασσαν: perhaps to secure water for the purpose of his trade, perhaps because it seems that a tanner was not allowed to carry on his business unless outside the walls of a town, see on ix. 43, at a distance of fifty cubits, see Wendt, in loco; Hackett, p. 135.

Ver. 7. οἰκετῶν: one related to the οἶκος, a milder and a narrower term than δοῦλος, which would simply de-
4-Ι. Ι. και εξηγησάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀνάντα, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν. 9. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ὅδοιπορώντων ἑκείνων καὶ τῇ πόλει ἐγγύστων, ἀνέβη Πέτρος ἐπὶ τὸ δώμα προσεύχωντα, περὶ ὅραν ἑκτένος. 10. Εξηγήσατο δὲ πρόστεινοι, καὶ ἠδειλε γεύσασθαι. 11. καὶ θεωρεί τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφευρόμενον καὶ καταβαίνον ἐπ' αὐτόν ἡ ἐκάπων τῶν οἰκετῶν καὶ δούλων, καὶ καταβαίνον ἐπ' αὐτόν ἡ ἐκάπων τῆς γῆς, οἱκείοι του Θεού καὶ συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων, εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν προσκαρτεροῦντων αὐτῶν, καὶ εξηγήσαμεν αὐτοῖς ἀπάντα, καὶ ἠδειλε γεύσασθαι. 12. καὶ ἠθέλη γεύσασθαι παρασκευαζόντων αὐτῶν, ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτόν ἡ ἐκάπων τῶν οἰκετῶν καὶ δούλων, καὶ καταβαίνον ἐπ' αὐτόν ἡ ἐκάπων τῆς γῆς. 13. καὶ θεωρεί τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφευρόμενον, καὶ καταβαίνον ἐπ' αὐτόν ἡ ἐκάπων τῶν οἰκετῶν καὶ δούλων. 14. A good reference is given by Wendt, as against Meyer. ἸΙ. 2. το. εγένετο δὲ πρόσπεινος: only here, not found in LXX or classical Greek, probably intensive force in πρός, see Grimm; but see on the other hand Blass, in loco. Κυνουελ supposes that they acted as house-sentries, but there is no need to limit the service to that. cf. viii. 13, and LXX, Susannah, ver. 6.
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καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 12. ἐν ὧτῇ ὑπήρχε πάντα τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἐρπετὰ καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 13. καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν, Ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, ὅπως καὶ φάγε. 14. δὲ Πέτρος εἶπε, Μηδαμώς, Κύριε· τί οὐδέποτε ἐφαγόν πᾶν κοίνον ἢ ἀκάθαρτον. 15. καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν, "Αλλὰ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σὺ μὴ κοίνον. 16. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρίς καὶ πάλιν ἀνελήφθη τὸ σκεῦος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν.

1 According to ΝΑΒ 61 the words τα θηρια and the articles before ἐρπετα and πετεινα are to be omitted, and τῆς γῆς to be inserted after ἐρπετα according to ΝΑΒΕ, etc.; see R.V., W.H., Wendt, Weiss.

2 For ἀναστάς Π.: Aug. has Πέτρε παν δ en τη σκευε βλέπετε, see β text (Blass).

3 For μηδαμώς... ἀκαθάρτον Aug. has Κύριε κοίνον καὶ ἀκαθάρτον οὐρακαθαρμαι (see β).

4 For ά ο Θ... κοίνου Aug. has εγὼ ἡγιάσα ἀκαθάρτον μη λεγε (see β). These three readings are preferred by Belser, p. 59, as clearer, and more characteristic in Peter's answer. εκ δευτερου om. Gig., Aug., Apost., Const. Blass brackets, and cf. xi. 9.

5 παλιν, cf. xi. 10: but ευθυς is supported by ΝΑΒΕ 61, Vulg., Boh., Syr. Harcl. mg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. In Blass omits, for which there is some authority, but evidence for ευθυς strongest; Hilg. reads παλιν.

in LXX, Exod. xxxvi. 24 (xxxix. 17), οθόνη not at all in LXX, but both words are found in classical writers in senses approaching their meaning here; but here as elsewhere in St. Luke it is the combination which arrests attention, for ἀρχαί and ἀρχαί are found again and again in medical language with ὀθόνη or ὀθόνων.—τέσσαρον ἀρχαί: "by four corners," R.V. No article; there might have been many ends or corners. It is doubtful how far we can therefore press the imagery as referring to the four regions of the world, or that men would come from the north, south, etc., to share the kingdom.

Ver. 12. τετράποδα κ.τ.λ.: fish are not mentioned, perhaps because the vessel was not represented as containing water (so Blass, Weiss, Wendt), although fish also were divided into clean and unclean, Lev. xi. 9, Deut. xiv. 9.

Ver. 13. ἀναστάς, see above on v. 17: he may have been, as St. Chrysostom says, on his knees.—θύσον: the beasts are represented as living—not here in a sacrificial sense, cf. Luke xv. 23.

Ver. 14. Μηδαμώς: abscit (LXX for ᾧτῃ), 1 Sam. xx. 2, xxii. 15 (Weiss).—Κύριε: Weiss refers to i. 24, and takes it as meaning Jehovah, but others refer the expression here to Christ; the next verse shows us that there was still the same element of self-will in the Apostolic which had misled the Peter of the Gospels.—οὐδέποτε... πάν: the words of strong negation, characteristic of the vehement and impulsive Peter—Hebraistic, cf. Exod. xx. 10, Judg. xiii. 4, and in N.T., Matt. xxiv. 22, Luke i. 37, Rom. iii. 12, 1 Cor. i. 29; Simcox, Language of the N. T., pp. 72, 73, and Blass, Gram., p. 174.—κοίνον = βέβηλος; Ι Μacc. i. 62, opposed to άγιος, Lev. χ. το, cf. Ezek. xxii. 26, often used in N.T. for unclean, cf. Mark vii. 2.—ἀκάθαρτος, Lev. xx. 25, of clean and unclean animals; κοίνος in I Macc. above is used, as ver. 63 shows, for defilement from meats.

Ver. 15. The last word of ver. 14 carries us back to the thought of the teaching of his Master, which St. Peter had evidently not yet realised, cf. Mark vii. 19. Mark alone draws the inference, "this He said, making all meats clean," which, compared with this verse, makes another link of interest between St. Mark and St. Peter.—ἐκ δευτ. οὐτ... ἐπὶ τρίς (only here and in xi. 10, in classics εἰς τρίς), to emphasise the command, cf. Gen. xlii. 32, "ad confirmationem valuit" Calvin.—ἀκάθαρτος, declarative: "de coelo enim nil nisi purum demittitur" Bengel.—κοίνον: "make not thou common," R.V., "as though man by his harsh verdict actually created unclean-
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17. ὥς δὲ ἐν δυνατῷ διηπόρει Πέτρος, ἵνα εἰς τὸ δραμα τέκε, καὶ ἱδοὺ, οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου, διερωτήσαντες τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος, ἐπέπτωσαν εἰς τὸν τυλίγμα. 18. καὶ φωνήσαντες ἐπείγοντο, εἰ ὅν ἐντολομένου Πέτρος ἀνάβας ξενίζεται. 19. Τοῦ δὲ Πέτρου ἀνθυμουμένου ἃ περὶ τοῦ ὀράματος, εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ λεγόμενον ἔναν ἄνδρα τὸν Πετρό, ἵνα ἐπεστησαν ἐπί τὸν πύλωνα. 20. ἀρρενωπῶς καταβαίνει καὶ πορεύεται, μισθοῦν μηδεν διακρινόμενος. 21. καταβαίνει Πέτρος πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου πρὸς αὐτὸν, εἶπεν, ἵνα, ἵνα εἰμὶ διὰ τῆς θείας ὁμολογίας τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔξερεν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τοῦ Πάπα. 22. καταβάς δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς τους ἄνδρας τοὺς απεσταλμένους απὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου πρὸς αὐτὸν, εἶπεν, ἵνα, ἵνα εἰμὶ διὰ τῆς θείας ὁμολογίας τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔξερεν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τοῦ Πάπα. 23. καταβάς δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς τους ἄνδρας τοὺς απεσταλμένους απὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου πρὸς αὐτόν, εἶπεν, ἵνα, ἵνα εἰμὶ διὰ τῆς θείας ὁμολογίας τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔξερεν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τοῦ Πάπα. 24. καταβάς δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς τους ἄνδρας τοὺς απεσταλμένους απὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου πρὸς αὐτόν, εἶπεν, ἵνα, ἵνα εἰμὶ διὰ τῆς θείας ὁμολογίας τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔξερεν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τοῦ Πάπα. 25. καταβάς δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς τους ἄνδρας τοὺς απεσταλμένους απὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου πρὸς αὐτόν, εἶπεν, ἵνα, ἵνα εἰμὶ διὰ τῆς θείας ὁμολογίας τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔξερεν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τοῦ Πάπα.
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ζητείτε; τίς ή αιτία δε’ ήν πάρεστε; 22. οἱ δὲ εἶπον, Κορνήλιος ἐκατοντάρχης, ἀνὴρ δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεόν, μαρτυρούμενος τε ὑπὸ δίκου τοῦ ἑθους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐχρηματίσθη ὑπὸ ἄγγελου ἀγίου, μετατέψατο δὲ εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκούσας ῥήματα παρὰ σοῦ. 23. εἰσκαλεσάμενος δὲ αὐτοῦ εξέστη. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐξήλθε σὺν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τινὲς τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τις τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ. 24. καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν. δὲ Κορνήλιος ἦν προσδοκών ἀυτοῦ, συγκαλεσάμενος

1 After ζητείτε D, Syr. Harcl. add τι θελετε; (ἡ) α.λ. looks like an anticipatory gloss of τίς ή αιτία.

2 For εἰσκαλεσάμενος D, Par. read εἰσαγαγών, a fairly common word (six times in Acts), but εἰσχ. "στ. λεγ." in N.T.

3 The art. before I. should be omitted, on the evidence of ΑΒCDΕΗLΡ; Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

4 εἰσῆλθον— but BD 47, 61, Vulg., Syr. Harcl. text, Aeth. εἰσῆλθεν, so W.H., R.V., marg., Weiss, Hilg.— but plural ΑΕΗLP (εἰσῆλθαν in Η), and several vers., Chrys., Tisch., Blass. Alford thinks sing. a corn. to suit εἰσῆλθεν above; but, on the other hand, as the sing. lies between several plurals, transcriptual prob. seems to favour it. Καισάρειαν, see on viii. 40. D, Syr. Harcl. Par. add περιεμενεν at the end of verse retained by Blass and Hilg., see Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, on its possible force here.

Ver. 22. δίκαιος: "sensu Judaico" (Blass), cf. Luke i. 6, ii. 25, xxiii. 50—μαρτ., see on vi. 3. τε closely joins it, as confirming the judgment. On construction with ὑπὸ in inscriptions, Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 95.—ἔθνου τῶν "Ι.: ἕθνος in the mouth of Gentiles, cf. Luke vii. 5 and see above on iv. 25— ἄγγελος: "was warned of God," R.V., Matt. ii. 21, 22, Luke ii. 26, cf. Heb. viii. 5, xi. 7, and Jos., Ant., iii., 8, 8; see Westcott, Hebrews, p. 217. For use of the active in LXX, see Jer. xxxiii. (xxvi.) 2, cf. also xi. 26.— ἄγνων: only here with ἄγνων, expressing the reverence of these pious men (Weiss).

Ver. 23. εἰσχ.: only used here in N.T., so ματ.: in ver. 32; both verbs are also frequent in medical writers, as Hobart urges, but both are found in classical Greek, and the latter three times in LXX, although the former not at all.—ἐξελθεν, recept hospitio, Vulgate, cf. Heb. xiii. 2, and Westcott, l.c.; verb used six times in Acts in this sense, but nowhere else in N.T.; cf. Ecclus. xxix. 25. In this Christian hospitality to Gentile strangers Peter had taken another step towards understanding what the will of the Lord was.—τινες τῶν ἀδελφῶν = xi. 12.

Ver. 24. On the route see Edersheim, "Jewish Social Life," p. 27; and on this and the following verse in β text as specially supporting his theory, see Blass, Philology of the Gospels, pp. 116 ff. and 127.— ήν προσδοκῶν: characteristic Lucan construction, see above i. το; cf. Luke i. 21. προσδ., favourite with St. Luke; six times in Gospel, five in Acts, elsewhere in Gospels only twice in Matthew.—συγκ., i.e., on the day on which he expected the advent of Peter and the returning messengers as to a feast; they were probably also fearers of the true God, and of a like mind with Cornelius.—ἀναγκαίους, necessaries, cf. Jos., Ant., vii., 14, 4; xi., 6, 4; xiii., 7, 2, etc., and instances in Wetstein.

Ver. 25. ὅς δὲ εγένετο (του) εἰσ.: for του see critical notes: "and when it came to pass that Peter entered," R.V., i.e., into the house, see Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 139. It may be regarded as an extension of του beyond its usual sphere, see Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., for instances in LXX, pp. 166, 170 (1893). Simcox regards the sense as much the same as in the common (and specially Lucan), ἔγενετο τὸν Π. εἰσελθεῖν.—προσεκύνησεν (cf. xiv. 15): expressive of lowliest humiliation, but not of necessity involving divine worship, cf. LXX, Gen. xxiii. 7, 12, etc. Weiss thinks that as the verb is used here absolutely, as in viii. 27, the act was
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22—29.

1. Οις δὲ εγένετο εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον, συναντήσας αὐτὸν ὁ Κορνήλιος, πεσὼν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας προσεκύνησεν. 2. Ως δὲ εγένετο εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον, συναντήσας αὐτὸν ὁ Κορνήλιος, πεσὼν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας προσεκύνησεν. 26. ο δὲ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἐγείρει λέγων, Ἀνάστηθι. 27. καὶ συνομιλών αὐτῷ, εἰσῆλθε, καὶ εὐδηκεῖ τοινύντων πολλοῖς, ἐφ’ ἑτ’ τοῖς αὐτοῖς, 28. ἦμεις ἐπίτασαν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐν τοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰσελθέντων. 29. διὸ καὶ ἀναπτυχθῶν ἤλθον μεταπεμφθεὶς.

1 For the whole verse D, Syr. Harcl., Gig. read προσεγγιζοντος δε του Π.(εις την Κ.) προβράμων εις των δουλων διεσαφησεν παραγεγονεναι αυτον. D, Syr. Harcl. read also ο δὲ Κ. εκπηδησας και συναντησας αυτω. Ηarcl. reads as above and Belser strongly supports β text, p. 60; so Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 63, who calls these details “as lifelike as anything we could wish,” but see also Corssen, G. G. Α., p. 437, Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, and Wendt, in loco, edit. 1899, where he refers the expansion in Western text to a misunderstanding of εισελθειν in a text. After εγενς ΗABCELP, Tisch, Weiss., W. H. read του.

2 D, Syr. Harcl., Par., Wern. read τι ποιεις; (cf. Acts xi v. 15); whilst D omits αναστηθι, the others read it after ποιεις. Par., Wern. add τον Θεον προσκυνει, cf. Αpoc. xix. Ιο, χxii. 9, so after ειμι DΕ, Gig., Par., Wern. add ως και συ.

3 After γειρε D, Aug.insert βελτιον, so Ηilg. (cf. compar. in iv. 16, β).

4 ἀναπτυχθῶν, so Tisch., Blass, Weiss; but ἀναπτυχθῶς BD, 61, W. H., Ηilg.

5 ἔνθις D, Syr. Harcl., Gig. read προσεγγιζοντος δε του Π. (εις την Κ.) προβράμων εις των δουλων διεσαφησεν παραγεγονεναι αυτον. D, Syr. Harcl. read also ο δὲ Κ. εκπηδησας και συναντησας αυτω. Ηarcl. reads as above and Belser strongly supports β text, p. 60; so Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 63, who calls these details “as lifelike as anything we could wish,” but see also Corssen, G. G. Α., p. 437, Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, and Wendt, in loco, edit. 1899, where he refers the expansion in Western text to a misunderstanding of εισελθειν in a text. After εγενς ΗABCELP, Tisch, Weiss., W. H. read του.

6 D, Syr. Harcl., Par., Wern. read τι ποιεις; (cf. Acts xiv. 15); whilst D omits αναστηθι, the others read it after ποιεις. Par., Wern. add τον Θεον προσκυνει, cf. Αpoc. xix. 10, xxii. 9, so after ειμι DΕ, Gig., Par., Wern. add ως και συ.

7 After γειρε D, Aug.insert βελτιον, so Ηilg. (cf. compar. in iv. 16, β).

8 ἀναπτυχθῶν, so Tisch., Blass, Weiss; but ἀναπτυχθῶς BD, 61, W. H., Ηilg.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

πεμφθείς πυνθάνομαι ούν, τίνι λόγῳ μεταπέμψασθε με; 30. Καὶ ὁ Κορνήλιος ἐφη, ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας, καὶ τὴν ἐννατήν ὥραν προσευχόμενον εἷς οἶκῳ μου· καὶ Ἰδοῦ, ἀλήθη ἐνώπιον μου εἷς οὐδέτερος λαμπρός, 31. καὶ πρὸς Κορνήλιον ἐλεημόσυνῇ σοι ἡ προσευχή, καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σοι ἐμνήσθησαν εἰς τὸν Θεόν: 32. πέμψον οὖν εἰς Ἰούππην, καὶ μετακαλέσαι Σίμωνα δὲ παραγένεσθαι καὶ Πέτρον εἰς αὐτὸν Θεόν: 33. εξαυτής οὖν ἐπεμένας πρὸς σέ· σὺ τὸν καλὸν ἐπόντος παραγένεσθαι. 4

1 απὸ τ. ημέρας; Blass emends: τετάρτην ἡμέραν ταυτήν, a more usual construction, but Β emendation has no support.

2 ἐν εσθήτι λαμπρός: see on i. i., cur illum contemneatur et fugacem cui angelic petitum. Teststein.

3 ἐξαυτής: perhaps “was heard” or “has been heard” is best (see Rendall and Hackett). ἵππος may refer to his present prayer, as it is in the singular, but the burden of all his past prayers had doubtless been the same, cf. ver. 33 for God's guidance into truth. —ἐμνήσθησαν, cf. LXX, Ps. xix. 3, Ezek. xviii. 22, 24; Rev. xvi. 10.

34. Ἀνοίξας δὲ Πέτρος τὸ στόμα ἑαυτοῦ, Ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνωμεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶ προσωπολήπτης ὁ Θεός. 35. ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ἐδειν ὁ φοβοῦμαιναυτὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστι. 36. τῶν λόγων δὲ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ, εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (οὗτός ἐστι πάντων Κύριος,) 37. οἵμας ἀνέβαλε τὸ γενόμενον ῥήμα καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ιουδαίας, ἀφέσαμεν εἰς αὐτὸν. 38. τον λόγον δὲν ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (οὗτός ἐστι πάντων Κύριος,) 39. ὑμείς οίδατε τὸ γενόμενον βήμα καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ιουδαίας, ἀρχαίαν εἰς αὐτὸν.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

26ο. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ
Χ.

τῆς Γαλιλαίας, μετά τὸ βάπτισμα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐκήρυξεν Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, ὡς ἐξήραντο αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ δύναμις, ὡς διήλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἱωμένως πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευόμενους ὡς τὸ διαβόλου, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. 39. καὶ ἡμῖν ἐσμὲν μάρτυρες πάντων ἐν ἔκτη τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν ιουδαίων καὶ ἐν ἐρουσαλήμ. 40. τούτον ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρε τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ.
γενέσθαι, 41. οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ μάρτυς τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῖν, οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν 1 αὐτῶ, μετὰ τὰ ἀναστήναι αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 42. καὶ παρῆγγελεν ἡμῖν προφήται καὶ διακριτοῦσα, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν δόρυσμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριτῆς ζωντῶν καὶ νεκρῶν. 43. τοῖς πάντες οἱ προφήται μαρτύρον, ἀφεσιν αμαρτιῶν λαβείν διὰ τοῦ δυνάμος αὐτῶ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν. 44. "Ετι λαλούστοι τοῦ Πέτρου τῷ βήματα ταῦτα, ἐπέτερε τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἀγιόν ἐπὶ πάντας

1 After συνεπ. αὐτὸ D, Par., Syr. H. (cf. Wern.) add καὶ συνεναστραφημένοις; D' has συναστραφημένοις, cf. Matt. xxvii. 22; συναστραφημένον W.H.; αναστραφημένος in CD, etc. St. Luke himself never uses συναστραφημένος in this sense, nor αναστράφημένος at all; but Hilg. οστραφημένος, and compares D xi. 28. and xvi. 39.; see, however, note on xi. 28. After νεκρῶν D, Sah. (Wern.), Apost. Const. (Syr. H. mg.) (cf. E also) add οὐσίας τοῖς τεσσαράκοντα, cf. Hilg.; see Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 44.; Ephrem's commentary implies such a reading of the old Syriac. Par. also adds καὶ ανεβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, see Harris, ii. 5., for addition in Ephrem.

2 τετελεσθέντα, D has επιτελεσθέντα: but τετελεσθέντα is also a favourite word with Luke; an instance where D seems to be a reminiscence of i. 2. τῷ λαῷ om. Par., Blass brackets, see below. αὐτος but οὗτος ΒCDΕ, Syrr. Ρ. and Η., Sah., Boh., Lach., W.H., Hilg., Wendl, Weiss, R.V.; Tisch. and Meyer follow ΝΗΑΡ 61, Vulg., Aeth., Iren., Chrys., and read αὐτός, see Wendl's note in 1899, and also former edit. in favour of αὐτός.

3 επέτερε ΝΒΕΗΛΡ; all eed. επέτερ."
Χ. 45-48.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ τους ακούοντας τὸν λόγον. 45. καὶ ἐξετήσαν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ δοσὶ διδωμένου· 46. ἦκουσι γὰρ αὐτῶν λαλομένων γλώσσαις, καὶ μεγαλυνώντος τὸν θεόν. 47. τότε ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πέτρος, Μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ κωλύσαι δύναται τοὺς τοῦ Μὴ ἀναβείναι τοῦ Κυρίου; τότε ἔκρηξεν εἰς περιτομῆς καὶ ἐμφανίσθησαν ἡμῖν πνεύματος, γλώσσαις. 48. τότε αὐτοὺς βαπτίσακαὶ ἀποκατέστησαν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου.

1 οις retained by Tisch., W.Η. marg., Blass, Hilg., and even Weiss with ΝΑΘΕΗΛΠ; but Lach., W.Η. text, Wendt follow Β, d, Vulg.
2 γλώσσαις, D1 prefixes κανεὶς, d προσαραφεῖται (= τοικαίς, so Hilg.), Sah., alis, see below.
3 καθὼς ΕΗΛΡ; ως ΝΑΒ, Ιren., Chrys., Epiph., so Tisch., W.Η., R.V., Blass, Weiss. Hilg. has ἀστερ with D.
4 αυτοὺς BDEΗΛΠ, Cyr.-Jer., Chrys., so W.Η., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; αὐτοῖς, Tisch. following ΝΑ 33.
5 τοῦ Κ. ΝΑΒΕ verss. have instead Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, so all edd., so also Blass in β; but D has τοῦ κ. Ι. Χ., so Hilg.; Meyer retains Τ.Ρ.

Ζόκλερ.—ἐπέπεσε, cf. x. 44, xi. 15, and for the frequency of the word in Acts and its use in Luke's Gospel, see Friedrich, p. 41. By this wonderful proof St. Peter and his Jewish brethren with him saw that, uncircumcised though they were, Cornelius and his household were no longer "common or unclean": "The Holy Ghost," said the Jews, "never fell upon a Gentile". Bengel comments, "Alias baptismus susceptus est ante adventum Spiritus Sancti... Liberae gratiae habet ordinem".—ἀκούοντας, as in ver. 33.

Ver. 45. ὁι ἐκ π., see ver. 23, cf. Rom. iv. 12, and for the phrase as describing St. Paul's most bitter and narrow opponents, see Gal. ii. 12, Col. iv. 11, Tit. i. 10. The fact was thus fully testified, even by those who were not in sympathy with it.—καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ δόξα: "nam uno admissio jam nulli clausa est janua" Bengel. Cf. ii. 38, a gift which they thought did not appertain to the Gentiles; see on ver. 44, and Schöttgen, Hor. Heb., in loco.

Ver. 46. λαλομένων γλώσσαις, see on ii. 13; here no speaking in different languages is meant, but none the less the gift which manifested itself in jubilant ecstatic praise was a gift of the Spirit, and the event may well be called "the Gentile Pentecost": see on xi. 15 and Plumptre, in loco; Wendt, edition 1899. The words of ver. 47 need not mean that this gift of tongues was manifested precisely as the Pentecostal gift.

Ver. 47. μήτι τὸ ὕδ. . . . τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι cf. xiv. 18: on construction, Burton, p. 159; so also in LXX and classical Greek, Blass, Gram., p. 230; Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 172 (1893).—ἐπεῖς, qui qui, so Blass in this passage.—τὸ ὕδωρ: "the water" R.V., not simply "water" as A.V., as Bengel admirably says, "Non dicit: jam habent Spiritum, ergo aqua carere possunt". In baptism both the water and the Spirit were required, xi. 16. The greater had been bestowed; could the lesser be withheld? See the striking passage in Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 108, on the fact that Cornelius and his companions, even after they had first received the presence of the Holy Ghost, were nevertheless ordered to be baptised.

Ver. 48. προσέταξε, cf. St. Paul's rule, 1 Cor. i. 17. If Philip the Evangelist was at Caesarea at the time, the baptism may have been intrusted to him.—ἐπιμείναι: diutius om. orrari, Blass, so manere amplius, Bengel, cf.xxi. 4, 10, xxviii. 12, 14, and xv. 34 β (Blass); only in Luke and Paul, frequent in Acts, not found in Luke's Gospel, cf. John viii. 7; only once in LXX, Exod. xii. 39, in classics as in text.—ἀπείρω τίνας, no doubt spent in further instruction in the faith: aures dies, Bengel.

CHAPTER XI.—Ver. 1. For Western readings see critical notices.—κατὰ τὴν
ΧΙ. Ι-4. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

1. ΗΚΟΥΣΑΝ δε οι άπόστολοι και οι άδελφοι οι οίνες κατά την Ιουδαίαν, δι και τα εδεχεται των λόγων του Θεοῦ. 2. και οτε κατηντήσαν εις Ιεροσόλυμα, διεκρίνοντο προς αυτόν οι έκ περιτομής, λέγοντες, 3. οτι προς άνδρα ακροβυστίαν ειχοντας εισήλθες, και συνέφαγαν αυτοίς. 4. Αρξάμενος δε ο Πέτρος εξετίθετο

1. The Western text is here considerably expanded. Blass, following D, Syr., Par., Wern. (with differences in particulars), reads in β: ο μεν ουν Π. δια ικανου χρόνου πεθαμεί ουκ εδέχεται εις Ι. και προσφωνησας αυτούς και περιτομής, εξηλθεν, πολυν τε χρόνων ποιομενον (περενετο) δια των χωρων διδασκαλούς αυτούς. οτε δε κατηντήσαν εις Ι. και απηγγειλεν αυτούς την χαριν του Θεου οι εκ περιτομής αδελφοι διεκρινοντο προς αυτόν, λέγοντες, This, according to Belser, is an irrefutable proof that β gives us the original text of Luke, p. 63, and see also Blass, Phil. of the Gospels, p. 129, and cf. xxii. 16. It is true that in the first part of the addition all the words and clauses are Lucan (although if we read with D και κατηντήσαν εις Ι. we have no instance in Luke of καταντάω in construction with a dative). But Weiss, Codex D, takes a very opposite view from Belser (see also Wendt (1899)), p. 206, and it is, of course, quite possible that the additions were made on account of the apparent abrupt ending of the passage about Cornelius, and to show that Peter, too, did not break off his missionary work hurriedly, etc.

2. εισηλθες και συνέφαγας; W. H., following BL, Syrr., Arm., has the 3rd person sing., but Weiss has the 2nd person sing., and Ι.: not simply in but throughout Judaea, "all about Judaea," Hort, Ecclesia, p. 57, cf. viii.

Ver. 3. ακροβυστίαν ειχόντας: the expression intimates the bitterness of the opposition. Bengel curiously comments "benigne loquentur". On ακροβ., see especially Kennedy, Sources of N. T., Greek, p. 111.—και συνέφαγαν αυτούς: this was the real charge, the violation of the ceremonial law, cf. x. 28; see on the intolerant division between Pharisaical Jews and Gentiles, Weber, Jüdische Theol., pp. 59, 60; Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, pp. 26-28. There is therefore nothing in the statement to justify the objection raised by Zeller and others against the whole narrative of the baptism of Cornelius (so Wendt, edition 1888 and 1899). But if the complaint against Peter was based not upon the fact that he had baptised Cornelius but had eaten with him, then we can see a great difference between the narrative here and that of the Ethiopian eunuch in chap. vii. In the latter case there was no question of the obligations of the ceremonial law—the baptism was administered and Philip and the eunuch separated, but here the whole stress of the narrative lies in the fact referred to in ver. 3, so that if the eunuch and Cornelius both belonged to the class of "half-proselytes" their cases are not parallel. But even if they were, in other respects there would still remain a distinction between them. It was one thing for the Ethiopian to be received into the Church of Christ by the Hellenist Philip, but it was another thing—and a marked advance—when the principle asserted by Philip was ratified by the Apostles of the circumcision in the case of Cornelius. Wendt, edition 1899, pp. 181, 198, and Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 300.

Ver. 4. ἔριψαν δὲ διὸ. "But Peter began, and expounded the matter": ἔριψαν may be pleonastic, 1. 4, cf. καθιέρως, or may be used graphically, or because the reproaches of οἱ εκ περιτ. gave the first incentive to St. Peter's recital.—καθ. only in Luke, Gospel and Acts, see iii. 24.—ἐζητήθη, xviii. 26, xxviii. 23, Jos., Ant., i., 12, 2, so also in Polyb., x., 9, 3. Perhaps used here by St. Luke from its use by Dioscorides; familiar word to him also as a physician, see Vogel, p. 17.
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αυτοίς καθεξής λέγων, 5. Εγώ ήμην εν πόλει Ινππη προσευχόμενος, και είδον εν έκστάσει δραμα, καταβαίνον σκεύος τι άς θύβην μεγάλην, τέσσαρσι αρχαίς καθιεμένην εκ τού ουρανού, και ήλθην όχις εμόν; 6. είς ήν ατεκνίας κατενόουν, και είδον τα τετράποδα της γης και τα θηρία και τα ερπετά και τα πετεινά του ουρανού. 7. ήκουσα δέ φωνής λεγούσης μοι, Ἄναστάς, Πέτρε, θυσον και φάγε. 8. είπον δέ, Μηδαμώς, Κύριε", 8. είπον οτι πάν κοινόν άκαθάρτον έις το στόμα μου. 9. απεκρίθη δέ μοι φωνή εκ δευτέρου εκ του ουρανού, Α ο Θεός έκαθάρισε, συ μή κοίνου. 10. τούτο δέ έγένετο επί τρεις, και πάλιν ανεσπάθη άπαντα εις τον ουρανόν. 11. και ίδοι, εξαυτής τρεις άνδρες επέστησαν

Evidently St. Luke by the two accounts attaches great significance to this first reception, exceptional case as it was, of a Gentile proselyte like Cornelius into the Christian Church, but it was an isolated case, and moreover a case within Palestine, not beyond its borders, so that the great questions of a mission to the Gentiles of the heathen world, and of the conditions for their reception as Christians, were not matter for consideration as afterwards in chap. xv., see Wendt, edition 1899, p. 211; Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 58, 59; and see below on ver. 12.

Ver. 5. κάτενόουν, cf. vii. 31, 32, Matt. vii. 3, Luke vi. 41, R.V., etc., the seeing is the result of the considering—"contemplabar singula, effectus comprehenditur aoristo" ενδον.-θηρία: not specially mentioned in x. 12 (see critical notes), but there ἄναστα προς τετράποδα.

Ver. 8. ειδοθην, cf. Matt. xv. 11, 17. Blass sees in the phrase "locutio hebraismum redolens," cf. viii. 35; on the other hand the Hebraistic τῶν of x. 14 is omitted (Weiss).

Ver. 10. άνεσπάθη: only found in Luke xiv. 5 in N.T., another touch of vividness as in vv. 5, 6. In LXX three times, and possibly once in Bel and the Dragon, ver. 42, of drawing up Daniel from the den (but reading may be the simple verb, see H. and R.).

Ver. 12. μηδεν διακρινομενον, cf. x. 20, but if we read (see critical notes) μ. διακρινομενον, "making no distinction," R.V.—οι δε αδελφοι σου: who had been with Peter at Caesarea, and had returned with him to Jerusalem, see x. 45. Hilgenfeld would regard them as constant companions of St. Peter on his Apostolic journeys. Differences such as these between the narrative here and that in x. 23 where the brethren are mentioned without their number constrain Feine to regard xi. 1-18 as derived like the earlier narrative in x. from one and the same source, not as added by a reviser (although he excludes vv. 1 and 18 in xi. from the original narrative). Spitta agrees with Feine in this view of xi. 1-7; a forger writing with a "tendency" would have smoothed away any apparent discrepancies, as Zöckler well points out. With regard to the whole Cornelius
ἄδελφοι αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσῆλθομεν εἰς τὸν οίκον τοῦ ἄνδρος, 13. ἀπῆγγελε τε ἡμῖν τῶς εἶδε τὸν ἀγγέλον ἐν τῷ οίκῳ αὐτοῦ σταθέντα καὶ εἰπόντα αὐτῷ Ἃπόστειλον εἰς ἱστρήν τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ μετάπεμψαν Σίμωνα τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Πέτρον, 14. δὲ λαλῆσαι θήματα πρὸς σέ, ἐν οἷς σωθῆσαι σοῦ. 15. ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀρξάθαι μὲ δαλείν, ἐπέτεσε 1 τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Αγιον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ. 16. ἐμφάσησα δὲ τῷ ἰησουπτω Κυρίου, ὡς ἔλεγεν, "Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβαπτίσας κυρίων, ἡμῖν δὲ διαπαντοθέσθεν ἐν Πνεύματι Ἀγίω." 17. εἰ οὐν τὴν ἱστρῆν δωρεὰν ἐδωκαν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεός καὶ ἡμῖν, πιστεύσασιν εἰς τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, εγὼ δὲ τίς ἐμνήσθην τοῦ ῥήματος Κυρίου, ὡς ἔλεγεν, "Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβαπτίσας κυρίων, ἡμῖν δὲ διαπαντοθέσθεν ἐν Πνεύματι Ἀγίω." 18. Ακούσαντες δὲ ταύτα ἐς ὑπάγειν ἔδωκεν εἰς ζωήν.

1 ἑπέτεσε, but D reads simple verb, which Blass rejects here, although he accepts it in x. 44 (AD). Ηilg. has simple verb.

2 ο Θεὸς om. D, Aug., so Ηilg., but Blass retains. D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Par. Aug. (Ηilg. follows D) add τοις μὴ δουναι αυτοῖς τ. αγ., and D further adds τοις τυστεύσασιν επ" αὐτῶν and Syr. Harcl. πιστ. τοις τον Κ. I. X. Blass omits these last two additions (with Aug.), but places τυστεύσασιν επ' αὐτῶν in brackets; additions apparently to explain of what the κωλ. τον Θ. consisted, described by Weiss as quite superfluous, see Codex D, p. 71, and note.


4 ἀραγε, but aρα only in ΝABD 40, 61, 65, 133; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Blass, Wendt (against Meyer). D omits τὴν before μετανοιαν.

episode, Spitta and Feine (so Weiss and Wendt), inasmuch as they regard St. Luke's narrative as containing at least a genuine historical kernel, and as marking a special exceptional case, and not a general rule as existing at such an early time, are much less radical than Weizsäcker, Holtmann, and Clemen. For a good review of the relation of modern criticism to the narrative see Wendt (1899) on x. 1 and Ζöckler, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 226, 227 (second edition).

Ver. 15. ἀρξάθαι: somewhat more precisely stated than in x. 44. The speech has there no abruptness, but St. Peter may well have intended to say much more; if this was so, the notice here is quite natural, Winer-Moulton, lxv., 7 d.—ἐν ἀρχῇ, i.e., at the great Pentecost.

Ver. 16. Words not found in the Gospels, but in Acts i. 5, quoted here with the omission of οὐ μετὰ πολλάς ταύτας ήμέρας, showing that St. Peter regarded the baptism of the Holy Ghost received by Cornelius as equally decisive of the Spirit's presence as the bestowal upon himself and others at Pentecost.—ὡς ἔλεγεν: not merely pleonastic, cf. Luke xxii. 61; Winer-Moulton, lxv., 1 a, Wendt, Felten.

Ver. 17. τυστεύσασιν, see R.V., best to take participle as referring both to αὐτοῖς and to ήμῖν: in each case the Holy Spirit was bestowed, and in each case as a result of the preceding belief, not as a result of circumcision, or of
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ΧΙ.

19. Οι μὲν οὖν διασπαρόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐτὶ Στεφάνου, ἵστι λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις. 20. ἦσαν δὲ τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Κύπριοι καὶ Κυρηναίοι, οἳ τινες εἰσελθόντες εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν ἐδόξαζον πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστὰς, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν

1 ἔπει Στεφάνου ΝΒΗΛΠ 61, Bas., Chrys, Theoph., best supported; ἐπὶ Στεφάνου perhaps a gloss since ἐπὶ was taken temporally: ἀπὸ τοῦ Στεφάνου D, so Hilg. (but not Blass in β). Κυπρ. Par. reads Τυροῦ; Blass rejects.

2 Ἑλληνιστὰς ΒΔΕΗΛΠ 61, W.H., R.V. marg., so Sanday (cf. Shirley, Apostolic Age, pp. 27, 28; Wordsworth, and Hastings' B.D., art. "Christian," p. 384); Ἑλληνιστὰς ἐνΑ (discounted by reading Ἑλληνιστὰς wrongly in ix. 27), D1, Arm., Eus., Chrys., Tisch., Weiss, Blass, R.V. text. η εὐαγγελισταὶ claimed as supporting Ἑλληνιστὰς, but see Sanday, u. infra. Lightfoot and a large number of recent writers (Page, Ramsay, Zöckler, Holtzmann, Felten, Rendall, G. A. Smith, McGiffert) accept Ἑλληνιστὰς (although, in some cases, admitting that MS. authority is adverse), because demanded as antithetical to the preceding Ιουδαῖοι. It is urged that Ἑλληνιστὰς are included under Ιουδαῖοι, but whilst in one sense this is so, it is also possible to draw a distinction between the two. Ιουδαῖοι may be used as = Εβραῖοι in vi. 1, or as in xiv. 1, xviii. 4 where evidently Jews and proselytes (not heathen) are distinguished, so that whilst as far as Antioch Jews only had been addressed, now the Cyprians and Cyrenians addressed Hellenists, God-fearers (like Cornelius), "Greeks who came into relations with the Jews," whilst not addressing as yet those who were entirely heathen. In view of the great importance and future position of the Church of Antioch, it is not unlikely that Luke should carefully note the elements of which it was originally composed. The real turning-point in the sphere of Peter and Paul is not yet, but in xiii. 46. See W.H., Select Readings, p. 94; Hort, Judaising Christianity, pp. 59, 60; Ecclesia, p. 61; Sanday, Expositor, pp. 60-62, and Ramsay, p. 47 (1896).

uncircumcision; sometimes referred to ἡμῖν, so Bengel, Nösgen, Wendt, sometimes to αὐτοῖς, so Weiss, Blass.—τίς ἦμιν δ., εφ. Exod. iii. 11, 2 Kings viii. 13, Blass, Gram., p. 173; in reality two questions: Who was I? Was I able to withstand God? Winer-Moulton, lxvi., 5.—ἐγώ, emphatic, "merum organon," Bengel.

Ver. 18. ἐσύχασαν, cf. xxi. 14 and Luke xiv. 3, so in LXX, Neh. v. 8 (Job xxxii. 6, Hebrew different); also in a different sense in Luke xxiii. 56, 1 Thess. iv. 11, only in Luke and Paul in N.T.—ἐδόξαζον, see critical notes, imperfect of continuous action—the writer about to pass to other things thus depicts the state of things which he leaves, cf. viii. 3 (Blass).—Ἀραξοτη, see critical notes.


Ver. 19. οἱ μὲν οὖν, cf. viii. 4. μαῦρον introduces a general statement, whilst ἡμῖν (ver. 20) marks a particular instance.

—ἐπὶ Σ.: "about Stephen" A. and R. V. (best); some render "against Stephen," and others "post Stephanum". See also critical note.

Ver. 20. ἄνδρες Κυρ. καὶ Κυρ., cf. iv. 36, xxi. 16; ii. 10, vi. 9.—Εὐαγγελισταῖς, see critical notes.—εὐαγγελισταῖς ἐν Ὄλης ἔρωμεν τὸν Κ. '1.: on construction with accusative of the message, Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 79. We can scarcely take the phrase given here, instead of "preaching that Jesus was the Christ," as a proof that the word was preached not to Jews but to Gentiles.—Ἀντίοχειαν: on the Orontes, distinguished as 'Α. ἡ πρός, or εἰς Ἀδρατίαν, and bearing the title μητρόπολις. There appear to have been at least five places in Syria so called under the Seleucids. For the Arabs Damascus was the capital, but the Greeks wanted to be nearer the Mediterranean and Asia Minor. The city built in 500 B.C. by Seleucus Nicator I. became more and more beautiful, whilst all the trade of the Mediterranean was connected with it through its harbour Seleucia. All the varied elements of the life of the ancient world found a home there. From the first there were Jews amongst its inhabitants. But in such a mixed population, whilst art and literature could gain the praise of Cicero, vice as well as luxury made the city infamous as well as famous. Josephus calls it the third city of the empire, next to Rome and Alex-
21. καὶ ἦν χεῖρ Κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν· πολὺς τε ἄριθμος πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον. 22. Ἡκούσθη δὲ ὁ λόγος εἰς τὰ δτὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμων περὶ αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν διδάσκων ἐν αὐτῶν ἔως Ἀντιόχειαν. 23. δὲ παρα-

γενόμενοι καὶ ἠδοὺ τὸν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔχαρι, καὶ παρεκάλει πάντα τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ Κυρίῳ. 24. δός ἂν ἄρη, ἀγάθος καὶ πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἀγίου καὶ πίστεως, καὶ προσετέθη ὅχλος ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ. 25. εξῆλθε δὲ εἰς τὰ ἀρσον ο Βαρνάβας ἀναζητήσαι Σαύλον, καὶ εὑρὼν αὐτόν ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν.
26. ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτῶν ἵματων ἃνυμνον οὖν συνακρίνει ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ διδάσκαλος ἤκαν, χρηστιανὸς τε πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῶν


2 πρῶτον ΝBD 36, 163, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; ζητεῖν, see also Alford's note on its force; D, Gig., Par. read καὶ τοτε πρῶτον, so Hilg. Harnack regards the πρῶτον as secondary, and introduced by the Western reviser to mark that the disciples were then called Christians, which in Harnack's opinion was very improbable, see Sitzungsberichte d. Königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin, xvii., p. 4, 1899. Χριστιανοῦ, Ν has Χριστιανοί, "recte," Blass (so 61), but there is no reason to suppose that this was the original, although it may well have been a corrupted form, cf. the testimony of Tert., Just. Mar., Lactant.; D has Χριστιανοῦ.

nabas goes to Tarsus to seek him; each statement is the complement of the other, and a long period intervenes not marked by any critical event noted in Saul's history. So also Paul's own statement, Gal. i. 21, 22, marks the same period, and the two writers complete each other. Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 45, 46, on Luke's style and reading in D above.—ἀναζητήσαν, cf. Luke ii. 44, 45, nowhere else in N.T., a word therefore not only common to, but peculiar to Luke's writings.—ἀναζητήσαν: giving idea of thoroughness; it was not known at what precise spot Saul was prosecuting his work, so the word implies effort or thoroughness in the search; εὐρών implies the same uncertainty. In LXX, cf. Job iii. 4, x. 6, 2 Macc. xiii. 21. Calvin comments on the fresh proof of the "simplicitas" of Barnabas; he might have retained the chief place at Antioch, but he goes for Paul: "videmus ergo ut sui oblitus nihil aliud spectat, nisi ut eminat unus Christus".

Ver. 26. εγένετο δὲ αὐτῶν, see critical notes, if dative αὐτῶν = accidit eis, see Plummer, St. Luke, p. 45, on the use of ἐγένετο.—ἰματων δὲν: "even a whole year" R.V.—συνακρίνει ἐν τῇ ἐκκ.: "they were gathered together in the Church," so R.V. margin. Rendall holds that ἐν is fatal to the A.V. and R.V. text, and renders "they [i.e., Barnabas and Saul] were brought together in the Church," an intimate association of inestimable value. Hort adopts as "the least difficult explanation of this curious word" "were hospitably received in the Church," so Wendt, Weiss, Nosgen, cf. Matt. xxv. 35; Deut. xxii. 2, Josh. ii. 18, Judg. xix. 16, 2 Sam. xi. 27.—διδάσκαλος . . . χρηστιανὸς: both infinitives depend upon ἐγένετο, "and that the disciples," etc., suggesting that the name "Christian" followed as result upon the widespread teaching of the Apostles amongst the Gentiles. If St. Luke, as Eusebius states, was himself a native of Antioch, it has been suggested that he, being a contemporary of the event, might well record such a distinction for his city as the origin of the name "Christian".—χρηστιανὸς: prim. to transact business (χρήμα), passes into the meaning of taking a name from one's public business, so to receive a name, to be called, cf. Rom. vii. 3, so in Josephus and Philo, and instances in Grimm-Thayer. See also x. 22 for another shade of meaning, and so elsewhere in N.T.; and for its use to express a reply or information by a king or those in authority to inquiry, see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 118.—πρῶτον, see critical notes.—Χριστιανοῦ: in the N.T. the Christians always named themselves μαθηταί, αδελφοί, ἅγιοι, πιστοί, etc., but on no occasion "Christians," whilst the Jews not only refused to recognise that Jesus had any claim to be the Christ, but also called His followers Ναζωραίοι (χαίν. 5), or spoke of them as ἡ αἵρεσις αὐτῇ (xxviii. 22, cf. xxiv. 14). On the probably contemptuous use of the word in i Peter iv. 16 and Acts xxvi. 28 as not inconsistent with the above statements, see Wendt, edition 1899, in loco, and "Christian" in Hastings' B.D. But whilst it is difficult to find an origin for the title amongst Christians or amongst Jews, there is no difficulty in attributing it to the keen-witted populace of Antioch, already famous for their bestowal of nicknames, although perhaps the possibility that the name may have originated amongst the Latin-speaking official retinue of the legatus at Antioch should not be excluded (though there is no evidence whatever that it became at this early date an official name). But there is no need to suppose that the name
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μαθητάς Χριστιανούς. 27. Εν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις κατῆλθον ἀπὸ ἱεροσολύμων προφήται εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. 28. ἀναστὰς δὲ εἰς ἕξ

1 At end of verse and commencement of ver. 28 we have the remarkable reading in B: ην δὲ πολλὴ αγαλλιασις, συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν εφ' εἰς εξ αὐτῶν, so D, Aug., Par., Wern., and also, a new witness, Fragment of the Old Latin translation of Acts in the Miscellanea Cassinense, 1897 (see Harnack's note in Theol. Literaturzeitung, p. 172, 1898). *αγαλλιασις* is quite Lucan, cf. ii. 46, and the solutions of Weiss and Corssen are not sufficient to weaken the view that here, at least, we may have an original draft. If it is said that the words are introduced to show the impression made by the visit of the prophets (so Weiss), we must remember that they stand in strange contrast to the announcement of the coming famine, and that it would have been a bold thing for an emendator to introduce them here. The circumstances in viii. 8 are quite different. Blass sees in the following words, p. 137, "luculentissimum testimonium, quo auctor sese Αντιοχειον fuisse monstrat," see also Philology of the Gospels, p. 131; we get by these three words, *σωτρεφθείς δέ* εἰς ἕξ, a fresh *we-section* to the same effect Zöckler, Greifswalder Studien, p. 137; Salmon, Introd., pp. 597, 602: Belser, p. 64; see also Harnack, u. s., and Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., ii., pp. 341, 350. Wendl (1898), p. 216, note, inclines to accept the reading as original, and even Weiss, Codex D, p. 111, thinks it not impossible; so too Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 505 (1895); and cf. Jülicher, Einleitung in das N. T., p. 271. Harnack, u. s., admits, p. 6, that the language is not un-Lucan, but he regards the other passages in which *σωτρεφθείς* occurs as Western interpolations, and *ην δὲ πολλὴ αγαλλιασις* as a mere amplification, as in viii. 24, xiii. 8.

was of Roman origin, although we may readily concede that the Latin termination *-ianus* was common enough at this period. There is ample proof of the use of the same termination not only in Latin but in Greek, even if we do not regard *-iōn* with Wendt as a termination of a native "Asiatic type". The notice in Tacitus, Ann., xvi., 44 (cf. Suetonius, Nero, 16), who was probably in Rome during Nero's persecution, A.D. 64, is very significant, for he not only intimates that the word was commonly and popularly known, but also that the title had been in vogue for some time: "quos vulgus Christianos appellabant," note the imperfect tense. Against the recent strictures of Weitzsacker and Schmiedel we may place the opinion of Spitta, and also of Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 158. How soon the title given in mockery became a name of honour we may gather from the Ignatian Epistles, cf. Rom., iii., 3; Magn., iv.; Eph., xi., 2, and cf. Mart. Polyc. x. and xii., i. 2. See further Lightfoot, Phil., p. 16; Lechler, Das Apostolische Zeitalter, p. 129 ff.; Smith, B.D. D "Christian," Conybeare and Howson, p. 100 (smaller edition), and Expositor, June, 1896.

Ver. 27. Antioch sends relief to Jerusalem.—*ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις*, cf. i. 15, vi. 1. *ταύταις* emphatic, by its position and also by its significance, days full of importance for Barnabas and Saul, who were still at Antioch (Weiss).

*προφήται* the coming of the prophets gave an additional sanction to the work at Antioch. There is no reason in the uncertainty of the dates to suppose that they had been driven from Jerusalem by persecution. For the position of the Christian prophets in the N.T. cf. Acts xiii. 1, where Barnabas and Saul are spoken of as prophets and teachers; afterwards as Apostles, xiv. 4; xv. 32, where Judas and Silas are described as prophets, having been previously spoken of, ver. 22, as *γυναῖκες* amongst the brethren at Jerusalem (while Silas later bears the name of Apostle); cf., further, 1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. iv. 11, where in each case the Prophet is placed next to Apostles (although in 1 Cor. he may have been merely a member of a local community), perhaps because “he belonged to the same family as the great prophets of the Old Testament,” for whilst foreknowledge of events was not necessarily implied by the word either in the O.T. or in the N.T., the case of Agabus, both here and in xxi. 10, 11, shows that predictiveness was by no means excluded. The Christian prophets, moreover, as we see them in Acts, combine the duty of “ministering to the Lord” with that of preaching the word; they are not only foretellers, but forth-tellers of God's will, as in the case of a Samuel or an Elijah, Gore, Church and the Ministry, pp. 240, 261, 393, etc.; Mo-berly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 160 ff.; and for Sub-Apostolic Age, p. 179 ff.; Bigg, Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, p.
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αυτών, δύδατι "Αγαβος, εσήμανε" διά τού Πνεύματος, λιμόν μέγαν
μέλλειν ἐσεσθαι ἐφ’ ἄλλην τὴν οἰκουμένην· δοτις καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ
Κλαυδίου 3 Καισάρους. 29. τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν 4 καθὼς ηποτεριτί τις,

1 εσήμανε ΝΑΕΗΛΠ, most vers., so Tisch., W.H. marg.; but B, d, Vulg., Chron.,
2 μεγαν DΕΗLP, Chrys., Chron.; but ΝΑΒΔ 61, so Tisch., W.H., Blass,
Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. have μεγαλην (ἡς).
3 Καισάρους om. ΝΑΒΔ 13, 61, Vulg., several verss., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass,
Weiss, Wendt, so Hilg.
4 των δὲ μαθητων, D, Par., Vulg. (Gig.) read οί μαθηται, and so D καθως
ευπορουντο instead of ev' την.

28 (1898); Harnack, "Apostellehre" in Real-Encyclopädic für Protestant. Thel.
(Hauck), p. 716, and see, further, on xiii. 1.
Ver. 28. "Αγαβος: on derivation see
W.H., ii., 313, from ἀγαπεῖν "to love";
or from ἀλλοτρ "a locust," Ezra ii. 45;
Neh. vii. 48, with rough breathing
"Αγ. W.H. follow Syriac and read
the former as in T.R., so Weiss; Blass
doubtful; Klostermann would connect it
with 'Αγαυος, Probleme im Aposteltexte,
p. 10. As a Jewish prophet he would
naturally use the symbolic methods of
a Jeremiah or an Ezekiel, see on xxii. 10.
On insertion in D see critical notes.
—μεγαν εσεσθαι: future infinitive only
used in N.T. with μέλλειν in this one
phrase, and only so in Acts, cf. xxv. 15,
xxvii. 10. In xxii. 30 μεγαν omitted
(although in T.R.), and in xxiv. 25
ἐσεσθαι omitted (although in T.R.).
Klostermann, Vindicia Lucana, p. 51,
Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 120,
and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 158
25, and so in common usage, but in
Doric usage, as it is called, feminine,
and so also in later Greek; feminine in
Luke xv. 14 and here; see critical notes;
Blass, Gram., p. 26.—ἐφ’ ἄλλην τὴν οἰκ.
—the civilised world, i.e., the Roman
Empire. Cf. xxiv. 5, and Luke ii. 1, see
Plummer’s note on Luke iv. 5 (and
Hackett’s attempt, in loco, to limit the
expression), and Ramsay, Was Christ
born at Bethlehem? p. 118. We have
ample evidence as to a widespread dearth
over various parts of the Roman
Empire, to which Suetonius, Dion Cassius,
Tacitus, and Eusebius all bear witness,
in the reign of Claudius; and in no other
reign do we find such varied allusions to
periodical famines, "assiduae sterilitates,"

Suetonius, Claudius, xviii., cf. Dion Cassi-
sius, lx., 11; Tac., Ann., xii., 43, etc.
These and other references are given by
Schürer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii.,
p. 170, E.T. (so also by O. Holtzmann,
Neust. Zeitgeschichte, p. 124), but in
stead of drawing from these varied refer-
ences the inference that the author of
Acts had ample justification for his state-
m ent as to the prevalence of famine over
the Roman Empire, he takes him to task
for speaking of a famine "over the whole
world." See Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 48,
49, and also Was Christ Born at Beth-
At least there is no ground to suppose,
with Clemen and others, that the writer
of Acts was here dependent on Josephus
for the mention of the famine which that
historian confined to Judaea, but which
the writer of Acts, or rather Clemen’s
Redactor Antijuadicus, magnified ac-
cording to his usual custom.
Ver. 29. καθὼς ηποτεριτί τις: only
here in N.T., and the cognate noun in
xix. 25, but in same sense in classi-
cal Greek; cf. Lev. xxv. 26, 28, 49,
and Wisdom x. 10 (but see Hatch and Red-
path on passages in Lev.). "According
to his ability," so A. and R.V., i.e.,
as each man prospered, in proportion to
his means. The expression intimates
that the community of goods, at least in
a communistic sense, could not have been
the rule, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 2, but a right
view of "the community of goods" at
Jerusalem invokes no contradiction with
this statement, as Hilgenfeld apparently
maintains, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft.
Thel., p. 508, 1805. On the good effect
of this work of brotherly charity and
fellowship, this practical exhibition of
Christian union between Church and
Church, between the Christians of the
mother-city and those of the Jewish dis-
persion, see Hort, Ecclesia, p. 62; Ram-
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δρων ἐκατός αὐτῶν εἰς διακονίαν τίμησα τοὺς κατοικοῦν ἐν τῇ
'Ἰουδαίᾳ ἄδελφοι: 30. δ καὶ ἐποίησαν, ἀποστείλας πρὸς τοὺς
προσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρνάβα καὶ Σαῦλου.

say, u. s., p. 52; Baumgarten (Altord, in loco).—εἰς διακονίαν: “for a ministry,” R.V. margin, cf. Rom. xv. 31, 2 Cor. ix., etc., Acta Thomae, 56; “contributions for relief” Ramsay, see further below; on the construction and complexity of the sentence see especially Page’s note, and Wendt.—ἄδελφοι: not merely as fellow-disciples, but as brethren in the One Lord.

Ver. 30. δ καὶ εποίησαν κ.τ.λ.: a question arises as to whether this took place during, or at a later date than, Herod’s persecution in 44 B.C.—the year of his death. Bishop Lightfoot (with whom Dr. Sanday and Dr. Hort substantially agree) maintains that Barnabas and Saul went up to Jerusalem in the early months of 44, during Herod’s persecution, deposited their διακονία with the elders, and returned without delay. If we ask why “elders” are mentioned, and not Apostles, the probability is suggested that the Apostles had fled from Jerusalem and were in hiding. Against this view Ramsay strongly protests, not only on account of the part assigned to the leading Apostles, but also because of the meaning which he attaches to the διακονία of Barnabas and Saul (see on xii. 25). The elders, not Apostles, are mentioned because the embassy was of a purely business kind, and it was not fit that the Apostles should serve tables. Moreover, Ramsay places the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem in 45, or preferably in 46, at the commencement of the great famine in Judea—not in 44, but in 45. Still, as Dr. Sanday urges, the entire omission of any reference to the Apostles is strange (cf. Blass on xi. 30, xii. 17, who holds that the Apostles had fled, especially as elsewhere Apostles and elders are constantly bracketed together as a single body (xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, xvi. 4, cf. xxi. 18)). Nor does it follow that because James, presumably “the brother of the Lord,” is mentioned as remaining in Jerusalem during the persecution (but see Lightfoot, Gal., p. 127, note), which his reputation for sanctity amongst his countrymen might have enabled him to do, that the other Apostles could have done so with equal safety. But Ramsay at all events removes us from the difficulty involved in the entrance of Paul into Jerusalem at a time of persecution, and the more so in view of the previous plots against his life, a difficulty which is quite unsatisfactorily met by supposing that Paul did not enter the city at all for some unknown reasons, or more unsatisfactorily still by attributing to the author of Acts a mistake in asserting that any visit of Paul to Jerusalem was made at this time. On the chronological order involved in accordance with the two views mentioned, see Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 48 ff., 68, 69; Lightfoot, Gal., p. 124, note; and, as space forbids more, for the whole question Expositor for February and March, 1896; Lightfoot, Gal., p. 123 ff.; Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 61, and Ecclesia, p. 62; Wendt, p. 215 (1888) and p. 218 (1899).—τοὺς προσβυτέρους, see previous verse. It is also noticeable that St. Luke gives no account of the appointment of the elders; he takes it for granted. These Christian elders are therefore in all probability no new kind of officers, but a continuation in the Christian Church of the office of the ἄδελφοι, προσβυτέροι, to whom probably the government of the Synagogue was assigned—hence we may account for St. Luke’s silence (Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 141; Hort, Ecclesia, p. 62; Lightfoot, Phil., pp. 191-193: “Bishop” (Gwatkin), Hastings’ B.D.). In the Christian συναγωγή (James ii. 2) there would naturally be elders occupying a position of trust and authority. There is certainly no reason to regard them as the Seven under another name (so Zeller, Ritschl), although it is quite conceivable that if the Seven represented the Hellenists, the elders may have been already in existence as representing the Hebrew part of the Church. But there is need to guard against the exaggeration of the Jewish nature of the office in question. In the N.T. we find mention of elders, not merely so on account of age, not merely as administrative and disciplinary officers (Hatch, Hampton Lectures, pp. 58, 61), as in a Jewish synagogue, but as officers of the Christian Church with spiritual functions, cf. James v. 14, 1 Pet. v. 2, Acts xx. 17, Tit. i. 5, and also 1 Thess. v. 12-14, Heb. xiii. 7 (see Mayor, St. James, p. cxxviii; Gore, Church and the Ministry, pp. 253, 263, and note.
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ΧΙΙ. Ι. ΚΑΤ’ εκείνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέβαλεν Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς χείρας κακώσαι τινὰς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.\footnote{After ἐκκλησίας D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Par., Wern. add τῆς en τῇ λουδαίᾳ—if the words were original it seems difficult to account for their omission; but see Belser’s defence, p. 64, of this and β in vv. 3 and 5.}

1. κακώσαι τινὰς τῶν απὸ τῆς εκκλησίας...

2. ανείλε δὲ Ἰάκωβον τὸν αδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρα.

3. καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι ἀρετὸν ἦστι τοῖς Ιουδαίοις...

4. Α’τερον ἦστι τοῖς Ιουδαίοις... After Ιουδαιοὶ D, Syr. Η, mg., Ρar., so Ηilg., add η επιχείρησις αυτοῦ επὶ τοὺς πιστούς this again may be an explanatory gloss, defining what pleased the Jews—but τις and τοῦτο are used by Luke in his writings.

Κ). Α’τερον ἦστι τοῖς Ιουδαίοις... After Ιουδαιοὶ D, Syr. Η, mg., Ρar., so Ηilg., add η επιχείρησις αυτοῦ επὶ τοὺς πιστούς—this again may be an explanatory gloss, defining what pleased the Jews—but τις and τοῦτο are used by Luke in his writings.

At the same time there is nothing to surprise us in the fact that the administration of alms should be connected \textit{in loco} with the office of elders. If they were representing the Apostles at the time in Jerusalem, it is what we should expect, since the organisation of alms-giving remained part of the Apostolic office, Gal. ii. 10, 2 Cor. viii., etc.; and if in a passage from Polycarp (quoted by Dr. Hatch) we find the two connected—the presbyterate and what looks like the administration of alms, Polycarp, \textit{Philo.}, vi., xi.—this again need not surprise us, since not only in the N.T., but from the passage referred to in Polycarp, it is evident that they exercised judicial and administrative functions, exercised also spiritual gifts, and discharged the office of teachers, functions to which there was nothing analogous in the Jewish presbyters (see Gore, \textit{u. s.}, note Κ, and Gwatkin, \textit{n. s.}, p. 302).

To turn back the sheep that are gone astray (ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀπεπλανημένα) is one of the first commands laid by Polycarp in his Epistle upon the Christian Presbyters (vi., quoted by Hatch), and from this alone it would appear that a familiar title in the Jewish Church passed into the Church of Christ, gaining therein a new and spiritual power. See further on xx. τ.\text{, and for the use of the word in inscriptions, Deissmann, \textit{Bibelstudien}, p. 153, and \textit{Neue Bibelstudien}, p. 160.}

CHAPTER XII. Persecution by Herod; St. Peter’s deliverance.—Ver. 1. κατ’ ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν: “about that time,” or more precisely “at that time,” Rendall, \textit{cf.} Rom. ix. 9, so in Gen. xviii. 10, 2 Macc. iii. 5: in the early part of 44 A.D.—Ἡρώδης ὁ β., Herod Agrippa I.: only in this chapter in the N.T.: on his character and death, see below xii. 3, 23. Born in B.C. 10 and educated in his early life in Rome, he rose from a rash adventurer to good fortune and high position first through the friendship of Caligula and afterwards of Claudius. He united under his own sway the entire empire of his grand-father, Herod the Great, while his Pharisaeic piety and also his attachment to the Roman supremacy found expression in the titles which he bore, \textit{βασιλεὺς μέγας φιλόκαισαρ εὐσεβής καὶ φιλορωμαῖος}. On the pathetic story told of him in connection with the Feast of Tabernacles (A.D. 41) see Hamburger, \textit{Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums}, ii., 1. p. 28, and the whole article; Schürer, \textit{Jewish People}, \textit{div. i., vol. ii.}, p. 150 ff., E.T.; Farrar, \textit{The Herods}, p. 179 ff. (1898)—ἐπέβαλεν τὰς χείρας, Luke xx. 19, xxii. 12, and \textit{cf.} Acts iv. 3, v. 18, xxii. 27, once in Matthew and Mark, in John twice; Friedrich, p. 39. \textit{cf.} LXX, Gen. xxii. 12, 2 Sam. xviii. 12 (so in Polyb.), \textit{cf.} for similar construction of the infinitive of the purpose xviii. 10, not in the sense of \textit{ἐνεχείρησε}, \textit{conatus est}, but to be rendered quite literally; \textit{cf.} also the context, ver. 3.—κακώσαι: \textit{cf.} κακώσετε, in Polycarp, \textit{Πετρον...} (\textit{προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον...})—this again need not surprise us, since not only in the N.T., but from the passage referred to in Polycarp, it is evident that they exercised judicial and administrative functions, exercised also spiritual gifts, and discharged the office of teachers, functions to which there was nothing analogous in the Jewish presbyters (see Gore, \textit{u. s.}, note Κ, and Gwatkin, \textit{1ι.5.}, p. 302). Το turn back the sheep that are gone astray (ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀπεπλανημένα) is one of the first commands laid by Polycarp in his Epistle upon the Christian Presbyters (vi., quoted by Hatch), and from this alone it would appear that a familiar title in the Jewish Church passed into the Church of Christ, gaining therein a new and spiritual power. See further on xx. τ.\text{, and for the use of the word in inscriptions, Deissmann, \textit{Bibelstudien}, p. 153, and \textit{Neue Bibelstudien}, p. 160.}

Ver. 2. ἀνείλε, characteristic word, \textit{see on v. 33.}—τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς εἰκ.”: St. Chrysostom reminds us of our Lord’s prophecy in Mark x. 38 ff. (Matt. xx. 23), distinguished thus from the James of i. 13. Possibly his prominent position, and his characteristic nature as a son of Thunder marked him out as an early victim.—μαχαίρα: so in the case of John the Baptist. This mode of death was regarded as very disgraceful among the Jews (J. Lightfoot, Wetstein), and as in the Baptist’s case so here, the mode of execution shows that the punishment was not for blasphemy, but that James was apprehended and killed by the political power. For the touching account of his
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ημέραιτων αζύμων) 4. δνκαιπιάσαςέθετοειςφυλακήν,παραδούς
tέσσαριςτετραδίοιςστρατιωτώνφυλάσσειναυτόν,βουλόμενοςμετά
tό πάσχα ἀναγαγεῖναυτόντω λαώ.

5. ο μεν ουνΠέτροςετηρείτο
εντηφυλακήνπροσευχήδεηνεκτενής"γινομένηυπότηςεκκλησίας
προς τονΘεόν υπέρ αυτού.

1 Αφετ φυλακή Syr. H. mg., Par. add γως της στερησ του βασιλεως—here, again,
the words may be a glossto explainετηρειτο,unnecessaryafter ver. 4.

2 εκτενής ΑΕΗL P 61, Bas., Chrys., so Meyer: εκτενεώς ΝΑΒ 13, 40, 81, Vulg.,
Lucif, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt, R. V. ; D has εν εκτενεια (cf. xxvi. 7), so Hig.

martyrdom narrated by Clement of Alexander,
see Eus., H. E., ii. 9. Whatever
St. Luke's reason for the brevity of the
account, whether he knew no more, or
whether he intended to write a third book
publishing an account of the other Apostles
besides Peter and Paul, and so mentioned
here what concerned the following
history (so Meyer, but see Wendt, p. 267
(1888)), his brief notice is at least in
striking contrast (ἀπλώς και ώς έτυχεν,
Chrys.) with the details of later martyr
ologies.

Ver. 3. ἀρεστόν . .. τοίς Ι.: exactly
what we should expect from the character
and policy of Ηerod in his zeal for the
law, and from the success with which
during his short reign he retained the
favour of Jews and Romans alike. Holtz
tmann, p. 37o, seems inclined to doubt
the truth of this description of Ηerod,
and lays stress upon the mention of the
king's mild disposition in Josephus,Αντ.,
xix., 7. 3. But Josephus also makes it
quite plain how zealous Agrippa was, or
pretended to be, for the laws and ordi
nances of Judaism, u. s. and xx., 7. 1, and
see Schürer, u. s., and Feine, p. 226.
Nor is it at all certain that Agrippa's
epted mildness and gentleness would
have kept him from rejoicing in the per
secution of the Christians, cf. the descrip
tion of his delight in the bloody gladiato
tory games, Ιos., Αντ., xix., 9. 5.—
xix. 11, xx. 11: LXX, Gen. iv. 2, viii. 12,
xxv. 1, Exod. xiv. 13, etc., peculiar to St.
Luke in N.T., Βiteau, Λεγ Θεν του Ν. T.,
p. 209 (1893).— τιν αὐτούμεν, and
therefore a large number of Jews would
be in Jerusalem, and Ηerod would thus
have a good opportunity of gaining wide
popularity by his zeal for the law.

Ver. 4. δια καλ πίεσων, iii. 7, really
Donic form of πίεσω (cf. Luke vi. 38, no
where else in N.T.), used in this sense
also in LXX, and elsewhere in N.T., cf.
Cant. ii. 15, Ecclus. xxiii. 21 (not Α).

Modern Greek πίασω = seize, apprehend.
—καλ: "when he had taken him, indeed," so Rendall, as if a delay had taken place,
before the arrest was actually made.—
τέσσαρις τετραδίοις: the night was divided
by the Romans—here imitated by Ηerod—into four watches, and each
watch of three hours was kept by four
soldiers, quaternio, two probably guarding
the prisoner within the cell, chained to
him, and two outside. τετραδιος, cf. Philo,
in Flaccum, 13; Polyb., xv., 33, 7, and
see for other instances, Wetstein.—μετά
tο πάσχα, "after the Passover," R.V.,
ϊ.ε., after the whole festival was over:
Ηerod either did not wish, or affected
not to wish, to profane the Feast: " non
judicat die festo" (Μoed Κατων., ν., 2).—
ἀναγαγεῖν: only here in this sense (in
Luke xxii. 66, ἀνέγαγον, W. Η.), probably
means to lead the prisoner up, i.e., before
the judgment tribunal (John xix. 13),
to sentence him openly to death before the
people.

Ver. 5. ο μεν ουν . . . προσευχή δε:
both Α. and R. V. regard προσ. δε in the
same verse as the antithesis, but see
Page's note, where the antithesis is found
in ver. 6, ὅτε δε. If we retain the former
interpretation, ver. 5 may be regarded as a
kind of parenthesis, the ὅτε δε in ver. 6
forming a kind of antithesis to ver. 4.
—εκτενής, see critical notes; if we read
εκτενῶς = "earnestly," R. V. (Latin, in
tente), adverb is Ηellenistic, used (by St.
Luke xxii. 44, and) once elsewhere in 1
Peter i. 22 (cf. the adjective in 1 Peter
iv. 8), so of prayer in Clem. Rom., Cor.,
xxvii. 7. In LXX cf. the use of the word
in Joel i. 14 (but see H. and R.), Jonah iii.
8, Judith iv. 12 (see H. and R.), 3 Macc.
v. 9. The adjective is also found in 3
Macc. iii. 10 and v. 29. Their praying
shows "non fuisse animis fractos,"
Calvin. The word passed into the
services of the Church, and was often
repeated by the deacon: δεηθώμενεκ. or
εκτενέστερον.
6. "οτε δέ εξελλεν αυτῶν προσάγειν ὁ Ἦρωδης, τῇ νυκτὶ ἑκείνῃ ἵνα ὁ Πέτρος κοιμόμενος μεταξὺ δύο στρατιωτῶν, διδεμένος ἀλύσει διοίκησε, φολάκες τε πρὸ τῆς θύρας ἐτήρουν τὴν φυλακὴν. 7. καὶ Ἰδοῦ, ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέστη, καὶ ὡς ἠλάμπη ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ. πατάξας δὲ τὴν πλευράν τοῦ Πέτρου, ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν λέγων, Ἀνάστα ἐν τάχει. Εἰπε γὰρ τὸ ἄγγελον πρὸς αὐτῶν, Περιβάλοι, καὶ ὑπόδηση τὰ σανδάλιά σου. Αὐτῶν δὲ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν. 8. ἐπέτε αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν. "Περιβάλοι, Ιμάτιόν σου, καὶ ακολούθει."
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9. καὶ ἐξῆλθον ἡκολούθει αὐτῷ· καὶ οὐκ ἦδει ὅτι ἄλλος ἔστι τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἁγγελοῦ, ἐδέχεται δὲ ὅραμα βλέπειν. 10. ἐξῆλθον δὲ πρώτην φυλακὴν καὶ δεύτεραν, ἤδην ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν οἰκήσατο, τὴν φερομένην εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἢτοις αὐτομάτῳ ἴνοψθήναιν 1 αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐξῆλθοντες 2 πρὸς ἡμᾶς μίαν, καὶ εὗθως ἀπέστη ὁ ἄγγελος ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. 11. καὶ ὁ Πέτρος γενόμενος εν εαυτῷ εἶπε, Νῦν οίδα ἀληθῶς ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλε Κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, καὶ εξείλετο με εἰ χειρὸς Ηρώδου καὶ πάσης τῆς προσδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν ἱουδαίων·

1 ἴδος ἨΗ ΛΠ, Chrys.; ἴδοις Α, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 103; Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 17.
2 After ἐξῆλθοντες D, Par.add κατεβῆσαν τους επτα βαθμους· Both Weiss (p. 110) and Corrsen (p. 441) (see too Harris, p. 63, Four Lectures, etc.) regard this as possibly original, so Wendt (p. 221, edit. 1899), whilst Belser (p. 65), Zahn (ii., 350), Salmon (pp. 600, 601), Zöckler incline still more strongly to its acceptance, and Blass and Hilg. retain. The addition has been referred to the mention of the seven steps in Ezek. xl. 22 (cf. 26, 31) as its source (so Chase), but, on the other hand, Zahn can see no explanation of the present passage in the seven or the eight (ver. 31) steps of Ezekiel. It is quite possible, he thinks, that the writer might introduce a detail of the kind into his first draft, but omit it afterwards as unnecessary for distant readers. In xxii. 35, 40, the steps lead not into the street, but from Antonia into the Temple, and there is no connection between them and the definite seven steps here, which are evidently presupposed (note the article) to be well known to the reader.

vision, ἄπτασις, but this word is not confined to appearances which the narrators regard as visions, cf. Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23, cf. Beyschlag, Studien und Kritiken, p. 203, 1864; Witness of the Epistles (Longmans, 1892).

Ver. 10. φυλακὴν: "ward," perhaps the best translation here with ἐξῆλθοντες so often used of traversing a place. The first ward might be the place outside the cell where the other soldiers of the quaternion were on guard, and the second ward might refer to some other part of the prison or fortress Antonia (see Blass in loco) where sentinels were stationed. Weiss apparently takes the expression to refer to the two φυλάκες, ver. 6, cf. 1 Chron. xxvi. 16. —οἰκήσατο: specially noted since such a gate, when shut, would effectually bar their way; but it opened ἄυτομα, only here in N.T. and in Mark iv. 28, cf. Lev. xxv. 5, 11, 2 Kings xix. 20, Wisdom xvii. 6, and in classical writers the striking parallel, Hom., Iliad, v., 749 (Wendt, Blass); Virgil, Æneid, vi., 61 (Wetstein).—φιλοσε: εἰς: only here in N.T., but quite usual in classical Greek. If the narrative means that immediately they were out of the prison they were in the street (so Weiss), evidently the prison was in the city, and εἰς τὴν π.: would simply mean the open town, in contrast to the confined prison-house (so Weiss and Wendt, 1899). Blass decides for the tower of Antonia on account of D.—γενόμενος εν εαυτῷ, cf. Luke xv. 17, and compare instances of similar phrases in Greek and Latin classical writers in Wetstein and Blass.—Κύριος, see critical notes.—ἐξαπέστειλε: for remarkable addition in D see critical notes.—έξείλετο εἰς: used several times in Acts, but εὐθὺς only once, see x. 16.—ἀπόστη: when there were no further hindrances to the Apostle's flight, then the angel departed (Chrys.).

Ver. 11. γενόμενος εν εαυτῷ, cf. Luke xv. 17, and compare instances of similar phrases in Greek and Latin classical writers in Wetstein and Blass.—Κύριος, see critical notes, if without the articleNousgen (so Weiss) takes it of G., Jehovah. —ἐξηλθοντει: a compound only found in Luke and Paul; four times in Luke's Gospel, six or seven times in Acts, and Gal. iv. 6, 6; very frequent in LXX, and used also in active voice by Polybius.—ἐξηλθοντει: εἰς: close parallels in LXX, cf. Exod. iii. 8, 2 Sam. xxii. 1, Isa. xiii. 13, Baruch iv. 18, 21, etc.—ἐ με ἱερός: Hebraism, cf. Luke i. 74. The expression is also classical, Blass, Gram., p. 127, for close parallel.—προσδοκήσα: only in Luke here and in Luke xxii. 26, cf. Gen. xlix. 10, but more allied to its sense here Ps. cxix. 116, Wisdom xvii. 13, Ecclus. xl. 2, and in 2 and 3 Macc. (see H. and R.), and Psalms of Solomon, Tit. xi.; frequently in classics. Ho-
12. Having been led by their own accord into the house of Mary, the mother of John the Baptist, who was a prudent and prayerful man.

13. Knocking at the door of Peter, he went in, and hearing the voice of the Apostle, he did not open the door, but went into the house and cried out to Peter, 'Open the door to me.'
15. οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπον, Μαίνη. ἐδιδόχυρίζετο οὖσα δυναμικάν. οἱ δὲ Ἱλευγόν, 'Ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῶν ἐστιν. 16. οἱ δὲ Πέτρος ἀπέφημι κρούων. ἀνοίξαντες δὲ εἶδον αὐτὸν, καὶ ἔξοδον. 17. κατασείσας δὲ αὐτοῖς τῇ χειρὶ στιγμῆς, διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ὁ Κύριος αὐτὸν ἔξηγαγαν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς. εἰπε δὲ, 'Ἀπαγγείλατε ιακώβῳ καὶ τοῖς προκέροσι.
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αδελφοὶ τοῦτο, καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἄλλον τόπον. 18. Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, ἦν τάραχος οὐκ ὁλίγος ἐν τοῖς στρατιώτεσι, τί ἀρα ὁ Πέτρος ἔγνετο. 19. Ἡρώδης δὲ ἐκτίθησα αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ εὗροι, ἀνακρίνας τοὺς φύλακας, ἐκλευσεν ἀπαχθῆναι καὶ κατελθὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Καισαρείαν διέτριβεν.

1 οὐκ ὁλίγος om. D, Gig., Par., so Blass in β, and Hilg., may be "Western non-interpolation," and for ordinary reading cf. xx. 23. At end of verse β adds η τῶν εὐφόρων, cf. Par. "aut quomodo exisset"; cf. Blass, p. ix., for defence, so Belser, p. 65. 2 ἀπαχθ., D¹ reads ἀποκτάνθηναι, so Hilg., but Blass rejects—certainly looks like a gloss.

St. James; Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., i., 72; Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 252 ff. and 364; Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 76, 77. In this mention of James, Feine points out that a knowledge as to who he was is evidently presupposed, and that therefore we have another indication that the "Jerusalem tradition" is the source of St. Luke's information here.—εἰς ἄλλον τόπον: all conjectures as to the place, whether it was Antioch, Rome, Caesarea, are rendered more arbitrary by the fact that it is not even said that the place was outside Jerusalem (however probable this may have been); ἐξελθὼν need not mean that he went out of the city, but out of the house in which he had taken refuge, cf. ver. 9. For all that can be said in support of the view that he went to Rome, see Felten, u. 5., pp. 240-244, Knabenbauer, p. 214. Harnack, Chronol., i., p. 243, apparently is prepared to regard the visit to Rome in the reign of Claudius, A.D. 42, as not impossible, although unpromising. But see the whole question treated from the opposite side by Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 233, 234 (second edition). The notice is so indefinite that we cannot build anything upon it, and we can scarcely go beyond Wendt's view that if Peter left Jerusalem at all, he may have undertaken some missionary journey, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 5.

Ver. 18. τάραχος (generally ταραχῆ): only in Acts xix. 23, although several times in LXX.—οὐκ ὁλίγος: only found in Acts, where it occurs eight times (litotes), cf. xix. 11, xx. 12, xxvii. 14, and for similar expressions Luke xv. 13 (Acts i. 5), vii. 6; see Klostermann, Vindicia Lucana, p. 52, and Page, in loco. The guards would answer for the escape of the prisoner by suffering a like penalty, cf. Cod. Fust., ix., 4, 4.—οὐ δρα (cf. Luke i. 66), Peter has disappeared, what, then, has become of him? (Grimm, sub v. ἄρα (i.), and Winer-Moulton, liii. 8); it thus marks the perplexity of the soldier as to what had become of Peter.—ὑπὸ: Blass, quid Petro (ablat.) factum sit.

Ver. 19. μὴ for οὐ, as often with a participle. Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 188.—ἀνακρίνας, Acts iv. 9, xxiv. 8, xxviii. 18, Luke xxiii. 14, of a judicial investigation, cf. also 1 Cor. ix. 3 for this judicial use by St. Paul, see Grimm sub v.—ἀπαχθ., "to be put to death," R.V., only here in this sense in N.T. absolutely; so Latin duci in Pliny, ad Traj., 96 (Page); Nestle, Philologia Sacra (1896), p. 53, cf. Gen. xxxix. 22, xl. 3, xlii. 16, LXX, use of the same verb of carrying off to prison.—κατελθὼν: Herod was wont to make his residence for the most part at Jerusalem, Jos., Ant., xix., 7, 3, and we are not told why he went down to Caesarea on this occasion. Josephus, xix., 8, 2, tells us that the festival during which the king met his death was appointed in honour of the emperor's safety, and the conjecture has been made that the thanksgiving was for the return of Claudius from Britain (see Farrar, St. Paul, i., 315), but this must remain uncertain; he may have gone down to Caesarea "propter Tyros," Blass, see also B.D., 11, p. 135.

Ver. 20. ὕμοιρακήν: lit., "to fight desperately" Polyb., ix., 40, 4; xxvii., 8, 4, and it might be used not only of open warfare, but of any violent quarrel: here almost = ἀργυροῦτος. There could be no question of actual warfare, as Phoenicia was part of the province of Syria, and Herod had no power to wage war against it. Probably the cause of this ὕμοιρακήλιος lay in commercial interests. The word is not found in LXX, or elsewhere in N.T.—ἀργυροῦτος, i. 14.—παρευρίσκεται, cf. Matt. xxviii. 14, possibly with bribes, as Blass and Wendt suggest.—ὁ κατετύμων
20. "Ην δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης θυμομαχῶν Τυρίοις καὶ Σιδωνίοις ὁ ὀροφυρακαὶ διὰ τῶν παρῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ πείσαντες Βλάστον τοῦ κοιτῶν τοῦ βασιλέως, ἤτουντο εἰρήνη, διὰ τὸ τρεφεσθαί αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς. 21. Ταχύτερο τὸ ἡμέρα ὁ Ἡρώδης ἐνδυσάμενος ἐσθήτα βασιλικά, καὶ καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτούς. 22. ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει, Θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπον. 23. παραχρήμα διὰ τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἄγγελον Κυρίου, ἀν' αὐτὸν ἐδωκεν τῇ δόξῃ τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκὸς βρωτός, ἐξέψυξεν.

1 ομοθ., D, Syr. H. mg. (Par. Vulg.), so Blass and Hilg. read οι δε ομοθ., εξ αμφοτερων των πολεων παρησαν. May be a glosso to the word εξαμφοτερων των πολεων παρησαν., may be a glosson ομοθ. meaning that the two cities made common cause, cf. τις χωρας for την χώραν in same verse (Western). D, Par. (Wern.) add at end of ver. 21 καταλλαγεντος δε αυτον τοις Τ. και τοις Σ. D omits και τοις Σ. Syr. Η. mg. has κατηλλαγη δε αυτοις. But this appearsto introduce a freshconnection into the narrative, and to divert attention from the main point, τις., the speech. So Weiss, p. 73, thinks φωναι (β), for φωνη, ver. 22, is introduced to indicate the contents of the speech.

2 D reads καταβας απο του βηματος after Θεω και. και ουτως, so Blass and Hilg. Blass in possible πη is understandings, see comment.

κοιτῶν, “chamberlain,” perhaps best. κοιτῶν will imply that he was over the king's bed-chamber. Exod. viii. 3, cf. 2 Sam. vi. 7, 2 Kings, vii. 11, 1 Esd. i. 3 = Latin cubiculium. κοιτῶν, in Dio Cassius, lix., 5, is used of the king's treasure, but the ordinary usage is as above. In Attic Greek δῆμος, not κοιτῶν. τρεφεσθαί, i.e., with corn (cf. 1 Kings v. 9, Ezr. iii. 7, Ezk. xxvii. 17; Jos., Ant., xiv., 10, 6), and see Blass, note in loco.

Ver. 21. ταχύτερο: only here in N.T.; cf. Jos., Ant., xiv., 8, 2 (cf. xvii., 67), διατροφῆς δι' τῶν θύμων κρίνων. It is quite true that Josephus says nothing directly of the Tyrians and Sidonians, but the audience was evidently granted to them on the second day of the public spectacle; cf. for the expression, Polyb., iii., 34, 9. The description of Josephus evidently implies some special occasion, and not the return of the ordinary Quinquennalia; see on ver. 19 and also below. Josephus does not mention Blastus, or those of Tyre and Sidon, but this is no reason against the narrative, as Krenkel maintains. Belser, much more reasonably, contends that Luke's narrative supplements and completes the statement of Josephus. — διὰ δημηγορεῖν, cf. Jos., Ant., xiv., 8, 2, στόλην ἐνδυσάμενον δι' ἐγγυων πεποιημένον πάσαν; on εξα. see 1. 10. — βήματος: Josephus speaks of the event happening in the theatre, and the βήμα here = rather “the throne,” R.V. (margin, “judgment-seat”), the royal seat in the theatre from which the king saw the games and made his harangues to the people (so of an orator's pulpit, Neh. viii. 4, 2 Macc. xiii. 26), see Blass and Grimm-Thayer, sub τ. -εδημηγόρει: only here in N.T. In 4 Macc. v. 15 = continuari, frequent in classical Greek.—καταταχλαγεντος δε αυτον τοις Τ. και τοις Σ. D reads καταβας απο του βηματος after Θεω και. After σκωλ. D adds ετιζων και ουτως, so Blass and Hilg. Blass in possible πη is understandings, see comment.

Ver. 22. δῆμος: only in Acts, xvii. 5, 30, 33, but in the same significanation in classical Greek.—ἐδημηγόρει: only here in N.T. In 4 Macc. v. 15 = continuari, frequent in classical Greek.—προς αυτούς, i.e., to the Tyrian and Sidonian representatives, but the word εδημ. might well be used of what was in any case an address, ad populum, cf. ver. 22.

Ver. 23. παραχρήμα, see above, p. 106. — ἐπάταξεν, cf. Exod. xi. 23, 2 Sam. xxiv. 17, 2 Kings xix. 35, 1 Chron. xxix. 15, Isa. xxxvii. 36, 1 Macc. vii. 41. See p. 188. On the confusion in the reading of Eusebius, H. E., ii., 10, where for the owl whom Josephus describes as appearing to Herod as ἄγγελος κακῶν we have the reading “the angel” of the Acts, the unseen minister of the divine will, see B.D. 1a, p. 1345, and Eusebius, Schaff and Wace's
28ο ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ ΧΙΙ. 24-25.

24. ο δε λόγος του Θεού ηύξανε και ἐπληθύνετο. 25. Βαρνάβας δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος ὁ ἀποστέφων ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ λειτουργον τὸν ἐπικληθήντα Μάρκον.

1 After Σαῦλος Syr. H. mg., Par. add ὁ εὐκαλυφητὸς Παῦλος. Par. also reads Παῦλος in xiii. 1, 2. This seems a mere anticipation of xiii. 9. Blass in β follows Par. (p. ix.), and regards Παῦλος as original. So Belser, pp. 65, 66, warmly defends, as showing that there is no need to see in xiii. 9 a sudden introd. of the name Paul, but that Luke, at least in the first draft of his work, had already spoken of him here as bearing a double name, like John Mark. "υπεστρεψαν εἰς Ιερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες την διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ιωάννην τον επικληθέντα Μάρκον."

2 Τhis seems a mere anticipation of xiii. 9. Βlass in β follows Par. (p. ix.), and regards Παῦλος as original...So Belser, pp. 65, 66, warmly defends, as showing that there is no need to see in xiii. 9 a sudden introd. of the name Paul, but that Luke, at least in the first draft of his work, had already spoken of him here as bearing a doublename, like John Mark. "υπεστρεψαν εἰς Ιερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες την διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ιωάννην τον επικληθέντα Μάρκον."
ΧΙΙΙ. Ι. 28 ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ΧΙΙΙ. Ι. "ΗΣΑΝ δέ τίνες εν Αντιοχεία κατά τὴν οὐσάν έκκλησίαν προφηταί καὶ διδάσκαλοι, δὲ τῇ Βαρνάβας καὶ Συμεών ό καλομένως Νιγέρ, καὶ Λούκιος ό Κυρηναίος, Μανάην τε Ηρώδου τουτετράρχου


2 For δε τι D, Vulg. read δε, and before Κυρ. D omits ο—Blass, "recte," but there may have been some other Lucius from whom this one was distinguished. Σαύλος, Par. reads Παυλος, so in ver. 2, and Blass in β; see on xii. 25.

only between the death of the persecutor and the growth of the Word, but also between the persecution and the vitality of the Church.—ηύξαν καὶ επλήθ. im perfects, marking the continuous growth in spite of all obstacles; cf. Luke viii. 11, Matt. xiii. 32, 2 Cor. ix. 10.

Ver. 25. "ο τε D, Vulg. read εν οις, and before Κυρ. D omitso—Blass, "recte," but there may have been some other Lucius from whom this one was distinguished. Σαύλος, Par. reads Παυλος, so in ver. 2, and Blass in β; see on xii. 25.

only between the death of the persecutor and the growth of the Word, but also between the persecution and the vitality of the Church.—ηύξαν καὶ επλήθ. im perfects, marking the continuous growth in spite of all obstacles; cf. Luke viii. 11, Matt. xiii. 32, 2 Cor. ix. 10.

Ver. 25. "ο τε D, Vulg. read εν οις, and before Κυρ. D omitso—Blass, "recte," but there may have been some other Lucius from whom this one was distinguished. Σαύλος, Par. reads Παυλος, so in ver. 2, and Blass in β; see on xii. 25.
ΧΙΙΙ. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

σύντροφος, καὶ Σαῦλος. 2. λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων, ἐπὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιον, ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν τε Βαρνάβαν καὶ τὸν Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον διὰ προσκέκλημα αὐτῶς.

hood, pp. 159, 160, 166, 208. See further on the relation of the prophets and teachers in the Didaché “Church,” Hastings’ B.D., i. 436, Bigg, Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, p. 27; and on the relation of prophecy and teaching in the N.T., McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 528, Zöckler, in loco.—.. καί: a difficulty arises as to the force of these particles. It is urged that two groups are thus represented, the first three names forming one group (prophets), and the last two another group (teachers), so Ramsay (p. 65), Weiss, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Harnack, Knabenbauer, and amongst older commentators Meyer and Alford; but on the other hand Wendt, so Nösgen, Felten, Hilgenfeld think that there is no such separation intended, as Paul himself later claims the prophetic gift (1 Cor. xiv. 6), to which Zöckler would reply that at this time Paul might well be described as a teacher, his prophetic gift being more developed at a later date. Amongst recent English writers both Hort and Gore regard the term “prophets and teachers” as applying to all the five (so Page).—Συμεών: nothing is known of him. Spitta would identify him with Simon of Cyrene, Matt. xxvii. 32, but the epithet Niger may have been given to distinguish him from others of the same name, and possibly from the Simon to whom Spitta refers.—Λούκιος ο Κ.: Zöckler describes as “quite absurd” the attempt to identify him with Luke of the Acts. The names are quite different, and the identification has been supported on the ground that Cyrene was a famous school of medicine. This Lucius may have been one of the men of Cyrene, xi. 20, who first preached the Gospel at Antioch. Others have proposed to identify him with the Lucius of Rom. xvi. 21.—Μαναὴν: of the three names, as distinct from Barnabas and Paul, Blass says ignoti reliqui, and we cannot say more than this. For although Mark is described as σύντροφος of Herod the Tetrarch (Antipas), the description is still very indefinite. A.V. “brought up with,” R.V. “foster-brother,” colластaνευς, Vulgate. For an ingenious study on the name and the man see Plumptre, in loco, cf. also Wetstein and Zöckler. The name occurs in Ἱ Μacc. i. 6, but the reading must apparently give place to συνιάστροφος. It is also found in 2 Macc. ix. 29, and once in the N.T. in the present passage. Deissmann, from the evidence of the inscriptions, regards it as a court title, and quotes amongst other places an inscription in Delos of the first half of the second century b.c., where Heliodorus is described as σύντροφος τοῦ βασιλέως Σελεύκου Φιλοπάτορος. So Manaen also might be described as a confidential friend of Herod Antipas, Bibelstudien, pp. 173, 178-181.—Σαῦλος, placed last probably because the others were older members of the Church. The position certainly does not mark the list as unhistorical; if the account came from the Apostle himself, the lowest place was eminently characteristic of him.

Ver. 2. λειτουργούντων: “as they ministered to the Lord,” A. and R. V., ministrantibus Domino, Vulgate. It would be difficult to find a more appropriate rendering. On the one hand the word is habitually used in the LXX of the service of the priests and Levites (cf. Heb. viii. 2, x. 11), although it has a wider meaning as, e.g., when used to describe the service of Samuel to God, 1 Sam. ii. 18, iii. 1, or of service to man, 1 Kings i. 4, 15, 2 Chron. xvii. 19, Eccles. x. 25. So too in the N.T. it is used in the widest sense of those who aid others in their poverty, Rom. xv. 27 (cf. 2 Cor. ix. 12), Phil. ii. 25, 27, and also λειτουργία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, Phil. ii. 17, of the whole life of the Christian Society. But here the context, see on ver. 3 (cf. xiv. 23), seems to point to some special public religious service (Hort, Ecclesia, p. 63, but see also Ramsay’s rendering of the words, and Zöckler, in loco). In this early period λειτουργία could of course not be applied to the Eucharist alone, and the Romanist commentator Felten only goes so far as to say that a reference to it cannot be excluded in the passage before us, and in this we may agree with him. At all events it seems somewhat arbitrary to explain Didaché, xv. 1, where we have a parallel phrase, of the service of public worship, whilst in the passage before us the words are explained of serving Christ whether by prayer or by instructing others concerning the way of salvation; so Grimm-Thayer. In each passage the verb should certainly be taken as referring to the
3. τότε ἑστίντις καὶ προσευχόμενοι, καὶ ἐπιδέητες τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῶς, ἀπέλυσαν. 4. οὕτωι μὲν ὁὐν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος

1 ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

3. τότε ἑστίντις καὶ προσευχόμενοι, καὶ ἐπιδέητες τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῶς, ἀπέλυσαν. 4. οὕτωι μὲν ὁὐν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος

ministry of public worship. In the N.T. the whole group of words, λειτουργεῖν, λειτουργία, λειτουργός, λειτουργικός, is found only in St. Luke, St. Paul, and Hebrews. See further on the classical and Biblical usage Westcott, Hebrews, additional note on viii. 2. Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 137, from pre-Christian papyri points out that λειτουργεῖν and λειτουργία were used by the Egyptians of the sacred service of the priests, and sometimes of a wider religious service. 

αὐτῶν: not the whole Ecclesia, but the prophets and teachers: "prophetarum doctorumque antiquus sunt concilium," Blass.—προσευχόμενοι, cf. x. 30, xiv. 23, xxvii. 9, and in O.T. 1 Sam. vii. 5, 6, Dan. ix. 3, on the union of fasting and prayer. In Didaché, viii., 1, while the fasts of the "hypocrites" are condemned, fasting is enjoined on the fourth day of the week, and on Friday, i.e., the day of the Betrayal and the Crucifixion. But Didaché, viii., 4, lays it down that before baptism the baptiser and the candidate should fast. The conduct therefore of the prophets and teachers at Antioch before the solemn mission of Barnabas and Saul to their work is exactly what might have been expected, cf. Ebersheim, Temple and its Services, p. 66.—ἐξει ν. τὸ Π.: we may reasonably infer by one of the prophets; it may have been at a solemn meeting of the whole Ecclesia held expressly with reference to a project for carrying the Gospel to the heathen (Hort, Felten, Hackett). Felten sees in δή an indication of an answer to a special prayer. But it does not follow that the "liturgical" functions should be assigned to the whole Ecclesia.

Ver. 3. τότε probably indicating a new and special act of fasting and prayer. But is the subject of the sentence the whole Ecclesia, or only the prophets and teachers mentioned before? Ramsay maintains that it cannot be the officials just mentioned, because they cannot be said to lay hands on two of themselves, so that he considers some awkward change of subject takes place, and that the simplest interpretation is that the Church as a whole held a meeting for this solemn purpose (cf. τάντας in D). But if the whole Church was present, it does not follow that they took part in every detail of the service, just as they may have been present in the public service of worship in ver. 2 (see above) without λειτουργ. τῷ Κ. equally with the prophets and teachers (cf. Felten and also Wendt). There is therefore no reason to assume that the laying on of hands was performed by the whole Church, or that St. Luke could have been ignorant that this function was one which belonged specifically to the officers of the Church. The change of subject is not more awkward than in vi. 6. Dr. Hort is evidently conscious of the difficulty, see especially Ecclesia, p. 64. No doubt, on the return of the two missionaries, they report their doings to the whole Church, xiv. 27, but this is not proof that the laying on of hands for their consecration to their mission was the act of the whole Church. That prophets and teachers should thus perform what is represented in Acts as an Apostolic function need not surprise us, see Gore, u. s., pp. 241, 260, 261. A further question arises as to whether this passage conflicts with the fact that St. Paul
was already an Apostle, and that his Apostleship was based not upon his appointment by man, or upon human teaching, but upon a revelation from God, and upon the fact that he had seen the Lord. It is certainly remarkable that both Barnabas and Saul are called Apostles by St. Luke in connection with this first missionary journey, and that under no other circumstance does he apply the term to either, viz., to have seen the Lord, and to bear witness to His Resurrection, see Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 95 ff. (as against the recent statements of McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 653): "We have no reason to suppose that this condition was ever waived, unless we throw forward the Teaching into the second century," Gwatkin, "Apostle," Hastings' B.D.: see further, Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 350, additional note on the Didachē. This we may accept, except in so far as it bears upon the Didachē, in which the Apostles (only mentioned in one passage, xi. 3-6) may be contrasted rather than compared with the Apostles of the N.T., inasmuch as they are represented as wandering missionaries, itinerating from place to place, in days of corruption and gross imposture, and inasmuch as the picture which the Didachē reveals is apparently characteristic of a corner of Church life rather than of the whole of it; Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 176; Bright, Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life, p. 34, and the strictures of Bigg, Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, pp. 37, 40 ff. It may of course be urged that we know nothing of Barnabas and of the others, to whom Lightfoot and Gwatkin refer as to their special call from Christ, whilst in the case of St. Paul we have his own positive assertion. But even in his case the laying on of hands recognised, if it did not bestow, his Apostolic commission, and "the ceremony of Ordination when it was not the channel of the grace was its recognition," Gore, u. s., pp. 257-267, 383, 395, etc., and see especially the striking passage in Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, pp. 107, 108.

Ver. 4. μεν ούν answered by δέ in ver. 5, so Weiss and Rendall, Appendix on μεν ούν, p. 167. Page takes διελ. δέ in ver. 6 as the antithesis, see his note on ii. 41—εξερευν., cf. ver. 2; only in N.T. in xvii. 10, cf. 2 Sam. xix. 31, where it denotes personal conduct. Mr. Rendall's note takes the verb here also of the personal presence of the Holy Spirit conducting the Apostles on their way.—κατήλθον: "went down," R.V., of a journey from the interior to the coast, cf. xv. 30; Vulgate, abierunt, and so A.V. "departed," which fails to give the full force of the word.—Σελεύκειαν: the port of Antioch, built by the first Seleucus, about sixteen miles from the city on the Orontes; Seleucia ad mare and ἡ ἐν Πιερία to distinguish it from other places bearing the same name, see Wetstein for references to it. On its mention here and St. Luke's custom see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 70.—Κύπρον, cf. iv. 36. Although not expressly stated, we may well believe that the place was divinely intimated. But it was natural for more reasons than one that the missionary should make for Cyprus. Barnabas was a Cypriote, and the nearness of Cyprus to Syria and its productive copper mines had attracted a large settlement of Jews, cf. also xi. 19, 20, and the Church at Antioch moreover owed its birth in part to the Cypriotes, xi. 20 (xxi. 16).

Ver. 5. Σαλαμίνι: the nearest place to Seleucia on the eastern coast of Cyprus. A few hours' sail in favourable weather would bring the traveller to a harbour convenient and capacious. The Jewish colony must have been considerable since mention is made of synagogues.—κατήγγελον: "they began to proclaim"...ἐν ταῖς συν., it was St. Paul's habitual custom to go to the synagogues first, cf. ix. 20, xiv. 1, etc.—ὑπανθην: the marked silence about him previously seems to emphasise the fact that he was not selected by the Holy Ghost in the same solemn way as Barnabas and Saul.—
τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ἢχον δὲ καὶ ἴωνην ὑπηρέτην. 6. διελθόντες δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν ἀχρὶ Πάφου, εὑρόν τινα μάγον

1 νετρότεν, D, Par., Syr. Harcl. mg. read νετρότοιται αὐτοῖς (E reads εἰς διακοιν.). Weiss considers that this is in order to avoid describing Mark as νετρότεν.

2 διελθόντες δὲ, D1 reads καὶ μετελθόντες αὐτῶν, and so Blass and Hilg., and D1 διελθόντες δὲ αὐτῶν. περι may have been changed into δια, as the latter prep. may have been thought to mean that they went straight through, instead of going about the island; see also Weiss, Codex D, p. 73. ολὴν τὴν νῆσον, so ΛABCDE 61, Vulg., several vers., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.—perhaps fell out, as in T.R., because the situation of Paphos was not known, and οὐς seemed to contradict χρείας. (Wendt). D reads υπερηφανείς καλομένον; υπερήφανον is common in Gospels but not elsewhere in Acts, υπερήφανος and καλός are both common; cf. also Luke xix. 1. Βαρίσον BCD 13, Sah., Chrys., so W.H., Weiss; Βαρίσον ADHLP, Syr. H. mg.: Βαρίσον 40, Vulg., Boh., Syr. H. text, Arm., Tisch.; Βαρίσον D, so Blass, Hilg. with ν or μ added (D)—other variations. E, G. and Lucif. add οὐδεμετελθόντες Ετοίμος (see on ver. 8) according to Blass in B (E reading Ετοίμος, G. and Lucif. reading paratus = Ετοίμος). In ver. 8 almost all authorities read Ετοίμος, but D, Lucif. have Ετοίμος (not G., Par.). This reading is defended by Klostermann, Prob. im Apostelltexte, p. 21, and adopted by Blass (although he is not satisfied with Klostermann's derivation) and also by Ramsay. Blass holds that this name Ετοίμος, whatever it is, must be interpreted of Βαρίσον—οὐδεμετελθόντες—οὐδεμαγος of it. It is possible that some desire may have been at work to avoid any connection between the name of the Magian and the name of Jesus, and thus the words οὐδεμετελθόντες Ετοίμος in ver. 8, which are omitted by Blass without any authority, simply because of the reading in ver. 6 in E, etc., may have crept into ver. 6 as more appropriate. See also “Barjesus,” Hastings' B.D. Weiss, Codex D, p. 74, points out that Ετοίμος may be an old corruption for Ελυμας, and this seems very probable. See further, Schmieder, Enc. Bibl., i., 478 ff.

3 Πάφον: Nea Paphos—the chief town and the place of residence of the Roman governor—some little distance from the old Paphos (Παλαίπαφος, Strabo) celebrated for its Venus temple. The place still bears the name of Βαφα, Renan, St. Paul, p. 14; O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 101; C. and H., smaller edition, p. 125.—μάγον, cf. viii. 9: “sorcerer,” A. and R.V. margin, cf. Matt. ii. 1, but word used here as among the Greeks and Romans in a bad sense. Wycl. has “witch,” and this in its masculine form “wizard” has been suggested as an appropriate rendering here. On the absurd attempt to show that the whole narrative is merely introduced as a parallel to St. Peter's encounter with Simon, chap. viii., see Nösgen, p. 427, Zöckler, in loco, and Salmon, Introduction, p. 310. The parallel really amounts to this, that both Peter and Paul encountered a person described under the same title, a magician—an encounter surely not improbable in the social circumstances of the time (see below)!

Ver. 6. διελθόντες δὲ (ὁλὴν) τὴν ν.: “and they made a missionary progress through the whole island,” Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 72 and 384, and “Words denoting Missionary Travel in Acts,” Expositor, May, 1890; on ολὴν, see critical notes. Ramsay gives nine examples in Acts of this use of διέρχομαι or διελθείν with the accusative of the region traversed, the only other instance in the N.T. being 1 Cor. xvi. 5. In each of these ten cases the verb implies the process of going over a country as a missionary, and it is remarkable that in i.-xii. this construction of διέρχομαι never occurs, though there are cases in which the idea of a missionary tour requires expression. Ramsay therefore sees in the use of the word in the second part of the book a quasi technical term which the writer had caught from St. Paul himself, by whom alone it is also employed.—
to the narrative, says Jüngst, was either a magician or a false prophet. But the proconsul is styled ἄνηρ συνετός, and this could not have been consistent with his relation with a magician: Elymas was therefore a kind of Jewish confessor. But neither supposition does much to establish the wisdom of Sergius Paulus.


Ver. 7. δς ήν συν τῷ ἀ., cf. iv. 13. Nothing was more in accordance with what we know of the personnel of the strange groups which often followed the Roman governors as comites, and it is quite possible that Sergius Paulus may have been keenly interested in the powers or assumed powers of the Magian, and in gaining a knowledge of the strange religions which dominated the East. If the Roman had been completely under the influence of the false prophet, it is difficult to believe that St. Luke would have described him as συνετός (a title in which Zöckler sees a distinction between Sergius Paulus and another Roman, Felix, over whom a Jewish Magian gained such influence, Jos., Ant., xx., 7, 2), although magicians of all kinds found a welcome in unexpected quarters in Roman society, even at the hands of otherwise discerning and clear-sighted personages, as the pages of Roman writers from Horace to Lucian testify. It was not the first time in the world's history that credulity and scepticism had gone hand in hand: Wetstein, in loco; Farrar, St. Paul, i., pp. 351, 352; Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 74 ff.—συνετός: perhaps means, as in classical Greek, "put questions to them". The typical Roman is again marked by the fact that he was thus desirous to hear what the travellers would say, and it is also indicated that he was not inclined to submit himself entirely to the Magian.—τῇ ἀνθυπάτῃ: "the proconsul," R.V., "deputy," A.V.

In the reign of James I. the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland was called "the deputy" (cf. Shakespeare, Measure for Measure, i., 2, 161). Under Augustus, b.c. 27, the Roman provinces had been divided into two classes: (1) imperial and (2) senatorial, the former being governed by praetors or generals, and the latter by proconsuls. But as the first kind of government would often be required when a province was unruly, it frequently happened that the same province might be at one time classed under (1) and at another time under (2). Cyprus had been originally an imperial province, Strabo, xiv., but in 22 b.c. it had been transferred by Augustus to the Senate, and was accordingly, as Luke describes it, under a proconsul, Dio Cassius, iii., 12, iv., 4. Under Hadrian it appears to have been under a praetor; under Severus it was again under a proconsul. At Soloi, a town on the north coast of Cyprus, an inscription was discovered by General Cesnola, Cyprus, 1877, p. 425 (cf. Hogarth, Devia Cypria, 1889, p. 114), dated επί Παύλου (ἀνθ)υπάτου, and the probable identification with Sergius Paulus is accepted by Lightfoot, Zöckler, Ramsay, Knabenbauer, etc.; see especially amongst recent writers Zahn, Einleitung, ii., Excurs. ii., p. 632, for a similar view, and also for information as to date, as to another and more recent inscription (1887), bearing upon the connection of the gens Sergia with Cyprus; see also McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 175, note, and Wendt, edition 1899.—συνετός: R.V., "a man of understanding," cf. Matt. xi. 25. A.V. and other E.V. translate "prudent," Vulgate, prudentis, but see Genevan Version on Matt., u. s.; frequent in LXX in various significations: σύνεσις, practical discernment, intelligence, so συνετός, one who can "put things together" (συνετάω): σοφία, the wisdom of culture (Grimm-Thayer); on "prudent," see Humphry, Commentary on R.V., p. 28.

Ver. 8. ἄνθιστο: because he saw that his hope of gain was gone, cf. xvi. 19, xix. 27, and the hope of retaining influence with the proconsul; see reading in D, cf. 2 Tim. iii. 8, where St. Paul
8. ἀνθίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἑλύμας, ὁ μάγος, (οὗτος γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,) ἵπτιν διαστρέφαι τὸν αὐτήν παρὰ τῆς πίστεως.¹

9. Σαύλος δὲ, ὁ καὶ Παύλος, πληθοῦσιν Πνεῦματος Ἁγίου, καὶ ἀτενίσας εἰς αὐτούς, εἶπεν, 10. ὁ πλήρης πάντως δόλου καὶ πάσης ραδιουργίας, νεκρὸν ἄδικον, δικαστήριον δικαστήρων τὸς διαστρέφων τάς ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

¹ After πιστεως D, Syr. Harcl. mg. add ἑκατοντάκιον αὐτων (cf. E). We may compare Mark vi. 20; see also Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 81.

uses the same verb of the magicians withstanding Moses.—Ἑλύμας, see critical notes in answer to Klostermann, who finds in 'Ε. a translation of Bar-Jesus; Wendt points out (1890) that in this case οὔτω γάρ μεθ. would follow immediately after 'Ε., but as οὔτω κ.τ.λ. follows immediately upon ὁ μάγος, 'Ε. can only be a translation of that word; see also MS. authority, so Blass in β, where he adds to βαρίσων the words δ μεθ. Ἐτοίμας. In Ἐλύμας we have the Greek form either of Αραμαϊκά Αλίμα, strong, or more probably of an Αραβ word alim, wise: we cannot arrive at any derivation closer than this, cf. "Bar-Jesus," Hastings' B.D., and for a similar explanation Zöckler, in loco; and Wendt (1890), Grimm-Thayer, sub v., Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 74, and so Blass, in loco, read Ἐτοίμας, and render "Son of the Ready".—διαστρέφαι, Εὐδόκ. ν. 4, same construction with από; Ι Κings χνίι.17, 18, Matt. xvii.27, Luke ix.41, Phil. ii.15; see also critical notes.

Ver. 9. Σαύλος δὲ, ὁ καὶ Παύλος: since the days of St. Jerome (De Vir. Ill., chap. vi., cf. Aug., Confess., viii., 4, etc., cf. amongst moderns Bengel, Olschaeus, Ewald, Meyer) it has been thought that there is some connection between the name Sergius Paulus and the assumption of the name Paul by the Apostle at this juncture. (Wendt (1895) inclines to the view that the name Paul was first used in ver. 1. See in loco and critical notes.) So too Baur, Zeller, Hausrath, Overbeck, Hilgenfeld are of opinion that Luke intended some reference to the name of the proconsul, although they regard the narrative of his conversion as unhistorical. But Wendt rightly maintains (1899) that the simple ὁ καὶ without the addition of ἕνως τούτως would not denote the accomplishment of a change of name at this juncture, and that if the change or rather addition of name had been now effected, the mention of it would naturally have followed after the mention of the conversion of the proconsul in ver. 13. The connection seemed so strained and artificial to many that they abandoned it, and regarded the collocation of the two names as a mere chance incident, whilst Zöckler (whose note should be consulted, Apostelgeschichte, in loco, second edition), who cannot thus get rid of the striking similarity in the names of the two men, thinks that the narrative of St. Luke is too condensed to enable us fully to solve the connection. But since it was customary for many Jews to bear two names, a Hebrew and a Gentile name, cf. Acts i. 23, xii. 25, xiii. 1, Col. iv. 11, Jos., Ant., xii., 9, 7, and frequent instances in Deissmann, Bibelstudien, pp. 182, 183, cf. Winer-Schmidel, p. 149 note, it may well be that Luke wished to intimate that if not at this moment, yet during his first missionary journey, when the Apostle definitely entered upon his Gentile missionary labours, he employed not his Jewish but his Gentile name to mark his Apostleship to the Gentile world. ("Seit 13. Ι. ist der jüdische Junger Σαύλος Weltapostel," Deissmann): by a marvellous stroke of historic brevity the author sets before us the past and the present in the formula ὁ καὶ Π.—a simple change in the order of a recurring pair of names: see Ramsay's striking remarks, St. Paul, p. 83 ff., with which however, mutatis mutandis, his more recent remarks, Was Christ born at Bethlehem? p. 54, should be carefully compared. See also Deissmann, u. 5., Nosgen, Wendt, Hackett, Felten, and Zöckler, in loco, and Nossen, Wendt, Hackett, Felten, and Zöckler, in loco, and McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 176. This preference by St. Luke of the Gentile for the Hebrew name has its analogy in St. Paul's own use in his Epistles (and in his preference for Roman provincial names in his geographical references, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 1, ix. 2, Rom. xv. 26, Phil. iv. 15).

ΧΙΙΙ. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

οδούς Κυρίου 1 τὰς εὐθείας; 11. καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ χείρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ ἐξαίρετος μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον ἄχρι καιροῦ. παραχώρημα δὲ ἐπέτευσεν 2 ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἄχλως καὶ σκότος, καὶ περιάγων ἐξεταζεὶ χειραγωγούς. 12. τότε ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν τὸ γεγονός ἐπίστευσεν, 3 ἐκπλησμὸνος ἐπὶ τῇ διδακῇ τοῦ Κυρίου.

1 Κυριου, but Μ' Β τοῦ Κ., so W. H. text, cf. Hos. xiv. 9 (10) (but see var. lec.), so Weiss, Wendt.
3 ἐπίστευσεν—DE prefix εθαυμασεν καί; after επίστ. D adds τῷ Θεῷ, so Blass and Hilg.

but other E. V. “deceit”; the idea of deceit, however, is more properly contained in δόλου R. V., “guile”. δόλος, lit., ease in doing, so easiness, laziness, and hence fraud, wickedness, deceit, επετευσεν, of the ways of the Lord, frequently used, although not necessarily so, in a bad sense.—τό διαβόλου, John viii. 44, the expression may be used in marked and indignant contrast to the name “Son of Jesus,” cf. iii. 25, iv. 36. But without any reference to ver. 6 the expression would describe him as the natural enemy of the messengers of God. On the phrase and its use here see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 163. Note the thrice πανωτὸς—πάσης—πάσης, “ter repetitur emphaticus.” Wetstein.—διαστρέφων, cf. LXX, Prov. x. 9, and Isa. ix. 8, Micah iii. 9.—τὰς ὑδάς . . . τὰς εὐθείας: similar expressions frequent in LXX, so of the ways of the Lord in contrast to the ways of men, Ezek. xxxiii. 17, Ecclesiast. xxxix. 24, Song of the Three Children, ver. 3.

Ver. 11. καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ, cf. Hort, Ecclesia, p. 179.—μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον: emphasising the punishment, as it would imply that he should be stone-blind (Weiss).—ἄρα καπάρο: “until a season,” R. V. margin, “until the time” (Rendall), i.e., the duly appointed time when it should please God to restore his sight, cf. Luke iv. 13, 21 (Acts xxiv. 25). The exact expression is only found here and in Luke iv. 13. Wendt (1899) asks if the ceasing of the punishment is conceived of as ceasing with the opposition in ver. 8. See his earlier edition, 1888, and the comment of Chrys., so Occumenius: οὐκ ἐστιν ταῦτα ἢ ἀλλ' ἀρματος: so too Theophylact.—παραχώρημα, see above on p. 106.—ἐπέτευσεν, see critical notes. If we retain T. R. with Weiss, the word may be called characteristic of St. Luke, see above on p. 216 its use as denoting an attack of disease

is quite medical, Hobart, p. 44.—ἄχλως: only here in N. T., not in LXX. Galen in describing diseases of the eye mentions ἄχλως amongst them. So Dioscorides uses the word in his work, and Hippocrates also employs it, Hobart, p. 44. The word is no doubt frequent in Homer, sometimes of one deprived of sight by divine power, and it also occurs in Polyb. and Josephus. But here it is used in conjunction with other words which may also be classed as medical, παραχωρήσεως, σκότους, to say nothing of (ἐπ)έπεσεν.—σκότος: marks the final stage of blindness—the word is no doubt a common one, but it is used, as also some of its derivatives, by medical writers in a technical sense, and Dioscorides in one place connects σκοτώματα and ἄχλως together.—περιάγων: only absolutely here in N. T., sometimes in classical Greek, and sometimes with acc. loci, as also in N. T. (cf. Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, etc.).—ἐκπλησσ., imperf., he sought but did not find.—χειραγωγούς: only here in N. T., not in LXX, cf. the verb in ix. 8, xxii. 11, and in LXX, Judg. xvi. 26 A, Tobit xi. 16 (but not A, B); used by Plutarch, etc.

Ver. 12. ἐπίστευσεν: “the blindness of Elymas opened the eyes of the proconsul” (Felten). If the verb is understood in its full sense, viz., that Sergius Paulus became a convert to the faith, ver. 48, ii. 44, iv. 4, xi. 21, baptism would be implied, viii. 12.—ἐκτησον, Matt. vii. 28, Mark i. 22, xi. 18, Luke iv. 32, ix. 43, etc., so in classical Greek with ἐπτε. The verb is also found in Eccl. vii. 17 (16), Wisdom xiii. 4, 2 Macc. vii. 12, 4 Macc. viii. 4, xvi. 16. Bengel’s comment is suggestive, “miraculo acuebatur attentio ad doctrinam”: the conversion is not represented as the result of the miracle alone. The conversion of a Roman proconsul is regarded as absolutely incredible by Renan (so more recent critics). But if
II—14.
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13. Ἀναχθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου οἱ περί τοῦ Παύλου ἠλθον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας. Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀποχώρησας αὐτῶν ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. 14. αὐτοί δὲ, διελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης, παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἀντίόχεια τῆς Πισιδίας, καὶ εἰσελθόντες

1 Τῆς Πισιδίας, DEHLP but acc. in ΝΑΒΚ, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt. Blass (so Hilg.) retains gen. on the ground that the adj. Πισιδίος "non exstat," but see Ramsay, and Wendt (1899), p. 231; also Grimm-Thayer, sub v. and sub "Ἀντίόχεια, 2.

the narrative had been a mere fiction to magnify Paul's powers in converting such an important personage in his first encounter with the powers of heathenism, the forger would not have contented himself with the brief Σαῦλος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Π. of ver. 9, see Zöckler's Apostelgeschichte, p. 245, second edition, on this and other objections against the narrative. See Intro. for the favourable light in which St. Luke describes the relations between the Roman government and Christianity.

Ver. 13. "Ἀναχθέντες, "set sail," R.V. So in classical use, here in its technical nautical sense—so too, in opposite sense, κατάγεσθαι. In this sense thirteen times in Acts, and once in Luke's Gospel, viii. 22, but not in the other Gospels at all; it is only used once, in another sense, by St. Matthew among the Evangelists, cf. iv. 1. ἐγειν and its compounds with ἀνά, κατά, εἰς, are characteristic of Luke's writings, Friedrich, p. 7.—οἱ περί τοῦ Π.: Paul now taking the first place as the leader of the company, see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 84, the order henceforth is Paul and Barnabas, with two significant exceptions, xv. 12, 25, and xiv. 12, see in loco.

Ver. 14. Διελθόντες: in this journey northwards to Antioch the Apostles would probably follow the one definite route of commerce between Perga and that city; the natural and easy course would lead them to Adada, now Kara Bâvo, and the dedication there of a church to St. Paul may point to the belief that he had visited the place on his way to Antioch (Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 23, and in connection with the above, pp. 62, 65, also C. and H. (smaller edition), p. 129, Hausrath, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, iii., 133.

Ver. 13. "Ἀναχθέντες," "set sail," R.V. So in classical use, here in its technical nautical sense—so too, in opposite sense, κατάγεσθαι. In this sense thirteen times in Acts, and once in Luke's Gospel, viii. 22, but not in the other Gospels at all; it is only used once, in another sense, by St. Matthew among the Evangelists, cf. iv. 1. ἐγειν and its compounds with ἀνά, κατά, εἰς, are characteristic of Luke's writings, Friedrich, p. 7.—οἱ περί τοῦ Π.: Paul now taking the first place as the leader of the company, see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 84, the order henceforth is Paul and Barnabas, with two significant exceptions, xv. 12, 25, and xiv. 12, see in loco.

—οἱ περί τοῦ Π.: Ramsay refers St. Mark's withdrawal to the above circumstances, inasmuch as he disapproved of St. Paul's change of place, which he regarded as an abandonment of the work. But the withdrawal on the part of Mark is still more difficult to understand, if we are to suppose that he withdrew because Paul and Barnabas made, as it were, a trip to Antioch for the recovery of the former; and xv. 38 seems to imply something different from this. Various reasons may have contributed to the desertion of Mark, perhaps the fact that his cousin Barnabas was no longer the leader, or Paul's preaching to the Gentiles may have been too liberal for him, or lack of courage to face the dangers of the mountain passes and missionary work inland, or affection for his home at Jerusalem and anxiety for the coming famine (he withdrew, says Holtzmann, "zu seinem Mutter"). See Deissmann's striking note, Bibelstudien, p. 185, on the fact that here, where John Mark leaves Paul for Jerusalem, he is simply "John," his Jewish name; in xv. 39 he goes with Barnabas to Cyprus, and on that occasion only is he described by his Gentile name "Mark" alone. On the "perils of rivers, and perils of robbers," see Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 23, and in connection with the above, pp. 62, 65, also C. and H. (smaller edition), p. 129, Hausrath, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, iii., 133.

Ver. 14. Διελθόντες: in this journey northwards to Antioch the Apostles would probably follow the one definite route of commerce between Perga and that city; the natural and easy course would lead them to Adada, now Kara Bâvo, and the dedication there of a church to St. Paul may point to the belief that he had visited the place on his way to Antioch (Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 23, and Zöckler, in loco, who agrees here with Ramsay's view). Although disagreeing with C. and H. in bringing the Apostles to Adada, Ramsay fully agrees with them in emphasising the dangers of the journey across the Pisidian highlands, and in referring to his travels from Perga across Taurus to Antioch and back his perils of rivers, and perils of robbers, 2 Cor. xi. 26 (see too Wendt, in loco (1899), in agreement with Ramsay, whose instances of the dangers of the way, from the notices of the inscriptions, should be consulted, u. s.).—Ἀντίόχεια τῆς Πισιδίας, see critical notes. If we adopt with R.V., etc., 'Α. τῆς Πισιδίας = an adjective, τῆς Πισιδίας, "Pisidian Antioch," or, as it was also called, Antioch towards Pisidia, or on the side of Pisidia, to distinguish it from Antioch on the Maeander, or Carian Antioch. At this period Antioch did not belong to Pisidia at all (Strabo, pp. 557, 569, 577), but later the term Pisidia was widened, and so the expression "Antioch of Pisidia" came into vogue. Ptolemy, v., 4, 11, employs it,
and so some MSS. in the passage before us; see critical notes, and Ramsay, "Antioch in Pisidia," in Hastings' B.D., Church in the Roman Empire, p. 25, and Wndt (1899), in loco; see further on xvi. 6. On the death of Amyntas, B.C. 25, Antioch became part of the Roman province Galatia, and a little later, some time before 6 B.C., it was made a "colonia" by Augustus, with Latin rights, and as such it became an administrative and military centre in the protection of the province against the Pisidian robbers in their mountain fortresses, Ramsay, u. s. There can be no doubt that Paul would also find there a considerable Jewish population, as the Jews were trusted supporters of the Seleucid kings, and found a home in many of the cities which they founded.— ἀρχισυνάγωγοι: Ramsay supposes that the travellers hurried on from Perga (chief town of Pamphylia on the Cestrus, and an important place of commerce) to Antioch, without any evangelisation on their way, because in Perga the Apostle had been smitten with an attack of malarial fever, which obliged him to seek the higher ground of Antioch. In Gal. iv. 13 Ramsay finds a corroboration of this view, a passage in which Paul himself states that an illness occasioned his first preaching to the Churches of Galatia, i.e., of the Roman province Galatia. The suggestion has much to recommend it, see St. Paul, p. 92. McGiffert's remarks, however, should be consulted in support of the view that the illness overtook the Apostle at Antioch rather than at Perga, Apostolic Age, p. 177, and Weitzsäcker, Apostolic Age, i., 275, E.T.— την συναγωγήν, "to the Jew first," was Paul's primary rule, and here amongst those φοβ. τόν Θεόν he would find, perhaps, the best soil for his labours, cf. xvi. 14, and also xiii. 5, xiv. 1, xvi. 13, xvii. 2, 10, 17, xviii. 4, xix. 8. Against the doubts raised by the Tubingen School as to the historical character of the notice, see especially Wndt, 1888 and 1899 editions. It is inconceivable, as he says, that Paul, who could express himself as in Rom. i. 16, ix. 32, x. 16, xi. 30, should entirely disregard the Jews in his missionary efforts. The notice in xvi. 13, from a "We-source," of St. Paul's first Sabbath at Philippi enables us to form a correct judgment as to his probable course in other places.— την συναγωγήν, not necessarily the first Sabbath after their arrival; some time may have been spent previously in mission work before a critical event took place, Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 99, 100.— εις την συναγωγήν την ημέρα των σαββάτων, εκάθισαν. 15. Μετά δὲ την ανάγνωσιν του νόμου και των προφητῶν, ἀπέστειλαν οἱ αρχισυνάγωγοι πρὸς αὐτούς, λέγοντες, "Ανδρες ἀδελφοί, εἰ ἐστι λόγος
Τονλαόνλέγετε. Ανδρες τον Θεόν, ακούσατε. αναστάς δε Παύλος, Ισραηλίται, και οι φοβούμενοι τον Θεόν, ακούσατε. τοις πατέρας ἡμῶν και τον λαόν ὑψωσεν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αιγύπτῳ, και μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψήλου ἐξήγαγεν αὐτούς ἐς αὐτής:
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and the name was given to those who conducted the assemblies for that purpose. They had to guard against anything unfitting taking place in the synagogue (Luke xiii. 14). and to appoint readers and preachers, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 65, E. T.; Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 281, and on the present passage, Jesus the Messiah, i., 434, and for the title in inscriptions, Grimm-Thayer, sub τ., see also below on xiv. 2.

—άνδρες ἡλεοφί: courteous address, ii. 37, “ Gentlemen, brethren” (Ramsay).

Ver. 16. κατασείσας, see above on xii. 17, and cf. xix. 33, xxi. 40 (xxvi. 1), “ made a gesture with his hand,” a gesture common to orators, “ nam hoc gestu olim verba facturum pro contione silentium exigebant,” and here a graphic touch quite characteristic of Acts. The speech which follows may well have remained in the memory, or possibly may have found a place in the manuscript diary of one of Paul’s hearers (Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 100), or St. Paul may himself have furnished St. Luke with an outline of it, for the main sections, as Ewald suggested, may have formed part of the Apostle’s regular mode of addressing similar audiences; and if not St. Paul himself, yet one of those who are described as οἱ περί Παύλον, νερ. 13 (Ζόκελ), may have supplied the information. On the other hand it is maintained that the speech in its present form is a free composition of the author of Acts, since it is so similar to the early addresses of St. Peter, or to the defence made by St. Stephen, and that St. Luke wished to illustrate St. Paul’s method of proclaiming the Messianic salvation to Jews. But considering the audience and the occasion, it is difficult to see how St. Paul could have avoided touching upon points similar to those which had claimed the attention of 2 St. Peter or 2 St. Stephen: “ non poterat multum differre vel a ferti orationibus, vel a defensione Stephani . . . hae igitur non magis in Paulum cadunt quam in quemvis novae salutis praecomnem” (Blass), while at the same time it is quite possible to press this similarity too far and to ignore the points which are confessedly characteristic of St. Paul, cf., e.g., vv. 38, 39 (Hethge, Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte, pp. 19-22; Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 244, 245; Lechler, Das Apostolische Zeitalter, p. 272; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., i., p. 46 (1896)); see further, Farrar, St. Paul, i., p. 360, note, and Alford references for the several Pauline expressions, and the remarkable list of parallels drawn out recently by Ramsay between the speech at Pisidian Antioch and the thoughts and phrases of the Epistle to the Galatians, Expositor, December, 1898 (see below on pp. 295, 297); also Nisgen’s list of Pauline expressions, Apostelgeschichte, p. 53, in this and in other speeches in Acts.- οἱ θεόν, cf. ii. 22, iii. 12, v. 35, a mode of address fitly chosen as in harmony with the references to the history of Israel which were to follow.—οι θεον, cf. x. 2, xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, etc.

Ver. 17. τουτον: this points back to ισρ.: an appeal to the national pride of the people in their theocratic privileges and names, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 22, Rom. ix. 6.—ἡσιλ: so often in LXX of God’s choice of Israel.—ἐξαλ: “ exalted,” A. and R.V. Weiss and Wendt, with Zöckler, may have supplied the information. On the other hand it is maintained that the speech in its present form is a free composition of the author of Acts, since it is so similar to the early addresses of St. Peter, or to the defence made by St. Stephen, and that St. Luke wished to illustrate St. Paul’s method of proclaiming the Messianic salvation to Jews. But considering the audience and the occasion, it is difficult to see how St. Paul could have avoided touching upon points similar to those which had claimed the attention of 2 St. Peter or 2 St. Stephen: “ non poterat multum differre vel a ferti orationibus, vel a defense Stephani . . . hae igitur non magis in Paulum cadunt quam in quemvis novae salutis praecomnem” (Blass), while at the same time it is quite possible to press this similarity too far and to ignore the points which are confessedly characteristic of St. Paul, cf., e.g., vv. 38, 39 (Hethge, Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte, pp. 19-22; Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 244, 245; Lechler, Das Apostolische Zeitalter, p. 272; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., i., p. 46 (1896)); see further, Farrar, St. Paul, i., p. 360, note, and Alford references for the several Pauline expressions, and the remarkable list of parallels drawn out recently by Ramsay between the speech at Pisidian Antioch and the thoughts and phrases of the Epistle to the Galatians, Expositor, December, 1898 (see below on pp. 295, 297); also Nisgen’s list of Pauline expressions, Apostelgeschichte, p. 53, in this and in other speeches in Acts.— άνδρες I., cf. ii. 22, iii. 12, v. 35, a mode of address fitly chosen as in harmony with the references to the history of Israel which were to follow.—οι θεον, cf. x. 2, xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, etc.
18. καὶ ὡς τεσσαρακονταετὴν Χρόνον ἔτροφόφησεν 1 αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. 19. καὶ καθελὼν ἐθνὶ ἔπετα ἐν γῇ Χαναάν, κατεκληροδότησεν αὐτοῖς 2 τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν. 20. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς ἔτει πετρακοσίους

1 ἔτροφ. ΝΒCDEHLP 36, 61, Vulg., Syr. Harcl. mg., so W.H., Blass, R.V. text, Rendall, Weiss; ἔτροφ. AC* 13, d, Gig., Sah., Boh., Syrr. Pesh. Harcl. text, so Tisch., R.V. marg., and Hilg. Wendt cannot decide, although he considers ἔτροφ. as more fitting here, while he regards ἔτροφον. as the more original reading in LXX Deut. i. 31 (B*, Orig.). Tischendorf, however, regards ἔτροφον. as best attested in Deut. i. 31 and as best suited to the context both there and here. W.H., App., p. 94, maintain that ἔτροφον. is the more obvious rendering of ἐποτ., but that when the orig. meaning was forgotten, the context in Deut. i. 31 led to the change to ἔτροφον. This corruption in LXX was doubtless widely current in the Apostolic age, and might have been followed here. W.H. conclude that there can be no reason to question a reading supported by ΝΒ 61, Vulg., and many good cursives, a reading which they regard as best authenticated in the LXX and as agreeing with the Heb., especially when it was liable to be changed by the influence of the common and corrupt text of the LXX. They add that both here and in Deut. either reading gives excellent sense.


4 The words ὡς ἔτεσιν τετρακοσίαπεντανίχνεν are to be placed before καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα—so ΝΑΒΟC, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. W. H. thinks with Meyer and Holtzmann that the transposition may have been made to meet a difficulty; see also Farrar, St. Paul, i., 370. D, Sah., Syr. Harcl. mg. omit μετὰ ταῦτα altogether, so Blass and Hilg.

4 it is used of bringing up children.—παροικία, cf. vii. 6, and for the noun as here, LXX, 2 Esdras viii. 35, Wisdom xix. 10. Prologue of Ecclus., ver. 26, Ps. cxx. 5—μετὰ βραχίονος υψ., cf. Exod. vi. 1, 6, Deut. v. 15, etc., Ps. cxxxv. 12, Baruch ii. 11, etc. Hebrew, cf. Luke i. 51, where we have ἐν as in Hebrew, but in LXX μετὰ as of the accompanying the arm of God, and not merely of his power as bringing the people out.

Ver. 18. ἔτροφόφησεν, see critical notes. ἔτροφον., “suffered he their manners,” so A. and R.V. ἔτροφον., “bare he them as a nursing father,” R.V. margin. This latter rendering is supported by Bengel, Alford, Behge, Nösgen, Hackett, Page, Farrar, Plumptre, etc., as more agreeable to the conciliatory drift of the Apostle's words, but see above, cf. 2 Mac. vii. 27.

Ver. 19. καθελὼν, cf. Deut. vii. 1. In LXX the stronger verb ἐξαρέω is used, but καθαρέω in LXX often means to destroy, Jer. xxiv. 6, Ps. xxvii. 5, and so in classical Greek. Weiss prefers the force of the verb as in Luke i. 52, to cast down, i.e., from their sovereignty.—κατεκληροδότησεν, see critical notes. If we adopt reading of R.V. W.H.: “he gave them their land for an inheritance—Ver. 20. If we follow the best attested reading, see critical notes, we may connect the dative of time ἔτεσιν, cf. viii. 11, closely with the preceding words as signifying the period within which an event is accomplished. The κληρονομία was already assured to the fathers as God's chosen, vii. 5, and the four hundred years of the people's sojourn in a strange land, Acts vii. 6, Gen. xv. 13, forty years in the wilderness, and some ten years for the actual conquest of the land made up the four hundred and fifty years (so Weiss, Felten, see Wendt, in loco). If reading in T.R. is accepted (strongly defended by Farrar, St. Paul, i., p. 370), although it is at variance with 1 Kings vi. 1, according to which Solomon began his Temple in the 480th (LXX 440th) year after the Exodus, we
καὶ πεντήκοντα, έδωκε κριτάς έως Σαμουήλ του προφήτου. 21. καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτόν, ἤγειρεν αὐτός τὸν Δαβίδ εἰς βασιλεά, καὶ εἶπε μαρτυρίσας, "Εὕρων Δαβίδ τοῦ τοῦ ἱερατεύς, ἀνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, δὲ ποιήσατα τὰ θελήματά μου." 22. Τούτου ο Θεός ἀπὸ τοῦ στέρματος κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν ἤγειρεν 1 τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν, 24. προκηρύξαντος Ἰωάννου πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ βάπτισμα μετανοιας παντί τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ. 25. ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρων ἦ τῇ ἀνάπτυξι τῶν ἀρχάγγελων, ἦλεγεν, "Τίνα με 2 ὁμοσπονδίας εἶλαί; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ἀλλ’ ἰδοὺ, ἤρχεται μετ’ ἐμοί, οὐ δὲ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν


have merely to suppose that the Apostle followed the popular chronology adopted by Josephus, Ant., viii., 3, 1; x., 8, 5, especially when we remember that speaking in round numbers (ὅσο) that chronology tallies very fairly with that of the Book of Judges. See Meyer-Wendt, Alford, and cf. also the almost similar reckoning in Wetstein, and Bethge, Die Paulinischen Reden, pp. 30, 31. Another explanation is given by Rendall, in loco, where ἔτες is taken as marking not duration of time (which would require the accusative), but the limit of time within which, etc.

Ver. 21. καὶ καίθεν: only here of time in N.T. as in later Greek. Weiss even here interprets the expression to mean that they asked for a king from him, i.e., Samuel, in his character as prophet.—ηγεῖραι: not mentioned in O.T., but cf. Jos., Ant., vi., 14, 9. The period does not seem much too long for Saul's reign when we remember that Ishbosheth was forty years old at his father's death, when he was placed on the throne by Abner, 2 Sam. ii. 10.—Σαούλ κ.τ.λ., cf. Paul's description of himself in Phil. iii. 5.

Ver. 22. μεταστήσας, Luke xvi. 4: refers here to Saul's deposition from the throne, 1 Sam. xv. 16, cf. Dan. ii. 21, 1 Macc. viii. 13, not as Bethge thinks to his removal from the presence of God, cf. 2 Kings xvii. 23, nor to his death, 3 Macc. iii. 1, vi. 12. Saul therefore could not have been the bringer of the promised salvation.—ἐὗρων κ.τ.λ.: a combination of two passages, Ps. lxxxix. 20 and 1 Sam. xiii. 14, and freely referred to as a saying pronounced by God Himself, but the latter part was pronounced by Samuel in God's name.—τῶν τοῦ ἱερατεύς, but in LXX τῶν δούλων μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).—κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τον δουλόν μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).—κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τον δουλόν μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).—κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τον δουλόν μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).—κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τον δουλόν μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).—κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τον δουλόν μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).—κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τον δουλόν μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).—κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τον δουλόν μου. ἀνδρα to mark the dignity (Bethge).
26. "Andres adelphoi, ioe genous 'Aβρααμ, kai oi en ymι
foboymenoνon toν Θεου, omiν o λόγos tis souterias taυtis apostalh.1
27. oi gar katakoivotes en Ierousalh kai oi arhontes aυtων; toυtων
agnoiasantes, kai toς fownas tων prophētων tōs kata tān sabbatow
agniaskomewnas, kriantas eπhörw. 28. kai mēdeiνων αυτων

1 ymι CEHLP, Vulg., Syr. P. and H. (text), Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys., so Blass;
ymι NAABD 13, 61, Sah., Syr. Harcl. mg.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, so
Hilg. apostalh EHLH; eπesep. NAABCD 13, 61, Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V.,
Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

2 For toυtων αγν. ... των προφ. τας D has µη συνιεντες τας γραφας των π. τας
... , cf. Luke xxiv. 45. D also reads και κριναντες eπηρ, so Hilg. Par. reads
reprobaverunt for eπhörw, so Blass tουtων apeboikiasan (omitting κριναντες
eπηρ.), reading κριναντες in the next verse; see on ver. 29.

N. T., p. 154, and also Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, p. 23.—eisodou: the entry
of Jesus upon His public Messianic min-

istry, a word which may also have been suggested by Mal. iii. 2, LXX.

Ver. 25. eπλήρου: "i.e., non multo
ante finem vite," Blass, cf. vii. 23.—
βρόμων: "Paulum sapit," cf. xx. 24, 2
Tim. iv. 7. Gal. ii. 2.—ιπωναι: three
times in Acts, cf. xxvii. 18, xxvii. 27; nowhere
else in N.T., but see Judith xiv. 14, Tob.
viii. 16, Ecclus. xxiii. 21. Note this free
reproduction of the words of the Evan-
gelist—essentially the same but verbally
different.—οι ευλ εγω, I am not he,
i.e., the Messiah; best to punctuate as in
A. and R.V., so Wendt; but see on the
other hand Betteg and Weiss, and the
reading they adopt: τι επι ενων εναι,
οι ευλ εγω; the gloss ΧC. after εγω,
old enough to have crept into the text,
shows that the punctuation in A.V. was
a natural one, Simcox, u. s., p. 70.

Ver. 26. άνδρες adelphoi: the address
of ver. 16 is here renewed in more affec-
tionate tones, and here as in ver. 16 both
Jews and proselytes are two classes, here
both regarded by Paul as adelphoi.—οι
ymι, see critical notes. Some take it as mark-
ing a sharp antithesis between the Jews
of Antioch and those of Jerusalem (an
antithesis not removed by ημιν), as if the
Jews at Antioch and of the Dispersion
were contrasted with the Jews of the
capital. But γάρ need not mark a con-
trast, it may rather confirm the implica-
tion in σωτ. ταυτης that Jesus was the
Saviour, for He had suffered and died,
and so had fulfilled the predictions relat-
ing to the Messiah. Nor indeed was it
true that those who crucified the Saviour
had excluded themselves from the offer
i. 13, Phil. ii. 16, 1 Thess. ii. 13, etc.—
apostalh: if we read the compound
εξαπ., critical notes, R.V. "is sent forth,"
i.e., from God, cf. χ. 36. Weiss takes
the verb as simply referring to the send-
ing forth of the word from the place
where it was first announced. But cf.
on the other hand Gal. iv. 4, 6, and ver.
23 above, where God is spoken of as the
agent in the Messianic salvation, and on
the possible force of δ λογος της σωτ.
and επανασταλη here see Ramsay, Expositor,
December, 1898.

Ver. 27. Both A. and R.V. take
agnoiasantes as governing toυtων and
tas fownas. But και may be not copula-
less but intensive—not only did they not
recognise the Christ, but even condemned
Him to death, so Rendall. Meyer ren-
dered και = "also," and makes τας φωνας
the direct object of επλήρ. Wendt ren-
dered as A. and R.V., see critical notes.—
agnoiasantes, cf. iii. 14, it is very doubt-
ful how far we can see in the expression
an excuse in the former passage, and
guiltiness here. Paul speaks of himself
as acting agnoων and yet obtaining
mercy, 1 Tim. i. 13, cf. also for the use
of the word by Paul xvii. 23, and fre-
quently in his Epistles.

Ver. 29. δε δι ετελεσαν επταια: St.
Paul was evidently acquainted with the
details of the Passion as well as with the
main facts of the death and burial, cf.
1 Cor. xi. 23; and for the verb used here
Luke xviii. 31, xxii. 37, John xix. 28, 30;
only here in Acts. Weiss regards the
subject of ετελ., καθιλ., θηκαι as pre-
supposed as known in accordance with
the Gospel history, but St. Paul may
have been speaking in general terms of
the action of the Jews, although not the
enemies of Christ but His friends actually
took Him down and buried Him. Taken
literally, St. Paul's statement agrees with
26-33.
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θανάτου ευρόντες, ἦργασεν Πιλάτον ἁνευρισκόμενα, καθελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου ἤθεσαν εἰς μνήμειον. 29. ὡς δὲ Θεός ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 30. ἀπερεῖσθαι αὐτὸν. 31. ἦς ὁ θάνατος ἐνεργείας, οὕτως εἰς μάρτυρας αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν. 32. καὶ ημεῖς ὡς εὐαγγελίζομεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐναγγελίαν γενομένην, 33. ὃτι ταύτην ἡ θεοσ ἐκεπλήρωσε τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἤλθεν, ἀναστήσας Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ παλαίμῳ τῷ

1 ηττοματο—Ν reads ηττοματο, so W.H. marg., but mid. better, “asked for themselves”. D reads κρωματες αυτον παρεδωκαν Πιλατω ινα εις αναρεσιν; Blass and Hilg. omit ινα; see ver. 29.

2 ετελεσαν, in D ετελουν.

3 D reads after νεκρ. ηττοματο τον Π. τοντο μεν σταυρωσαν και επιτυχοντες ταλαι. The reason of these insertions, as has been suggested, seems the same as in the previous verses—to gain a complete, although summary, account according to the Gospels. Syr. Harcl. mg. after νεκρ.: του τον Π. τουτον ανθεγεκαρε και επιτυχοντες ταλαι. But one seems rather a corruption of the other, although the same motive mentioned above might lead to the insertion of either.


the Gospel of Peter, 21-24, as Hilgenfeld noted. But Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus were both Jews and members of the Council.—τοῦ ξύλου, cf. v. 30, x. 39. Jüngst, without any ground, as Hilgenfeld remarks, refers ver. 29 partly on account of this expression to a reviser, and so 34-37. On ξύλον, significant here and in Gal. iii. 13, see Ramsay, Expositor, December, 1898.—εις μν., cf. 1 Cor. xv. 4, the death followed by the burial, and so the reality of the death, "εις νεκρων", was vouched for.

Ver. 31. δεινη, see Milligan’s note on the word. Resurrection of our Lord, p. 265; Witness of the Epistles (1892), pp. 369, 377, 386; and Byschlag, Leben Jesu, i., p. 434 (second edition), cf. Luke xxiv. 34, 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.—ἐνιαίοις: with accusative of duration of time, cf. xvi. 18, xviii. 20, xix. 8, 10, 34, xcvii. 20, cf. Luke iv. 25, xviii. 4; in classical writers, but only in St. Luke in N.T., except Heb. xi. 30, Vindicatia Lucana, p. 53.—ἐδραμον: if we add νυν, see critical notes, the word intimates that this announcement of Jesus as the Messiah was not first made by Paul, as some new thing, but that His Apostles were still bearing the same witness to the Jews (λαον) as a living message in the same city in which Jesus had been crucified.

Ver. 32. και ημεις, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 11, "whether it were I or they," etc., "ut illi illis, sic nos vobis".—ευαγγελ. see above on p. 210, and Simcox, u. s., pp. 78, 79,—την προς τους θεος επαγγελιαν γεν., cf. Rom. xv. 8, Acts xxvi. 6.

Ver. 33. ἀποκαλυφθηκαμει: "hath fulfilled to the utmost," cf. 3 Macc. i. 2, 22, Polyb., i., 67, 1, τας επαγγελιας επι τοις τεκνοις αυτων ημιν, see critical notes.—ἀναστήσας: "in that he raised up Jesus," R.V.; "in that he hath raised up Jesus again," A.V. The former rendering is quite compatible with the view that the reference of the word here is not to the resurrection of Jesus, but to the raising up of Jesus as the Messiah, cf. iii. 22, vii. 37, Deut. xviii. 15. The
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ XIII.

δευτέρων 1 γέγραπται, "Υιός μου εἰς σῶμα σήμερον γεγένηται σε." 34. ὅτι δὲ αἴσθησιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, μὴ κατιῷ μελλόντα υποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, οὗτος εἰρήκει, "Ὅτι δώσω ὅμαί τοι σῶτα Δαβίδ τὰ πιστὰ." 35. διὰ καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ λέγει, "Ὅτι δώσεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου εἰς διαφθοράν." 36. Δαβίδ μὲν γὰρ ἤδη γεννᾶ ὑποτεθηκὼς τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλή ἐκομίζη, καὶ προσκήνηθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶδε

1 τὸ ψαλμὸν τω δευτερῷ γεγ. ELP, Vulg., Syr. H., R.V. (T.R.); τὸ ψ. γεγ. τῷ δευτ. ΝΑΒC 13, 61, Arm., W.H. But in D (τῷ) πρῶτῳ ψ. γεγ. cf. Or., Hil., Gig., Latin. MS. known to Bede, Tisch., Meyer, Blass. The δευτ. and πρῶτ. is the only important var., and the authority for the latter is almost entirely Western. According to Origen the Jews frequently combined Ps. i. and ii. (cf. also Justin, Apol., i., 40; Tert., adv. Marc., iv., 22; Cypri., Testim., i., 13), so that a Western scribe, being probably accustomed to read the two Psalms combined, would be under a temptation to alter δευτ. to πρῶτ. and not εντερω, W. H., App., R. 95. In D, Syr. Harcl. marg, the quotation also comprises Ps. ii. 5 (cf. Blass in β, and Hilg.); see Wendt (1899), note, p. 241; Belser, p. 69. Wern. omits εν τῷ πρ. ψ. altogether; "fort. recte," Blass.

first prophecy, ver. 33, would be fulfilled in this way, whilst in vv. 34 and 35 the prophecy would be fulfilled by the resurrection from the dead, ἀνασ. ἐκ νεκρῶν (see Knabenbauer in loco, p. 233 ff.). Wendt argues that Heb. i. 5, where the same prophecy is quoted as in ver. 33, also refers to the raising up as the Messiah, but see on the other hand Westcott, Hebrews, in loco.

Ver. 34. μὴ κατι τῷ ἔπος εἰς διαφό. cf. Rom. vi. 9, "no more to return to corruption," does not of course mean that Christ had already seen corruption, so that there is no need to understand διαφό. of the place of corruption, sepulchrum, with Beza, Kuinoel. Hilgenfeld refuses to follow Jüngst, Sorof, Clemen in referring vv. 34-37 to a reviser, for he justly remarks that the speech which was intended to move the Israelites to a recognition of Jesus as the promised Saviour of the seed of David, would have been imperfect, unless it had set forth His sufferings and after-resurrection. (Δώσω κ.τ.λ. "I will give you the holy and sure blessings of David"). This rendering makes the connection with the next verse more evident, cf. Isa. lv. 3, καὶ διαθήκης ἐκ νεκρῶν διαθήκην τῷ σῶτα Δαβίδ τῷ πιστά. "By David was understood the Messiah, which yet the Rabbis themselves have well observed:" J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. (so Schöttgen), in loco. "The everlasting covenant," what was it but the holy and sure blessings promised to David? But these blessings, δόσω, sancta promissa Davidi data, are connected with the resurrection of Christ because ("δόσω not διῶ, T. R., see critical notes, stating the cause, not the consequence") only in the triumph of God's Holy One (τὸν ὅσιον) are these blessings ratified and assured. Just as Peter (ii. 47), so here Paul applies the passage in Ps. xvi. directly to Christ, Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, p. 151.

Ver. 36. γάρ: David is contrasted with Christ by St. Paul as by St. Peter, ii. 29. — ἤδη γενεὰν ὑπηρ. "after he had in his own generation served the counsel of God, fell on sleep," R. V., but in margin the rendering of A. V. is practically retained. It seems best to take ἤδη γενεὰν as a dative of time, cf. ver. 20, Ephes. iii. 5 (so Blass, Wendt, Zöckler, Felten), and not as dat. commodi. St. Paul's point seems to be (1) the contrast between the service of David which extended only for a generation, and the service of Christ which lasted through all ages permanently. But this contrast would be also marked if we adopt R. V. margin rendering and govern ἤδη γενεὰν by τῇ. (see Weiss). (2) The second point of contrast is between the corruption which David saw, and the incorruption of the Holy One of God. Weiss still connects τῇ θεοῦ βουλή with εκοιμήθη, see margin (2) in R. V.; but this does not seem so significant as the contrast drawn between David serving the counsel or purpose of God for one, or during one generation, whilst in Christ the eternal purpose of God was realised. — προσκήνηθη πρὸς τοὺς π. α.τ.οῖ: Hebraistic expression, lit., "was added," i.e., in Sheol, cf. Gen. xxvi. 8, Judg. ii. 10, 1 Macc. ii. 69.
διαφθοράν. 37. δὲ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἠγείρεν, οὐκ εἰδε διαφθοράν. 38. ἐγενόμενοι δὲ ζωτώς ὑμῖν, ἀνδρεὶς ἄδελφοι, διὰ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἕφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν καταγγέλλεται. 39. καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων ὃν ὡς ἠδυνήθη ἐν τῷ θόρυβῳ Μωσέως διακαθηκάσθαι, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται.

1 διὰ τοῦτον ΜΑΒCDLΡ, so all edd.; διὰ τούτο B* 15, 18, 180—Weiss here follows above authorities.


Ver. 37. ἠγείρεν: more than resurrection from the dead, "hic non notatur resuscitatio ex mortuis; quippe quae ipsa in conclusione evincitur: sed quem Deus suscitavit est Sanctus Dei, ver. 35, ut haec Subjecti descriptio contineat etiam logiam," Bengel.

Ver. 38. γνωστὸν οὖν: "incipit adhortatio qua orationem claudit," Blass.—ηθεος ἄριστος: the keynote of St. Paul's preaching, cf. xxvi. 18, as it had been of St. Peter's, ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43; and as it had been of the preaching of the Baptist, and of our Lord Himself.—διὰ τοῦτον, i.e., Christ—through Him Who died, and was risen again—the phrase is characteristically Pauline, cf. x. 43.

Ver. 39. So far the words represent the entire harmony between the preaching of St. Peter and St. Paul, and there is no reason to attribute this verse, as also x. 43, with Jungst, to any reviser; δικαιοῦσθαι ἀπὸ only elsewhere in Rom. vi. 7. But if St. Paul's next words seem to imply that within certain limits, i.e., so far as it was obeyed, the law of Moses brought justification, they affirm at the same time the utter inefficacy of all legal obedience, since one thing was certain, that the law exacted much more than Israel could obey; complete justification must be found, if anywhere, elsewhere. Can we doubt that St. Paul is here giving us what was really his own experience? (See Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, p. 76.) In spite of all his efforts to fulfil the law, there was still the feeling that these efforts were hopelessly deficient; there was an area of transgression in which the law, so far from justifying, condemned. But in the Messiah, the Holy One of God, he saw a realisation of that perfect holiness to which in the weakness of the flesh he could not attain, and in Him, Who died, and rose again, for us—that Righteous One, Whom he saw, not only on the road to Damascus, but ever on his right hand by the eye of faith—he found complete and full justification. That this forgiveness of sins is not connected specially with the Death of Christ, but with His Resurrection, or rather with His whole Messianic character, to which the Resurrection put the final seal, is certainly not to be regarded as an indication of a non-Pauline view, cf. Romans iv. 25, viii. 34, 2 Cor. v. 15. Moreover, if we consider the connection of the whole address, the Resurrection is not regarded apart from the Death of Christ: vv. 20-29 show us that the Message of Salvation starts from the Death of Christ, and is based upon that, cf. Buthse, Die Paulinischen Reden, p. 54. It is unreasonable to complain that St. Paul's conception of justification in this address falls below his characteristic and controlling idea of it (McGiffert, p. 186). We could not justly expect that the Apostle's utterances, thus summarised by St. Luke, would contain as full and complete a doctrinal exposition as his Galatian and Roman Epistles. To the former McGiffert points as giving us what Paul actually taught in Galatia; but there is no contradiction between the teaching given us in St. Luke's account of the address in Pisidian Antioch and St. Paul's account of his teaching to his converts in his letter: "the coincidences between the two are so striking as to make each the best commentary on the other . . . and there is no such close resemblance between the Epistle and any other of Paul's addresses reported in Acts," Ramsay, Expositor, December, 1898. "Historical Commentary on Gal." see below, and also Lightfoot, on Gal. iii. 11. St. Paul's teaching is essentially the same in the synagogue at Antioch as when he is writing to his Galatian converts: only in Christ is justification, and in the law as such there is no forgiveness of sins. He does not say in so many words that there was no sin from which men could be freed under the law of Moses, but it is evident that the most solemn warning with which the Apostle
πράξεις αποστόλων

ΧΙΙΙ.

4ο. βλέπετε οὖν μη ἐπέλθῃ ἡ ὑμᾶς τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις,

41. "Ἰδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ θαυμάσατε καὶ αφανίσθητε· ὅτι ἐργάζομαι ἐν τοῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, ἐργῶν ὧν οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε, εάν τοῖς εἰρημένοις ὑμῖν."

42. Εξιόντων δὲ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν ἱουδαίων, παρεκάλουν τὰ ἐδή εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σαββατον λαληθήναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ἴδια ταῦτα.

1 At end D adds καὶ εὐγγέλιαν, Syr. Harcl. mg. καὶ εὐγγέλιαν. In the former case points to the impression the speech made; in the latter, merely to the fact that he finished it; cf. xv. 12, 13. Blass reads εὐγγέλιαν (β), so Hilg.; see Weiss, Codex D, p. 76.

2 εκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν ἱουδαίων only in δ, FABCDEI 13, 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. (Pesh.) and Harcl., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. τὰ εὐθύς, but om. δ, BCD(E), Syr. P. and H., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Evidence overwhelming for R.V.; the subject of the verbs not being clear the sentence was interpreted wrongly. ΒΕ (81) omits παρεκαλεῖν—B inserting τίς, while Chrys. substitutes ις, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Ηεθνη, but om. δ, BCD(E), Syr., Sah., Boh., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Evidence overwhelming for R.V.; the subject of the verbs not being clear the sentence was interpreted wrongly. εκτίς ευθύς after εφανεροῦν, while Chrys. substitutes ευθύς for επεκαλεῖν. W.H., Aph., p. 95, suspect primitive corruption, probably in opening words, and see Hort's suggestion. μεταξύ—D reads οἰς, Hilg. retains; Blass rejects, although he thinks it good as an explanation.

follows up his declaration could only be justified on the ground that some essential principle was involved in the acceptance or rejection of the work of Christ. On δικαιοῦν in classical literature, in LXX, and in N.T., see Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, pp. 104, 105, and Sanday and Headlam, Romans, pp. 30, 31.

Ver. 40. ἐν τοῖς προφ., cf. Luke xxiv. 44, and Acts xxiv. 14; John vi. 45. ἐπέλθῃ: quite Lucan in this sense, cf. viii. 24, Luke xii. 22, xxi. 26 (James v. 1). Ver. 41. Hab. i. 5; but here slightly different from the Hebrew " behold, ye among the nations," in LXX through the possible mistake of reading the Hebrew noun as if = deceitful ones (with the idea perhaps of impudence, shamelessness). On βλέπετε, μη ἐπέλθη, see Burton, pp. 85, 89; Viteau, p. 83 (1893).—ἀφανίσθητε: added by LXX to the " wonder marvellously" of Heb. and LXX: " perish," " vanish away," R.V. margin, an idea involved in Heb. though not expressed: verb frequent in LXX, in N.T. three times, in Matt. vi., and nowhere else except James iv. 14. See Mayor's note, in loco. The Apostle here transfers the prophecies of the temporal judgments following on the Chaldean invasion to the judgment of the nation by the Romans, or to the punishment which would fall upon the Jews by the election of the Gentiles into their place. Perhaps the latter is more probable before his present audience. The τοὺς δ λατρεύσατε naturally leads him to the warning for those who disbelieved (ἐργάζομαι) ων ου μη, πλειονεύσητε). It is tempting to regard the words with Ramsay (Expositor, December, 1898), as insisting upon the marvellous and mysterious nature of God's action in the sending forth of His Son, but the context (cf. ἐπέλθῃ) here, and the O.T. prophecy, both point to the imminence of judgment and penalty. —ἐργάζομαι: the present (so in LXX), because the result was so certain that it was regarded as actually in process. With true rhetorical force St. Paul concludes his speech, as at Athens, by an appeal to awaken all consciences, cf. St. Peter's closing words, ii. 36, iii. 26, possibly, as at the close perhaps of St. Stephen's speech, signs of impatience had begun to manifest themselves in his audience (Plumptre).

Ver. 42. ἔξω: " and as they went out," i.e., the Apostles, before the synagogue broke up the congregation of Jews and proselytes besought them—" when they had gone out," which would introduce a confusion of time; see critical notes. Wendt refers to ver. 15, and takes ἔξω as the subject of παρεκάλεσαν. Ver. 43. λατρεύσατε: Paul and Barnabas
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

43. λυθείσης δέ τῆς συναγωγῆς, ἡκολούθησαν πολλοί τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσολότων τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ. 44. ἡ κολούθησαν πολλοί τῶν σεβομένων προσήλυτῶν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ, οί τινες προσλαλοῦντες αὐτούς, ἐπεθυμοῦντες δέ τῇ χαρίτω τοῦ Θεοῦ.

45. τῷ δὲ εἰρημένῳ συμβατά σχεδόν πάσα ή πόλις συνήχθη ακούσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 46. Τῷ δὲ ἐρχομένῳ σχεδόν πάσα ή πόλις συνήχθη ακοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Υμῖν ἤν αναγκαίον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ: επειδή δὲ απωθείσθη αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἄξιος κρίνετε.
Paul, cf. 1 Tim. i. 19, Rom. xi. 1, Acts vii. 27, 39; frequent in LXX, cf., e.g., Ps. xciii. 14, Ezek. xliii. 9, and 3 Macc. iii. 22, vi. 32, 4 Macc. ii. 16.—οὐκ ἔδειν, cf. Matt. xxii. 8.

Ver. 47. γὰρ: this action of the Apostles in turning to the Gentiles was not arbitrary.—Τῇ δὲ εἰς φύσιν τοὺς ἔθνες, for the phrase cf. 2 Thess. iii. 1. toν Κυρίον, but τον Θ. BD*Ε 180, Boh., Arm., Aug., W.H. text, R.V. text, Blass, Hilg.—Weiss retains τον Κ., so Tisch., W.H. mg. following ΝΑCLP 61, Vulg., Sah., Chrys.

Ver. 48. εδόξεν τον λ. του Κ.: δοξεν τον Θ.; frequent in Luke and Paul, cf. 2 Thess. iii. i for the nearest approach to the exact phrase here. — δοιος γὰρ τῆς αιωνίου ζωῆς, ιδού στραφόμεθα εις τα ἐθνη. 48. ακούοντα δε τα ἐθνη ἔχαιρον, και εδάφαξαν τον λόγον του Κυρίου, και ἐπήγειραν διὸν ζωῆν αιωνίον. 49. διεφέρετο δε τον Κυρίου δι' θλισσ. τῆς χειρος. 50. οἱ δε Ιουδαίοι παρώτρυναν τὰς σεβομένας γυναικας και τὰς ευσχήμονας τοῦ τούτος τῆς πόλεως, και ἐστηχαν διωγμὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Παύλου και τὸν Βαρνάβαν,

Paul, cf. 1 Tim. i. 19, Rom. xi. 1, Acts vii. 27, 39; frequent in LXX, cf., e.g., Ps. xciii. 14, Ezek. xliii. 9, and 3 Macc. iii. 22, vi. 32, 4 Macc. ii. 16.—οὐκ ἔδειν, cf. Matt. xxii. 8.

Ver. 47. γὰρ: this action of the Apostles in turning to the Gentiles was not arbitrary.—Τῇ δὲ εἰς φύσιν τοὺς ἔθνες, for the phrase cf. 2 Thess. iii. 1. toν Κυρίον, but τον Θ. BD*Ε 180, Boh., Arm., Aug., W.H. text, R.V. text, Blass, Hilg.—Weiss retains τον Κ., so Tisch., W.H. mg. following ΝΑCLP 61, Vulg., Sah., Chrys.

Ver. 48. εδόξεν τον λ. του Κ.: δοξεν τον Θ.; frequent in Luke and Paul, cf. 2 Thess. iii. i for the nearest approach to the exact phrase here. — δοιος γὰρ τῆς αιωνίου ζωῆς, ιδού στραφόμεθα εις τα ἐθνη. 48. ακούοντα δε τα ἐθνη ἔχαιρον, και εδάφαξαν τον λόγον του Κυρίου, και ἐπήγειραν διὸν ζωῆν αιωνίον. 49. διεφέρετο δε τον Κυρίου δι' θλισσ. τῆς χειρος. 50. οἱ δε Ιουδαίοι παρώτρυναν τὰς σεβομένας γυναικας και τὰς ευσχήμονας τοῦ τούτος τῆς πόλεως, και ἐστηχαν διωγμὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Παύλου και τὸν Βαρνάβαν,
καὶ ἔβαλον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν. 51. οἱ δὲ ἐκτιναξάμενοι τὸν κοινορτὸν τῶν ποιῶν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς, ἥλθον ἣ εἰς Ἰκόνιον. 52. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐκπλήσσοντο χαῖρες καὶ Πνεῦμα εἰς Αγίου.

ΧΙV. Ι. ΕΓΕΝΕτο δὲ εν Ἰκόνιον, κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἱλαται αὐτῶς ὡστε πιστεύειν

1 ἥλθον, D reads κατηντησαν, so Blass and Hilg., a common word in Acts but not necessary here.

and also in Hippocrates and Aretaeus, εἰσελθεῖν, cf. xiv. 2; nowhere else in N.T., several times in LXX, and also frequently in Hippocrates and Galen, Hobart, pp. 225, 226. On the addition in Codex D see critical notes, and Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 105, 106. ό ταυτα ἐσχ.: "of honourable estate," R.V.; not of character, but of position, cf. Mark xv. 43. This influence assigned to women at Antioch, and exerted by them, is quite in accordance with the manners of the country, and we find evidence of it in all periods and under most varying conditions. Thus women were appointed under the empire as magistrates, as presidents of the games, and even the Jews elected a woman as an Adjutisynagogos, at least in one instance, at Smyrna, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 102; Church in the Roman Empire, p. 67; C. and H., p. 144; "Antioch," Hastings' B.D.; Loening, Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums, p. 15.-τοὺς πρώτους: perhaps approaching them through their wives. On the addiction of women to the Jewish religion cf. Jos., B. θ., ii., 20, 2; Strabo, vii., 2; Juvenal, vi., 542; see Blass, Felten, Plumptre, in loco, and instances in Wetstein.-ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς, see xiv. 21. διαφιλακτισμοῦν, cf. Matt. x. 14. Luke x. 11, Mark vi. 11... The symbolic act would be understood by the Jews as an intimation that all further intercourse was at an end. There is no reason to see in the words a late addition by the author of Acts to the source; the disciples mentioned in ver. 52 need not have been Jews at all, but Gentiles, and in xiv. 21 nothing is said of any intercourse except with those who were already disciples.—ἱκόνιον, see on xiv. 1. Ver. 52. ἡξιῶσας, cf. 1 Thess. i. 6, Rom. xiv. 17, 2 Tim. i. 4.

CHAPTER XIV.—Ver. 1. ἐν Ἰκόνιον (Κοινια), sometimes regarded as a Roman colony towards the end of the reign of Claudius, thus dignified on account of the title conferred upon the frontier town, Claudio-Derbe. But Hadrian, not Claudius, constituted it a colony. In ver. 6 the Apostles flee from Iconium to the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra and Derbe, and the inference from this statement is that Iconium was not itself Lycaonian. But this inference justifies the local accuracy of the historian, as it would appear that the people of Iconium regarded themselves as Phrygian even after Iconium had been united with Lycaonia in one district of Roman administration: cf. Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 37 ff., and the testimony of the Christian Hierax, 163 A.D., before his Roman judge: "I have come hither (i.e., as a slave), torn away from Iconium of Phrygia": on the road travelled by the Apostles see also Ramsay, u. s., p. 27 ff. Strictly speaking, Lystra and Derbe were cities of Lycaonia-Galatia, while Iconium reckoned itself as a city of Phrygia-Galatia, all three being comprised within the Roman province of Galatia. See also Rendall, Acts, p. 262. On the place and its importance, situated with a busy trade on the principal lines of communication through Asia Minor, see C. and H., smaller edition, p. 145, B.D. Iconium is the scene of the famous Acts of Paul and Thekla, forming a part of the Acts of Paul, C. Schmidt's translation of which we must await with interest. See Harnack, Chronol., i., p. 403, Wendt (1899), p. 42, Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 375, and "Iconium," Hastings' B.D.—κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ, "together," so R. and A.V., cf. LXX, τSam. xi. 11, or it may mean "at the same time". Blass however (so Ramsay, Weiss, Rendall) renders "after the same fashion," i.e., as at Antioch. But for this meaning cf. xvii. 2, where a different phrase is used.—Εὐθηνῶν: on the whole best taken as referring to the σεβ. or φοβ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, because in ver. 2 we have ἐθην, which would signify the Gentiles generally, as opposed to those devout persons who as proselytes had joined the Jewish synagogue.

Ver. 2. ἀπειθοῦντες, see critical notes. If we read ἀπεἰθήσαντες, "that were disobedient," R.V., but cf. John iii. 36, and Page's note in loco. Lumby quotes
Baruch i.19, and regards the expression here as stronger than “unbelieving,” rather unbelief breaking forth into rebellion, as in the case of these Jews at Iconium and elsewhere. Ramsay renders “the disaffected.”—ἔκακωσαν: “exasperated,” Ramsay; only here in N.T. in this sense, five times in Acts, once in quotation; only once elsewhere in N.T., 1 Pet. iii. 13, cf. for its use here Jos., Ant., xvi., 1, 2; vii., 3; viii., 6. It is used several times in LXX, but not in this sense, the nearest approach to it is Ps. ev. (LXX) 32. The same phrase occurs twice, Num. xxix. 7, xxx. 14, but with a different meaning or reading in D. See critical notes.

Ver. 3. ἰκανόν μὲν οὖν χρόνον διείσρυων διαθησαμένοι εἴτε above, so Hilgenfeld, who holds that this reading makes it conceivable how Paul and Barnabas could continue their work. On ἰκανός with χρόνος, peculiar to St. Luke, see p. 215. Ramsay sees the same force in the aorists and therefore ver. 3 seems so disconnected that he can only regard it as an early gloss similar to many which have crept into the Bezan text. He thus inclines to adopt here Spitta's hypothesis, and to regard vv. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 as a primitive document. The Bezan text is to him simply an attempt to remedy the discrepancy which was felt to exist between vv. 2 and 3, and it presupposes two tumults: one in ver. 2, and the other in vv. 4 and 5. But there seems nothing unnatural in taking οὖν as marking a result from the events of the two previous verses, not from the second alone, or in the extended stay of the Apostles in the divided city. (Wendt (1899) supposes that in the original source ver. 3 preceded ver. 2, which makes the sequence quite easy. Clemen is much more drastic in his
methods, and refers ver. 2 and vv. 4-6a to his Redactor Anti-Judaicus.)—έκφρασται: speaking boldly in spite of the opposition of the Jews, see above on the verb, p. 242.  
—εἰς, cf. iv. 17, 18 (elsewhere with ἐν), the Lord being the ground and support of their preaching; Calvin notes that the words may mean that they spoke boldly in the cause of the Lord, or that relying on His grace they took courage, but that both meanings really run into each other.  
—τῷ Κυρίῳ: difficult to decide whether the reference is to Jesus; Noetius takes it so, not only on account of St. Luke’s usual way of giving Him this title, but also because the Acts speak expressly of the miracles of the Apostles as works of Christ, iii. 16, cf. iv. 30. On the other hand Meyer-Wendt appeals to iv. 29, xx. 24, 32 (but for last passage see var. lect.), Heb. ii. 4.  
Ver. 4. ἐνοχὴν διά, better “and the multitude” (see Page’s note on ver. 3), cf. xxiii. 17. John vii. 43. There is no such marked success in ver. 3 as in Ramsay’s view. In Thessalonica, xviii. 4. 5. a similar division, cf. Luke xii. 51. —ἐποτατόν: the note of Weiss here takes the word, not in its technical sense at all, but only as missionaries; but see above on xiii. 1.  
Ver. 5. The real contrast is marked in this verse, ἦς δὲ ἐφίν. Hitherto the evil results indicated in ver. 2 had not resulted in an open combination of Jews and Gentiles to injure Paul and Barnabas, but now the Jews and their rulers were prepared to act in concert with the Gentiles, so that the opposition assumed a public shape, and a definite accusation of blasphemy could be formulated against the Apostles.—ὁρμή, “onset,” R.V.; “assault,” A.V., but neither word seems appropriate, since neither onset nor assault actually occurred. It seems therefore better to take the word as expressing the inclination, or hostile intention, or instigation, and to connect it with the infinitives. In classical Greek the word is used of eagerness (joined with ἐπίθυμα), of impulse, of eager desire of, or for, a thing, cf. Thuc. iv. 4. Plat., Phil., 35 D, although it is also used of an assault or attack. The only other place in the N.T. in which it occurs is James iii. 4 (R.V. renders “impulse”). Hesychius regards it as equivalent to βουλή, ἐπιθυμία, but see also for its use as expressing attack, violence, 3 Macc. i. 16, 23; iv. 5.—σὺν τοῖς ἐρχομένοις αὐτῶν, i.e., of the Jewish synagogues, as αὐτῶν shows. Hackett and Lumbay take it of the heathen magistrates. On the distinction between these and the ἐρχομένοις, see Schürer, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 64, 250, E.T. The magistrates of the city could not have participated in an act of mob-violence, and the plot to stone the Apostles seems to point to Jewish instigation for enforcing the punishment of blasphemy.—ὑπείρασα, “to entreat them shamefully,” so A. and R.V., indicating
3 ουσίδοντες κατέφυγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας, Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην, καὶ τὴν περίχωρον, 7. κάκει ἦσαν εὐαγγελιζόμενοι. 2

1 Syr. Harcl. mg. (cf. Flor.) reads "et fugientes pervenerunt in Lycaoniam, in civitatem quandam, quae vocatur Lystra, et Derben," so Blass in Β; in civil. quandam does not sound Lucan. After περιχωρον DE (Flor., Vulg.) add ολην, so Blass and Hilg., but see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 113.

2 At end of verse D(Ε), Flor., Wern., Prov. add εκνηθή ωλον το πλῆθος επὶ τῇ δίδαξῃ, and also apparently by way of transition to the following narrative δέ Π. καὶ Β. διετριβον εν λυστροις, so Blass and Hilg., but see Ramsay, u. s., and Weiss, Codex D, p. 78. E has εξεπλησσετο πασα η πολυπληθεια επι τη διαξη αυτων, and Harris thinks that the gloss arose in Latin and points out the closeness of d and e here (see also Blass, Proleg., p. 28). But it has been pointed out that the Latin of d and Flor. also differ.


Ver. 6. συνιδόντες, cf. xii. 12, v. 2, only in Luke and Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 4; 1 Macc. iv. 21; 2 Macc. iv. 41, xiv. 26, 30; 3 Macc. v. 50.—κατέφυγον, cf. Matt. x. 23: "We ought not to run into danger, but to flee from it if needful, like these leaders of the Church wishing to extend their preaching, and to multiply by persecution" Oecumenius; only elsewhere in N. T., Heb. vi. 18; see Westcott, l.c., cf. Deut. iv. 42, Numb. xxxv. 26; 1 Macc. v. 11, etc. So in classical Greek with εις, επί, πρός.—εις τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λ. Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην, καὶ τὴν περίχωρον: in these words Ramsay sees a notable indication of St. Luke's habit of defining each new sphere of work according to the existing political divisions of the Roman Empire: "Lystra and Derbe and the surrounding Region"; in going from Antioch to Iconium the travellers entered no new Region (χώρα), but in ver. 6 another Region is referred to, comprising part of Lycaonia, consisting of two cities and a stretch of cityless territory; and if this is so, we see also in the words an indication of St. Paul's constant aim in his missionary efforts, viz., the Roman world and its centres of life and commerce; when he reached the limit of Roman territory (Derbe) he retraced his steps. The position of Lystra, about six hours south-south-west from Iconium, near the village Κhatyn Serai, is now considered as established by Professor Sterrett's evidence based on an inscription; and from similar evidence of inscriptions it appears that Lystra had been a Roman colony since Augustus, Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 47 ff., and Wendt (1899), p. 248; O. Holtzmann, Neuzeitliche Zeitgeschichte, p. 102. The site of Derbe cannot be quite so satisfactorily determined, but probably near the village Losta or Zosta; about three miles north-west of this place, a large mound, by name Gudelissin, is marked by evident traces of the remains of a city, "Derbe," Hastings' B.D.; Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 54 ff., and Wendt (1899), p. 249. From 41-72 A.D. Derbe was the frontier city of the Roman province on the south-east. But if St. Paul thus found in Lystra and Derbe centres of Roman commercial life, we must modify our view of the wild and uncivilised nature of the region into which the Apostles penetrated after leaving Antioch and Iconium, cf. C. and H., p. 147, with Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 56, 57. If Paul had gone to the ruder parts of Lycaonia, it is very doubtful whether the inhabitants could have understood him, or any one addressing them in Greek (see also Rendall, Acts, p. 263).

Ver. 7. See critical notes for reading in D.—κάκει; found in four other places in Acts, but not at all in Luke's Gospel.

—εὐαγγ. ἦσαν: "they were engaged in preaching the Gospel," Ramsay; on participle with ἦσαν see i. 10.

Ver. 8. εν λυστροις: here neuter plural, and not as in vv. 6 and 21, feminine. Clemem. clem. and Jüngst, p. 131, see a proof in this that 8-12, or 214, was interpolated by a redactor. But Hilgenfeld points out that the same interchange of feminine singular and neuter plural recurs in xvi. 1, 2; cf. also 2 Tim. iii. 11. The miracle which follows has often been compared with those narrated in iii. 1 ff., and it has been alleged that this second miracle is a mere imitation of the first, to
6-το.
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8. Καὶ τις ἄνηρ ἐν Λύστροις ἄδυνάτος τοῖς ποιών ἐκάθητο, χωλὸς
ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρξων, 2 δὲ οὐδέποτε περιεπατήκης. 3

9. οὗτος ἦκουε 4 τοῦ Παύλου λαλοῦντος· δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ, καὶ ἰδὼν
ὅτι πίστιν ἔχει τοῦ σωθῆναι, 10. εἶπε μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ, Ἀνάστηθι.

1 εἰ Λυστροῖς, D omissions (so Hilig. and Blass in β, where he reads καὶ (εἰςι))—
attractive, although probably due to the previous interpolation, because it would
do away with the perplexity of the two readings εν Λ. ἄν(υ)ν. (so Weiss) and ἄνυν.
ἐν Λ. (W. H.).

2 εἰκ. μητρὸς Blass thinks out of iii. 2, so apparently Wendt—χωλὸς om. D,
Gig., but see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 114.

3 περιεπατήκης, but περιεπατήκης ΛΑΒΚ 51, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt,
R.V., Blass. At end of verse Flor. reads υπάρξων εἰς φοβί τοῦ θεοῦ, so Blass in β;
D omits τοῦ θεοῦ and puts the clause after λαλοῦντος in ver. 9; so Hilig. υπάρξ.
omitted above, where it seems clearly an interpolation in T.R. out of iii. 2. According
Flor. to the man would be a proselyte, see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 116, Hilgenfeld, Blass;
but Weiss, Codex D, p. 78, regards the reading in Flor. as quite secondary, and it is
to be noticed that D omits entirely the words τοῦ θεοῦ after φοβί.

ΜΑΘΗΛ. 13, 61, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm., ΑΕθ., Chrys., so Tisch. Flor. adds
"libenter," and Gig. adds επιστευσέν, so Blass in β.

keep up the parallel between Peter and Paul. But whilst there are, no doubt,
features in common in the two nar-
tatives—no great matter for surprise in
similar healings, where a similarity of
expressions would fitly recur, especially
in the literary usage of a medical writer
(see Zöckler, p. 240)—the differences are
also marked: e.g., in the Petrine miracle
the man is a beggar, and asks only for
alms; in the Pauline nothing is said of
all this, even if the first fact is implied
in the Petrine miracle nothing is said of
the man's faith, although it is implied
(see notes, in loco); here it is distinctly
stated—in the earlier miracle Peter is re-
presented as taking the man and raising
him up; here nothing of the kind is men-
tioned (see Blass, Apostelgeschichte,
p. 267). On St. Paul's own claim to
work miracles see 2 Cor. xii. 12, Rom.
xv. 19, Gal. iii. 5. If the latter passage
occurs in an Epistle addressed amongst
other Churches to Christians in Lystra,
in accordance with the South Galatian
theory, the assertion of miraculous powers
is the more notable; see also McGiffert,
Apostolic Age, p. 189. —ὁλόθος οὐς: π.: adjective only here in N.T. in this sense,
cf. LXX, S. Tobit ii. 10, v. 9, ἃθος τοις
ἀθαλοίς. It is used frequently in a
similar sense by medical writers, Hobart,
p. 46. —ἐκάθητο; not "dwell" Hebra-
istic; but simply "used to sit," cf. Luke
xviii. 35. John ix. 8; probably in the
Forum, cf. ver. 11 (Blass).—ἐκ κοιλ.
μητρὸς α.: "no mendicant pretender,
but one whose history from infancy
was well known". See Ramsay on the

Ver. 9. οὗτος: a genuine Lucan mark
of connection, Friedrich, p. 10.—ἡκουέ;
"used to hear," or "was listening to," i.e.,
as an habitual hearer of Paul's preach-
ing, see critical notes on D. Ramsay, St.
Paul, pp. 114, 116, regards the man as a
proselyte, cf. additions in Bezan text, but
for another view of the additions here and
in ver. 10, Page, Classical Review, July,
1899.—ἀτεν., see above, i. το.—τοῦ σ.,
Burton, Moods and Tenses, p. 158.

Ver. 10. ἀνάσ. . . . ὑπάρξε: verb, as
elsewhere, ix. 34, 40, but only here
with ἐν τοῖς π., hitherto they had
been too weak to support him, ὑπάρξε
signifying that he was entirely whole,
cf. reading in D. On ὑπάρξε see Hob-
bart, p. 46: it was frequently used by
medical writers, so by Hippocrates and
Galen, with ἱστημι; only elsewhere in
N.T. in a figurative sense and in a
quotation, Heb. xi. 13. The coloca-
tion is also found in classical Greek,
and cf. 1 Esdras ix. 46 (see also Hatch
and Redpath), but cf. also ἀνορθῶμ, Luke
xii. 13, and the combination in Galen of
ὁρθῶμ and τοῖς ἄδυνατον καλῶν.—ἀλῆτα
καὶ περιεπ., see also reading in D. If
we read ἀλῆτα, note aorist and imperfect,
he sprang up with a single bound, whilst
the walking is a continuous action, or
inceptive: "he began to walk".

VOL. II.
 HTMLElement, but ήλετο ABC 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss. D, Syr. H. mg. (Flor.), Hilg. have και ευθείς παραχρημα ανηλάτο, so Vulg., Gig. ανηλ. for ήλ. (εξηλ.Ε)  

Ver. II. έπηραν την φ. αυτών: aorist; lifted up their voices with a sudden outburst, and then went on to devise names for the two: εκάλουν, "were for calling," imperfect; cf. Luke i. 54 (Rendall). The phrase here only found in ii. 14, xxii. 22 and Luke xi. 27; Friedrich, p. 29, cf. LXX, Judg. ix. 7; phrase also found in classical Greek.—οι Όχλοι: the common city mob; the crowd, who would speak in their own native tongue. The Apostles had evidently spoken in Greek, which the native Lycaonians would understand and speak, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 57. But in moments of excitement their native tongue would rise more naturally to their lips, and they would give expression to their old superstitious beliefs, see Church in the Roman Empire, p. 58, and Wendt (1888), p. 313.—Λυκαονιστί: specially mentioned not only on account of its naturalness here (see above) but also because, as St. Chrysostom noted, this mention of the fact would explain why Paul and Barnabas made no protest. Bethge's objection that ομοιοπαθείς (ver. 15) shows that St. Paul understood the words of ver. 11 is no answer, because the preparations for the sacrifice, rather than the words of the people, enabled the Apostles to understand the bearings of the scene. On the speech of L. see Conder, Palestine Explor. Fund, October, 1888.—ΟΙ ΘΕΟΙ Κ.Τ.Λ.: the knowledge of the story of Baucis and Philemon, according to which Jupiter and Mercury visited in human form the neighbouring district, Ovid, Met., viii., 611 ff., would render such words quite natural (cf. Fasti, v., 495, and Dio Chrys., Orat., xxxiii., p. 408). Baur, Zeller, and Overbeck, followed by Wendt, object that the people would not have thought of such high gods, but rather of magicians or demons, and the latter evidently thinks that St. Luke has coloured the narrative by introducing into it the form which in his opinion the adoration of the Apostles would assume; but the same narrative emphasises the fact that the miracle was a notable one, and we can scarcely limit the bounds of excitement on the part of a superstitious people who were wont to make their pilgrimages to the spot where Jupiter and Mercury conversed with men. At Malta a similar result follows from the miracle of Paul, and heathen mythology was full of narratives of the appearances of high gods, which were by no means strange to N.T. times (see Holtzmann's note, Hand-Commentar, p. 379). Moreover, the people, rude as they were, might easily have seen that Paul and Barnabas were not altogether like the common magicians of the day. The main incident, McGiffert admits, was entirely natural under the circumstances, and is too striking and unique to have been invented, Apostolic Age, pp. 188, 189.  

Ver. 12. εκάλουν, see above on ver. II.—τον μεν Β. Δίας· τον δε Π. Ἐρμήν. The relative estimate of the Lycaonians was strikingly in accordance with Oriental notions—Barnabas, the more silent and passive, is identified with Jupiter; and Paul, the more active, with Mercury. Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 57; St. Paul, pp. 84, 85; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 189. With the reason given for the identification of Paul with Mercury, cf. Iamblichus, De Myst. Αρχηγ., i, where Mercury is designated as Θεός δ' τῶν λόγων ήμῶν (see also Wetstein). The comparison could not have been because of the Apostle's insignificant appearance (although the fact that he was the younger of the two men may be taken into account), since Hermes is always represented as of a graceful well-formed figure. On the traditional accounts of Paul's personal appearances see Wendt (1888), in loco, Blass, Renan, and Plumtre, Acts (Excursus, pp. 191, 192). It is of interest to note that in Gal. iv. 14 Paul writes to
13. ο δὲ ιερεύς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὀντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν, ταύτως καὶ στέμματα

1. Flor. om. στεμματα αὐτῶν . . . τον λ., and Blass brackets, comparing xvii. 18, xviii. 3, where some Western authorities omit explanatory clause. Ramsay also rejects clause, St. Paul, p. 117, but Hilig. retains. It is quite possible that in these cases the Western reading may be original, and the explanation may have been added later.

2. D reads τοῦ ὀντος Διος προ πολεως (Blass accepts, so Hilig., adding της before πολ.), and D, Gig. read οἱ ιερεῖς, so Hilig. (Blass rejects), so D reads επιθυειν, so Hilig. (not Blass). Ramsay, C. R. E., p. 51, and St. Paul, p. 118, defends all these readings as indications of local accuracy; see notes. Perhaps he forces too much his rendering of επιθυειν.

the Galatians: "Ye received me as a messenger of God," Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 117.

Ver. 13. ο δὲ ιερεύς. Plural in D; strongly rejected by Blass, with other details. Ramsay defends D (p. 118), and points out that at each of the great temples in Asia Minor a college of priests would be in regular service: see also Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 52, 53. — τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὀντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν, see critical notes. R.V., omitting αὐτῶν, renders "whose temple was before the city," i.e., enshrined in the temple outside the city as the protecting deity. Zöckler, with Ramsay, compares "Ζεὺς Προαστίος" on an inscription at Claudiopolis, cf. also παρὰ Διί (=ad fanum Jovis), παρὰ "Ηρη, and modern, the name of a church in Rome, "S. Paolo fuori le mura" (see also Holtzmann and Wendt). Here again the reading of D seems to bring out the technical force of the phrase more accurately, του ὀντος Δ. προ πολεως (so Blass in β) — possibly = Προπόλεως (cf. an unpublished inscription of Smyrna with the phrase ιερεία προ πολεως or Προπόλεως). In this phrase, as read in D, the force of the participle is retained in a way characteristic of Acts, as almost = τοῦ ὀνομαζομένου: see on xiii. 1, a characteristic lost by the transposition of τοῦ; see on the whole question Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 51 ff., and also on the possible site of the temple. The words cannot refer to the statue of Jupiter (so lately Rendall), to which no priests would be attached. See Blass in Studiun u. Kritiken, 1900, p. 27, n. 1. — ταύτως καὶ στέμματα: brought by the ministri who would be included in the generic term priests. On the sacrifice of a bull to Jupiter, Ovid, Met., iv., 755, as also to Mercury, Persius, Sat., ii., 44. On the garlands to wreath and adorn the victims, Αἰνειδ., v., 366; Eur., Heracl., 529, perhaps also for the priests and the altars, the doors, and the attendants; see instances in Wetstein, and cf. Tertullian, De Corona, x. The words do not refer to the Apostles: the aim seems to be indicated in ήθελε θύειν. — έπι τοὺς πυλῶνας: some see a reference to the gates of the city, mainly because of the collocation τοῦ βυθος πρὸ τῆς Π. Blass supposes that the priest came from the temple outside to the city gates, but in that case Ramsay urges that Lucan usage would = πύλη rather than πυλῶν, cf. ix. 24, xvi. 13. Others take it of the gates of the temple in front of which the altar stood, cf. οἱ μὲν ιεροὶ τοῦ νεω πυλῶν, Plut., Tim., xii. Ramsay suggests that the priests probably prepared their sacrifices at the outer gateway of the temple grounds, as something beyond the usual ritual, and so not to be performed at one of the usual places, cf. άπουθεν D; St. Paul, p. 119. Others again refer the words to the gates leading into the atrium or courtyard of the house in which the Apostles were lodging, partly on the ground that the word εξεπήδησαν is best referred to the house (cf. Judith xiv. 17, and Susannah, ver. 39). But the verb may mean that they ran hastily out of the city to the temple, and there mingled with the crowd: in 2 Macc. iii. 18 the same verb is used of a general rush of the people to the temple for supplication to heaven. — ήθελε θύειν: What was his motive? Was he acting in good faith, or out of complaisant regard to the wishes of the multitude (Ewald), or for the sake of gain? On the attitude of the native priests see Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 144. In the present instance it would appear that they had known of the Apostles' preaching for some time at all events, and also, it may be, of its success, cf. D., xiv. 7, critical notes, and apparently they were willing to honour the Apostles with divine honours, and to turn the religious revival to their own ends.
6οι αποστολοι om. D, Flor., Gig., Syr. Pesh., Blass "recte". Weiss thinks om. caused because offence was taken at the extension of the title to Barnabas. In ver. 4 Barnabas is not expressly mentioned, while here he is not only mentioned by name but placed first.


3 εφι τον Θεον τον ζωντα δScΑΒCD 13, 4ο, 6Ι, Αth., so Tisch., W. H., R. V., Weiss, Wendt; εφ. Blass, Gram., p. 144. D has ευαγγ. υμιν τον Θεον (so Ιren.), and again εφι τον Θεον ζωντα τον ποιησαντα, thus reading τον Θεον in both places (whilst Blass in β and Hilg. follow Flor. in omitting τον Θεον the second time). Ramsay however also retains the words in both places, as "the God" was the title under which the supreme God was worshipped in Asia Minor, St. Paul, p. 118.

Ver. 14. άκοντος: how, we are not told; whether, as Blass supposes, they had returned to their lodgings, and hurried forth to the city gates when they heard what was going on, or whether, later in the day, they hurried from the city to the temple when they heard of the approaching sacrifice, we do not know, and a better knowledge of the localities would no doubt make many points clearer. The crowd who had seen the miracle, ver. 11, would naturally be eager to follow the priest to the sacrifice, συν τοις όχλοις, ver. 13.—διαρρήξαντες: in token of distress and horror, cf. Gen. xxxvii. 29, 34; Josh. vii. 6; Matt. xxvi. 65; frequently in LXX, and several times in 1 Macc.—εισεπηδησαν: xvi. 29, see critical notes.

Ver. 15. ινος: brief address in accordance with the hurry of the moment. — ινος: James ν. τ7, "of like passions," so R. V. in both passages, but 'nature' in margin, so Ramsay. But to others the latter word seems too general, and they explain it as meaning equally capable of passion or feeling, as opposed to the άπαθεια of the idols; or, equally prone to human weakness, and not all-powerful as the people seemed to infer from the miracle (Bethge); whilst others again take it as meaning άμοιοι θητοὶ (so Blass). On its meaning in Wisdom vii. 3 see Grimm, sub v., and Speaker's Commentary. In 4 Macc. xii. 13 it is also used to mark the atrocious nature of persecution inflicted by one who, a man himself, was not ashamed τοις άμοιοι θητοὶς γιλιττοτομημαι: cf. its use in medical writers and in classical Greek (Wetstein); by the Fathers it was used of our Lord Himself, Euseb., H. E., i., 2, cf. Heb. iv. 15 (see Mayor on James v. 17).—ευαγγελιζ.: we preach not ourselves—Paul was a "messenger of God" in a higher sense than the people conceived; on the construction see above p. 210 and Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 79. For reading in D see critical note = bringing you glad tidings of "the God"—in Asia Minor a familiar term for the great God, so that just as St. Paul introduces the Christian God at Athens as "the Unknown God," whom the Athenians had been worshipping, so here he may have used a familiar term known to the crowd around him at Lystra, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 118.—επιστρέφειν. επι, cf. especially 1 Thess. i. 8, in Acts ix. 35, xi. 21, xv. 19, xxvi. 20; on the construction see Wendt, and Plummer, in loco, cf. iv. 18, v. 28, 40, infinitive after παραγγελλειν.—τον ζωντα, see critical note.—τοτε: may be used contemptuously, as if St. Paul pointed to the preparations for the sacrifice.—ματαιως, cf. Jer. ii. 5, x. 3, of the gods of the nations and their worship, cf. also 2 Kings xvii. 15 B, Jer. viii. 19; cf. Rom. i. 21, Ephes. iv. 17. R. V. and A. V. take it as neuter, others as masculine, sc. Θεων.—δς επηχει τον θυσιαστηριον κ.τ.λ., cf. especially Jer. x. 11, 12-15, 16, for the contrast between the gods who are no gods, and the God Who made the heavens, and cf. also Acts xvii. 24 for a similar appeal from the same Apostle.
The "living" God manifests His life in creation—a manifestation to which St. Paul would naturally appeal before such an audience; even in writing to Christian converts of the deepest mysteries of the faith he does not forget that the God of Nature and the God of Redemption are one, cf. Ephes. iii. 9, R.V.; so too St. Peter faces the first Christian hymn with the same words used here by the Apostle of the Gentiles, iv. 24. On the tact of St. Paul at Lystra and at Athens, laying the foundation of his teaching as a wise master-builder in the truths of natural religion, and leading his audience from them as stepping-stones to higher things, see notes on xvii. That he did not even at Lystra confine his teaching or his appeal simply to Nature's witness, see notes on vv. 22 and 23.

Vv. 16-17. δέ: God working not only in creation, but in history, not only the source of life but the personal living Guide and Ruler of man, even in His tolerance far removed from the easy indifference of the gods of Olympus. The three present participles αγαθοποιών, διδούς, εμπιπλών mark the continuous activity and goodness of God, and are all three epexegetical of αμάρτυρον, whilst the second participle is generally regarded as specifying a mode of the first, and the third as expressing a consequence of the second.—ουρανόθεν: only again in xxv. 13 in N.T., see 4 Macc. iv. 10; so in Hom. and Hes., old genitive of οὐρανός.

—ὑετούς διδοὺς καὶ καιρούς καρπ.: the Apostle's appeal becomes more significant when we remember that Zeus was spoken of as ὑετής, ὑετάρτος (Bethge); the rain was regarded in the East as a special sign of divine favour, and here, as in the O.T., God's goodness and power in this gift are asserted as against the impotence of the gods of the heathen, see especially Jer. xiv. 22, and cf. 1 Kings xviii. 1 and 1 Sam. xii. 17 where this same phrase ἀνήμερος is used of God.—καρπ.: here only in N.T., cf. LXX, Jer. ii. 21, Ps. civ. 34, and also classical; cf. for the whole passage Cicero, De Nat. Deorum, ii., 53.—ὑεταρτών (ὑεταρτῶν), cf. Luke i. 53, vi. 25, Rom. xv. 24, John vi. 12, frequent in LXX, e.g., Ps. cxi. 9, Isa. xxix. 19, Jer. xxxviii. 14, Ecclus. iv. 12; see also below on εὐφροσύνης. —καρπίας: Blass compares Luke xxii. 34, where the heart is spoken of as overcharged with surfeiting, as here it is spoken of as filled with food. But the word may be used not merely as ὑμάς, or in a merely material sense, but as including the idea of enjoyment, cf. for the whole passage Cicero, De Nat. Deorum, ii., 53.—εὐφροσύνης: in its ordinary Greek use might simply mean "good cheer," although we need not limit it here with Grotius to wine as in Ecclus. xxii. 28; very frequently used in LXX (only here and in ii. 28 in N.T.), sometimes of mere festive joy, Gen. xxxii. 27, sometimes of religious gladness, Deut. xxviii. 47. Although St. Paul could not have used it here as it is employed in ii. 28, yet he might perhaps have used it as a kind of transition word to lead his hearers on to a deeper gladness of heart, a richer gift of God than corn and wine, cf. Ps. iv. 7, and for the phrase ὑμεῖς. εὐφροσύνης. Isa. xxxix. 19, Ecclus. iv. 12. It may well be that whilst we have in this address the germ of the thoughts afterwards developed in Rom. i. 18, 23, etc., St. Paul did not press his argument on this occasion as in his Epistle, but took the first step to arrest the attention of his hearers by an appeal to the goodness, not to the severity, of God—the goodness which leadeth to repentance. It has been thought that the words οὐρανόθεν διδοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρπ.: the Apostle expressed his thoughts; others have maintained that they may have formed part
εἴφροσύνης τὸς καρδίας ἡμῶν. 18. καὶ ταῦτα λέγουσε, μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μηθείν αὐτοῖς. 19. Ἐπήλθον δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας καὶ Ἰκώνου ᾿Ιουδαίων, καὶ πείσαντες τοὺς ὄχλους, καὶ λιθάσαντες τὸν Παύλον, ἐσύρον ἑαυτοὺς.

1 ημῶν...ημῶν, but μόλις...μόλις ημῶν BCDE, Syr. Harcl., Arm., Ir., Ath., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; υμῖν however is om. by ΜC A 13, 61, Vulg.

2 μόλις, D reads μοις, and for κατεπαυσαν...αυτοῖς Flor. has "vix persuaserunt ne immolarent sibi illi homines" (so Blass in b, cf. Hilg.). C, many min., and Syr. H. mg. add ἀλλὰ πορευέσθαι εκατόν σις τὰ ἱδία, cf. v. 18 D, John vii. 53; Flor. adds "et discedere eos ab se" (so Blass in b preceding previous addition; Hilg. omits).

3 At the begin. of verse CDE (Flor. Cassiod.), Syr. H. mg., Arm., Bed. read διατριβοῦσαν...κατεπαυσαν evidently to show that the outbreak did not ensue immediately upon the intended worship. D, Flor., Syr. H. mg. (E, Vulg.) insert tines before loub. and change order. C, Syr. H. mg., Flor. proceed κατεπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους αποστῆσαι αὐτοῖς ("ne crederent illis docentibus," Flor.), λεγόντες ὅτι οὐκ εἰληφθεὶς λεγοντες ἀλλὰ παντὰ φεύγονται—so Blass throughout in b, and Hilg., see Belser, p. 71, in support, on the ground that β thus explains fully the change in the attitude of the people; but the whole might proceed from a reviser, and need not be original.

of the hymn sung in the procession for the sacrifice, and that St. Paul made the words his text; see Humphry, in loco; Farrar, St. Paul, i., p. 384; Felten, in loco; but it may be fairly said that the O.T. language was in itself quite sufficient to suggest the Apostle's words. On the remarkable parallels between this speech and the sayings of Pseudo-Heraclitus in his letters see Gore, Ephesian, p. 253 ff., but see also Bernays, Die Herraklitischen Briefe, p. 29. —πάντα τὰ ἔθνη: all the Gentiles, R.V., the words divided mankind into two classes, but there was the same Lord over all, Rom. iii. 29. —ἐν ταῖς παρώχ. γενεσίαις: "in the generations gone by," R.V. παρώχ.: not in LXX or Apocrypha, but classical, and used also by Josephus.—ἐίσασθαι (cf. xvii. 30, Rom. iii. 25, 26) ...πορεύ. ταῖς ὀδοῖς αὐτῶν, i.e., without summoning them as now to repent, cf. for the combination ix. 31, and for the expression 2 Cor. xii. 18, Jude v. 11, James v. 20 (in classical Greek cf. Thuc., iii., 64. ἐκοιμήθη ὅπως, cf. also the contrast between God's ways and the wilfulness of Israel in the past, Ps. lxxxi. 13 and previous verses, expressed in the same phraseology.

Ver. 17. κατατιμής, see critical notes. If we read κατατιμής the word is only found in the N.T. here and in Heb. iv. 3; used here as an adversative conjunction; see Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 168, and further Blass, Gramm., pp. 242, 264; Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 118 (1893); see 4 Macc. ii. 6.—ἀμαρτησαν: not in LXX or Apocrypha; only here in N.T., but in classical Greek, and also in Josephus, see instances in Wetstein. This witness is not as at Athens, xvii. 27, Rom. ii. 15, to man's consciousness and conscience, but rather to God's presence in nature, cf. for the expression LXX, Ps. lxxxviii. 37, δὲ μάρτυς ἐν οὐρανῷ πιστός, and Pseudo-Heraclitus, letter iv., where the moon is spoken of as God's οὐράνιος μαρτύρια; see below on ver. 17.—τινὰς θέαν: non reliquit sed sivit (Blass).—Ἀγαθοτοιοί, see critical notes. Neither ἄγαθοποιοί nor ἀγαθοφορεῖν, 1 Tim. vi. 18, occur in classical Greek or LXX. T.R. uses the more familiar word; found three times in Luke's Gospel and elsewhere in N.T., and also a few times in LXX (in different senses), but not in classical Greek; see Plummer on Luke vi. 33, and Hatch, Essays in B. G., p. 7.


Ver. 19. Ἐπηλθον δὲ: on readings to account for the interval see critical notes. Nothing in the narrative forbids some kind of interval, whilst nothing is said as to its duration.—Ἰουδαίοι: a proof of their enmity in that they undertook a long journey of some one hundred and
πόλεως, 
νομίσαντες 
αυτόν τεθνάναι. 20. κυκλωσάντων δὲ αυτὸν τῶν 
μαθητῶν, ἀναστὰς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν 
καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον εξῆλθε 
σὺν τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ εἰς Δέρβην. 21. εὐαγγελιζομενοὶ τῇ 
πόλιν εἰκανοῦ, καὶ μαθητεύσαντες υπάρχον 
σὺν τῇ Λύστραν

1 νομίσαντες Μ:ADB 13, 40, 61, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg
2 Flor. reads "tunc circumdederunt eum discentes et cum surrissete (x) populus 
vespere ...." Par. adds μορίᾳ before ανασ., so Blass in β; cf. Belser, p. 71.
3 εὐαγγελιζομενοὶ Μ:BC61 61, Bas., Chrys., so W.H., Blass, R.V.; ευαγγελιζομενοὶ 
ADEHP, Lach., Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg., the aor. part. probably a mechanical 
conformity to the following part.

thirty miles.—πείσαντες τοὺς δὲ: mobile vulgus. The change in their attitude 
need not surprise us, cf. the fickleness of the inhabitants of Malta, xxviii. 6, and, 
more notably still, the change of feeling in the multitudes who could cry 
Hosannah! and Crucify! The Scholiast, Homer. II., iv. 89-92, has οὕτω 
τῷ Λυκανθέ, ἕς καὶ ἄριστοτέλης μαρ 
tρεῖ. These Jews may have received 
help from their fellow-countrymen, some 
few of whom were resident in Lystra, 
vi. 1, or possibly, as McGiffert suggests, 
it may have been easy to incite the 
populace against Paul and Barnabas, 
because of the Apostles' rejection of the 
divine honours offered to them. But 
probably the persuasion implies that they 
influenced the multitudes to regard the 
miracle, the reality of which they could 
not dispute, as the work not of beneficent 
gods but of evil demons. The form of 
punishment, λιθάσαντες, would seem at 
all events to point to Jewish instigation, 
although the stoning took place not out 
biside but inside the city, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 25, 
2 Tim. iii. 11, and Wendt (1888), p. 318, 
as against Zeller. In Gal. vi. 17 the 
Apostle may allude to the scars marked 
on him by these same people (Ramsay, 
Zahn), cf. also Clem. Rom., Cor., v. 6. 
λιθάσαντες: "Uti Paulus prius lapidationi 
Stephani consenserat: ita nunc veterem 
culpam expiat, 2 Cor. xi. 25" (Wetstein). 
On the undesigned coincidence 
between this narrative and the notice in 2 Tim. 
cf. Paley, Hora Paulina, xii., 5. Hilgen 
feld refers this verse to his "author 
to Theophilus," but the change in the 
multitude and the hatred of the Jews 
are not surprising, but perfectly natural. 
—εὐαγγελ.: as a past indignity, 
cf. viii. 3, xvii. 6.—νομίσαντες: St. Luke's 
words do not require us to think that St. 
Paul was rendered lifeless, and we need 
not suppose that he was more than 
stunned. But at the same time the 
narrative undoubtedly leads us to recog 
nise in St. Paul's speedy recovery from 
such an outrage, and his ability to resume 
his journey, the good hand of God upon 
him. We may again notice St. Luke's 
reserve in dwelling on the Apostle's 
sufferings, and his carefulness in re 
fraining from magnifying the incident. 
Ver. 20. κυκλ.: Bengel says "tan 
quam sepelium," and others have 
held the same view, but the word need 
not imply more than that the disciples 
surrounded him, to help if human aid 
could profit, and to lament for him in his 
sufferings. Amongst the mourners the 
youthful Timothy may well have found 
a place. On Timothy's means of knowing 
of the Apostle's sufferings here narrated 
see Paley, Hora Paulina, s. s.—μαθητῶν: 
the Apostles' work had not therefore been 
unsuccessful: there were converts willing 
to brave persecution, and to avow them 
selves as disciples.—τῇ ἐπαύριον: 
the journey to Derbe was one of some hours, 
not free from risk, and the mention of 
Paul's undertaking and finishing it on 
the morrow indicates how wonderfully he 
had been strengthened in his recovery. 
The word is found ten times in Acts, 
and not at all in Luke's Gospel, but cf. 
ἀριστοτέλης: Luke x. 35, Acts iv. 5 only; 
Hawkins' Hora Syn., p. 144. It occurs 
three times in chap. x., no less than in 
the second half of the book.—οὖν τῷ Β.: 
apparently he had been free from attack, 
since Paul was the chief speaker, and 
consequently provoked hostility. 
Ver. 21. εὐαγγελ.: continuous preach 
ing, present participle, and the result, 
many disciples; not "having taught 
many," A.V., but "had made many dis 
doubt they pursued the same course as 
at Lystra, and again we have direct 
proof that the teaching of the Gospel 
was not in vain: it is therefore quite 
unwarrantable to suppose that Paul's
καὶ ἑκὼν καὶ Ἀντίοχειαν, 22. ἐπιστηρίζετε τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν, παρακαλοῦντες ἐμένων τῇ πίστει, καὶ ὑπακούσαντες ἐν ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 23. χειροτονησάντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτερους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, προσευχάμενοι μετὰ ἑσυχῶν, παρέδωκαν τῷ Κυρίῳ εἰς ἑν

speech at Lystra indicates the powerlessness of the message of the Gospel in contact with deep-rooted heathenism (Bethge); in vv. 22, 23 we have abundant proof that Paul had not limited his first preaching in Lystra to truths of natural religion, for now on his return the disciples are bidden ἐμένων τῇ πίστει, and they are commended to the Lord, ἐν ὑποστυλείσαν, "on whom they had believed". No persecution is mentioned at Lystra, with which cf. 2 Tim. iii. 12, as he looked back upon these same sufferings at the close of his life. The teaching thus expressed may have struck deep root in the heart of one of St. Paul's hearers—why not Timothy?—and have been repeated by him to St. Luke as the Apostle had uttered it; see further in its bearing on the date, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 123. Alford's note strongly suggests that Luke himself was present, see in loco and also Proleg., pp. 6, 7. On the possibility that the words contain an Ἀγραφόν of the Lord see Resch, Ἀγραφά, pp. 148, 278, and cf. Epist. Barn., vii., 11.—θλίψεων, cf. xx. 23, quite a Pauline word, not used by Luke at all in his Gospel (five times in Acts), cf. 1 Thess. iii. 3 and ii. 12, and Epist. Barn., n. s. On St. Paul's reference to "the kingdom of God," sometimes as future, sometimes as actually present, see Witness of the Epistles, p. 311, note (τ892).

Ver. 23. χειροτονησάντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβ., see above, x. 41, where the compound verb is used, "chosen of God," ὑπὸ Θ. The simple verb is only used here and in 2 Cor. viii. 19; lit., to elect by popular vote, by show of hands, but it is by no means a word of certain sense, although for the simple verb cf. Ps. li. (l.) 12.—ἐμένων, Gal. iii. 10, Heb. viii. 9, two quotations: in the former, with the simple dative; in the latter, with ἐν; several times in LXX, and with both constructions, cf. Xen., Mem., iv., 4.—τῇ πίστει: subjective or objective, as a feeling of trust, or a belief, a creed! That it was used in the latter sense by St. Paul we cannot doubt, in such passages as Col. i. 23, 1 Tim. v. 8 (cf. 1 Pet. v. 9, Jude vv. 3, 20), and St. Luke may have used the word in this latter sense in recording the incident. But cf. also vi. 7, xiii. 8, where the word may be used, as perhaps here, in a kind of intermediate stage.—ὁτι, cf. xi. 3, xv. 1, we have the language of the preachers themselves, but it is precarious to conclude that ἡμᾶς includes the presence of the author of the book, St. Luke himself. The ἡμᾶς may simply mean that the speakers thus associated themselves with their hearers, and drew a general lesson similar to that drawn by St. Paul in 2 Tim. iii. 12, as he looked back upon these same sufferings at the close of his life. The teaching thus expressed may have struck deep root in the heart of one of St. Paul's hearers—why not Timothy?—and have been repeated by him to St. Luke as the Apostle had uttered it; see further in its bearing on the date, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 123. Alford's note strongly suggests that Luke himself was present, see in loco and also Proleg., pp. 6, 7. On the possibility that the words contain an Ἀγραφόν of the Lord see Resch, Ἀγραφά, pp. 148, 278, and cf. Epist. Barn., vii., 11.—θλίψεων, cf. xx. 23, quite a Pauline word, not used by Luke at all in his Gospel (five times in Acts), cf. 1 Thess. iii. 3 and ii. 12, and Epist. Barn., n. s. On St. Paul's reference to "the kingdom of God," sometimes as future, sometimes as actually present, see Witness of the Epistles, p. 311, note (τ892).
πεπιστεύκεισαν. 24. και διελθόντες τήν Πισιδίαν, ήλθον εἰς Παμφύλιαν. 25. καὶ λαλήσαμεν ἐν Πέργῃ τὸν λόγον, κατέβησαν εἰς

1 εν Περγῇ Νε:BCDEHL, so Lach., W. H. text, Rendall, Hilg.; εἰς τὴν Π. Ν*Α (without art.) 61, so Tisch., W. H. marg., Weiss, Wendt, Blass—the change of εν into εις is quite inconceivable, so Weiss, who compares other frequent uses of εις as characteristic of Acts ii. 5, ix. 21 (Apostelgeschichte, p. 36).

"Ordination" (Hatch, Dict. of Chr. Ant., ii., p. 1501 ff.). Blass takes the word here as = καθιστάναι, and compares Titus i. 5, although he thinks that nothing is said here about the mode of election, and that the Church may have had some share in it. So too Ramsay compares the same passage, Titus i. 5, and concludes that St. Paul doubtless followed there the same method which he followed here, a method in which the votes and voices of each congregation were considered, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 19. But the office to which Luke was appointed in 2 Cor., l. c., was not an office which involved ordination, and we could not argue from it alone to the method of the appointment of elders in the passage before us. At the same time it may be fully admitted that the Church was not without some share in the election of the elders, and it must not be forgotten that, in the case of the Seven, the Church had elected, and the Apostles had ordained, Acts vi. 3. In Clem. Rom., Cor., xlv., whilst the Apostles took care to secure that after their death distinguished men should appoint presbyters and deacons, yet the latter were elected with the consent of the whole Church, and they were exposed, as it were, to the judgment of the Church (see on this voice of the Church, Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 89, and Gore, Church and the Ministry, p. 100 ff.). If we compare the language of Acts vi. 3, Tit. i. 5, Clem. Rom., Cor., xliii., xlv., xlv., 2, 3, and the use of the verb καθιστήμην in each, it would seem that the κατάστασις was throughout reserved to the Apostles or their representatives, whilst the Church, if not always selecting, may at least be regarded as consenting, συνουσίας τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάντως, Clem. Rom., u. s., xlv., 3; see "Bishop" (Haddan), Dict. of Chr. Ant., i., p. 213. But, further, in the passage before us it is not impossible that the choice as well as the ordination of the presbyters may be referred to Paul and Barnabas, cf. the pronoun αὐτοῦς: "having appointed for them," and in newly founded communities it was not unnatural that the Apostles should exercise such choice and authority. On the use of the verb in the Didaché, xv., i, and its compatibility with ordination in accordance with Apostolic practice and injunction, see Gore, Church and the Ministry, p. 281; and further, Church Quarterly Review, 42, p. 265 ff., on the strictures passed by Loening, Die Gemeindeverfassung, 61, 62.—κατ’ ἐκκλησίαν, "in every Church," distributive, ii. 46, v. 42, cf. Titus i. 5, Clem. Rom., Cor., xiii., 4. On the spread of Christianity in Asia Minor see additional note at end of chapter.—προσευξ. μετά της: Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 122, speaks of the solemn prayer and fasting which accompanied the appointment of the elders, and of this meeting and rite of fasting, as the form permanently observed, cf. xii. 1-3. The two participles χειροτ. and προσευξ. evidently refer to the appointment, and not to the subsequent commendation. See also Harnack, Proleg. to Didaché, p. 148; and on the other hand, Overbeck, Wendt, Weiss, Zöckler.—παρέθεντο, χξ. 32, cf. Luke xii. 48, xxiii. 46, l Pet. iv. 19, cf. 1 Tim. i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 2 (in no parallel sense in the other Evangelists). In the first three passages above used as here of solemn committal to God; also of giving into another's charge or keeping, cf. παραδόθηκεν, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. i. 12, 14. In classical Greek of money or property entrusted to one's care. In Tobit x. 12 (cf. i. 14, iv. 1, 20 Tim. ii. 18, cf. 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. iv. 1, 20) both verb and noun are found together, παρατίθεμαι σοι την θυγατέρα μου ἐν παραθήκῃ S (see Hatch and Redpath).—αὐτοὺς may refer to the believers in general, cf. Hort, Ecclesia, p. 66.—τῷ Κ., Ἰ. ε., Christ, as the πιστεύω indicates: the phrase πιστεύω εις, or επί τινα, is peculiarly Christian, cf. Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 24. ἐν Περγῇ τον λόγον: in the beginning of their journey they made a missionary journey through Pisidia, see above on xiii. 6. Here it seems clearly implied that Pisidian Antioch was not in Pisidia, see above on xiii. 14, and Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 124.

Ver. 25. καὶ λ. ἐν Περγῇ τὸν λόγον: in the beginning of their journey they probably made a slight stay at Perga, but without preaching there—possibly
for the reason mentioned above which prompted them to hurry on to Antioch, and possibly because, as C. and H. (so Felten) think, the inhabitants at the time of the Apostles' first visit were all leaving Perga for the cool mountain districts, their summer retreats, whereas on the return journey of the missionaries Perga would again be full (C. and H., pp. 131, 158, smaller edition). — ἐν Π., see critical notes. — κατέβησαν, went down, i.e., to the sea coast where Attalia lay, cf. xvi. 8 (xiii. 4), Jonah i. 3, so in classical Greek ἀναβαίνω, to go up from the coast. — Αττάλειαν: mentioned because it was the harbour of embarkation, and so called from Αττάλος Π. εἰρήνης, king of Pergamus, its builder, b.c. 159-138; is a port for the trade of Egypt and Syria, Strabo, xiv., 4. It bears the modern name of Adalia, and until quite recent days it was the chief harbour of the south coast of Asia Minor. See B.D. and Hastings' B.D., "Attalia" (Ramsay). The distance from Perga was about sixteen miles, and the travellers would reach it across the plain: formerly they had gone up the Cestrus to Perga, and probably they now go to Attalia to find a ship for Antioch. See Hackett, in loco, and C. and H.

Ver. 26. κακείθεν, cf. vii. 3, and Luke xi. 53, in six other places in Acts in a local sense as here, only once elsewhere in N.T., in Mark ix. 30, in same sense; see also xiii. 21. — ἂν ἦσαν παραδεδομὲν: "they had been committed," R.V., in xvi. 40 "commended"; in both passages A.V. "recommended," a rendering which has changed its meaning; only in these two passages in this sense, but cf. 1 Pet. ii. 23 (John xix. 30). — ἐπλήρωσαν, cf. xii. 25, xiii. 25, still, as hitherto, St. Paul found the χάρις of God "sufficient".

Ver. 27. συν τὴν ἑκκλ., cf. xv. 30, 2 as was natural, for they had been sent out by them. — ἄντεπελευσαν: xv. 4 (xx. 20, 27), lit., to carry back tidings (so in classical Greek, as from a less to a greater), cf. 2 Cor. vii. 7; used here as in Aeschylus, Xen., Polyb., of messengers reporting what they had seen or heard (Grimm). Blass takes it as simply ἀντεπελευσαν as in LXX and later Greek. — ὡς: "how many (or "how great") things," — ἄντεπελευσαν ἐκ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ: a striking coincidence with St. Paul's use of the same metaphor elsewhere, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Col. iv. 3, and cf. Rev. iii. 8. St. Paul's Galatian Epistle clearly shows that his missionary work in Galatia had met with much success, and that the Churches now founded held a large place in his affections, cf. Gal. iv. 14, 15. Enough had been accomplished, even if all his desires were still unfulfilled, to make him eager for a continuation of the work to which he had been called as an Apostle of the Gentiles, see McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 191, 192; Hort, Ecclesia, p. 66: "perhaps the greatest epoch in the history of the Ecclesia at large": Spitta refers the whole verse to his Redactor, p. 171.

Ver. 28. χρόνον οὐκ ολίγον: only in Acts, where it occurs eight times, cf. xii. 18, etc.; on the length of time thus spent see "Chronology of the N.T.," Hastings' B.D., and also Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 74, with which cf. Lewin, Fasti Sacri, p. 288.

Additional Note.—In chapters xiii. and xiv. many critics find the commencement of a new source, a belief based to a great extent upon the view that Barnabas and Saul are here introduced as if they had not been previously mentioned. But whilst some description is given of each of the remaining persons in the list (xiii. 1), nothing is added to the name of Barnabas or of Saul, so that it seems quite permissible to argue that these two are thus simply mentioned by name because they were already known. It is therefore not surprising to find that some writers, e.g., Hilgenfeld, regard these chapters as part of a previous source, so too Wendt, Spitta, Jüngst. Others see in these chapters a separate document, possibly not used again by the author of Acts; a document composed by a different hand from that to which we owe the "We" sections, and incorporated by the author of the whole book into his work (McGiffert). Others again see in these same chapters the commencement of a Travel-Document, containing not only these two chapters, but also the later journeys of St. Paul, coming to us from...
27. παραγενόμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόντες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀνήγγειλαν ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἦνοιξε τοῖς θέναι δύον πίστεως. 28. διέτριβον δὲ ἐκεῖ χρόνον οὕτω διόγγον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

1 ἀνήγγειλαν, but imperf. ΝΑΒC 18, 40, 61, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt—Blass and Hiigel follow T.R. For μετ' αὐτῶν D, Gig., so Hilg., read μετ' τῶν φυλῶν αὐτῶν, perhaps Syriac influence (Harris). Blass brackets καὶ ὀπ. . . τ. πίστευς without any authority, and adds the same words to xiv. 4, see below l. c.

the same hand as the “We” sections, and from the same hand as the rest of the book (Ramsay). It is disappointing to find how Clemen, while referring xiii., xiv. to his good source, Historia Pauli, goes even further than Spitta in breaking up the different parts of the narrative: e.g., xiv. 8-11, we owe to the Redactor Judaicus, and vv. 19, 20, 22b, 23 in the same chapter to the Redactor Anti-Judaicus. (See on the whole question Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., 1e Hefl, 1896; Wendt (1899), p. 225, note; Zückerl, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 243, 244 (second edition).) It is no wonder in face of the unsatisfactory attempts to break up these chapters, or to separate their authorship from that of the rest of the book, that Zahn should maintain that a man like Luke needed for the composition of chapters xiii.-xxviii. no other source than his recollections of the narratives recited by St. Paul himself, or of the events in which he, as St. Paul’s companion, had participated, Einleitung in das N. T., ii., 412 (1899), cf. Nösgen, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 25, 26. Certainly the unity of authorship between the two chapters under consideration and the rest of the book seems most clearly marked in language and style: e.g., καταστάλω, xiii. 6, only found elsewhere in N.T., Acts xii. 17, xiii. 33, xxi. 40; ἐπιτρέπων τὴν φωνήν, xiv. 11, only elsewhere in N.T., Luke xii. 27, Acts ii. 14, xxi. 22; παραχρῆμα, xiii. 11, elsewhere in N.T., ten times in Luke’s Gospel (only twice in St. Matthew, and not at all in the other Evangelists), Acts iii. 7, v. 10, xii. 23, xvi. (26), 33; ἔπειρα, with participle, xiii. 48, xiv. 7, 12, 26; ἡμέραι πλείους, xiii. 4; ἡμέραι πλείους, xiii. 21; προσεύχομαι with accusative, xiii. 2, 7; άπονοια, xiii. 25. On the position of these two chapters relatively to chap. xv. see below.

Additional note on xiv. 23.—On the rapid spread of Christianity in Asia Minor see Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., pp. 87, 94, 95, 135-137, and Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 161, 397. The old nature religion with its negation of moral distinctions and family ties was doomed, a religion which on the one hand made woman the head of the family, and on the other hand compelled her to a so-called sacred service which involved the surrender of all which in a civilised community womanhood held most dear. The strength of the old ritual, however, was so great that it seems to have been maintained in Phrygia even after a higher type of society became known in the Roman period. But with the growth of Roman organisation and educational influences the minds of men were at least prepared for new ideas, and at this juncture St. Paul came preaching a gospel of home life, of Christian purity: and wherever higher social ideas had already penetrated he found converts disposed to follow his teaching as a more excellent way. In connection with the wide spread of Christianity in Asia Minor see also Orr, Some Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity, p. 48 ff. (1899).
the brethren.—περιτεμνησθε, see critical
note.—το Μωυσεως: R.V. as in vi. 15,
"custom of Moses"; in A.V. "manner,
"which might be used of a temporary
fashion or habit; δος marks a national
custom, but see also Deissmann, Neue
Bibelstudien, p. 79. On its national
significance, see art. "Circumcision,"
B.D., and Hastings' B.D., "Beschnei-
dung"; Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie
des Judentums, i., 2, 174; Weber,
Judische Theol., p. 266 (1807); Renan,
Saint Paul, p. 66; and cf. Book of
Tübiles, xv., cf. i.; Assumption of Moses,
viii.; Jos., Ant., xx. 2, 4; c. Apion., ii.,
14; Vitæ, xxiii. —σωθήναι, i.e., in the
Messianic salvation, cf. ii. 40, iv. 12, xi.
14. On the tradition that Cerinthus was
amongst these Judaisers, as he and his
had already rebuked Peter, Acts xi. 2,
see "Cerinthus," Dict. of Christ. Biog.,
i., 447. It is very probable that the
successful mission of Paul and Barnabas
was really the immediate cause of this
protest on the part of the narrow Judaic
party. This party, as the Church in
Jerusalem grew, may well have grown
also; the case of Cornelius had been
acquiesced in, but it was exceptional,and
it was a very different thing to be asked
to embrace all Gentiles in the new cove-
nant, and to place them on a level with
the Jewish Christians, whether they did
homage or not to the Mosaic law, Hort,
Ecclesia, p. 67; McGiffert, Apostolic Age,
p. 192.
Ver. 2. στάσεως: the word, with the
exception of Mark xv. 7, and Heb. ix. 8
(in a totally different sense), is peculiar
to St. Luke: twice in his Gospel, and
times in Acts; used in classical
Greek of sedition, discord, faction, and
so of the factious opposition of parties in
the state; frequent in LXX, but only
once in any similar sense, Prov. xvii. 14.
—σωθήναι, but Δικτ.: "questioning,"
R.V., cf. John iii. 25; three times in St.
Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit.
iii. 9, in a depreciatory sense in each
case; not in LXX or Apocrypha.—οίνος
dlίγης, see on xii. 18 and xiv. 28; eight
times in Acts.—φάμα, sc., οi αδελφοι,
ver. 1; no discrepancy with Gal. ii. 2,
see additional note.—αισθαι άλλον: Titus
amongst them, Gal. ii. 1, 3; expression
found only here in N.T.; men like the
prophets and teachers in xiii. 1 may have
been included. On the attempt to identify
Titus with Silas see Zöckler, in loco,
and further Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 300, for
the entire omission of Titus from Acts and
its probable reason; Lightfoot, Biblical
Essays, p. 281; Farrar, St. Paul, ii., 532;
Alford, iii., 106, Proleg. A Gentile con-
vert, and so keenly concerned in the
settlement of the question, and in himself
a proof of the "repentance unto life"
granted to the Gentiles.—μεταβατε: first
mentioned in xi. 30, cf. note, in all official
communications henceforth prominent,
xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, xvi. 4, xxi. 18,
Light-foot, Phil., p. 193. —βιβλιοματησατο:
five times in Acts, nowhere else in N.T.;
one in LXX, Ezek. xxxvi. 37 Α (see
Hatch and Redpath), and in classical
Greek: "question," A. and R.V.
Ver. 3. οι μεν ουν: Phoenicia and
Samaria on the one hand welcome them
with joy, but on the other hand the
Church in Jerusalem is divided, ver. 5,
see Rendall, Appendix on μεν ουν,p.
161. Blass however thinks that the
words are used "without opposition" as
often.—διήρχοντο την Φ. και Σ., see note
on xiii. 6. In both cases the presence of
brethren is presupposed, cf. vii. 25, xi.
19, imperfect, "peragrabat donec per-
venerunt," ver. 4 (Blass).—προτερυμφ.:
escorted on their way, not as Tit. iii. 13,
of being provided with necessaries for
the journey (Wisdom xix. 2); cf. xx. 38,
xxi. 5, and so in classical Greek, only in
Luke and Paul in N.T. (except once,
3 John 6), cf. Rom. xv. 24; but in i
Cor. xvi. 6, 11, 2 Cor. i. 16, R.V. renders
as in Titus, l. c., and John, l. c., cf. i
Esd. iv. 47, Judith x. 15, 1 Macc. xii. 4,
see Grimm-Thayer, sub n.; Polycarp,
Phil., i., 1, of the conduct of St. Ignatius
through Macedonia, amongst the early
σωθήναι. 2. γενομένης οὖν στάσεως καὶ συζητήσεως 1 οὐκ ὑλίτης τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ πρὸς αὐτούς, ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παύλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν καὶ πινα ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εἰς ἱερουσαλήμ, περί τοῦ ζητήματος τούτου. 3. οἱ μὲν οὖν προσφέρθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, διήρχοντο τὴν Φαίδηκην καὶ Σαμάρειαν, εἴδοσον γενομένης τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς τῶν θυμῶν· καὶ ἐποίους χαράν μεγάλην τάσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. 4. παραγενόμενοι δὲ εἰς ἱεροσαλήμ, ἀπεδέχθησαν 2 ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν

1 συζητήσεως, but συζητήσεως ΝABCDHLP, Const., Apost., Chrys., so Tisch., W. H., Blass, R. V., Weiss, Wendt. Blass in β reads without authority εγενέτο δὲ στάσις καὶ ζητήσις οὐκ ολίγη, to give good construction, and on the supposition that all authorities have been influenced by a. After αυτοὺς D, Syr. Harcl. mg. Gig., Wer., Prov. add ελεγον γαρ τοῦ μετὰ τέκνων αὐτῶν καθὼς επιστευν διεξηρεῖσθαι; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 17, 20, 24. Hilig. brackets all this. διεξηρεῖσθαι. only in Luke in N.T., Luke xxii. 59, Acts xii. 15 (Zahn). In place of ἔταξαν D, Syr. Harcl. mg. read οἱ δὲ εἰληλυθοτές απὸ τής εκκλησίας, διήρχοντο την Φοινίκην καὶ Σαμάρειαν, εκδιηγούμενοι τὴν επιστροφὴν τῶν θυμῶν· καὶ ἐποίους χαράν μεγάλην τάσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. 4. παραγενόμενοι δὲ εἰς ἱεροσαλήμ, ἀπεδέχθησαν 2 ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν

Christians, as amongst the Jews (Gen. xviii. 16), a mark of affection and respect. The meaning of the word, as Wendt points out, depends on the context.—ἐκδίνῃς: only here and in quotation, xiii. 41 in N. T., “telling the tale of the conversion of the Gentiles”; so διηγοῦσθαι and διεξείσθαι more frequently in Luke than in other N. T. writers. Hobart describes all three as medical terms but all three also occur frequently in LXX. ἐκβι: cf. Hab. i. 5; several times in Ecclus., also in Josephus and Arist. (Grimm-Thayer, ad loc., in French).—μεγάλην: on Luke’s fondness for the predicate μέγας, Friedrich, p. 41, with χαρά as here, cf. Luke ii. 10, xxiv. 52, Acts viii. 8 (Matt. ii. 10, xxviii. 8), cf. LXX, Jon. iv. 6, Isa. xxxiii. 2, A. S.—πολυς, imperfect, continuous joy, as they went from place to place, perhaps visiting Cornelius or Philip the Evangelist, viii. 40, in their progress.—ἐπιστροφήν: only here in N. T. (cf. 1 Thess. i. 9), Ecclus. xviii. 21 (20), xlii. 2.
πρεσβυτέρων, ἀνεγγυλόν τινα τὸν θεὸ υποθύρηε μετ' αὐτῶν. 5. ἐξανέστησαν ἔναν επὶ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες, λέγοντες, ὅτι δεὶ περίτεμνοι αὐτοὺς, παραγγέλεσαν τοῖς τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως. 6. Συνήχθησαν δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβυτέροι ἵνα περι τοῦ λόγου τοῦτου.

1 D, Syr. Harcl. mg. begin verse οἱ δὲ παραγγελαντες αὐτοῦς αναβαινένων προς τοὺς πρεσ. εξανέστησαν λέγοντες, so Blass in β, so Hilg., but with αποστόλους instead of πρεσβ., Blass “man,” omitting τινες . . Πεπιστευκότες. According to this reading the Jerusalem Christians who stirred up the disputed question in Antioch are now identified with those who rise up against Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem. A.V. margin, following Beza and some of the older commentators, make this sentence part of the narrative of Paul and Barnabas, “there rose up, said they (ἐλεγον),” etc. Weiss, Völter, Spitta, see here a proof of a combination of two sources. But there does not seem to be any reason why, as in T.R., the Pharisees at Jerusalem should not represent the same point of view as had been presented by the Jews who had come down to Antioch; that they did so with accentuated bitterness in Jerusalem is quite in accordance with the notice in Gal. ii. 4, but this fact need not exclude the previous raising of the question against the Apostles in Antioch, especially as the Jews who had come thither from Jerusalem were plainly not merely Jews but Judaizers. See Wendt (1899), following Meyer, and for a favourable judgment of the Bezan text Salmon, Introd., p. 598; see also Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., i., 1896, and Acta Apost., p. 246, 1899; on the other hand Weiss, Codex D, p. 8o, and Wendt (1899), Introd., p. 49, and on this occasion Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 344.

2 After πρεσβ. 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. add σὺν τῷ πλῆθῳ so Blass in β, and Hilg. The πλῆθος here, although not mentioned except in authorities just named, is plainly presupposed in vv. 12 and 22, and Wendt (1899) opposes the view that we have before us in its omission elsewhere a trace of distinct sources.

probably in some smaller and more private assembly in answer to the ἀνήγγελον of ver. 4, which seems to mean that the delegates at first announced informally in Jerusalem what had happened, just as they had done in Phœnicia and Samaria, cf. παρείσακτοι αδελφοί, Gal. ii. 4. The Pharisees took up their remarks, objected—probably basing their teaching on the necessity of circumcision on such passages as Isa. ixi. 6, cf. lii. 1 (Lumby); and then followed as a consequence the official assembly in ver. 6 (see Zöckler’s note, ver. 4, and in loco, p. 246, second edition). Or if we consider that a representative meeting of the whole Church is implied in ver. 4, and that the Apostles spoke before it, then the private conference of Gal. ii. 2 may be regarded as taking place between the first public assembly, ver. 4, and the second in ver. 6 (Hort, Ecclesia, p. 60, cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 126).—ἀπόστολοι, see above p. 148.—θαυμάσῃς: the Pharisaic spirit had already shown itself in xi. 2, but this is the first definite mention in the book of the conversion of any of the Pharisees; not strange after the conversion of the priests, see note on vi. 7, or after the attitude of men like Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathæa towards our Lord, and the moderate counsels of Gamaliel.—πεπιστευκότες: believed, i.e., that Jesus was the Messiah, and the fulfiller of the law—but still only as the Head of a glorified Judaism, from which Gentiles were to be rigidly excluded unless they conformed to the enactments relating to circumcision. How difficult it was for a Pharisaic Quietist probably of the earlier part of the first century to acknowledge that the law of circumcision and of Moses could possibly be regarded as unessential we may learn from Assumption of Moses, ix., 4-6, and viii., on circumcision, and see references on ver. 1.—αὐτοῦς, i.e., the Gentiles, speaking generally, not the τινὲς ἄλλους of ver. 2 (Lekebusch), the uncircumcised companions of Paul and Barnabas, although in accordance with Gal. ii. 3-5 such persons would no doubt have been included.—τὴν αἰρέσιν: only used here by St. Luke of keeping the law, and only elsewhere in James ii. 10 in a similar phrase, cf. Mark vii. 9, John ix. 16, of keeping the law of the Sabbath; Matt. xix. 17, of keeping the commandments; Tobit xiv. 9 (S, al.), Jos., Ant., xiii., 10, 6.
7. Πολλής δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης, ἀναστὰς Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Ανδρεὶς αδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἐφ' ἡμέρον ἄρχαίον ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν εξέλέξατο ὅτι τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἐθνῆ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ πιστεύσαι. 8. καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης Θεός ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς, δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιόν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν. 9. καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινε μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν. 10. νῦν οὖν τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεόν;

1 συζητήσεως, but ἠγγέλισμα as in ver. 1 ΝΑΒ, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt. Meyer retains Τ. Ρ. with Lach. (so Hilg. and Blass) on the ground of alteration to ζητ. after ver. 1.

2 εν ἡμῖν εξέλατο, but εν ἡμῖν ΝΑΒ 13, 40, 61, Arm., Const., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (as against Meyer, Blass, Hilg.).

3 After πειράζετε one Latin MS. and several Latin Fathers omit τον Θεον. Blass says "recte fort.," but does not follow in β. But no need to omit the words or to regard πειράζετε = πειρασθαι (Wendt in loco).

Ver. 6. λόγον: "de causa quae in desceptationem venit" (Blass), cf. vili. 21, xii. 38. The Ecclesia at large was in some manner also present at this final assembly, cf. vv. 12, 22, although the chief responsibility would rest with the Apostles and Elders, cf. Iren., Har., iii., chap. xii. 14, "cum universa ecclesia convenisset in unum," Zöckler, in loco, p. 246, and cf. p. 254; Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 66, 70, and see critical notes above.

Ver. 7. ἀναστάς, Lucan, see v. 17; the position of Peter is one of authority, not of pre-eminence—the latter belongs to James. The part which Peter had formerly taken in the conversion of Cornelius would naturally make him the most fitting person to introduce the discussion. From Gal. ii. 3 we learn that the general principle was debated with reference to the individual case of Titus.—ἐν ἡμέρον ἄρχαίον: "a good while ago," meaning probably from the beginnings of the Christian Church, cf. xi. 15, xii. 16; cf. Phil. iv. 15 (see Lightfoot's note, l. c.), and cf. Clem. Rom., Cor., xlvii., 2, and Polycarp, Phil., i., 2; or, if the words are referred to the one definite incident of the conversion of the Gentile Cornelius, some ten or twelve years (Blass, "for tasse") may have passed since that event, possibly longer, see Zöckler, Page, Knaubenauer, in loco. Others take the words as referring to our Lord's declaration to St. Peter as long ago as at Caesarea Philippi, Matt. xvi. 13-20; see Speaker's Commentary, so Bishop Williams of Connecticut, Studies in the Book of Acts, p. 139 (1888). Rendall connects εν ἡμῖν with ἄρχει, on the ground that thus the whole phrase would point to early Christian days, whereas, without qualification, confusion as to its meaning would arise, cf. ver. 21. But a reference to the case of Cornelius need not exhaust the meaning of the phrase, and St. Peter would naturally think of his own choice by God as going back earlier still, dating from the foundation of the Church, and receiving its confirmation and significance in the acceptance of the Gospel by Cornelius.—ἐξέλατο, see on i. 2.—τού εὐαγ.: not used by St. Luke in his Gospel, but here and in xx. 24; used once by St. Peter, 1 Pet. iv. 17; so also εὐαγγελίζομαι, three times in the same Epistle.

Ver. 8. ὁ καρδιογνώστης, i. 24, where the same word is used by St. Peter; cf. Jer. xvii. 10. έτέρων καρδίας, and cf. St. Peter's words in x. 34—καθαρὸς καὶ ἡμῖν, x. 44, xi. 15.

Ver. 9. τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τ. κ.: the thought is described by Zöckler as equally Petrine, Pauline, and Johannine; cf. iii. 16, 19, 1 Pet. i. 18-21, xii. 38, Rom. iii. 24, 1 John i. 8, ii. 2, Rev. vii. 14; here it stands in contrast to the outward purification of circumcision upon which the Judaisers insisted, cf. also x. 15, and for the phrase καθαρ. τ. κ., Ecclus. xxxviii. 10. Rendall renders τῇ πίστει, the faith, i.e., the Christian faith, and he is no doubt right in this, in so far as the faith is faith in Jesus Christ (Schmid, Bibl. Theol. des N. T., pp. 424, 425). cf. St. Peter's language in 1 Pet. i. 18-22.
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ΧV.

ημών οὖτε ήμεῖς ἵσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι; ΙΙ. αλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος
Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι, καθ' ὅν τρόπον κάκεινον.

12. 'Εσίγησε δὲ πάν τὸ πλήθος, καὶ Ἦκουν Βαρνάβα καὶ Παύλου
dηγουμένων διὰ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς σημεία καὶ τέρατα εἰς τοὺς έδεσι

1 D, Syr. Harcl. mg. prefix συγκατατιθεμενων δε των πρεσβυτερων τοις υπο του
Πετρου ειρημενων, so Blass and Hilg., an addition which shows why the multitude
kept silence, and connects Peter's speech with Paul and Barnabas. Weiss, p. 84,
sees here the characteristic love of D for the gen. abs., cf. ii. 1, iv. 18, etc., and notes
that the same stress is here laid as in ver. 5 upon the πρεσβυτεροι rather than upon
the Apostles.

Ver. 10. τὸν οὖν: in Acts four times, nowhere else in N.T.; cf. x. 35, munc
igitur: LXX, Gen. xxvii. 8, etc.; i Macc. x. 71.—τι περάζετε τῶν Θ., cf.
v. 9, they put God to the proof, as to
whether He had not admitted unworthy
persons into the Church.—τως διὰ ίσως on the infinite see Burton, N. T. Moods
and Tenses, p. 151; Blass, Gram. x. 221: metaphor common among the Rabbis,
and also in classical literature, cf. Jer. v. 5,
Lam. iii. 27, Ecclus. li. 26 (Zephi. iii. 9),
and Matt. xi. 29 (Luke xi. 46), Gal. v. 1.
Possibly in Jer. v. 5 reference is made to
the yoke of the law, but Psalms of Solomon,
vii., 8, cf. xvii., 32, present undoubted in-
stances of the metaphorical use of the term
"the yoke" for the service of Jehovah.
In Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, iii., 8
(Taylor, second edition, p. 46), we have a
definite and twice repeated reference to the
yoke of Thorah, cf. Apocalypse of Baruch,
xli., 3 (Charles' edition, p. 66 and note),
and also Psalms of Solomon, Ryle and
James, p. 72, note. It would seem there-
fore that St. Peter uses an almost
technical word in his warning to the
first Christians.—τῶν μαθητῶν, i.e., of
those who had learnt of Christ and knew
the meaning of His yoke, Matt. xi. 29.—
λογχ. βαστάσαι: cf. xii. 39. St. Peter
no less than St. Paul endorses the charge
made by St. Stephen, vii. 53.—οὗτος
ἡμεῖς: a remarkable confession on St.
Peter's lips: the conversations with Paul
and Barnabas, Gal. ii. 7, may well have
confirmed the attitude which he had
taken after the baptism of Cornelius
(Zöckler).

Ver. 11. ίσα τῆς χ.: twice in his
First Epistle St. Peter speaks of the
grace of God, of the God of all grace;
so also of the grace prophesied before-
hand, of the grace brought to them, cf.
also iii. 7 and 2 Pet. iii. 18. The exact
phrase here is not found elsewhere in St.
Peter, although common in St. Paul, but
see Plumptre (Cambridge Bible) on i

Pet. v. 12. In R.V. σωθήναι is joined
more clearly with διὰ than in A.V.—
kakeinoi, i.e., the Gentile Christians, not
οι πατέρες (as St. Aug. and Calvin).
For points of likeness between these, the
last words of St. Peter in Acts, and his
previous utterances, with characteristic
idioms and expressions, see Alford on
des N. T., p. 427.

Ver. 12. ἐσίγησε: may mean " be
came silent," "itaque antea non tacue
rant" (Blass), cf. Burton, N. T. Moods
and Tenses, 21, A. and R.V., " kept silence".
—πάν το πλήθος: implying a general as-
sembly of the Church: on the word see
ii. 6, iv. 32, etc.—ἡκουν: imperfect,
marking a continuous hearing; the silence
and the audience both testified to the
effect produced by St. Peter's words.—
Βαρ. καὶ Π., on the order here and in
ver. 25 cf. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 84.—
δηγουμενων: setting forth in detail; see
above on ver. 3, and x. 8.—ἠγα τω του,
f. xiv. 27 and ver. 4. In each case the
appeal is made to what God had done,
and to the further answer to the prayer
of iv. 30 by the miracles wrought among
the Gentiles: it was an answer which a
Jewish audience would understand, John
iii. 2. The historical truthfulness of Paul
and Barnabas thus recounting the facts,
and leaving the actual proof of the right-
fulness of their method of working to
Peter and James, is to Zeller inconceiv-
able—an objection sufficiently answered
by the consideration that Luke wished
to represent not so much the attitude of
Paul and Barnabas, but that of the
original Apostles to the Gentile-ques
tion; and in Jerusalem it was only natural
that Peter and James should be the
spokesmen.

Ver. 13. μετα δὲ το σ., i.e., after
Barnabas and Paul had ceased speaking.
—ἄπερ. 'Ι. λ.: his speech may be divided
into two parts: (1) reference to the pro-
phesy foretelling the reception of the
δὲ αὐτῶν. 13. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ συνήσαι αὐτῶν, ἀπεκρίθη ἦκακὼς λέγων, "Ἀνδρεὶς ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατε μου. 14. Συμεών εξηγήσατο, καθὼς πρῶτον ο ὁ Θεός ἐπεσκέπτατο λαβεῖν εἰς ηθνῶν λαὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ. 15. καὶ τούτῳ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται, Μετὰ ταύτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνήν Δαβὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυίαν καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς.


2 κατεσκαμμένα ACDEHL, Const., Chrys., so Lach., Blass in β, and Hilg.; κατεστραμμένα (B) 13, 33, 34, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss. Similar variation in the passage in LXX.

Gentiles; (2) his opinion on the conditions of that reception. Δ. ἀκούσατε μου: only here and in James ii. 5.

Ver. 14. Συμεών: Peter so named only here and in 2 Pet. ii. 1. The use of the word here in its old Hebrew form by James is exactly what we should expect, cf. Luke ii. 25, 34, W.H.; probably therefore the form current in Jerusalem, a form which reappears in the list of the successors of St. James in the bishopric of the Holy City, Eusebius, H. E., iv. 5, cf. Luke xxiv. 34, from which also it would appear that the Hebrew name of Peter, in the contracted or uncontracted form, was current in Jerusalem.—πρῶτον like ἀπ’ ἀρ. ημ. in ver. 7.—ἐπιστέφατο, cf. James i. 27, and above on vii. 23. Kenneth, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 105.—λαβεῖν: infinitive of purpose, ἐξ ηθνῶν λαόν, ex gentibus populum, "egregium paradoxon" Bengel; the converts from among the Gentiles were no less than Israel the people of God. Ον ηθνῶν and λαός see iii. 25.—τῷ ὄνοματι, i.e., who should bear His Name as a people of God, or may mean simply "for Himself," God's name being often so used. On the "pregnant use" of the word cf. James ii. 7. v, 10, 14. St. James thus in his address agrees with St. Peter.

Ver. 15. καὶ τούτῳ, "and to this agree," A. and R.V., i.e., to the fact just stated (so Wendt, Weiss, Blass, Ramsay); if the pronoun referred to St. Peter, as some take it, we had should have οἱ προφῆται, not as in text, οἱ λ. τῶν π. The quotation Amos ix. 11, 12, is freely cited from the LXX, and indeed the chief point made by St. James depends upon that version.—τῶν προφ., plural, as including those prophets whose words of prophecy had been of similar import.

Ver. 16. Μετὰ ταύτα: both Hebrew and LXX, ἐν τῇ έκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, in the Messianic times, after the predicted chastisement of Israel: the house of David is in ruins, but it is to be re-erected, and from the restoration of its prosperity the Messianic blessings will flow: "the person of the Messiah does not appear in this prophecy, but there is the generic reference to the house of David, and the people of Israel," Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, p. 163, Deitzsch, Messianische Weissagungen, second edition, p. 94. St. James sees the spiritual fulfilment of the prophecy in the kingdom of Christ erected on the Day of Pentecost, and in the ingathering of the Gentile nations to it. On the Messianic interpretations of the passage amongst the Jews see Ebersheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., 734.—ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοί.: like Hebrew יְאָשֵׁר = I will return and do, i.e., I will do again—but not in LXX or Hebrew. In the latter we have simply בָאָשֵׁר, יָאשֵׁר.—κατεσκαμμένα, where St. James has ἀνοικοδομήσω: the idea of restoration is fully contained in the twice repeated ἀνοί., and in ἀναστρέψω. —ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: the noun is used to show how low the house of David (2 Sam. vii. 12) had fallen—it is no longer a palace but a hut, and that in ruins: the Hebrew word might be used for a temporary structure of the boughs of trees as at the Feast of Tabernacles. We may compare the way in which this hope of restoration was assterted itself in Psalms of Solomon, xviii., 23, where Ryle and James, p. 137, compare the words with Amos ix. 11, Jer. xxx. 9, etc. From the passage before us the Messiah received the name of Bar Naphli, "Son of the fallen."—κατεσκαμμένα, see critical note. In LXX B, ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοί., A κατασκαμ.
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ανοικοδομήσω, καὶ ανορθώσω αὐτήν. 17. διότι ἐν ἐκζητήσεωι οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν Κύριοι, καὶ πάντα τά ἐδώ, ἐφ᾽ οὗ ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐν αὐτοῖς: ἵνα δέχητε Κύριος ὁ 1 ποιῶν τάτα πάντα." 18. γνωστά ἀπ᾿ αἰώνός ἐστι τῷ Θεῷ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

19. διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρεσχεῖν τούς ἀπό τῶν ἑδών ἐπιστρεφόντων.


2 γνωστά ἀπ᾽ αἰώνος, om. rest, so НBC 61, 180, Sah., Boh., Arm., so also Tisch., Alford, W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; see W.H., App. p. 96, and for the same explanation Wendt, 1888 and 1890, in loco. The quot. in Amos ix. does not contain γνωστά ἀπ' αἰώνος, so that the words were separated from the clause and formed into an independent sentence. T. R. is supported by EHL, Syr. H., Const., Chrys.; whilst AD, Vulg., Syr. H. mg., Irrint., Blass in both texts, and Hilg. read γνωστόν ἀπ' αἰώνος ἐστι τῷ θεῷ ἐργον αὐτοῦ.

After ἐγὼ Iren. adds το κατ᾽ εμε" secundum me," cf. Rom. i. 15; may be translator's paraphrase; retained by Blass in B.

Ver. 17. ὅτις ἐν ἐκζήτῃ οἱ κ. τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Κ.: LXX and Hebrew are here considerably at variance. Hebrew: "that they may possess the remnant of Edom". In LXX: "that the rest of men may seek after (the Lord)" (so also Arabic Version, whilst Vulgate, Peshitto, and Targum support the Massoretic text, see Briggs, n. s., p. 162). In LXX Α τῶν Κ. is found, but not in B. In LXX rendering ἡν, men, takes the place of ἡν, Edom, and ἦν, instead of ἦν, to seek, instead of ἦν, to possess. -καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐδώ: explicative, "the rest of men," i.e., ἦν, to seek, instead of ἦν, to possess. -καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐδώ: explicative, "the rest of men," i.e., the heathen: "sine respectu personarum et operum". -ὅτις ἐν, Winer-Moulton, xiii., 6; Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 85; cf. Luke ii. 35, Acts iii. 19, Rom. iii. 4, and in no other instances, three of these quotations from LXX. -δις οὖς οὐκ ἐπικέκληται. . . ἐπὶ α.: "upon whom my name is called [pronounced]": Hebraistic formula, cf. LXX, Jer. xlii. 15; and Deut. xxviii. 10, Isa. lixii. 19, 2 Macc. viii. 15. In James ii. 7, and only there in the N.T. does the same formula recur (see Mayor, Intro., and Nösgen, Geschichte der Neuesten Offb., ii., 51).

Ver. 18. In R.V. the phrase ἀπ' αἰώνος is connected closely with the preceding clause, see critical notes: "who maketh these things which were known from the beginning of the world" ("of time," Ramsay), or margin, "who doeth these things which were known" etc. St. James may perhaps have added the words freely to the LXX to emphasise his argument that the call of the Gentiles was a carrying out of God's eternal purpose, but there is nothing corresponding to the words in the Hebrew, although at the end of ver. 11 we have 

ηγείρειν τῷ θεῷ ἐργον αὐτοῦ. and somewhat similar phrase in Isa. xlv. 21, see Zöckler, in loco, for different authorities, and for further discussion of the words, Klostermann, Probleme im Apostelsextze, p. 128. ἀπ' αἰώνος is peculiar to Luke in N.T., cf. Luke i. 70, Acts iii. 21; it may simply = "of old time," see Plummer, St. Luke, l. c., but here it may intimate that St. James refers to that purpose of God revealed by all the prophets, as in iii. 21. In Psalms of Solomon, viii., 7, ἀπ' αἰώνος seems to be equivalent to "from the creation of the heaven and earth," cf. Ps. cxviii. 52. If the conference was held in Greek, as we may reasonably conclude from the fact that Gentile interests were at stake, and that many of the Gentiles, as of the Hellenistic Jews, would probably be present, it is very significant that St. James, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, quotes the rendering of the LXX so apposite for his purpose, and that he should see the spiritual restoration of the house of David in the kingdom of Jesus, and the fulfilment of prophecy in the reception of the Gentiles into the kingdom of the Messiah, so exclusively guarded by the Jews.
ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 20. ἀλλὰ ἐπιστεύσας αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀληθετημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τοῦ

1 οτοι οἱ ΝΒΔ 61, 180, so Tisch., Weiss. D, Gg., Iren. omit καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ (see also ver. 29). Wendt (1888) accounts for the omission partly by the fact that no such command was precisely given in Lev. xvi. 13 (so Meyer, Alford), and partly from the laxer views of the Western Church; but (1899, Introductory, p. 50) he now gives in his adherence to Corssen's view (G. G. A., p. 442; 1896), with which compare for similarity Zahn's explanation, Einleitung, ii., pp. 344, 345 (1899), Weiss, Codex D, p. 198, that the omission, as also the addition following (see below), were intended to do away with the Judaic and ceremonial character of the decree, and to substitute the comprehensive moral prescription of the Sermon on the Mount; so too recently Harnack. τοῦ πνικ. being eliminated αἷμα can be referred to homicidium, Tert., De Pud., xii., so that the decree means that they should abstain from pollutions, i.e., idolatry, fornication, bloodshed (cf. the punctuation in β), and that they should love their neighbours (the negative injunction of the Golden Rule); see below. See further in favour of the omission Blass, Pref., Evang. sec. Lucam, p. xxv. (1897); Philology of the Gospels, p. 250; but for a very different reason; as against the interpretation given above by Harnack and others to αἷμα, see also Blass, Studien und Kritiken, i., 1900; Hilgenfeld, also Corssen, C. G. G., p. 445 ff., remark on the probability of Montanistic influences in the Bezan text of the passage before us, and in reply to their strictures see Blass, Evang. sec. Lucam, Pref., xiv. ff. At the end of the clause we have καὶ σας μὴ βέλτιστον αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι στερεῖς μὴ τοιείς, so D, 11 minuscules, Säh., Aeth., Iren. (cf. also ver. 29). Harris, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 31, 32, points out that the addition was known to Aristides (Seeberg, Die Apologie des A., p. 213), and that therefore the Acts was known and used and interpolated by the middle of the second century. But he refrains from speaking positively as to the source of this variant in Acts, as "the negative precept turns up everywhere in the early Church, having been absorbed in the first instance from Jewish ethics"; cf. also Weiss, Codex D, p. 109. So Theophilius, Didache, Const. Apost. and Ephrem on Rom. iii. 21 and vii. 7; see Harris, u. s.; Resch, Agrapha, p. 95; W. H., App., 96. Zahn unhesitatingly refers the addition to the Didache, but it is very doubtful how far the Didache enjoyed the high and wide credit which Zahn attaches to it: about 110-140 the words were interpolated in the text in the East, and soon after, but by no means with universal acceptance, they found their way into the Western text. Blass in Studien und Kritiken, u. s., replies further to Harnack. Harnack asks why the "golden rule," if genuine, is not found in xxi. 25. Blass replies that Luke kept a rough draft for himself in which were both πνικτα and the rule, and thus omitted πνικτα in β, and in α the rule "brevitati consulens".

Ver. 19. διὰ τῶν ἐπιστ. εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν: "wherefore my judgment is." St. James apparently speaks as the president of the meeting, Chrysostom, Hom., xxxiii., and his words with the emphatic τῷ (Weiss) may express more than the opinion of a private member—he sums up the debate and proposes "the draught of a practical resolution" (see however Hort, Ecclesia, 79; Hackett, in loco; and on the other hand Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 147). If a position of authority is thus given to St. James at the conference, it is very significant that this should be so in Jerusalem itself, where the Twelve would naturally carry special weight. But this presidency and Apostolic authority of St. James in Jerusalem is exactly in accordance with the remarkable order of the three names referred to by St. Paul in Gal. ii. 9 (cf. Acts xii. 17, xxii. 18). At the same time ver. 22 shows us that neither the authority of St. James nor that of the other Apostles is conceived of as overriding the general consent of the whole Church. —μὴ παρενοχλείν: only here in N.T.; "not to trouble," A. and R.V.; it may be possible to press the παρά, "not to trouble further," i.e., by anything more than he is about to mention, or in their conversion to God. The verb is found with dative and accusative in LXX; for the former cf. Judg. xiv. 17, 1 Macc. x. 63 SR, xii. 14; and for the latter Jer. xxvii. (xvi.) 27, 1 Macc. x. 35. Bengel takes παρά as = prater, but whilst it is very doubtful how far the preposition can be so rendered here, he adds fides quies non obturbanda. —τοῖς επιστ. cf. xi. 21, "who are turn-
Ver. 2ο. επιστείλαι (xxi. 25), Heb. xiii. 22; the verb is used of a written injunction, Westcott, l. c. (so Wendt here and in xxi. 25, and so Klostermann), and so often in ecclesiastical writers; here it may mean to write or enjoin, or may well include both, cf. Hort, Ecclesia, p. 70, Westcott, u. s., Weiss, in loco; in classical Greek it is used in both senses. In LXX it is not used, except in a few passages in which the reading is doubtful, ἀνώτερον ἔργον ἐπιστεύεται, see Hatch and Redpath, sub v.—τοῦ ἀπεργείου: Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 159, cf. Jer. xvi. 10, 1 Pet. v. 1, 1 Tim. iv. 3; generally without ἀπό, τῶν ἀλισγημάτων: from Hellenistic verb, ἀλισγεῖν, LXX, Dan. i. 8, Mal. i. 7, 12, Ecclus. xl. 29 (S, al); may mean the pollution from the flesh used in heathen offerings = εἰδωλοθύτων in ver. 29 (xxi. 25), cf. 1 Cor. viii. 1, x. 14 ff., but see further Klostermann, Probleme im Aposteltexte, p. 144 ff., and Wendt, 1888 and 1899, in loco. The phrase stands by itself, and the three following genitives are not dependent upon it. If St. James’s words are interpreted more widely than as = εἰδωλοθύτων, ver. 29, they would involve the prohibition for a Christian not only not to eat anything offered to idols, or to share in the idolatrous feasts, but even to accept an invitation to a domestic feast of the Gentiles or at least to a participation in the food on such an occasion. That it was easy for Christians to run these risks is evident from 1 Cor. viii. 10 when St. Paul refers to the case of those who had not only eaten of the flesh offered to idols, but had also sat down to a feast in the idol’s temple.—τῆς πορνείας: the moral explanation of this close allocation of idolatry and uncleanness is that the former so often involved the latter. But Dr. Hort whilst pointing out that such an association is not fanciful or accidental, reminds us that we ought not to lay too much stress on the connection, since many forms of idolatry might fairly be regarded as free from that particular stain. The language, however, of St. James in his Epistle shows us how imperative it was in the moral atmosphere of the Syria of the first century to guard the Christian life from sexual defilement, and the burning language of St. Paul in 1 Cor. vi. 15 and 1 Thess. iv. 3, etc., shows us the terrible risks to which Christian morality was exposed, risks enhanced by the fact that the heathen view of impurity was so lax throughout the Roman empire, cf. Horace, Sat., i., 2, 31; Terence, Adelphi, i., 2, 21; Cicero, Pro Catil., xx.; and on the intimate and almost universal connection between the heathen religious guilds and societies and the observance of nameless breaches of the Christian law of purity, see Loening, Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums, and his references to Foucart, p. 12 ff. Without some special prohibition it was conceivable that a man might pass from some scene of licentious indulgence to the participation in the Supper of the Lord (Plumptre, Felten). An attempt has been made to refer the word here to the sin of incest, or to marriage within the forbidden degrees, rather than to the sin of fornication, so Hofmann, Ritschl, Zöckler, Wendt, Ramsay; but on the other hand Meyer, Ewald, Godet, Weiss, and others take the word in its general sense as it is employed elsewhere in the N. T. From what has been said above, and from the way in which women might be called upon to serve impurely in a heathen temple (to which religious obligation, as Zöckler reminds us, some have seen a reference in the word here, cf. also Wendt, p. 332 (1888)), we see the need and the likelihood of such a specific enjoinder against the sin of fornication. Bentley conjectured χοιρείας or πορκείας.—τοῦ πνικτοῦ: “from that which has been strangled,” lit., such beasts as had been killed through strangling, and whose blood had not been let out when they were killed. For this prohibition reference is usually made to Lev. xvii. 13, Deut. xii. 23, 25; so Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler, Plumptre, Felten, Hackett. But on the other hand Dr. Hort
21-22.
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22. Τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐκλέξαντος ἄνδρας ἧς ἀπότομος πέμψαι εἰς Ἀντίοχειαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβα, ἵνα πέμψαν τὸν ἑπικαλούμενον Βαρσαβάν, καὶ


contends that all attempts to find the prohibition in the Pentateuch quite fail, although he considers it perfectly conceivable that the flesh of animals strangled in such a way as not to allow of the letting out of blood would be counted as unlawful food by the Jews, cf. Origen, c. Cels., viii., 30; Jus Pastor Christianity, p. 73, and Appendix, p. 209. But his further remark, that if such a prohibition had been actually prescribed (as in his view it is not) we should have a separate fourth precept referring only to a particular case of the third precept, viz., abstinence from blood, is probably the reason why in D, cf. Irenæus, Hær., iii., 12, 14; Cyprian, Testim., iii., 119: Tertullian, De Pudicitia, xii., the words καὶ τοῦ πυκτοῦ are omitted here and in the decree, ver. 29, although it is also possible that the laxer views on the subject in the West may have contributed to the omission (see Zuckler and Wendt). Dr. Hort leaves the difficulty unsolved, merely referring to the "Western" text without adopting it. But in xxi. 25 the words are again found in a reference to, and in a summary of, the decree, although here too D consistently omits them (see critical notes).—τοῦ άιματος: specially forbidden by the Jewish law, Lev. xvii. to, cf. iii. 17, vii. 26, xix. 26, Deut. xii. 16, 23, xv. 23, and we may refer the prohibition, with Dr. Hort, to the feeling entertained by various nations of antiquity with regard to blood, so that the feeling is not exclusively Jewish, although the Jewish law had given it such express and divine sanction. "The blood is the life," and abstinence from it was a manifestation of reverence for the life given by and dedicated to God. This was the ground upon which the Jews based, and still base, the prohibition. Nothing could override the command first given to Noah, Gen. ix. 4, together with the permission to eat animal food, and renewed in the law. άιμα cannot refer (so Cyprian and Tertullian) to homicide, as the collocation with πυκτοῦ (if retained) is against any such interpretation. See additional note (2) at end of chapter.

Ver. 21. ἐκ γενεών ἄρχαλων: pointing back to the first days when the Diaspora had first spread to any considerable extent in heathen lands; see on ver. 7. The exact phrase (άτο) γενεών ἄρχ. occurs in Psalms of Solomon, xviii., 14—from the generations of old the lights of heaven have not departed from their path. For the custom referred to here, see Schurer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 55. E. T. The words seem closely connected in sense with the preceding in this way, viz., that the Gentile proselytes could long ago in the synagogues have been acquainted week by week with the spirit and enactments of the Mosaic law, and they would thus be the more easily inclined to take upon themselves the few elementary precepts laid down in the decree of the Jerusalem Church, so as to avoid any serious cause of offence to their Jewish-Christian brethren. Others however take the meaning to be that, as the Jewish Christians in their continual association with the synagogue would still hear the law read every Sabbath, there would be no intercourse between them and the Gentile Christians, unless the latter observed the necessary restrictions enjoined by the decree for brotherly intercommunion. There is no occasion to interpret the meaning to be that it is superfluous to write the decree to the Jewish Christians, since they knew its contents already from the law (so St. Chrysostom, and Blass), for a decree for the Jewish Christians is not in question, see ver. 23. Others again interpret: there is no fear that the Mosaic law should be neglected or despised "for Moses, etc.". See further, Wendt, Weiss, McGiffert, Knabenbauer.

Ver. 22. ἔδοξε: the word is often found in public resolutions and official decrees, Herod., i., 3; Thuc., iv., 118 (L and S.).—τοῖς ἀπόσ. p. 173.—ἐκ γενεών ἄρχαλων, cf. ver. 12, ἐκ πάν τὸ πλήθος, cf. Iren., Hær., iii., 12.—
ΧV. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

Σίλαν, ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, 23. γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν τάδε. Οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἔθνων,

1 καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Ἱ.ΕΗ.ΛΡ., Συμπ. Ρ. and Η., Αρμ.Ζόβ., Αθ.Ν., Αθ., Τισ., Β.Β.Η., Ρ.Β., Βέντν. Βλασ., following Σαθ., Οριγ., reads ἀδελφοί here and brackets the same word after Κιλ., so Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 171, rejecting the word as an accidental corruption; “The Apostles and the Elders unto the brethren,” etc., R.V. renders “The Apostles and the elder brethren,” a title which the Jerusalem Church might use in addressing younger Churches (Rendall), but see commentary.

ἐκλεξ. ἄνδρας πέμψαι: “to choose men out of their company, and send,” R.V. In A.V. we lose sight of the fact that the choice was thus made in the rendering “chosen men;” a rendering which takes ἐκλεξ. middle as if passive (see Wendt’s just criticism, and cf. ver. 40 ἐκλεξ.).—

Ἰσόδαν τῶν ἔτυκτ. Θ., see critical note, sometimes regarded as a brother of Joseph Barsabbas in i. 23. Ewald thinks that he was actually identical with him. Nothing further is known of him, but if he was a brother of Joseph Barsabbas, he too may have been amongst the personal followers of the Lord; hence his leading position, see also B.D.2 “Judas,” p. 1830.—Σίλαν, cf. ver. 40, xvi. 19, 25, 29, xvii. 4, 10, 14, xviii. 5, 2 Cor. i. 19, i. Θεσσ. i. 1, i. Πετ. v. 12.

The name may have been contracted for Silvanus, but it may also have been a Greek equivalent for a Hebrew name שִׁלְעִי = Tertius, or שִׁלְעָי, Gen. x. 24, see especially Winer-Schmiedel, p. 143, note, and Zahn, Einleitung, p. 23, who prefers שִׁלְעָי, „bitten, erfragen“.
Paul always used the form Σιλουανός (so i Πετ. v. 12), Blass, Gram., pp. 70, 71, Winer-Schmiedel, u. s., and also pp. 74, 75. On the supposed identity of Silas with Titus, who is never mentioned in Acts, see above; and Wendt, in loco. If the two passages, 2 Cor. i. 19 and viii. 23, on which the advocates of this view rely make the identity possible, the description of Titus, Gal. ii. 3, is completely at variance with the description of Silas in this chapter (“perversa, ne quid durius dicam, conjectura” Blass, in commenting on the supposed identity).

—ἡγουμένους, cf. ver. 32, προφήται δύντες: the word is also used in Heb. xiii. three times, once of those who had passed away, ver. 7, and in vv. 17 and 24 of actual authorities to be obeyed. The word is applied in the LXX to various forms of authority and leadership (see also references to the word in classical Greek, Grimm-Thayer), and cf. Clem. Rom., Cor., i. 3 (xii., 6), with v. 7, xxxvii. 2, lv. 1, lx. 4. It is quite possible that it may have essentially = διδάσκαλος, xiii. 1 (cf. xiv. 12, ὑγοῦ, τοῦ λόγου), cf. Heb. u. s., with Didache, iv., 1, and see Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 249; Harnack, Proleg. to Didache, p. 95; or the mere fact that Judas and Silas may both have been personal followers of Jesus would have conferred upon them a high degree of authority (Plumptre); or the term ὑγοῦ may be used as a general one, and we cannot say to what particular office or qualification it may have extended besides that involved in ver. 32. For use of the word in sub-apostolic times see Gore, Church and the Ministry, p. 322, etc., Moerby, Ministerial Priesthood, pp. 166, 186. The word may be called characteristic of St. Luke (Friedrich, p. 22, cf. Luke xxi. 22, Acts vii. 10 (of civil rule), xiv. 12).

Ver. 23.—οι ἀπόστ. καὶ οἱ πρεσβ. καὶ οἱ ἀδελ., but in R.V. “the Apostles and the elder brethren,” see critical notes. The phrase as it stands in R.V. has been called meaningless (Page), but Hort, Ecclesia, p. 71, while admitting that the phrase is unusual, defends it as indicating that they who held the office of elder were to be regarded as bearing the characteristic from which the title itself had arisen, and that they were but elder brethren at the head of a great family of brethren (cf. Knabenbauer in loco). It is of course quite possible that ἅδηλος is merely to be taken as in apposition to ἀπόστ. and πρεσβ., meaning that as brethren they sent a message to brethren (Wendt, Felten, Page).—τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀ. κ.τ.λ., see below.—χαίρειν: amongst the Epistles of the N.T. only that of St. James thus commences, as has been often pointed out by Bengel and others. The
χαίρειν. 24. ἐπείδη ἡ κοινομα γέταςέξ εἰς ἡμῶν ἐξελθόντες ετάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγους, ἀνασκευάζοντες τάς ψυχάς ὑμῶν, λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τόν νόμον, οἷς ὁ διεστειλάμεθα 25. ἐδοξεὶς ἡμῖν γενομένους ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐκλέξαμεν ἀνδρὰς πέμψας πρὸς ὑμᾶς, σὺν τοῖς 1 ἐξελθόντες ὑμῖν. Ἡ, B, Arm., Aethro., Const., Ath., Chrys., so W. H., R. V. marg., Weiss, Wendt; but retained Ν, C, D, E, DE, Vulg., Syrr. P. and H., Sah., Boh., Aethro., Iren., so Tisch., Blass, Hilg. It might have been introduced (cf. ver. 1, κατα.,) to guard against the appearances that τινες εξ ημῶν belonged to the senders of the letter (see Wendt's note, τ. 888). 2 λεγ. . . . τον νομον om. ξ, S, A, B, D, τ. 3, 6, τ. Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aethro., Οr., Const., Αθ., so Τisch., W. H., Βlass., R. V., Weiss, Wendt, but Βlass retains in β, following C, E, Η, L, P, Gig., Ιren. (Chrys.), so Ηilg., Weiss and Ηilg.; -οις Α, B, L, 6, τ. Lach., W. H. text. Wendt unable to decide whether acc. after ver. 22 or dat. for gram. was the later reading. coincidence may be a chance one, but it is the more remarkable, since the letter may well have been written and dictated by St. James in his authoritative position. On the phrase in letters see Mayor's interesting note on James i. 1. It occurs again in Acts xxiii. 26, but nowhere else in N. T. 3 λεγόμενος Ν, C, D, E, DE, Ηilg., Const., Ιren., Chrys., so Τisch., W. H., Blass, Weiss and Hilg.; -οις Α, B, L, 6, τ. Lach., W. H. text. Wendt unable to decide whether acc. after ver. 22 or dat. for gram. was the later reading.

Ver. 24. On the similarity of this verse in phraseology to St. Luke's preface, Luke i. 1, Schwengler, Zeller, Weiss, Friedrich, Hilgenfeld, and others have commented. But, after all, in what does the likeness consist? Simply in the fact that here as there we have επείδη introducing the antecedent clause, and ἐδοξείς the subsequent clause. Friedrich (p. 46) considers this as too striking to be a matter of chance, but strangely he writes each of the two passages as if they commenced with the same word, see below on ver. 28 -επείδητέρος. This word is a curious one, and is only found in Luke i. 1 (not in LXX), but there is no authority for reading it in the passage before us in Acts. Nösgen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 45, refers to instances of a similar formula and phraseology as in use in Jewish writings, cf. Jost, J. jud. Gesc., i., 284.-τινες εἰς ήμας, cf. for the expression Gal. ii. 12.-ἐξελθόντες τέταρας ἡμᾶς, cf. Gal. i. 7, v. 10. λόγοι may mean with words only, words without true doctrine. -ἀνασκευάζοντες, "subverting," A. and R. V.; not in LXX, and only here in N. T., in classical Greek, primarily colligere tasa, to pack up, and so to carry away: or to dismantle a place; to destroy, overthrow, and so trop. as in text—of breaking treaties (Polyb.), of destroying an opponent's arguments (Arist.). Nösgen and Felten note it amongst the non-Lucan words in the decree, so βάρος, τὸ ἐπάναγκες, διὰ λόγον, ἀπαγγέλλειν, σὲ προτείνειν, ἔμπροσθε, ἀγαπητοί.—οἷς ὁ διεστειλάμεθα: "to whom we gave no commandment," R. V., omitting "such," not in text, and weakens; in Tyndale, Cramner, and Genevan Version; cf. Gal. ii. 12, and Acts xxi. 20; only used once in passive in N. T., Heb. xii. 20, often in LXX in middle voice, meaning to warn, cf. also its meaning in Judith xi. 12 with Mark v. 43, etc.

Ver. 25. γενομ. ομοθυμαδόν: "having come to one accord," "einmutiggeworden," Weiss: ομοθ., though frequent in Acts, see i. 14, only here with γεν. For the form of the phrase as indicating mutual deliberation on the part of the Church collectively see "Council," Dict. of Chr. Ant., i., 474.—ἐκλέξ. ἀνδρας: "to choose out men and send them unto you," R. V., whether we read accusative or dative see critical note, and cf. ver. 22.—ἀγαπητοίς: very frequent in St. Paul's Epistles; used three times by St. James in his Epistle, twice by St. Peter in his First Epistle, four times in the Second, cf. iii. 15, where the word is used by St. Peter of St. Paul, ten times by St. John; it was therefore a very natural word to occur in the letter, and we may compare it with the right hand of fellowship given by the three Apostles just named to Barnabas and Paul, Gal. ii. 9.—Β. και Π.: this order because in Jerusalem Church; see above on ver. 12. Meyer, Bleek, Nösgen, Wendt, all note its truthful significance.

Ver. 26. παραδείδεκατος τος ψ. η.: "hazarded their lives," A. and R. V.; so in classical Greek, and in LXX, Dan. iii. 28 (95). The sufferings of the mission-
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1. καὶ Σ. καὶ αὐτοὺς: "who themselves also shall tell you the same things by word of mouth," R.V. Judas and Silas were sent to confirm personally the contents of the letter, as they could speak with authority as representing the Church at Jerusalem, while Barnabas and Saul alone would be regarded as already committed to the conciliatory side (Alford). The present participle, as the writer thinks of Judas and Silas as actually present with the letter at its reception, cf. ἀπεστάλκαμεν, "we have sent" by a common idiom, and also xxii.16; Blass compares Thuc., vii., 26, ἐπέμψαν αγγέλλοντας, Gram., p. 194. τὰ αὐτὰ: not the same things as Barnabas and Paul had preached, but, as διὰ λ. intimates, the same things as the letter contained, see critical notes.

2. ἔδοξε γὰρ τῷ Α. Π. καὶ ἡμῖν: "causa principalis" and "causa ministerialis" of the decree. The words of Hooker exactly describe the meaning and purpose of the words, E. P., iii., 10, 2, cf. viii., 6, 7, and cf. St. Chrysostom’s words, Hom., xxxiii., "not making themselves equal to Him [i.e., the Holy Ghost]—they are not so mad—the one to the Holy Ghost, that they may not deem it to be of man; the other to us, that they may be taught that they also themselves admit the Gentiles, although themselves being in circumcision". On other suggested but improbable meanings see Alford’s and Wendt’s notes. The words became a kind of general formula in the decrees of Councils and Synods, cf. the phrase commonly prefixed to Councils: Sancto Spiritu sugerente (Dict. Chr. Ant., i., 483). On this classical construction of ἔδοξε γὰρ with the infinitive see Nestle’s note, Expository Times, December, 1898. Moreover it would seem that this ἔδοξε is quite in accordance with the manner in which Jewish Rabbis would formulate their decisions. — μηδὲν πλέον... βάρος: the words indicate authority on the part of the speakers, although in ver. 20 we read only of “enjoining”. St. Peter had used the cognate verb in ver. 10, cf. Rev. ii. 24, where the same noun occurs with a possible reference to the decree, see Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 309, and Plumptre, in loco. — ἐπάναγκες, i.e., for mutual intercourse, that Jewish and Gentile Christians might live as brethren in the One Lord. There is nothing said to imply that these four abstinences were to be imposed as necessary to salvation; the receivers of the letter are only told that it should be well with them if they observed the decree, and we cannot interpret Εὐ πράξετε as = σωθήσεσθε. At the same time the word was a very emphatic one, and might be easily interpreted, as its speedily was, in a narrower sense, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 172; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 310. Rendall compares the use of ἄναγκαιος in Thuc., i., 90.

2. απέχ. : preposition omitted as in ver. 20, W. H.; so usually in classical Greek, but in N. T. ἀπέχ. ἀπό, 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 22; so in LXX. Job i. 1, 8, ii. 3, etc. On the difference in meaning in the two constructions, see Alford and Wendt, in loco.— ἐιδωλοθύτων, see ver. 20.— πνικτοῦ: omitted in Western text; see critical notes. — διατηροῦντες ἑαυτούς: verb, only in Luke, cf. Luke ii. 51 (in LXX with ἐκ or ἀπό, Ps. xi. 7, Prov. xxii. 23). In Jas. i. 27 we have a somewhat striking similarity of expression (cf. also John xvii. 15).— ὑπερέπαντος: "it shall be well with you," R. V.; viv., through the peace and concord established in the Christian community, cf. 2 Mac. ix. 19, so in classical Greek. The reading in A. V. is somewhat ambiguous, but the Greek signifies

aries in their first journey were evidently well known, and appeal was fittingly made to them in recognition of their self-sacrifice, and in proof of their sincerity.

Ver. 27. Ι. καὶ Σ. καὶ αὐτούς: "who themselves also shall tell you the same things by word of mouth," R.V. Judas and Silas were sent to confirm personally the contents of the letter, as they could speak with authority as representing the Church at Jerusalem, while Barnabas and Saul alone would be regarded as already committed to the conciliatory side (Alford). The present participle, as the writer thinks of Judas and Silas as actually present with the letter at its reception, cf. ἀπεστάλκαμεν, "we have sent" by a common idiom, and also xxii.16; Blass compares Thuc., vii., 26, ἐπέμψαν αγγέλλοντας, Gram., p. 194. τὰ αὐτὰ: not the same things as Barnabas and Paul had preached, but, as διὰ λ. intimates, the same things as the letter contained, see critical notes.

Ver. 28. ἔδοξε γάρ τῷ Α. Π. καὶ ἡμῖν: "causa principalis" and "causa minis terialis" of the decree. The words of Hooker exactly describe the meaning and purpose of the words, E. P., iii., 10, 2, cf. viii., 6, 7, and cf. St. Chrysostom’s words, Hom., xxxiii., "not making themselves equal to Him [i.e., the Holy Ghost]—they are not so mad—the one to the Holy Ghost, that they may not deem it to be of man; the other to us, that they may be taught that they also themselves admit the Gentiles, although themselves being in circumcision". On other suggested but improbable meanings see Alford’s and Wendt’s notes. The words became a kind of general formula in the decrees of Councils and Synods, cf. the phrase commonly prefixed to Councils: Sancto Spiritu sugerente (Dict. Chr. Ant., i., 483). On this classical construction of ἔδοξε γὰρ with the infinitive see Nestle’s note, Expository

1 At end of verse, DE 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. add εἰς παντα πειρασμον, so Blass in β, Hilg. Harris, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 85, 86, describes this as the best example extant of a Syriac assimilation in the text of Acts; παραδεδωκασιν in D, ambiguous, but in Sirach, ii., τ, Syriac had rendered “thou hast surrendered thy soul to all temptations” (ετοιμασον την ψυχην σου εις πειρασμον, LXX); gloss added here for clearness.

Weiss, Codex D, p. 82, refers the words to a reminiscence of Acts xx. τ9. Times, December, 1898. Moreover it would seem that this ἔδοξε is quite in accordance with the manner in which Jewish Rabbis would formulate their decisions. — μηδέν πλέον... βάρος: the words indicate authority on the part of the speakers, although in ver. 20 we read only of “enjoining”. St. Peter had used the cognate verb in ver. 10, cf. Rev. ii. 24, where the same noun occurs with a possible reference to the decree, see Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 309, and Plumptre, in loco. — ἐπάναγκες, i.e., for mutual intercourse, that Jewish and Gentile Christians might live as brethren in the One Lord. There is nothing said to imply that these four abstinences were to be imposed as necessary to salvation; the receivers of the letter are only told that it should be well with them if they observed the decree, and we cannot interpret Εὐ πράξετε as = σωθήσεσθε. At the same time the word was a very emphatic one, and might be easily interpreted, as its speedily was, in a narrower sense, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 172; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 310. Rendall compares the use of ἄναγκαιος in Thuc., i., 90.

Ver. 29. απέχ.: preposition omitted as in ver. 20, W. H.; so usually in classical Greek, but in N. T. ἀπέχ. ἀπό, 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 22; so in LXX. Job i. 1, 8, ii. 3, etc. On the difference in meaning in the two constructions, see Alford and Wendt, in loco.— ἐιδωλοθύτων, see ver. 20.— ἐιδωλοθύτων, see ver. 20.— πνικτοῦ: omitted in Western text; see critical notes. — διατηροῦντες ἑαυτούς: verb, only in Luke, cf. Luke ii. 51 (in LXX with ἐκ or ἀπό, Ps. xi. 7, Prov. xxi. 23). In Jas. i. 27 we have a somewhat striking similarity of expression (cf. also John xvii. 15).— ὑπερέπαντος: "it shall be well with you," R. V.; viv., through the peace and concord established in the Christian community, cf. 2 Mac. ix. 19, so in classical Greek. The reading in A. V. is somewhat ambiguous, but the Greek signifies
26—32.
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tοτών, 29. ἀπέχεσθαι ειδωλοθυτῶν καὶ αἵματος καὶ πνικτοῦ καὶ πορνείας. εὲ ὧν διατηροῦντες έαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε. ἔρρωσθε.

3ο. Οἱ μὲν οὐν ἀπολυθέντες ἠλθον εἰς Αντιόχειαν καὶ συναγ- γόντες τὰ πλῆθος, ἔπειδωκαν τὴν ἐπιτολὴν. 31. ἀγανόντες τε ἐξάρσησαν ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει. 32. ἱούδας δὲ καὶ Σίλας, καὶ αὐτοὶ προφήται ὄντες, διὰ λόγου πολλοῦ παρεκάλεσαν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, καὶ


2 πράξετε ΝΑΒ, Vulg., all edd.; πράξατε CDHL; πράξητε E; see Zahn, u.s., p. 354. After πραξ. D, Iren., Tert. (Ephrem) add φερομενοι εν τω άγιω πνευματι, so Blass in B. Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 77, thinks that the gloss has been misplaced, and declining all references to Montanus or Marcion or to N.T. parallels, regards it as simply an expansion or explanation of απολυθέντες, ver. 30; cf. xiii. 4. Weiss also declines all Montanist influence, but takes the words after en πραξ. as meaning that they would fare well being guided by the Holy Spirit, by Whom the decree, ver. 28, had been inspired. χρωσθε, Blass brackets in B, om. by Irenæus; see also Zahn, u.s., p. 354.

3 ἡλθον, but κατηλθον ΝΑΒCD 61, Vulg., Arm., Aeth., Theophyl., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt. After απολυθέντες D* adds εν ήμεραις ολιγαις, so Blass in B, and Hilg. Belser, Beitrag, p. 72, speaks of the addition as more valuable than much gold, as showing their eagerness to bring the good news to Antioch, and the speed of their travelling, contrasted with ver. 3. Weiss however would connect it (p. 82), not with the time consumed in the journey, but with the time of their departure, i.e., they set off a few days after the Council to put an end to the disquietude at Antioch.

4 After αντες D adds πληρεις πνευμатος άγιου, so Blass and Hilg., no Montanistic source; either explanation of προφ. (unnecessary), or may be connected with dia λόγου implying that their oral words no less than the written letter were spoken in the Holy Ghost (Weiss, p. 82). Mr. Page, Classical Review, p. 320 (1897), refers this addition, with similar ones in vv. 7 and 29 of this chap., to the characteristic of Ν to emphasise words and actions as inspired ".

prosperity. For D, see critical notes.—χρωσθε, see critical notes, 2 Macc. xi. 21 and 33, 3 Macc. vii. 9, etc., and often in classics; a natural conclusion of a letter addressed to Gentile Christians, see additional note (2) at end of chapter.

Ver. 30. οὶ μὲν οὖν... ἀγανόντες ηδ: two parties are presented as acting in concert as here (or in opposition), see Rendall, Acts, Appendix on μὲν οὖν, p. 161. —ἐλθον, but κατηλθον R.V., Jerusalem is still the centre from which Barnabas and Paul go down. See reading in D, critical note.—τὸ πλῆθος = τῇ έκκλησίᾳ, cf. xiv. 27; Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 59, especially refers to this passage: τὸ πλ. = Christengemeinde at Antioch, cf. plesbs. popularis in Lat. Chr. authors.—ιερωστάτων τὴν ουτω, see instances in Wetstein of same phrase in same sense.

Ver. 31. παρακλήσει: A. and R.V., “consolation” (“exhortation’ margin, R.V.). The former rendering seems suitable here, because the letter causes rejoicing, not as an exhortation, but as a message of relief and concord. Ramsay and Hort render "encouragement". Barnabas was a fitting bearer of such a message, cf. iv. 36.

Ver. 32. καὶ αὐτοὶ προφ. δύτες: Wendt, so Meyer, takes καὶ αὐτοὶ not with προφ. δύτες (these words in common), but with the words which follow, indicating that Judas and Silas gave encouragement to the brethren personally (cf. ver. 27), as the letter had verbally; but punctuation of T.R. in R.V., W.H., Weiss, etc. On καὶ αὐτοὶ and its frequency in St. Luke, Friedrich, p. 37; Hawkins, Hora Synoptica (1899), p.
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33. Ποιήσαντες δὲ χρόνον, ἀπελύθησαν μετ’ εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους. 1 34. ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλῳ


2 Om. ΝΑΒΕΗLP 6t, Vulg. (am. fu. demid.), Syr. Pesh., Syr. H. text, Bohb., Chrys., so Tisch., W., R.V. text, Weiss, Wendt. In CD 13, Vulg.clem. + tol., Sah., Bohw., Syr. Harcl. mg., Arm., Aeth., so Blass and Hilg. Also D, G., Wern., Prov., Vulg.clem., Cassiod.add μονος δὲ λογικάς επισεβασμος (Wern. adding "reversus est Hierosolyma," cf. also Vulg. cl.). It is difficult to see why if 34a was genuine it should have been omitted, but the sentence may have been introduced to account for the presence of Silas at Antioch in ver. 40, so Weiss and Corssen. (In C and D αυτου instead of αυτον, and in a few mins. αυτοθη.) Ver. 34a is defended as genuine by Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 174, 175; Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 148 (whilst both regard 34b as a gloss): cf. Belser, Beiträge, p. 73, on the same ground, etc., that ver. 33 does not declare that Judas and Silas actually departed, but only that they were free to depart. The Bezant reviser found the first part of the verse in his text and added the second. Blass retains both parts of the verse in B. If the first clause was introduced to explain a supposed difficulty about Silas, it must be remembered that the difficulty was more fanciful than real, since Barnabas takes Mark from Jerusalem, xii. 13 (see Ramsay, u. s.). W., App., p. 96, considers the first clause as probably Alexandrian, as well as Western, while Corssen regards them both as Western.

33.—παρεκάλεσαν: A. and R.V., "exhorted"; R.V. margin, "comforted," Ramsay, "encouraged" (so Hort; or "exhorted"). Possibly the word may include something of all these meanings (see also Alford's note).—ἐπεστήριξαν, cf. xiv. 22.

Ver. 33. τοιούτας δὲ χρόνον, cf. xviii. 23, and xx. 3, only in Acts in N.T., cf. 2 Cor. xi. 25, James iv. 13. For the phrase both in LXX and classical Greek (so in Latin), see Wetstein, Blass, Grimm. In LXX cf. Prov. xiii. 23, Eccl. vi. 12 (Tob.x. 7), so Hebrew γύρος,—μετ’ εἰρήνης: exact phrase only Heb. xi. 31 in N.T.; in LXX several times; in Apocrypha, in 1 and 3 Macc.—πρὸς τοὺς ἀπόστολους: but if as in R.V., "unto those that had sent them" (see critical notes and Hort, Ecclesia, p. 73), i.e., the whole synod at Jerusalem, not only the Apostles.

Ver. 34. Omitted in R.V. text, but not in margin. See critical notes.

Ver. 35. διέτριβον, cf. xii. 19, and see also on xvi. 12. In LXX cf. Lev. xiv. 8, Jer. xiii. (xxxvii. 7), Judith x. 2, 2 Macc. xiv. 23. So also in classics with or without χρόνον.—διδασκαλία. καὶ εὐαγγ. : possibly the first may refer to work inside the Church, and the second to work outside, but the distinction can scarcely be pressed. Within this time, according to Wendt, falls the incident between Paul and Peter, Gal. ii. 11. On the other hand, see Weiss, Apostelgeschichte, p. 194, who thinks that the τινας ημέρας excludes, Gal. ii., etc., but the phrase is very indefinite, and may have included months as well as days, cf. xvi. 12, and ix. 23. On the incident referred to see additional note at end of chapter.

Ver. 36. μετὰ δὲ: second missionary journey commences, ending xviii. 22. —ἐπιστρέφειν, reversii, cf. Luke ii. 39, W.H., xvii. 31. The word is so used in LXX, and in modern Greek (Kennedy, p. 155).—δὴ, see on xiii. 2.—ἐπισκεψ., see above on vi. 3. The word was characteristic of a man like St. Paul, whose heart was the heart of the world, and who daily sustained the care of all the churches.—τῶς ἄνων: "in fide, amore, spe ... nervus visitationis ecclesiasticae." Bengel.

Ver. 37. ἰδούλευσα, but ἰδοῦλος see critical note, "wished," volebat; R.V., "was minded" almost too strong. Possibly owing to his kinship, Barnabas may have taken a more lenient view than Paul.

Ver. 38. Ἰακώβου, cf. xxviii. 22 (Luke vii. 7), and cf. 1 Macc. ii. 28, 2 Macc. ii. 8, etc.—ἰδοῦλος. is a mild word compared with this.—ὑπαρχομενοῖς, cf. xii. 25, used also by Paul in Gal. ii. 1 of taking Titus with him to Jerusalem, and nowhere else in N.T. except in this passage, cf. Job i. 4, 3 Macc. i. 1, so in classical Greek.—τῶν ἄποστόλων ἄντι αὐτῶν: the neutral word ἄποστολοι ἄντι αὐτῶν, xii. 13, is not used here, but a word which may denote not disloyalty in the sense of apostasy from Christ, but to the mission,
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επιμείναν αὐτοῦ. 35. Πάσος δὲ καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, μετὰ καὶ ἄτερων πολλῶν, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου.

1 Tim. iv. 1 (Rendall); it is doubtful, however, whether we can press this (see Weiss, in loco).—τοῦτον: significant at the end of the verse, and note also decisive contradiction between συμπαραλ., ver. 37, and μὴ συμπαραλ. here.

Ver. 39. παροξυσμός, Ἱεβ. χ. 24, in different sense, nowhere else in N.T. The verb is found twice, Acts xvii. 16, 1 Cor. xiii. 5; in the former passage of Paul's righteous provocation in Athens, and in the latter of irritation of mind as here; the noun twice in LXX of God's righteous anger, Deut. xxix. 28, Jer. xxxix. (xlii.) 37 (cf. also the verb, Deut. ix. 7, 8, etc.), so too in Dem. Both noun and verb are common in medical language (Hobart); παροξυσμεῖ, φησίν, ἔγνετο οὖν ἐξ ἀρδετῆς φιλονείκει; in the result good, for Mark was stirred up to greater diligence by Paul, and the kindness of Barnabas made him cling to him all the more devotedly, cf. Oecumenius, in loco.—ἐντός χωρὶς: “they parted asunder,” R.V., cf. διαχωρίζοντο ἀπό, Gen. xiii. 11, 14, cf. Luke ix. 33.—παραλεῖποντά: not the compound verb, because Barnabas alone takes Mark.—ἐκλέγοντα: with εἰς also in xviii. 18, with ἐν in xx. 6; on παρεῖδω and the number of its compounds in St. Luke, cf. xxvii. 4, etc.—εἰς Κ.: where he could be sure of influence, since by family he belonged to the Jews settled there, iv. 36. Barnabas is not mentioned again in Acts, and it is to be noted that St. Paul's friendship was not permanently impaired either with him or with Mark (see Chrysostom, in loco.) and 1 Cor. ix. 6. In Gal. ii. 13 St. Paul in speaking of Barnabas marks by implication his high estimate of his character and the expectations he had formed of him; καὶ Β. "even Barnabas" (Lightfoot, Gal., in loco, and Hackett). According to tradition Barnabas remained in Cyprus until his death, and the appearance of Mark at a later stage may point to this; but although possibly Mark's rejoining Paul may have been occasioned by the death of Barnabas, the sources for the life of Barnabas outside the N.T. are quite untrustworthy, “Barnabas,” B.D.; Hackett, Acts, p. 192. Whatever his fortunes may have been, St. Luke did not estimate his work in the same category as that of Paul as a main factor in the development of the Church, although we must never forget that "twice over did Barnabas save Saul for the work of Christianity." —Μάρκον: In his two imprisonments St. Paul mentions Mark in terms of high approval, Col. iv. 10, 11, Philem. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 11. In the first imprisonment St. Paul significantly recommends him to the Colossians as being the cousin of Barnabas, one of his own fellow-labourers unto the kingdom of God, one amongst the few who had been a παραστάτης, a comfort unto him. In such words as these St. Paul breaks the silence of the years during which we hear nothing of the relations between him and Mark, although the same notice in Colossians seems to indicate an earlier reconciliation than the date of the letter, since the Churches of the Lycus valley had already been instructed to receive Mark if he passed that way, Expositor, August, 1897, “St. Mark in the N.T.” (Dr. Swete), p. 85.

Ver. 40. Π. δὲ ἐπέλεξε, Σ.: not in the place of Mark, but in the place of Barnabas, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 171; having chosen, i.e., for himself: sibi eligere; only in N.T. in this sense, but in classical Greek and in LXX, 1 Sam. ii. 28 A, 2 Sam. x. 9 R, Eccles. vi. 18, 1 Esdras ix. 16, 1 Macc. i. 63 R, v. 17, etc.; "elegit ut socium, non ut ministrum" (Blass). If Silas had not returned to Jerusalem, but had remained in Antioch (see above on ver. 35), he had doubtless recommended himself to Paul by some special proof of fitness for dealing sympathetically with the relations of the Jewish Christians and the Gentile converts. This sympathy on the part of Silas would be the more marked and significant as he was himself almost certainly a Hebrew; otherwise we cannot account for his high position in the Jerusalem Church, ver. 22, although his Roman citizenship is implied in xvi. 37; perhaps this latter fact may account for his freedom from narrow Jewish prejudices. If we may identify, as we reasonably may, the Silas of Acts with the Silas (Silvanus) of the Epistles, 2 Cor. i. 19, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1, 1 Pet. v. 12, the last mention of him by St. Peter becomes very suggestive. For St. Peter's First Epistle contains the names of the two men, Mark and Sil-
vanus, who had originally been members of the Jerusalem Church, Acts xii. 12, xv. 22, and moreover the two oldest of St. Paul's associates, whose brotherly Christian concord had been broken for the time (when Paul chose the latter in the place of Barnabas, and rejected Mark's services altogether), but who are now both found at St. Peter's side in Rome (assuming that Babylon is Rome), evidently at one with each other; the one the bearer of a letter, the other the sender of greetings, to Pauline Churches. If St. Paul had passed to his rest, and the leader had thus changed, the teaching was the same, as the names of Silvanus and Mark assure us, and St. Peter takes up and carries on the work of the Apostle of the Gentiles, see Dr. Swete, u. s., pp. 82, 82._—ἐξήλθε, cf. Luke ix. 6, 3 John, ver. 7, where the word is used of going forth for missionary work.—παραβολέως, cf. xiv. 26. Possibly we may infer that the Church took Paul's view of the point at issue between himself and Barnabas, but on the other hand we cannot prove this, because the writer's thoughts are so specially fixed upon Paul as the great and chief worker in the organisation and unification of the Church.

Ver. 41. διήρχετο, see above on xiii. 6.—Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν: as Barnabas had turned to Cyprus, the scene of his early labours in the Gospel, and perhaps also his own home, so Paul turned to Syria and Cilicia, not only because his home was in Cilicia, but also because he had worked there in his early Christian life and labours, Gal., i. 21, 23. It is a coincidence with the notice in Gal. that St. Luke here and in ver. 23 presupposes the existence of Churches in Syria and Cilicia, although nothing had been previously said of their foundation, whilst the presence of Saul at Tarsus is twice intimated, ix. 30, xi. 25. Moreover the commencement of the letter, xv. 22, 23, indicates that these regions had been the centre of the teaching of the Judaisers, and St. Paul's presence, together with the fact that Silas, a prominent and leading member of the Jerusalem Church, was his colleague, would doubtless help to prevent further disquiet. On the addition to the verse in the Bezan text see critical note.

Additional note (1).

Amongst recent writers on the Acts, Mr. Rendall has stated that the evidence for the identification of Acts xv. with Gal. ii. 1-10 is overwhelming, Appendix to Acts, pp. 357, 359. If we cannot fully endorse this, it is at all events noticeable that critics of widely different schools of thought have refused to regard the alleged differences between the two as irreconcilable; in this conservative writers like Lechler, Godet, Belser, Knabenbauer and Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 627, 627; scientific critics, as we may call them, like Reuss, W. Weiss, and still more advanced critics like Lipsius and H. Holtzmann are agreed. This general agreement is recognised and endorsed by Wendt, p. 255 (1899), see also K. Schmidt, "Apostelkonvent," in Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theol. (Hauck), p. 704 ff. Amongst English writers Lightfoot, Hort, Sanday, Salmon, Drummond, Turner may be quoted on the same side (so too McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 208), (see for the points of agreement, Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 123; Drummond, Galatians, p. 73 ff.; Salmon, "Galatians," B.D.S.; Reuss, Geschichte des h. S. des Ν. Τ., p. 60, sixth edition, and very fully in Belser, Die Selbstvertheidigung der h. Paulus im Galaterbrief, p. 83 ff., 1896; for the difficulty in identifying Gal. ii. with any other visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem, cf. Salmon, Lightfoot, u. s., and Zahn, u. s., Felten, Introduct. to Apostelgeschichte, p. 46). But the recent forcible attempt of Professor Ramsay to identify Gal. ii. 1-10 with St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, and not with the third visit, Acts xv., has opened up the whole question again (see on the same identification recently proposed from a very different point of view by Völter, Witnesses of the Epistles, p. 231, and also by Spitta, Apostelgeschichte, p. 184). At first sight it is no doubt in favour of this conclusion that according to Acts the journey, xi. 30, is the second made by St. Paul to Jerusalem, and the journey in xv. the third, whilst Gal. ii. 1 also describes a journey which the Apostle
After the δε εβουλευσατο and at commencement of verse Syr. Harcl. mg. prefixes “placuit autem cogitatio Barnabae,” so Blass in β. εβουλευσατο, but with ΝABCE 13, 61, Vulg. vers., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, εβουλευετο; D, Gig. εβουλευετο, so Hilg.

herself represents as his second to the mother-city. We cannot fairly solve this difficulty by cutting the knot with McGiffert, who regards Acts xi. 30 and xv. as = Gal. ii. 1-10, and thinks that Luke found two independent accounts of the same journey, and supposed them to refer to separate events (Apostolic Age, p. 171); or by concluding with Drummond, Galatians, p. 78, that the writer of Acts made a mistake in bringing St. Paul to Jerusalem at the time of the famine, so that Gal. ii. and Acts xv. both refer to his second visit (cf. to the same effect, Wendt, p. 218 (1899), who looks upon the visit described in xi. 25 as a mistake of the author, at all events as regards Paul). But McGiffert and Drummond are both right in emphasising one most important and, as it seems to us, crucial difficulty in the way of the view advocated by Ramsay; if he is correct, it is difficult to see any object in the visit described in Acts xv. After the decision already arrived at in Gal. ii. 1-10: Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, the question then ex hypothesi at issue could scarcely have been raised again in the manner described in Acts xv. Moreover, whilst Ramsay admits that another purpose was achieved by the journey to Jerusalem described in Gal. ii. 1-10, although only as a mere private piece of business, St. Paul, p. 57, he maintains that the special and primary object of the visit was to relieve the poor. But if the pillars of the Church were already aware, as ex hypothesi they must have been aware, that St. Paul came to Jerusalem bringing food and money for the poor (Acts xi. 29, 30), we may be pardoned for finding it difficult to believe that the “one charge alone” (Gal. ii. 10) which they gave him was to do the very thing which he actually came for the purpose of doing.

If, too, Barnabas and Saul had just been associated in helping the poor, and if the expression δ και εσπούδασα, Gal. ii. 10, refers, as Professor Ramsay holds, to this service, we should hardly have expected Paul to use the first person singular, but rather to have associated Barnabas with himself in his reference to their work of love and danger. Professor Ramsey emphasises the fact (Expositor, p. 183, March, 1896) that Luke pointedly records that the distribution was carried out to its completion by Barnabas and Saul in person (Acts xii. 25). Why then does Paul only refer to his own zeal in remembering the poor in Acts xi. 29, and xii. 25 = Gal. ii. 1-10? (On the force of the aorist as against Professor Ramsey’s view, see Expositor, March, 1899, p. 221, Mr. Vernon Bartlet’s note.) Gal. ii. 10 should rather be read in the light of 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3; if the first-named Epistle was also the first in point of time, then we can understand how, whilst it contains no specific and definite mention of a collection for the Church at Jerusalem, which is so emphasised in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 9, etc., yet the eager desire of the pillars of the Church that the poor in Judæa should be remembered, and the thought of a fund for supplying their needs, may well have been working in St. Paul’s mind from the earlier time of the expression of that desire and need, Gal. ii. 10, Expositor, November, 1893, “Pauline Collection for the Saints,” and April, 1894, “The Galatians of St. Paul,” Rendall; Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 67.

For reasons why St. Paul did not refer to his second visit to Jerusalem when writing to the Galatians see on xi. 30, and Salmon, “Galatians,” B.D., p. 1111; Sanday, Expositor, February, 1896, p. 92; Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 61; “Acts of the Apostles,” p. 30, Hastings’ B.D. and “Chron. of the N.T.,” ibid., p. 423; Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 629. Further: Dr. Sanday has emphasised the fact that at the time of St. Paul’s second visit to Jerusalem the state of things which we find in Acts xv. (the third visit) did not exist; that a stage in the controversy as to the terms of admission of Gentile converts had been reached by the date of Acts xv. which had not been reached at the date of xi. 30; that at this latter date, e.g., there was no such clear demarcation of spheres between St. Peter and St. Paul, and that it is not until Acts xiii. 46 that the turning-point is actually
38. Παύλος δὲ ἥξιος, τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας, καὶ μὴ συνελθόντα αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ έργον, μὴ συμπαραλαβεῖν τούτον.

1 For ἥξιον D reads οὐκ εβουλετο λεγων.

2 For μὴ συμπ. τούτον D reads τούτον μὴ ειναι συν αυτοῖς; see on the passage Weiss, Codex D, p. 83; but if Weiss is correct, it has been well asked, how came Paul to take Silas? Hilig. reads ειναι for ειναι συμπαραλαβεῖν, cf. ver. 37, but pres. infin. NABC 61, 180, Tisch., W., H., Blass, R.V., Wendt, Weiss.

reached: henceforth St. Paul assumes his true “Apostleship of the Gentiles,” and preaches a real “Gospel of the uncircumcision”; see especially Expositor, July, 1896, p. 62. Of course Professor Ramsay’s theory obliges us to place Gal. ii. 1-10 before the Apostolic Conference, and to suppose that when the events narrated in Gal. ii. took place, the journey of Acts xiii., xiv. was still in the future. But is not the whole tone and attitude of St. Paul in Gal. ii. 1-10, placing himself, e.g., before Barnabas in ver. 9 and evidently regarding himself as the foremost representative of one sphere of missionary work, as St. Peter was of the other, ver. 8, more easily explained if his first missionary journey was already an accomplished fact and not still in the future?

In the two short references to Paul’s second visit to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, it is still “Barnabas and Saul,” so too in xiii. 1, 2, 7; not till xiii. 9 does the change come: henceforth Paul takes the lead, vv. 13, 16, 43, 45, 50, etc., with two exceptions as Professor Ramsay pointedly describes them (see above on xiii. 9), and in the account of the Conference and all connected with it St. Luke and the Church at Antioch evidently regard Paul as the leader, xv. 2 (2), 22 (although the Church at Jerusalem places Barnabas first, vv. 12, 25). But in xi. 30, xii. 25 the historian speaks of “Barnabas and Saul”. The whole position of St. Paul assigned to him by St. Luke in Acts xv. is in harmony with the Apostle’s own claims and prominence in Gal. ii. 1-10; it is not in harmony with the subordinate place which the same St. Luke assigns to him in the second visit to Jerusalem. In other words, if Gal. ii. 1-10 = Acts xv., then St. Paul’s claim to be an Apostle of the Gentiles is ratified by the Gentile Luke; but if Gal. ii. 1-10 = Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, then there is no hint in Acts that Luke as yet regarded Paul in any other light than a subordinate to the Hebrew Barnabas; he is still Saul, not Paul. For the points of discrepancy between Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv. see same authorities as above; one point upon which Ramsay strongly insists, viz., that a visit which is said to be “by revelation,” Gal. ii. 2, cannot be identified with a visit which takes place by the appointment of the Church, Acts xv. 2, is surely hypercritical; it would not be the first occasion on which the Spirit and the Church had spoken in harmony; in Acts xiii. 3, 4 the Church ἀπέλυσαν sent away Paul and Barnabas, and yet in the next verse we read οἱ ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἅγιον πνεύματος, see Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 125; Drummond, Galatians, p. 75; Turner, “Chronology of the N.T.” Hastings’ B.D., p. 424; cf. Niese, p. 258 (1890), and Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 632, who both point out that the statements referred to are by no means mutually exclusive. On the whole question see Wendt’s 1899 edition, p. 255 ff., and Expositor, 1896 (February, March, April, July) for its full discussion by Dr. Sanday and Professor Ramsay.

A further question arises as to the position to be assigned to the incident in Gal. ii. 11-14. Professor Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 157 ff., supposes that it took place before the Apostolic Conference, and finds a description of the occasion of the incident in Acts xv. 1, Acts xv. 24, Gal. ii. 12, i.e., in the words of three authorities, St. Luke, the Apostles at Jerusalem, and St. Paul himself; the actual conflict between St. Peter and St. Paul took place after the latter’s second visit to Jerusalem, but before his third visit. The issue of the conflict is not described by Paul, but it is implied in the events of the Jerusalem Conference, Acts xv. 2, 7. Barnabas had wavered, but had afterwards joined Paul; Peter had been rebuked, but had received the rebuke in such a way as to become a champion of freedom in the ensuing Conference, employing to others the argument which had convinced himself, cf. Acts xv. 10, Gal. ii. 14. Mr. Turner, “Chronology of the N.T.”, Hastings’ B.D., i., 424, is inclined to adopt this view, which identifies the two Judaising missions from Jerusalem to Antioch, Gal.
39. γέγονεν οὖν παροξυσμός, δοτε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοῖς ἀπ' ἄλληλων, τὸν \(^1\) τε Βαρνάβαν παραλαβόντα τὸν Μάρκον ἐκπλεύσαι εἰς Κύπρον.

\(^1\) D amplifies after ἄλληλων τοτε Β. παραλαβ. τον Μ. επλευσεν εις Κ., so Blass and Hilg. Weiss sees in τοτε a characteristic of D; cf. ii. 37.

ii. 12 and Acts xv. 1, while he still maintains the ordinary view that Gal. ii. 1-10 = Acts xv. This, as he points out, we may easily do, whilst Gal. ii. 11-14 may be allowed to precede Gal. ii. 1-10 in order of time, and in the absence of the ἐπεὶτα in Gal. i. 18, 21, ii. 1 there is nothing to suggest that the chronological series is continued. It may be noted that Paley, *Hora Paulina*, v., 9, had remarked that there is nothing to hinder us from supposing that the dispute at Antioch was prior to the Conference at Jerusalem. Moreover it may be fairly urged that this view puts a more favourable construction on the conduct of St. James and St. Peter in relation to the compact which they had made with Paul at the Jerusalem Conference. But on the attitude of St. James and the expression ἀλληλον τῶν ἀπὸ Ιακώβου, see Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 79; Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 12; Drummmond, *Galatians*, p. 85; and with regard to the conduct of St. Peter, see Hort, *π. s.*, p. 76; Lightfoot on the collision at Antioch, *Galatians*, p. 125 ff.; and Salmon, "Galatians," B.D. ³, p. 1114; Drummmond, *π. s.*, p. 78.

On Zahn's position that the dispute between Peter and Paul took place before the Apostolic Conference, when the former betook himself to Antioch after his liberation, Acts xii. 5 ff., a view put forward also by Schneckenburger, *Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 109 ff., see *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, p. 435 ff., 1894, and Belser's criticism, *Die Selbstverheirathung des h. Paulus im Galaterbriefe*, p. 127 ff., 1896 (Biblische Studien).

Wendt, pp. 211, 212 (1899), while declining to attempt any explanation either psychological or moral of St. Peter's action in Gal. ii. 11-14, points out with justice how perverse it is to argue that Peter could not have previously conducted himself with reference to Cornelius as Acts describes when we remember that in the incident before us Barnabas, who had been the constant companion of St. Paul in the Gentile mission, shared nevertheless in St. Peter's weakness.

Additional note (2), cf. ver. 29.

A further question arises as to why the particular prohibitions of the Decree are mentioned. According to a very common view they represented the Seven Precepts of Noah, six of which were said to have been given by God to Adam, while the seventh was given as an addition to Noah. The Seven Precepts were as follows: (1) against profanation of God's name; (2) against idolatry; (3) against fornication; (4) against murder; (5) against theft; (6) to obey those in authority; (7) against eating living flesh, i.e., flesh with the blood in it, see Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 318, E.T.; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 69. No doubt there are points of contact between these Precepts and the four Prohibitions of the Decree, but at the same time it would seem that there are certainly four of the Precepts to which there is nothing corresponding in the Decree. The Precepts were binding on every Ger Toshav, a stranger sojourning in the land of Israel, but it has been erroneously supposed that the Ger Toshav = σεβόμενος, and thus the conclusion is drawn that the idea of the four prohibitions was to place Gentiles on the footing of σεβόμενοι in the Christian community. Against this identification of the Ger Toshav and the σεβόμενοι Schürer's words are decisive, *π. s.*, pp. 318, 319. But if this view was valid historically, the position of the Gentile Christians under such conditions would have been far from satisfactory, and we cannot suppose that Paul would have regarded any such result as a success; still circumcision and the keeping of the law would have been necessary to entitle a man to the full privilege of the Christian Church and name. Ritschl, who takes practically the same view as Wendt below, admits that in a certain degree the Gentile Christians would be regarded as in an inferior position to the Jewish Christians, *Alt-katholische Kirche*, pp. 131, 133, second edition.

It seems even more difficult to trace the prohibitions of the Decree to the Levitical prohibitions, Lev. xvii., xviii., which were binding on strangers or sojourners in Israel (*LXX προσήλυτοι*), since, if the written law was to be the source of the Jerusalem prohibitions, it is inexplicable that the variations from it both in matter and number should be
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30. Παύλος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος Σίλαν ἐξῆλθε, παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄδελφων. 41. διήρχετο δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν,


so observable (Hort, n. s., p. 70); and although Wendt (so Ritschl, Überbeck, Lipsius, Zöckler, Holtzmann, and others; see on the other hand, Weiss, Biblische Theol., p. 145; Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 297; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 306; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., i., 72, 73, 1869) adopts the view that in the four prohibitions of the Jerusalem Decree we have the form in which prohibitions binding upon proselytes in the wider sense, i.e., upon the uncircumcised φοβούμ. or σεβ. τὸν Θεόν, existed in the Apostolic days, he can only say that this is “very probable”: of direct historical evidence, as Zöckler admits, there is none. The difficulty is so great in supposing that Paul and Barnabas could have submitted to the distinction drawn between the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians that it has led to doubts as to the historical character of the decree. Weissacker and McGiffert maintain that the decree was formulated after Paul’s departure, when James had reconsidered the matter, and had determined that some restriction should be put upon the complete Gentile liberty which had been previously granted. But this view can only be maintained by the sacrifice of xvi. 4, where Paul is distinctly said to have given the decrees to the Churches to keep.

Ramsay, agreeing with Lightfoot, calls the Decree a compromise, and although, as he points out, it seems impossible to suppose that St. Paul would have endorsed a decree which thus made mere points of ritual compulsory, it is probable, he thinks, that after the exordium in which the Jewish party had been so emphatically condemned, the concluding part of the Decree would be regarded as a strong recommendation that the four points should be observed in the interests of peace and amity (St. Paul, p. 172). In a previous passage, p. 167, he seems to take a very similar view to Wendt, who answers the question as to how the Precepts of the Decree were to be observed by the Gentile converts by maintaining that they were an attempt to make intercourse more feasible between the Jewish Christians and their Gentile brethren, p. 205 (1899).

We naturally ask why the Decree apparently fell so quickly into abeyance, and why it did not hold good over a wider area, since in writing to Corinth and Rome St. Paul never refers to it. But, to say nothing of the principle laid down in the reading of Codex D (see above on p. 323), St. Paul’s language in 1 Cor. viii. 1-13, x. 14-22, Rom. xiv., may be fairly said to possess the spirit of the Decree, and to mark the discriminating wisdom of one eager to lead his disciples behind the rule to the principle; and there is no more reason to doubt the historical truth of the compact made in the Jerusalem Decree, because St. Paul never expressly refers to it, than there is to throw doubt upon his statement in Gal. ii. 10, because he does not expressly refer to it as an additional motive for urging the Corinthians to join in the collection for the poor saints, 2 Cor. viii. 9. But further, there is a sufficient answer to the above question in the fact that the Decree was ordained for the Churches which are specifically mentioned, οἰς., those of Antioch (placed first as the centre of importance, not only as the local capital of Syria, but as the mother of the Gentile Churches, the Church from which the deputation had come), Syria and Cilicia. In these Churches Jewish prejudice had made itself felt, and in these Churches with their constant communication with Jerusalem the Decree would be maintained. The language of St. James in xxi. 25 proves that some years later reference was naturally made to the Decree as a standard still regulating the intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians, at least in Jerusalem, and we may presume in the Churches neighbouring. St. Paul’s attitude towards the Decree is marked by loyal acceptance on the one hand, and on the other by a deepening recognition of his own special sphere among the Gentiles as the Apostle of the Gentiles, Gal. ii. 9. Thus we find him delivering the Decrees to the Churches of his first missionary journey, xvi. 4, although those Churches were not mentioned in the address of the Decree (no mention is made of the same action on his part towards the Churches in Syria.
and Cilicia, xv, 41, doubtless because they were already aware of the enactments prescribed. It may well be that St. Paul regarded himself as the missionary-Apostle of the Church at Antioch, sent forth from that Church for a special work, and that he would recognise that if the Antiochian Christians were to be loyal to the compact of Jerusalem, he as their representative and emissary must enforce the requirements of that compact in revisiting those regions in which the converts had been so instrumental in causing the Decree to be enacted.

But the work upon which he had been specially sent forth from Antioch had been fulfilled, xiv, 27; the Conference at Jerusalem had assigned a wider and a separate sphere to his labours; henceforth his Apostleship to the Gentiles εἰς τὰ ἔθνη was more definitely recognised, and more abundantly fulfilled; and in what may be called strictly Gentile Churches, in Churches not only further removed from Palestine, but in which his own Apostleship was adequate authority, he may well have felt that he was relieved from enforcing the Decree. In these Churches the stress laid upon such secondary matters as "things strangled and blood" would simply have been a cause of perplexity, a burden too heavy to bear, the source of a Christianity maimed by Jewish particularism, see Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 127, 305; Hort, Ecclesia, pp. 88, 89; Judaistic Christianity, p. 74; Speaker's Commentary, Acts, p. 325; Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 254; "Apostelkonvent," K. Schmidt in Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theol. (Hauück, 1879, 1886); Wendt, p. 269 (1890); and for the after-history of the Decree, K. Schmidt, u.s., Lightfoot, u.s., Plumptre, Felten, and cf. also Hooker's remarks, Eccles. Pol., iv., 11, 5 ff.

On the attempt to place the Apostolic Conference at Jerusalem before chaps. xiii. and xiv., see Apostelgeschichte, Wendt (1899), pp. 254, 255, and McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 161. Weissacker adopts this view because no mention is made in Gal. i. 21 of the missionary journey in Acts xiii., xiv., and he therefore maintains that it could only have taken place after the Conference, but the Epistle does not require that Paul should give a complete account of all his missionary experiences outside Judæa; he is only concerned to show how far he was or was not likely to have received his Gospel from the older Apostles. Moreover, it is very difficult to find a place for the close companionship of Paul and Barnabas, and their mutual labours in xiii., xiv., subsequent to the incident described in Gal. ii. 13, whether that incident took place just before or just after the Jerusalem Conference; in either case a previous mutual association between Paul and Barnabas in mission work amongst the Gentiles, such as that described in Acts xiii., xiv., accounts for the expectations Paul had evidently formed of Barnabas, Gal. ii. 13, and also for the position which the latter holds in Gal. ii. 1-10.

Space forbids us to make more than a very brief reference to the attempt to break up chap. xv. into various sources. Spitta, who places the whole section xv. 1-33 before chap. xiii., refers vv. 1-4, 13-33 to his inferior source B, which the reviser has wrongly inserted here instead of in its proper place after xii. 24, and has added vv. 5-12. Clemen in the same section, which he regards as an interpolation, assigns vv. 1-4, 13-18, 20-22, to his Redactor Judaicus, and vv. 5-12, 19, 23-33 to Redactor Antijudaicus. Clemen, like Spitta, holds that ver. 34 simply takes up again xiv. 28; further, he regards xxi. 17-20 as the source of xv. 1-4, but Jüngst cautiously remarks that there is nothing strange in the fact that an author should use similar expressions to describe similar situations (p. 146)—a piece of advice which he might himself have remembered with advantage on other occasions. Hilgenfeld's "author to Theophilus" plays a large part in the representation of the negotiations at Jerusalem in respect to the Conference and the Decree, and this representation is based, according to Hilgenfeld and Jüngst, mainly upon the narrative of the conversion of Cornelius which the same author had formerly embellished, although not without some connection with tradition (Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., p. 59 ff., 1896). Still more recently Wendt (1899) credits the author of Acts with a tolerably free revision of the tradition he had received, with a view of representing the harmony between Paul and the original Apostles in the clearest light; thus the speeches of Peter and James in xv. are essentially his composition; but Wendt concludes by asserting that it seems in his judgment impossible to separate exactly the additions made by the author of Acts from the tradition, another note of caution against hasty subjective conclusions.
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ΧVΙ. επιστηρίζοντας εκκλησίας. 1 ΧVΙ. Ι. κατήντησε δε εις Δέρβην και Λύστραν και ιδού, μαθητής της εκεί ὑπό μόνης ἡμών, υἱός γυναικὸς τοῦ ἱουδαίος πιστῆς, πατρὸς δὲ Ἐλλήνων. 2. δς εμαρ

1 At end of verse D, Gig., Vulg., Syr. Η. mg. add παραδίδους τε καὶ ἐντόλας των ἀποστόλων καὶ (ἀποστ. καὶ om. D, Cassiod) πρεσβυτερῶν, so Blass in β and Hilg. (cf. vv. 5, 12 for omission of ἀποστόλων in β). The words look like an obvious addition, cf. xvi. 4, but Belser, Beiträge, p. 73, defends as “very interesting,” as showing that whilst the mission of Judas and Silas was limited to Antioch, Paul was afterwards in person the bearer of the decree to the Churches in Syria and Cilicia; see however Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 173, 174; C. R. E., p. 87.

2 Before εἰς Δ. καὶ with ΑΒ, Boh., Syr. Harcl. text, so W.Η., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, R.V. DAB 61 insert εἰς before Α., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt. τινος om. with ABCDE 61, Vulg., many verss., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After γυν. 25 (Gig., Prov., Wern.) has χρημα—Blass rejects. At beginning of verse D, Syr. Harcl. mg. (Gig., Cassiod.) prefix διελθον δε, to show that Lystra and Derbe were not included in Syria and Cilicia, so also the καὶ in AB may point to the same reason; see Ramsay, C. R. E., p. 87.

15, xxi. 7, xxv. 13, xxvi. 7, xxvii. 12, xxviii. 13, 1 Cor. x. 11, xiv. 36, Ephes. iv. 13, Phil. iii. 11. But whilst in St. Paul it is used in a figurative sense, it is used eight times by St. Luke of arriving at a place and making some stay there, cf. 2 Macc. iv. 21, 44. The fact that the verb is thus used frequently in the second part of Acts and not in i.-xii. is surely easily accounted for by the subjects of the narrative (Hawkins, Hora Synoptica, p. 147).—εἰς Δέρβην καὶ Α.: if we read εἰς before Α., also (see critical note): “he came also to Derbe and to Lystra.” The purpose was implied in xv. 36, but here places mentioned in the inverse order of xiv. 6 since coming from Cilicia through the “Cilician Gates” St. Paul would visit Derbe first, see Hastings’ B.D., “Derbe” (Ramsay). The two places are grouped together as a region according to the Roman classification (Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 110, 179). The second εἰς before Α. marks that while Derbe is mentioned as a place visited, Lystra is the scene of the events in the sequel.—καὶ Λύστρα: indicating the surprising fact that a successor to Mark was found at once (so Weiss); whilst Hort still more significantly marks the form of the phrase by pointing out that St. Luke reserves it for sudden and as it were providential interpretations, Ecclesia, p. 179, cf. i. 10, vili. 17, x. 17, xi. 7: however disheartening had been the rupture with Barnabas, in Timothy Paul was to find another “son of consolation,” cf. Hort’s comment on 1 Tim. i. 18 in this connection, u. s., pp. 179-185. It must not however be forgotten that there are good reasons for seeing in Timothy not the successor of Barnabas (this was Silas), but of Mark. It could hardly be said of one in the position of Silas that he was like Mark a ὑπηρέτης, on a mere subordinate footing, whereas the other hand the difference of age between Barnabas and Timothy, and their relative positions to St. Paul would have naturally placed Timothy in a subordinate position from the first.—καὶ, i.e., at Lystra, most probably. The view that reference is made not to Lystra but to Derbe arises from supposing that in xx. 4 the word Δέρβης refers to Timothy and not to Gaius, the truth being that Timothy is not described because already well known. Certainly the fact that his character was testified of by those of Lystra, as well as St. Paul’s reference to Lystra in 2 Tim. iii. 11, seems to favour Lystra as being at all events the home of Timothy, if not his birthplace. There is no reason why the Gaius mentioned as of Macedonia, xix. 29, should be identified with the Gaius of xx. 4. Gaius was a very common name, and in the N.T. we have apparently references to four persons bearing the name. Blass however refers Δέρβης in xx. 4 to Timothy.—ὑίος γυναικὸς τ. ἱουδ. πιστῆς Τ. δὲ Ἐ.: such marriages although forbidden by the law, Ezra x. 2, were sanctioned under certain conditions, cf. xxiv. 24 in the case of Drusilla, wife of Aziz, king of Emesa (see also C. and H., p. 203), who became a proselyte and actually accepted circumcision. In the Diaspora such marriages would probably be more or less frequent, especially if the husband became a proselyte. In this case even if he were ranked as one,
it could only have been as a "proselyte of the gate," otherwise Timothy would surely have been circumcised. We cannot argue from the fact that the boy had been trained in the Jewish Scriptures that his father was a proselyte, for the early training of the child was evidently the work of the mother, 2 Tim. iii. 15. But such a duty according to Jewish law rested primarily upon the father, and the fact that the father here is described as a Greek, without any qualifying adjective as in the case of the wife, indicates that he was a heathen, see Weiss, in loco: Eilersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 115. The mother, Eunice (on spelling see Hastings' B.D.), may conceivably have been a proselyte, as the name is Greek, as also that of Lois, but 'louð, seems to indicate that she was a Jewess by birth. Whether she was a widow or not we cannot say, although there is some evidence, see critical note, which points to the influence of some such tradition. On the picture of a Jewish home, and the influence of a Jewish mother, see Eidersheim, *u. s.*—παρθένος: Lydia uses the same term of herself in ver. 15. Both mother and son were probably converted in St. Paul's former visit, and there is no reason to suppose with Nösgen that the conversion of the latter was a proof of the growth of the Church in the Apostle's absence.

Ver. 2. ἔμαρτυρείτο, cf. vi. 3, x. 22, xxii. 13. The good report which may well have been formed to some extent by the aptitude and fitness which Timothy had shown in the Church during St. Paul's absence may also have helped the Apostle in the selection of his future companion. The union of Lystra and Iconium is quite natural for common intercourse, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 178. There is no reason to suppose with Rendall that Iconium would be the home of Eunice, as the synagogue and principal Jewish colony were there, see Eidersheim, *u. s.*

Ver. 3. περιέτεμεν αὐτόν: the act might be performed by any Israelite; cf. Gen. xvii. 23 for a similar phrase which may indicate that St. Paul performed the act himself. See also Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii., 674; the marriage and the exemption of Timothy from the Mosaic law may be regarded as typical of a relaxation of the exclusive Jewish standard in Lycaonia and Phrygia, and an approximation of the Jew to the pagan population around him, confirmed as it is by the evidence of inscriptions. —διὰ τού· 'l.: the true answer to the objection raised against Paul's conduct may be found in his own words, 1 Cor. ix. 20 (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 19). As a missionary he would have to make his way amongst the unbelieving Jews in the parts which were most hostile to him, 11., Antioch and Iconium, on his road into Asia. All along this frequented route of trade he would find colonies of Jews in close communication, and the story of Timothy's parentage would be known (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 180). But if so, his own usefulness and that of Timothy would be impaired, since his Jewish countrymen would take offence at seeing him in close intercourse with an uncircumcised person (a reason which McGilbert admits to be conceivable, *Apostolic Age*, p. 232), and Timothy would have been unacceptable to them, since with a Jewish mother and with a Jewish education he would be regarded as one who refused to adhere to the Jewish rule: "partus sequitur ventrem" (see Wetstein and Nösgen), and to remedy the one fatal flaw which separated him from them: see, however, B. Weiss, *Die Briefe Pauli an T.*, Introd., p. 2, who disagrees with this reason, whilst he lays stress on the other reason mentioned above. On the other hand, both among unbelieving and Christian Jews alike the circumcision of Timothy would not fail to produce a favourable impression. Amongst the former the fact that the convert thus submitted even in manhood to this painful rite would have afforded the clearest evidence that neither he nor his spiritual father despised the seal of the covenant for those who were Jews according to the flesh, whilst the Christian Jews would see in the act a loyal adherence to the Jerusalem decree. It was no question of enforcing circumcision upon Timothy as if it were necessary to salvation; it was simply a question of what was necessary under the special circumstances in which both he and Paul were to seek to gain a hearing for the Gospel on the lines of the Apostolic policy: "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek"; "neque salutis æternae causa Timotheus circumciditur, sed utilitatis,"
γὰρ ἀπαντᾷς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, διὸ ἂν ἦν ὑπήρχεν. 4. ὡς δὲ διεσπεραύοντο τὰς πόλεις, παρεδίδον ματαίοις φυλάσσον τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβύτερων τῶν ἰερουσαλήμ. 5. αἱ μὲν οὖν εκκλησίαι οὕτως ἔπιστευον ἐπερίσσευον τὰς εντολὰς τῶν αποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἱερουσαλήμ.


2 D, Gig. read διερχόμενοι δε τὰς πόλεις; D, Syr., Α-, Β-, Λ, V, D, Βlass follow ζ. 

Blass, cf. Godet, Epître aux Romains, i., pp. 43, 44; Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 85-87; Knabenbauer, in loco. “There is no time in Paul’s life when we should suppose him less likely to circumcise one of his converts,” says McGiffert, u. s., p. 233, but there were converts and converts, and none has pointed out more plainly than McGiffert that the case of Titus and that of Timothy stood on totally different grounds, and none has insisted on this more emphatically than St. Paul himself: ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ Τίτος, Gal. ii. 3. The case of Titus was a case of principle: Titus was a Greek, and if St. Paul had yielded, there would have been no need for the Apostle's further attendance at the conference as the advocate of freedom for the Gentile Churches. In the words ἂν ἦν, Gal. ii. 3, there may have been a tacit allusion to the different position of Timothy, whose parentage was different, and not wholly Gentile as in the case of Titus. For a defence of the historical nature of the incident as against the strictures of Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, Weizsäcker, see Wendt, 1898 and 1899, who regards St. Paul's action as falling under the Apostle's own principle, 1 Cor. ix. 14. ὑπήρχεν: Blass translates fuerat, and sees in the word an intimation that the father was no longer living, otherwise we should have ὑπήρχει, cf. Salmon, Hermathena, xxiii., p. 229.

Ver. 4. A proof of St. Paul's loyalty to the Jerusalem compact. The decree had not been delivered in Syria and Cilicia (where the letter had been already received), but in Galatia St. Paul delivers it. Wendt regards vv. 4 and 5 as interpolated by the author, who desires to give a universal importance to the decree which had previously been read to a few specified Churches (so too Spitta, Jüngst, Hilgenfeld, Clemen, who refers the verses to his Redactor Antijudaicus). But St. Paul might well feel himself bound to deliver the decree to the Churches evangelised by him before the conference in Jerusalem. Weiss, therefore, is probably right in pointing out that as no mention is again made of any similar proceeding, the action was confined to the Pauline Churches which had been previously founded, Churches which were, as it were, daughter Churches of Antioch.

—δόγματα: in the N.T. only in Luke and Paul (cannot be supported in Heb. xi.23), and only here of the decrees of the Christian Church relative to right living, cf. Ignat., Magnes., xiii., 1; Didachi, xi., 3. In 3 Macc. i. 3 it is used of the rules and requirements of the Mosaic Law, cf. its use by Philo, see further Plummer on Luke ii. 1, and Grimm, sub τ'. Dr. Hort refers the word back to xv. 22, ἀποφέρων, and so xvi. 14 (on έκκλησία), used by St. James. In these expressions he sees “more than advice,” but “less than a command,” and so here he regards “resolutions” as more nearly expressing the force of this passage, Ecclesia, pp. 81, 82; see however above on xv. 19.

Ver. 5. αἱ μὲν οὖν εὐκ.: the last time εὐκλησία is used by St. Luke, except of the Jerusalem Church, and in the peculiar case of the elders at Ephesus, Hort, Ecclesia, p. 95. Rendall, Appendix, μὲν εὐκ. p. 165, connects this verse with the following paragraph, cf. ix. 31, so apparently Blass in β.—ἐστερεοῦτο: only used in N.T. in Acts, cf. iii. 7, 16, and only here in this figurative sense, and it is very possible that St. Luke as a medical man might thus employ the verb which he had twice used in its literal sense, cf. similar instances in Hobart's Introd., p. xxxii.; here as in vi. 7, ix. 31, we have the outward growth of numbers and the inward in the stead-
6. Διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες ἕπά τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος λαλήσαι τῶν λόγων ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ. 

1 διελθόντες κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπεραζόν κατὰ τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορεύεσθαι καὶ οὕκειον.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ΧVΙ.

είσαι αυτού το Πνεύμα. 8. παρελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν, κατέβησαν εἰς Τροάδα. 9. καὶ δραμα διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ὀφθη τῷ Παύλῳ: ἀνήρ τις ἦν Μακεδών ἐστώς, παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων, Διαβάσει εἰς Τρωάδα.

1 For παρελθόντες D, Gig., Vulg. read διελθόντες, so Blass ("recte") in α and β. But the meaning of παρέλθ. is disputed. In its ordinary sense of "passing alongside" it can hardly stand, or even "passing along Mysia" i.e., on border of Mysia and Bithynia (Weiss, Codex D, p. 26), as the travellers to reach Troas would pass through Mysia, see below in comment. It seems unlikely that διελθ,—a common word,—should be changed to παρελθ.—the converse is far more probable; see also Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 83, note. For κατέβησαν D has καταβάθησαν: "nos venimus," Iren., iii., 14, 1; see especially Harris, u. s., pp. 64, 65.

2 In R.V. (ανήρ) Μακεδών τις ην, so HBADCD 13, 31, 61, Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; μακ. τις, των ην ΔΕ; so D reads also εν οραματι, and before ανήρ D, Syr.-Pesh., Sah. insert ωσει. After εστώς D, Syr.-Harcl. mg., Sah. add κατα προσωπον αυτου. Belser points out that the phrase occurs only in Luke, Luke ii. 13, Acts iii. 13, xxv. 16, and regards it as original; but see also Corssen, ηs.s., pp. 436, 437, who compares α and β, and holds that in the latter the reviser has purposely added words for clearness in the description. Blass in β and Hilg. both read these additions.

see further Askwith, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 46, 1899.

Ver. 7. κατά τὴν Μ.: "over against Mysia," R.V., i.e., opposite Mysia, or perhaps, on the outskirts of Mysia, cf. xxvii. 7, and Herod., i., 76, κατά Σινώπην, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 194, Wendt, p. 354 (1888), and Gifford, u. s., p. 13. If we read εις for κατά (2), it means that they endeavoured to go out of Asia into the Roman province Bithynia on the north, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 195.—ἐπείραζον: for a similar use of the verb cf. ix. 26, xxiv. 6.—τὸ Πνεύμα, add Ἡσυχας, see critical note. Doctrinally, the expression shows that the Spirit may be called the Spirit of Christ, Rom. viii. 9, or of Jesus, no less than the Spirit of God, Rom., i., Matt. x. 20; see Westcott, Historic Faith, p. 106.

Ver. 9. καὶ δραμα: used by St. Luke eleven times in Acts elsewhere (in N.T. only once, Matt. xvi. 19), three times in i.-xii., and eight times in xii.-xxviii. (see Hawkins, Hexa Syntopica, pp. 144, 145). But St. Luke never uses δραμα; sometimes δια νυκτός as here, sometimes δια alone. It is quite arbitrary on the part of Baur, Zeller, Overbeck to interpret this as a mere symbolical representation by the author of the Acts of the eagerness of the Macedonians for the message of salvation; see as against this view not only Wendt and Zöckler but Spitta, p. 331. Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol., ii., p. 189, 1896, thinks that the "author to Theophilus" here used and partly transcribed an account of one of the oldest members of the Church of Antioch who had written the journey of St. Paul partly as an eye-witness, and see for the question of the "We" sections Introduction.—ἀνήρ τις ἦν Μ.: Ramsay,
Macedoniam boēthēsōn ὑμῖν. 10. ὲδὲ τὸ ὄραμα εἶδεν, εὐθέως 
ζητήσαμεν εξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν, συμβιβάζοντες δὴ προσ-
κεκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτούς. 11. Ἀνακεχεῖται 
οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς Τροάδος, εὐθυδρομήσαμεν εἰς Σαμοθράκην, τῇ τε 

1 D, Sah. read διεγερθείς, not διεγερθεῖς. see on ix.22.

Ver. 11. Ἀναχθέντες, see on xiii.13.

εὐθυδρομήσαμεν: only in Acts here and in xxi.1, nowhere else in N.T., not in LXX or Apocrypha but used by Philo, cf. St. Luke's true Greek feeling for the sea, Ramsay, p. 205. Strabo used εὐθύδρομος, p. 45, and elsewhere St. Luke's language may point to the influence of the great geographer; see Plumptre’s Introduction to St. Luke’s Gospel.—Σαμοθράκην: an island of the Ægean sea on the Thracian coast about half-way between Troas and Neapolis, but with adverse winds or calms the voyage from Philippi to Troas takes five days, xx. 6. Samothracia, with the exception of Mount Athos, was the highest point in this part of the Ægean, and would have been a familiar landmark for every Greek sailor, see C. and H., pp. 220, 221. —Νεάπολιν: modern Cavallo, the harbour of Philippi, lying some miles further north: Thracian, but after Vespasian reckoned as Macedonian; opposite Thasos, C. and H., p. 221; Renan, Saint Paul, p. 139.—τή τε ἐπιούσῃ, sc., ἡμέρα, cf. xx. 15, xxii. 18, with ἡμέρα added, vii. 26, xiii. 11, so too in classical Greek, Polyb., Jos.: in N.T., phrase only found in Acts: mark the exact note of time.

Ver. 12. ἕκειδέν τε εἰς Φ.: on or near the site of Krenides (Wells or Fountains), so called from its founder Philip, the father of Alexander the Great. Near Philippi, Octavius and Anthony had decisively defeated Brutus and Cassius,
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ΧVΙ.

επιούση εἰς Νεάπολιν, έκειθέν τε εἰς Φιλίππους, ήτις ἔστιν πρώτῃ τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλεως κολωνία.

Ἡμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς, τῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐξήλθομεν ἐξ ἀυτῆς πόλεως παρὰ ποταμόν, οὖν ενομίζετο προσευχήν εἶναι, καὶ καθίσαντες ἔλαλομεν ταῖς συνελθούσαις.

1 Νεάπολιν, but Νεαν Πολιν ΝABBΔ, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 37; D 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. prefix τῇ δὲ επαυριον, so Blass and Hilg. If this is a revision, it is a further proof of the oft-recurring fact that the Western reviser takes nothing for granted. 2 πρώτῃ τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μ. πολις κολωνία: om. τῆς before Μ. ΝΑC 31, 4ο, 6τ, Tisch., W.Η., R.V., but retained in ΒDΗLP, so by Weiss; Β has the article before Μ. instead of before μερίδος. ΝΑC read πρώτῃ τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας π. κ.; B has πρώτη μεριδος της Μακ.; D has κεφαλη της Μακ. (so Hilg.). Blass in β (so Prov.) (see p. xx.) inserts πρώτης μερίδος της Μακ. and rejects κεφαλην, which is read in D and Syr.-Pesh., Cap. while μερίδος is omitted by D 137, Syr. Pesh. and Harcl.; see W.H., App., for Hort’s conjecture, Πιεριδος; Lightfoot, Phil., p. 50; Wendt, 1888 and 1899; and Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 100, and C. Ε. εποικία, p. 156; see additional note at end of chapter.

πολεως, but πυλης ΝABBΔ 13, 4ο, 6τ, Vulg., Sah., Boh., W.H., R.V., Weiss, so Blass and Hilg.; πολ. may have been a marginal expl. of πυλης (see Alford and Wendt). ενομίζετο προσευχήν εἶναι, so EΗLP, Amm., Chrys., Theophyl., but Ramsay and Wendt both follow Τ.Ρ.—Τisch., W.Η., Weiss, R.V. prefer ενομίζομεν προσευχήν, following ΝC 13, 4ο, 6τ, Boh., Achro. (ἐν ενομίζεν)—AB have ενομίζομεν προσευχήν, but this may testify to the originality of the nom., so D εδοκε προσευχή (Βlass in β, so Hilg.); cf. Vulg., "videbatur oratio". Ιn α text Βlass conjectures οὐ ενομίζον εν προσευχή εἶναι. Weiss maintains that in AB the ν in προσευχήν has dropped out, and regards ΝC as unquestionably correct.

and to that event it owed the honour of being made a Roman colony with the jus Italicum (R.V., "a Roman colony"), or in other words, "a miniature likeness of the great Roman people," cf. Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 51. Hence both in St. Luke’s account of the place, and in St. Paul’s Epistle we are constantly face to face with the political life of Rome, with the power and pride of Roman citizenship. But its geographical position really invested Philippi with its chief importance, thoroughfare as it was on the great Egnatian Way for the two continents of Europe and Asia. At Philippi we are standing at the confluence of the stream of Europe and Asiatic life; we see reflected in the evangelisation of Philippi as in a mirror the history of the passage of Christianity from the East to the West, Lightfoot, Phil., p. 49; Renan, St. Paul, p. 140; McGiffert, Apostolic Christianity, p. 239; Speaker’s Commentary, vol. iii., 580; C. and H., p. 202 ff.—πρώτη τῆς μερίδος, see Additional note.—κολωνία: "a Roman colony," R.V., there were many Greek colonies, αποικία or εποικία, but κολ. denoted a Roman colony, i.e., a colony enjoying the jus Italicum like Philippi at this time, governed by Roman law, and on the model of Rome; see "Colony" in B.D. and Hastings’ B.D.—ἡμεν . . . διατρ., see above on i. 10; characteristic Lucan construction.

Ver. 13. πόλεως, see critical notes, and C. and H., p. 226, note.—παρὰ ποταμόν: "by a river side," A. and R.V., see critical notes; here Ramsay sees in the omission of the article a touch of local familiarity and renders "by the river side". On the other hand Weiss holds that the absence of the article merely denotes that they supposed they should find a place of prayer, since a river provided the means for the necessary purifications.—οὖν προσευχήν εἶναι, see critical notes: "where there was wont to be held a meeting for prayer" (Ramsay); on the nominative see above. A further difficulty lies in the word ενομίζετο. Can it bear the above rendering? Rendall, p. 103, thinks that it hardly admits of it; on the other hand Wendt and Grimm compare 2 Macc. xiv. 4, and see instances of the use of the passive voice in L. and S., Herod., vi., 138, Thuc., iv., 32. Wendt renders
where there was according to custom a place of prayer". The R.V. reads "where we supposed there was a place of prayer". There is very good authority for rendering προσευχή, "a place of prayer," cf. 3 Macc. vii. 20; Philo, In Flacc., 6; Jos., Vita, 54, cf. also Juvenal, iii., 295, and Tertullian, Adv. Nat., i., 13, etc. To these instances we may add a striking use of the word in an Egyptian inscription, possibly of the third century B.C., Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, pp. 49, 50. See also Curtius, Gesammelle Abhandlungen, ii., 542. No doubt the word occurs also in heathen worship for a place of prayer, Schurer, "Jewish People," div. ii., vol. ii., p. 69, E.T., cf. also Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 214. Where there were no synagogues, owing perhaps to the smallness of the Jewish believers or proselytes, there may well have been a προσευχή, and St. Luke may have wished to mark this by the expression he chooses (in xvii. 1 he speaks of a συναγωγή at Thessalonica), although on the other hand it must not be forgotten that προσευχή might be used of a large building capable of holding a considerable crowd (Jos., u. s.), and we cannot with certainty distinguish between the two buildings, Schurer, u. s., pp. 72, 73. That the river side (not the Strymon, but a stream, the Gangas or Gangites, which flows into the larger river) should be chosen as the place of resort was very natural for the purpose of the Levitical washings, cf. also Juvenal, Sat., iii., 11, and long before Tertullian's day the Decree of Halicarnassus, Jos., Ant., xiv., 10, 23, cf. Ps. cxxxvii. 1, Ezra viii. 15, 21, cf. Plumptre's note on Luke vi. 12.—ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυν.: "which were come together," R.V., i.e., on this particular occasion; A.V. "resorted". It is noticeable that in the three Macedonian towns, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, women are specially mentioned as influenced by the Apostle's labours, and, as in the case of Lydia, it is evident that the women of Philippi occupied a position of considerable freedom and social influence. See this picture fully borne out by extant Macedonian inscriptions, which assign to women a higher social position in Macedonia than was the case for instance in Athens, Lightfoot, Philippians, pp. 55, 56; Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 224, 227, 252. In this lies an answer to the strictures of Hilgenfeld, who regards the whole of ver. 13 as an interpolation of the "author to Theophilus," and so also the expression ἵππων ἐν τὴν προσευχήν, whereas it was quite natural that Paul should go frequently to the Jewish house of prayer.

Ver. 14. Lydia: she may have taken her name "a solo natai," as Grotius and others have thought, like many of the libertinae, Afra, Graeca, Syra; but the name was a popular one for women, cf. its frequent use in Horace. Renan takes it as meaning "the Lydian," and compares Κορινθία in inscriptions, St. Paul, p. 116, cf. also Zahn, Einleitung, i., 375, but on the other hand, Nosgen, in loco.—πορφυρόπωλις: a seller of purple at Philippi of the purple dyed garments from Thyatira, which formed the finest class of her wares. It is evident that she must have possessed a considerable amount of capital to carry on this trade, and we may note that she was thus in a position to help Paul in the expenses connected with his trial, without endorsing Renan's view that she was his wife, St. Paul, p. 148; see below on xxiv. 26. The expression σεβ. τὸν Θεόν shows that she was "a proselyte of the gate"; she could easily have gained her knowledge of the Jewish religion as she was πόλεως Θυατείρων where a Jewish colony had been planted, and there is reason to believe that the Jews were specially devoted to the dyeing industry for which Thyatira and the Lydian land in general were noted. Thus the inscriptions make it certain that there was a guild of divers οἱ βαφεῖς at Thyatira, cf. Spohn, Miscell. erud. ant., p. 113; Blass in loco; Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., p. 145; Renan, St. Paul, p. 146, note; Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 375. According to Strabo, Thyatira was a Mysian town, but Pтолomy, v. 2, describes it as belonging to Lydia.—ἡκουεν: imperfect, denoting continuous hearing; the baptism would naturally follow after a period of hearing and instruction, "quod eventi aor. hēnōyeō declaratur" Blass, see also Bengel.—διήνοιξε τὴν καρδίαν, cf. xvii. 3, Eph. i. 18; in LXX, cf. Hos. ii.
κατά, προσέχοντας τοις λαλομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου. 15. ὡς δὲ ἐβαπτίσθη, καὶ ὁ ὀίκος αὐτῆς, παρεκάλεσε λέγουσα, Εἰ κεκρίκατε μὲν τοῖς λαλομένοις εἰς τὸν Παύλον, ἀναπτηθῆσαι καὶ παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς. 16. Ἡγένετο δὲ παρεμείνετο ἡμᾶς εἰς προσευχήν, καὶ οἱ πορευομένοι ἦσαν ἑνίον πνεύμα Πύθωνος ἀντανακλουμένον ἡμᾶς.

2. εἰς π., but ΝΑΒCE 13, 15, 40, 61, 180, Or. insert art. before π., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt (not Hilg.).

15 (17), 2 Μακκ. 1. 4. The verb is frequent in St. Luke, Luke xxiv. 31, 32, 45, and in ii. 23 quotation, Acts vii. 56, xviii. 3; only once elsewhere in N.T., Mark vii. 34. “To open is the part of God, to pay attention that of the woman,” Chrysostom: ὡστε καὶ θείον καὶ ανθρώπινον ἦν.—τοῖς λ. ὑπὸ τοῦ Π.: C. and H. see an indication of St. Luke’s own modesty: “we spake” in ver. 13, but now only Paul is mentioned.

Ver. 15. ὁ ὀίκος: as in the case of Cornelius, so here, the household is received as one into the fold of Christ, cf. ver. 33 and xviii. 8. We cannot say whether children or not were included, although we may well ask with Bengel: “quis credat in tot familias nullum fuisse infamtem ?” but nothing against infant baptism, which rests on a much more definite foundation, can be inferred from such cases, “Baptism,” Hastings’ B.D.P., p. 242. Possibly Euodia and Syntyche and the other women, Phil. iv. 2, 3, may have been included in the familia of Lydia, who may have employed many slaves and freed women in her trade.—ιε κεκρίκατε: almost = since you have judged me, viz., by my baptism; or ιε if instead of ιει chosen with delicate modesty.—μενετε: this has been called the first instance of the hospitality which was afterwards so characteristic of the early Church, and enforced by the words of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John alike; 1 Pet. iv. 9, Rom. xii. 13, 1 Tim. v. 10, etc., 3 John 5, cf. Clement, Cor., i., 17, and see Westcott on Heb. xiii. 2, Uihhorn, Charity in the Early Church, pp. 91, 325, E.T.; “Hospitality” in B.D.P., and Smith and Cheetham, Dict. of Christ. Antiq. Another trait is thus marked in the character of Lydia; the same generosity which afterwards no doubt made her one of the contributors to the Apostle’s necessities, as a member of a Church which so frequently helped him.

—παρεβιάσατο: only used by St. Luke, once in Luke xxiv. 29, in the same sense as here, cf. LXXI, 1 Sam. xxviii. 23, Gen. xix. 9, 2 Kings ii. 17, v. 16 (A omits). The word expresses urgency, but not compulsion (in classical Greek it is used of violent compulsion). The word may imply that Paul and his companions at first declined, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 9 (so Chrys., Bengel), although on occasion he accepted the aid of Christian friends, Phil. iv. 15, and the hospitality of a Christian host, Rom. xvi. 23; or it may refer to the urgent entreaty of Lydia in expression of her thankfulness.

Ver. 16. If we add the article την, see critical note: “to the place of prayer,” R.V.—πνεύμα Πύθωνος: in R.V., accusative, see critical note, “a spirit, a Python,” margin, i.e., a ventriloquist (Ramsay). The passage most frequently quoted in illustration is Plutarch, De defectu Orac., ix., from which it appears that ventriloquists who formerly took their name from Εὐρυκλής a famous ventriloquist (cf. Arist., Vesp., το19) were called Πύθωνες. The word ἑγγαστριμύθων, ventriloquist (Hebrew בְּן), of which Πύθων is thus used as an equivalent, is the term employed in the LXX, Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6, 27, 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, etc., for those that have a familiar spirit (cf. also the use of the two words ἑγγαστριμύθων and Πῦθων amongst the Rabbis, R. Salomo on Deut. xviii. 11, and instances in Wetstein), i.e., a man or a woman in whom is the spirit of divination; Gesenius uses בְּן for the divining spirit, the python, supposed to be present in the body of a sorcerer or conjurer,
15-17. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

17. οὗτος εἰκονίζεται τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, ἐκβάλει λέγουσα, οὕτω οἱ ἄνδρευτοι δουλοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υἱόστου εἰσὶν, σῶσιν


and illustrates from this passage in Acts, and adds that the LXX usually render

πλὴν correctly by ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, ventriloquists, since amongst the ancients this power of ventriloquism was often misused for the purposes of magic. But in addition to ventriloquism, it would certainly seem from the narrative in Acts that some prophetic power was claimed for the maiden, μαντευομένη, so Blass in describing the ἐγγαστρ. "credebatur daemon e ventre illorum logui et vatici."

τοίς κυρίοις, ver. 17, seems to imply not successive but joint owners (on the plural in Luke see Friedrich, p. 21).—μαντεύειν. μαντεύειν is used here in N.T., but it is significant that in LXX it is always employed of lying prophets of or of divination contrary to the law, e.g., Deut. xviii. 10, 1 Sam. xxviii. 8 (9), Ezek. xii. 6, xxi. 29 (34), Micah iii. 11, etc. The Greeks themselves distinguished between the two verbs and recognised the superior dignity of προφητεύειν; e.g., Plato contrasts the μάντις who more or less magic (cf. derivation μανία, μαίνομαι, thus chiefly used of Pythones, Sibyls, and the like) with the προφήτης, Timeus, 71 E, 72 A, B, Trench, Synonyme, i., 26.

Ver. 17. κατακολουθήσασα, but if we follow R.V. the present participle denotes that she continuously followed after (κατά), and kept crying (έκραζε). The verb is only used by St. Luke in N.T., cf. Luke xxiii. 35; in LXX, Jer. xviii. 16, Dan., LXX, ix. 10, 1 Esd. vii. 1; Jud. xi. 6, 1 Macc. vi. 23, but not in same literal sense as here; used by Polyb., Plut., Jos. —διδομένος placed emphatically first (see also Friedrich, pp. 10, 89). If we turn to the Gospel narratives of those possessed with evil spirits, as affording an analogy to the narrative here, we recall how Jesus had found recognition, cf. Mark i. 24, iii. 11, Luke iv. 41 (where the same verb, κράζω, is used of the ακάθαρτα πνεύματα και δαιμόνια).—τοῦ θ. τοῦ υἱός : similar title used by the demoniacs in Mark v. 7, Luke viii. 26; see Plumptre's note on former passage. Both Zeller and Friedrich note that Luke alone employs τοῦ θεοῦ of God without any word in apposition, Luke i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35, Acts v. 48, and that we have the title with τοῦ θεοῦ, both in his Gospel and Acts. (Heb. vii. 1, probably from Gen. xiv. 18.)—ἡμῖν —ἡμῖν very strongly supported, see critical note. But ἡμῖν might easily have been altered into ἡμῖν, as the former would appear to be an unfitting expression for the evil spirit: but ἡμῖν may point to that disturbed and divided consciousness which seems to have been so characteristic of the possessed (Eder schem); at one time the girl was overmastered by the evil spirit who was her real Κύριος, at another she felt a longing for deliverance from her bondage, and in ἡμῖν she associates herself with those around her who felt a similar longing for some way of salvation, for we must by no means regard her as a mere impostor (Ramsay).
καταγγέλλουσιν υμίν δύνων σωτηρίας. 18. τούτο ἐκεῖ ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας. διαποιηθεὶς δὲ ὁ Παύλος, καὶ ἐποντρέφας, τοῦ πνεύματι εἶπε, Παραγγέλω σοι εξελθείν ἀπ' αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡρῴ. 19. Ἰδὼντες δὲ οἱ κύριοι αὐτῆς, ἃτι ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς ἑργασίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβομένου τοῦ Παύλον καὶ τὸν Ἐλιακὸν εἰς τὴν ἀγοράν εἰς τοῦ άρχοντας.

1 Instead of εξ. D has ἐνα εξέλθην; instead of εἰ. αὐτῇ τῇ ἡρῷ D has εὔθεως; so Blass in β, and Hilg. Belser strongly supports D, see his remarks, Beiträge, p. 77; Blass retains changes in β.

2 Instead of στρατηγοὶ τῆς ἑργ. αὐτῶν, and adds with D πεὶ εἰσών β' αὐτής; but this spoils the play on the ἐξῆλθεν, see below.

3 ἀρχονται, but Gig., Lucif. (not D), Blass ("recte"), read στρατηγοῖς, omitting στρατηγοῖς in ver. 20.

Ver. 18. διαποιηθεῖς, only here and in iv. 2 in N.T.; its use in LXX in two passages only does not help us much, see iv. 2, and in classics it is not used in the sense required here. Aquila uses it four times of the Hebrew ἔναμ in passages which show that the word may combine the ideas of grief, pain, and anger, Gen. vi. 6, xxxiv. 7, 1 Sam. xx. 3, 34. It may be noticed that the word and other compounds of πονεῖν are frequent in medical writers.—Παραγγέλω, see on i. 4. The same strong word is used of our Lord, Luke viii. 29, where He charged another unclean spirit to come out.—ἀνάματι, see above on iii. 6, "Demonology," Hastings' B.D., where reference is made to Sayce, Hibbert Lect., pp. 302-347, as to the belief in the powerful efficacy of the name, the name meaning to an ancient Semite personal power and existence.—ἐξέλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς: the phrase occurs in Luke much more frequently than in any other N.T. writer; nine times in His Gospel of the coming out of evil spirits, as here. Rendall sees in the phrase the medical accuracy of the writer in describing the process of the cure; the evil spirit must not only come out, but depart, pp. 104, 280; it must however be remembered that St. Matthew uses the same phrase twice of the departure of evil spirits from men, xii. 43, xvii. 18. Paul charges the evil spirit to depart; it departed, and with it departed the master's hope of gain (see also Weiss, in loco).—αὐτῇ τῇ ἡρῷ: "that very hour," R.V., cf. xxii. 13, ἐν ίσο τῇ ἐποτῇ; peculiar to Luke, cf. Luke ii. 38, x. 21, xii. 12, xx. 19, xxiv. 33 (so too Friedrich, p. 37). We are not told anything further of the history of the girl, but we may well believe that she too would partake of the generous help of Lydia, and of the other Christian women at Philippi, who would see in her no longer a bondservant to the many lords who had had dominion over her, but a sister beloved in the One Lord.

Ver. 19. οτί εξῆλθεν εἰς την ἑργ. αὐτῶν: "The most sensitive part of civilized man is his pocket," Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 237, and we can see how bitter was the hostility excited both here and at Ephesus when the new faith threatened existing pecuniary profits.—ἐπιλαβ.: here with hostile intent, see above on ix. 27 and further on xvii. 19.—ἐλκυσαν: with violence, so ἔλκω in James ii. 4 (Acts xxii. 30), cf. Saul before his conversion, viii. 3, σύρων. "Everywhere money the cause of evils: O that heathen cruelty! they wished the girl to be still a demoniac, that they might make money by her! " Chrys., Hom., xxx., 5.—εἰς τὴν ἀγ.: where the magistrates would sit, as in the Roman forum.—ἀρχονται . . . στρατηγοίς: it is of course possible that the two clauses mean the same thing, and that the expressions halt, as Lightfoot and Ramsay maintain, between the Greek form and the Latin, between the ordinary Greek term for the supreme board of magistrates in any city ἀρχοντες, and the popular Latin designation στρατηγοῖ, praetores ("non licet distinguere inter ἄρχοντας et στρατηγόν," Blass, cf. O. Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt). But the former may mean the magistrates who happened to be presiding at the time in the forum, whereas the milder verb προσαγαγώντες may imply that there was another stage in the case, and that it was referred to the στρατηγοῖ, the praetors (as they
called themselves), because they were the chief magisterial authorities, and the accusation assumed a political form. Meyer and Zöckler, H. Holtzmann distinguish between the two, as if ἄρχης were the local magistrates of the town, cf. τολιτεχνης, xvii. 6. In the municipia and colonies the chief governing power was in the hands of duoviri who apparently in many places assumed the title of praetors, cf. Cicero, De Leg. Aegr., ii., 34, where he speaks with amusement of the duoviri at Capua who showed their ambition in this way, cf. Horace, Sat., i., 5, 34. A duumvir of Philippi is a title borne out by inscriptions, Lightfoot, Phil., p. 51, note; Felten, p. 315.

Ver. 20. ουτοὶ, contemptuously Ἰουδαῖοι ὄντες: If the decree of Claudius expelling the Jews from Rome had been enacted, it would have easily inflamed the minds of the people and the magistrates at Philippi against the Jews (cf. xviii. 2, so Holtzmann). Of the bad odour in which the Jews were held we have also other evidences, cf. Cicero, Pro Flacco, xxviii.: Juvenal, xiv., 96-106. On the attitude of the Romans towards the Jews see Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. xix. ff. It was of this intense feeling of hatred and contempt felt by Romans and Greeks alike that the masters of the maiden availed themselves: "causa autem alia atque prætextus causa", Blass; the real cause was not a religious but a social and mercenary one, see above on ver. 19, and Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 131; where the accusation was brought on purely religious grounds, as, e.g., at Corinth, xviii. 13, the Roman governor declined to be judge of such matters.—ἐκταράσσοντες: "exceedingly trouble" (舛), cf. LXX, Ps. xvii. 4, lxxxvii. 16, Wisd. xvii. 3, 4. see Hatch and Redpath, xvi., 7; Plut., Cor., xix., more often in classical Greek, σωτράσαντες.

Ver. 21. ἔθη: religious customs here; the charge ostensibly put forward was really that of introducing a religio illicita, licita as it was for the Jews themselves. No doubt the fact that they were Jews presented in itself no ground of accusation, but their Jewish nationality would suggest the kind of customs with which it would be easy to charge them, e.g., circumcision. The introduction of Jewish habits and mode of life included under έθη, cf. vi. 14, xxxi. 21, would upset the whole social system, so that here, as on other occasions, the missionaries suffered from being identified with their Jewish countrymen.—οὐκ ἐξεστίν ὑμῖν παραδέχεσθαι: Wetstein, in loco; Marquardt, Rom. Staatsrecht, iii., 7o, and see preceding verse, cf. xv. 5, xxxi. 21. In LXX, cf. Exod. xxiii.—Ῥωμαίοις οὖσι: in natural contrast (at the end of the sentence) to the despised Jews: as inhabitants of a Roman colonia they could lay claim to the proud title. On the force of ὑπάρχοντες and οὖσι see Alford's note in loco.

Ver. 22. συνεπέστη: only here in N.T., cf. xviii. 12, not in LXX, but cf. Num. xvi. 3, used in classical Greek, but not in same sense. No reason is given, but the ὄχλος would have been easily swayed by hatred of the Jews, and further incensed perhaps at finding an end put to their love of the revelations of fortune-telling.—περιρρήσαντες αὐτῶν τὰ ἵματα: just as there is no change of subject before ἐπιθ., so here probably what was done by the lictors is said to have been done by the magistrates. There is no need to suppose with Bengel that the praetors tore off the prisoners' clothes with their own hands. Grotius (but see on the other hand Calvin's note in loco) takes the words as meaning that the praetors rending their garments in horror at the ασέβεια, the impiety. But not only would such an act be strange on the part of Roman magistrates, but also
the verb seems to make against the interpretation; it means in classical and in later Greek to rend all round, tear off, cf. the numerous instances in Wetstein, and so it expresses the rough way in which the lictors tore off the garments of the prisoners. In 2 Macc. iv. 38 the word is used of tearing off the garments of another, see Wendt's (1888) note in loco.—ἱραβίλειν: to beat with rods: thrice St. Paul suffered this punishment, 2 Cor. xi. 23, grievous and degrading, of a Roman scourging, cf. his own words in τ Τhess. ii. 2, υβρισθέντες οίδατε εν Φιλίπποις. Nothing can be alleged against the truthfulness of the narrative on the ground that Paul as a Roman citizen could not have been thus maltreated. The whole proceeding was evidently tumultuary and hasty, and the magistrates acted with the high-handedness characteristic of the fussy provincial authorities; in such a scene St. Paul's protest may well have been made, but would very easily be disregarded. The incident in xxii. 25, which shows us how the Apostle barely escaped a similar punishment amidst the tumult and shouts of the mob in Jerusalem, and the instances quoted by Cicero, In Verr., v., 62, of a prisoner remorselessly scourged, while he cried "inter dolorem crepitumque plagarum" Civis Romanus sum, enables us to see how easily Paul and Silas (who probably enjoyed the Roman citizenship, cf. ver. 37) might have protested and yet have suffered.

Ver. 25. κατά δε το μεσονύκτιον: neuter of the adjective μεσονύκτιος, cf. xx. 7, Luke xi. 5, elsewhere only in Mark xiii. 35, often in medical writers, also in Arist. Plutarch. in LXX., Jodg. xvi. 3, A, Ruth iii. 8, Ps. cviii. 62 (Isaiah lxix. 10).—προσευχόμενοι, see on chap. xii. 12.—υμνοῦν with accusative Ηeb. ii. τα only, cf. Ephes. v. 19, Col. iii. 16, Trench, Syn., ii., 129. "Hoc erat gaudium in Spiritu sancto: in carcere ubi nec genua flectere, nec manus tollere poterant" Wetstein, cf. too the often-quoted words of Tertullian Ad Martyres, ii.: "Nihil crussent in nervo quum animus incoelo est," and Chrys., Ηom., xxxvi. "This let us also do, and we shall open for ourselves—not a prison, but heaven. If we pray, we shall be able even to open heaven. Elias both shut and opened heaven by prayer."—ἐπηκροώντο: used by Plato (Comicus), and referred to by Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 73, as one of the rare words mainly colloquial common to N. T. and the comic poets; it occurs also in Lucian, and in Test., xii., Patr. Not found in LXX (but the cognate noun of hearing so as to obey in r Sam. χν. 22). But it is peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., and it was the technical word in medical language for auscultation; the word might therefore naturally be employed by him to denote attentive hearing as God "gave songs in the night". Both verbs ύμν. and ἐπηκ. are in the imperfect; they were singing, and the prisoners were listening, when the earthquake happened.

Ver. 26. ἀφνω, see on ii. 2.—σεισμός, cf. iv. 31, where the divine nearness and presence were manifested in a similar manner; the neighbourhood and the period were conspicuous for such con-
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23—28.

ετηκροώντο δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ δεσμίοι. 26. ἄφνω δὲ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας, ὡστε σαλευθῆναι τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου 1· ἀνεψηθῆσαν τε παραχρήμα αἰ ϑυραί πᾶσαι, καὶ πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ 2 ἀνέθη. 27. ἐξυπνος δὲ γενόμενος ὡς δεσμοφύλαξ, καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνεψηθέν τὰς ϑυρας τῆς φυλακῆς, στασάμενος 5 μάχαιραν ἐμελλεν ἐαυτὸν ἀναίρεσιν, τομίζων ἐκφευγόντας τοὺς δεσμίους. 28. ἐφόνησε δὲ φωνὴ μεγάλη ὁ Παύλος λέγων, Μηδὲν πράξῃ σεαυτῷ κακὸν· ἀπαντες γὰρ ἐσμὲν ἐνθάδε.

1 ἀνεψηθῆσαν, but BCD 31, 33, 40, 180; so Lach., Alford, W.H., Blass, Weiss, Hilg. have ἄνεψηθησαν, whilst ΝΑΕ 13, 54, 61, Or., Tisch have ἤνεψηθησαν; Wendt cannot decide. 2 ἀνέθη, γ’D’ ανελυθῆ, so Hilg.

*μαχαιραν, BCD 6τ’ prefix την, so Lach., R.V., Weiss, Blass, Hilg.

vulsions of nature, cf. Plumptre on Matt. xxvii. 7, and Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 221.—παραχρήμα, see critical notes.—ἄνεψηθήσαν τε... αἰ ϑυραί πᾶσαι: any one who has seen a Turkish prison, says Prof. Ramsay, will not wonder at this; "each door was merely closed by a bar, and the earthquake, as it passed along the ground, forced the door-posts apart from each other, so that the bar slipped from its hold, and the doors swung open," and see further description on same page.—ἀνέθη, cf. xxviii. 40, nowhere else in N.T. in same sense; in LXX we have the same collocation of words in Mal. iv. 2. See also for the phrase, Plut., Alex., 73; see Winer-Schmidel, p. 101. If we ask, Why did not the prisoners escape? the answer is that a semi-Oriental mob would be panic-stricken by the earthquake, and there is nothing strange in the fact that they made no dash for safety; moreover, the opportunity must have been very quickly lost, for the jailor was not only roused himself, but evidently called at once to the guard for lights, see Ramsay's description, u.5., and the comments of Blass, in loco, and Felten, note, p. 318, to the same effect as Ramsay, that the prisoners were panic-stricken, and had no time to collect their thoughts for flight.

Ver. 27. ἐξυπνος: only here in N.T., once in LXX, 1 Esd. iii. 3, of Darius waking from sleep.—μάχαιραν: article omitted in T.R., see critical note. Weiss thinks that the omission occurs since in xii. 2, and five times in Luke, no article is found with μάχαιρα. την = his sword, cf. Mark xiv. 47.—μιμελλεν, cf. iii. 3, v. 35, xii. 6, etc., characteristic Lucan word, see Friedrich, p. 12. The act was quite natural, the act of a man who had lost in his terror his self-control (Weiss).—λαυτὸν ἀναίρεσιν: to avoid the disgraceful fate which would be allotted to him by Roman law, according to which the jailor was subjected to the same death as the escaped prisoners would have suffered (Wetstein, in loco), cf. xii. 19, xxvii. 42.—νομίζων, see on vii. 25. It seems hyper-critical to ask, How could Paul have seen that the jailor was about to kill himself? That there must have been some kind of light in the outer prison is evident, otherwise the jailor could not have even seen that the doors were open, nor is there any difficulty in supposing that Paul out of the darkness of the inner prison would see through the opened doors any one in the outer doorway, whilst to the jailor the inner prison would be lost in darkness. Moreover, as Blass notes, Paul may have heard from the jailor's utterances what he meant to do: "neque enim tacuisse putandum est" (see also Ramsay, Felten, Hackett, Lumby, in loco).

Ver. 28. μηδὲν πράξῃ σεαυτῷ κακὸν: Blass remarks that the distinction between πράσσειν and ποιεῖν is not always precisely observed in N.T., and takes it as = Attic, μ. ποιησῆς. πράσσειν is not found in St. Matthew or St. Mark, and only twice in St. John, whilst by St. Luke it is used six times in his Gospel, thirteen times in Acts, elsewhere in N.T. only by Paul. Philippi was famous in the annals of suicide (C. and H.); see also Plumptre's note in loco.—ἀπαντες γὰρ λ.: "Multa erant graviora, cur non debueret se interficere; sed Paulus id arripit, quod maxime opportunum erat" Bengel.

Ver. 29. φωτα: "lights," R.V., plural, and only in plural in later Greek, cf. 1 Macc. xii. 29, of fires in a military encampment; "the prisoners' chains were
29. aitísa de òwta euistephíse, kai éntromos genvómenos prosothpéte

tó Paulw kai té Sla · 30. kai prooagwv auótoù òw, éph, Kúrio,

tí mé deu stoíeiv òna swth; · 31. òi òe eítvon, Pístewv en tó tó Kúrion

iropóu Xristov, kai swthph sú kai d é oikov sú. · 32. kai alalhovan

auóto tó òwóv 3 tó Kúrioù, kai pása tois en tó oikia auótoù. · 33.

kai paralabwv auótoù en ékeíyn tì òph tis nuktis éleusen áp

tów plhgón, kai elamplwv auótoù kai oi auótoù pántes parakrhymba · 34.

anagwv tè auótoù ég tó oikov auótoù, paréthke trápezavn, kai

hgallassásat pawniko páisteteów tòv Thwv.

1 At beginning of verse Blass in ß prefixes akouvas de o deomofulaç (quo audito
cust. caro. Gig., Wer.).

3 D, Syr. H. mg. add (kai) tóus loiptous asphalismenous after òw, see on this

touch Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 222, who accepts it as most prob. genuine, retained by

Blass and Hilig.; Syr. H. mg. adds "appropinquavit et" (prosybhven in ß).

3 tòv K., W.H. text, R.V. marg., Blass, Wendt, Weiss, following Ν°B, read Thwv; see

Weiss, Apostelgeschichte, p. 5.

loosed, and worse chains were loosed from himself; he called for a light, but

the true heat was lighted in his own heart" Chrys., Hom., xxxvi.—elasth-

sè, cf. xiv. 14, òk. both verbs only in Luke in N.T. In LXX, cf. Amos v. 19,

Sus., ver. 26, especially the latter, found also in classical Greek.—éntromos gyn.,

see above.—prosothpète: he may have known of the words of the maiden, ver.

17, and recognised their truth in the earthquake, and in the calmness and de-

meanour of Paul; hence too his question.

Ver. 30. Kúrioù, in respect, cf. John xx. 15.—ìna swth; the word of

the maiden sôympla and the occurrence of the night may well have prompted the

question. The context, ver. 31, seems to indicate the higher meaning here, and

the question can scarcely be limited to mere desire of escape from personal

danger or punishment. On the addition in D see critical note.

Ver. 31. òi tòv K.: "non agnoscunt se dominos" Bengel—they point him to

the One Lord.—óikov . . . óikov: the first word is most frequently used in Attic

Greek, and in the N.T. for household, cf. ver. 15, but both words are used in

Attic, and in the N.T., for familia. òs òai d óikov sú: "and thou shalt be

saved, thou and thy house," R.V., not as if his faith could save his household, as

A.V. might imply, but that the same way was open to him and to them (Alford, see also Meyer-Wendt, and

Page).

Ver. 32. kai alalhovan: before baptism instruction.

Ver. 33. òi ékeíyn tè òph tis nuktis, cf. ver. 18, "at that hour of the night";

the jailor will not delay for a moment his first Christian duty, Matt. xxv. 36.—

éleusen áp tón plhgón: "and washed them of their stripes," Ramsay; i.e., the

stains of the wounds caused by the lictors (for similar construction of ìávem apó see

Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 54). Hobart, p. 112, compares Galen's words,

tò aíma tò tetramónou méron ìávem apó-

plaïvai.—kai oi auótoù pánteis: for the bearing of the words on Infant Baptism,

see on ver. 15. It may of course be said that the expression evidently implies the

same persons who are instructed in ver. 32, but it cannot be said that the phrase

may not include any other members of the household. The two washings are

put in striking juxtaposition: the waters of baptism washed the jailor from deeper

stains and more grievous wounds than those of the lictors' rods, Chrys., Hom.,

xxxvi.—parakrhymba, emphatic, see above on p. 106.

Ver. 34. anagwv tè auótoù: te closely connects this second proof of his

thankfulness with the first anav: "he brought them up into," R.V.; Blass

thinks that the anav means that he brought them up from underground, but it may

simply mean that the house was built over the prison; see also Knabenbauer

in loco.—paréthke trápe.: the phrase is a classical one, so in Homer, also in

Polyb.; so in Homer a separate table is assigned to each guest, Ody., xvii., 333;

xxii., 74. But the word is also used a

implying the meal on the table, see L.
35. Ημέρας δὲ γενομένης ἀπέστειλαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ τοὺς ῥαβδοῦχους λέγοντες, Ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡμᾶς εἰκένους. 36. ἀπήγγειλε δὲ δεσμοφύλαξ τοὺς λέγοντες τοὺς πρὸς τὸν Παύλον, ὅτι ἀπεστάλκαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ, ἵνα ἀπολύσητε· νῦν οὖν ἐξελθόντες πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ. 37. ὁ δὲ Παύλος ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς, Αἱ διείστατε ἡμᾶς δημοσία, ἀκατακρίτους ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας, ἐβαλον εἰς φυλακήν, καὶ νῦν λάθρα ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν; οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ ἐλθόντες αὐτοὶ

1 D, Syr. H. mg., after gen., add συνηλθονοιστρατηγοιεπι τον αυτον εις την αγοραν και αναμνησθεντες τον σεισμοντον γεγονοταεφοβηθησαν, so Βlassin β,and Ηilg. Βelserand Ζόεκλerbothdefendthisand subsequentadditionsin D as valuablein explanation of the sudden change of resolve on the part of the magistrates, butsee also Weiss, Codex D, p. 86, and Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 223. After εκεινους D 137, Syr. Harcl.add ους εχθεςπαρελαβες.

* Αfter πορευεσθε Βlass and Ηilg.omit εν ειρηνη, followingD and Gig.

**At beginning of verse Βlass, followingD, prefixes αναιτους (so Ηilg.), but brackets ακατακριτους.

and S., cf. Tobit ii. 2, παρετεθη μου ἡ τραπέζη, S. Ps. lxvii. 20. Paul makes no question about sitting at meat with the uncircumcised (Weiss).—ηγαλλιάτο: it is suggestive that St. Luke uses the cognate noun of this same verb to describe the intense exulting gladness of the early Church at Jerusalem in their social life, ii. 46—here was indeed an Agape, a Feast of Love, cf. 1 Pet. i. 6, 8, iv. 13 (Matt. v. 12, Rev. xix. 7); in St. Luke the word occurs twice in his Gospel, i. 47, x. 21, and in Acts ii. 26, quotation (see above); not found in classical Greek, but formed probably from ἡγάλλωμαι, Hellenistic, often in LXX. At the same time the word πεπιστευκώς, perfect participle, shows that this fulness of joy was caused by his full profession of belief, it was the joy of the Holy Ghost which followed on his baptism: “rejoiced greatly with all his house, having believed on the Lord,” gaudebat quod crediderat, Βlass (reading imperfect ἡγαλλιάτο, see critical note). See also Viteau, Le Grege du N.T., p. 194 (1893).—πανοικί(-ει), W.Η., Αpp., p. 154, cf. πανοικία, Luke xxii. 18. In LXX the word is found, Exod. i. 1, but A has πανοικία 3 Macc. iii. 27, where A has also ἡγαλλιάτο. On St. Luke’s fondness for πανοικίς and its related forms see Friedrich, p. 6. The form preferred in Attic is πανοικία. The word in text is found in Jos., Philo, and in Plato, Epιξ., p. 392 C., cf. Blass, in loco, and Πρόλεγ., p. 19.

Ver. 35. ἀπέστειλοι οἱ στρατηγοὶ: we are not told the reason of this sudden change in the action of the prætors, and no doubt the omission may fairly account for the reading in D, see critical notes. At the same time it is quite characteristic of St. Luke to give the plain facts without entering upon explanations. Meyer thinks that they were influenced by the earthquake, while Wendt rather inclines to the view that they were incited to this action, so inconsistent with their former conduct, by fresh intelligence as to their own hasty treatment of the missionaries; Ramsay combines both views, and see also St. Paul, p. 224, on the contrast brought out by St. Luke, and also on the Bezan text; see to the same effect Ζόκλερ, in loco. Βlass accounts for the change of front on the part of the prætors by supposing that they saw in the earthquake a sign that they had insulted a foreign deity, and that they had therefore better dismiss his servants at once, lest further mischief should result.—τοὺς ραβ.: · the lictors” R.V. margin, apparently as the duoviri aped the prætors, so the lictors carried the fasces and not the baculi, cf. Cicero, De Leg. Agr., ii., 34; Farrar, St. Paul, i., 493; Grimm-Thayer, sub τ., and references in Wetstein: διὰ τι λικτώ-ρεις τοὺς ραβδοῦχους ὑμῶν; Plut., Qvest. Rom. 67.

Ver. 36. οὐδὲν οὖν, Lucan, cf. x. 33, xv. 10, xxiii. 15.—ἐν εἰρήνῃ (omitted by D): the jailor may well have used the words in a deeper sense after the instruction of Paul, and his own admission to citizenship in a kingdom which was “righteousness, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost”.

Ver. 37. Διείστατε ἡμᾶς: in flagrant violation of the Lex Valeria, n.c. 509, and the Lex Porcia, n.c. 248; see also Cicero,
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ΧVΙ. ημάς εξαγαγέτωσαν. 38. ἀνήγγειλαν δὲ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ὡς ῥαβδοῦ-χοι τὰ βήματα ταῦτα. 1 καὶ ἔφοβήθησαν ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ῥωμαίοι εἰσί. 39. καὶ ἔθνες παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες ἡρώων

1 D reads at beginning of verse καὶ παραγενόμενοι μετὰ φίλων τῶν εἰς τὴν φυλακήν (εἰς τ. ψ. 137, Σyr. Η. mg.). After εξελθένυσιν the same authorities continue εἰποντες Ἡγνοησαμεν τα καθ' υμας ὅτι εστε ανδρες δικαιοι. D then continues (137, Σyr. Η. mg., Ephr.) καὶ εξαγαγοντες παρεκαλεσαν αυτους λεγοντες. Εκ της πολεως ταυτης εξελθατε, μηποτε παλιν συστραφωσιν επικραζοντες καθ' υμων (sopractically the other authorities above, followed here by Blass in β, and Hilg.). Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 224, points out that the Bezan text hits off the situation with obvious truth, and the way in which in the Ἐλληνικά cities the weak municipal government was always a danger to order, “one would gladly think this Lucan”.

Belsey draws attention to the fact that συστραφ. has a parallel in Acts xxiii.τ2; see Harris, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 26, 27, for Ephraem’s commentary on vv. 35-37, 39, and likenesses to the Bezan text. Schmiedel, Encycl. Bibl., p. 52, regards this passage as plainly derived from a fusion of two texts, and as militating strongly against Blass.

In Verrem, ν., 57, 66, it was the weightiest charge brought by Cicero against Verres. To claim Roman citizenship falsely was punishable with death, Suet., Claudio., xxv. — ἀκατάκριτος: “uncondemned” gives a wrong idea, cf. also xxii. 25, although it is difficult to translate the word otherwise. The meaning is “without investigating our cause,” res incognita, “causa cognita multi possunt absolvı; incognita quidem condemnari nemo potest,” Cicero, In Verrem, i., 9, see also Wetstein, in loco. The word is only found in N.T., but Blass takes it as= Attic, ἄκριτος, which might be sometimes used of a cause not yet tried. The rendering “uncondemned” implies that the flogging would have been legal after a fair trial, but it was illegal under any circumstances, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 224.

—βηματις contrasted with λάβρα, so a marked contrast between βαλον εἰς φυλ. and ἐκβάλλουσιν.—Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας: “Roman citizens as we are,” the boast made by the masters of the girl, ver. 21. St. Paul, too, had his rights as a Roman citizen, see below on xxii. 28. The antithesis is again marked in the Apostles’ assertion of their claim to courtesy as against the insolence of the praetors— they wish ἐκβάλλειν λάβρα; nay, but let them come in person (αυτοι), and conduct us forth (ἐξαγαγέτωσαν).—

—νυ γδρ: non profecto: Blass, Grammatik, pp. 268, 269, “ut saepe in responsis,” see also Page, in loco.—ἰδωσ: not only his sense of justice, but the fact that the public disgrace to which they had been subjected would seriously impede the acceptance of the Gospel-message, and perhaps raise a prejudice to the injury of his Philippian converts, would prompt Paul to demand at least this amount of reparation. Wetstein’s comments are well worth consulting.

Ver. 38. ἀνήγγειλαν, see critical notes. — ἐφοβήθησαν, so the chief captain, χxii. 29; and no wonder, for the illegal punishment of Roman citizens was a serious offence. If convicted, the magistrates would have been degraded, and incapable in future of holding office; cf. Cicero, In Verrem, ν., 66; Rep., ii., 31; and see Blass, note on xxii. 29, Grotius, in loco, and O. Holtzmann, Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 99. In A.D. 44 the Rhodians had been deprived by Claudius of their privileges for putting some Roman citizens to death (Speaker’s Commentary, in loco).

Ver. 39. See addition in D, critical note. The fear of a further riot expressed by the magistrates is exactly what we should expect in the cities of the Ἐλληνικά lands, which were always weak in their municipal government. D also expresses the naive way in which the magistrates not only try to throw the blame upon the people, but wanted to get out of a difficulty by procuring the withdrawal from the city of the injured parties, Ramsay, ν. s. p. 224. The Greek pointedly and dramatically expresses the change in the whole situation: ηλόντες—παρεκάλεσαν—ἐξαγαγόντες ἡρώων! (Wendt).

Ver. 40. εἰς, see critical notes; they would not leave the city without once more visiting the household out of which grew the Church nearest to St. Paul; see Lightfoot’s remarks on the growth of the Church from “the Church in the house,” Philippians, pp. 57, 58.—ἐξηλθον: the third person indicates that the narrator of the
After adelphous D adds διηγησαντο οσα εποιησεν Κυριος αυτοις, so Blass in β, and Hilg.

"We" section, xvi. 9, 10, remained at Philippi, Timothy probably accompanying Paul and Silas. In xx. 5 we again have ημλας introduced, and the inference is that St. Luke remained at Philippi during the interval, or at least for a part of it; and it is reasonable to infer that he laboured there in the Gospel, although he modestly refrains (as elsewhere) from any notice of his own work. The Apostle's first visit to Philippi represented in epitome the universality of the Gospel, so characteristic of St. Luke's record of our Lord's teaching, and so characteristic of the mind of St. Paul. Both from a religious and social point of view the conversions at Philippi are full of significance. The Jew could express his thankfulness in his morning prayer that God had not made him a Gentile—a woman—a slave. But at Philippi St. Paul taught in action the principle which he enforced in his Galatian Epistle, iii. 28, and again in writing to the Colossians, iii. 11: "Christ was all and in all"; in Him the soothsaying slave-girl, the proselyte of Thyatira, the Roman jailor, were each and all the children of God, and fellow-citizens with the saints, Lightfoot, Introduction to Philippians; Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, pp. 15, 26, 137 (second edition).

The narrative of St. Paul's visit to Philippi has been made the object of attack from various quarters. Most of the objections have been stated and met by Professor Ramsay, and a summary of them with their refutation is aptly given in a recent article by Dr. Giesekke (Studien und Kritiken, 1898) described at length in the Expository Times, March, 1898, see also Knabenbauer, pp. 292, 293. The view that the narrative is simply a fiction modelled upon the escape of St. Peter in iv. 31 and xii. is untenable in face of the many differences in the narratives (see the points of contrast in Nosgen, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 315, 316). (Schneckenburger in his list of parallels between Peter and Paul in Acts apparently makes no mention of the supposed parallel here.) Zeller's attempt to connect the narrative with the story in Lucian's Toxaris, c. 27, is still more absurd, cf. Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 262 (second edition), and Farrar, St. Paul, i., 501, whilst more recently Schmiedel (1898) attempts to find a parallel in Euripides, Bacchae, 436-441, 502, 602-628, see Wendt's note, p. 282 (1899). Weizsäcker boldly refuses to admit even the imprisonment as a fact, and regards only the meeting of Paul with the soothsayer as historical. But it should be noted that he allows the Apostle's intercourse with Lydia and his instruction of the women to be genuine historical incidents, and he makes the important remark that the name of Lydia is the more credible, since the Philippian Epistle seems to support the idea that women received Paul and contributed to the planting of the Church (Apostolic Age, i., 284, E.T.). Holtzmann represents in a general manner the standpoint of modern advanced criticism, when he divides the narrative of the events at Philippi into two parts, the one concerned with events transacted under the open heaven, belonging not only to the "We" source but bearing also the stamp of reality, whilst the other part is not guaranteed by the "We" source, and is full of legendary matter. Thus vv. 25-34 are dismissed as a later addition, and Ramsay's fresh and careful explanations are dismissed by Holtzmann as "hummbug"! Theologische Literaturzeitung, No. 7, 1899.

Additional Note. — Chap. xvi. 12, "which is a city of Macedonia, the first of the district," R.V. This might mean, so far as πρώτη is concerned, that Philippi was the city nearest in the district, and the city which they first reached. Neapolis, which actually came first on the route, was not generally regarded as Macedonian but Thracian; so Lightfoot, Rendall, O. Holtzmann. Or it might also mean that it was "the chief" (A.V.), the leading city of its division of Macedonia (Ramsay). Here again Ramsay sees a proof of St. Luke's intimate acquaintance with the rivalries of the Greek cities, and of his special interest in Philippi. In B.C. 167 the province Macedonia had been divided by the Romans into four districts, μαρί, and even if this division were obsolete at the time, another would be
likely to succeed to it (so Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158, as against Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 50, who takes πρώτη as denoting not the political but the geographical position of Philippi.) At this time Amphipolis was the chief (πρώτη) city of the district to which both it and Philippi belonged, but though Amphipolis held the rank, Philippi claimed the same title, a case of rivalry between two or even three cities which often occurred. This single passage Ramsay regards as conclusive of the claims of Philippi, see *St. Paul*, p. 207, and *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii., 429. As to whether μερίς can be used in the sense of a division of a province, cf. Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158, and the instances quoted from Egypt, and also *Expositor*, October, 1897, p. 320, as against Hort's limitation of the term. Hort, W.H., App. 96 (to whose view Rendall inclines, cf. also Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 375), thinks that μερίδος must be a corruption, and proposes Πιερίδος, Pieria being an ancient name of that part of Macedonia; but he declines to draw any positive conclusion in its favour. Wendt, following Meyer, regards πρώτη as signifying rank, and so far he is in agreement with Ramsay. But as Amphipolis was really the chief town of the district, he contends that πόλις κολωνία might be taken as one phrase (see also Hackett, *Overbeck*, Weiss, Holtzmann), and so he regards the whole expression as signifying that Philippi is spoken of as the most considerable colony-town in that district of Macedonia, whilst he agrees with Hort and Lightfoot in maintaining that πρώτη is only classical as an absolute title of towns in Asia Minor. This Ramsay allows, but the title was frequent in Asia and Cilicia, and might easily have been used elsewhere, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 156; Holtzmann quite admits that the term may have been applied as in Asian towns to signify the enjoyment of certain privileges. For Ramsay's criticism of Codex D, which substitutes κεφαλή τῆς M. and omits μερίδος altogether, see *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 156, 157, and *Expositor*, u. s., κεφαλή being evidently substituted because the term πρώτη is ambiguous, and so liable to be misunderstood. Blass himself finds fault with D, and also considers πρώτη wrong, not only because Amphipolis was superior in rank, but because Thessalonica was called πρώτη Μακεδόνων, C. T. Gr., 1967. But this would not prevent the rivalry amongst other towns in the various subdivisions of the province. Blass reads in β πρώτης μερίδος (a reading which Lightfoot thinks might deserve some consideration, though unsupported, if the original Roman fourfold division of the provinces were still maintained, see above, p. 355), and takes it as referring to Philippi as a city of the first of the four regions.

CHAPTER XVII.—Ver. 1. διοδεύσαντες δε: "and they went along the Roman road" (Ramsay): verb only found in Luke, Luke viii.1, and here, but frequent in LXX, and used also by Polyb. and Plut., cf. *Genesis* xiii.17, etc., so in I Macc. three times. The famous road, the *Via Egnatia*, Horace, Sat., i., 5, 97, extended for a distance of over five hundred miles from the Hellespont to Dyrrhachium; it was really the continuation through Macedonia of the *Via Appia*, and it might be truly said that when St. Paul was on the Roman road at Troas or Philippi, he was on a road which led to the gates of Rome; see some interesting details in C. and H., p. 244. The article "certam atque notam viam designat," Blass, *in loco.*, and *Gram.*, p. 149, but see also Weiss, *in loco.—Ἄμφ., thirty-two or thirty-three miles from Philippi. The *Via Egnatia* passed through it (cf. C. and H., and Hackett, *in loco*). The import of its name may be contained in the term applied to it, *Thuc.*, iv., 102, *περιφανής*, conspicuous towards sea and land, "the all around [visible] city"; or the name may simply refer to the fact that the Strymon flowed almost round the town, *Thuc.*, u. s. Its earlier name, "Nine Ways," *ʼΕννέα ὁδόι*, *Thuc.*, i., 100: Herod vii., 114, indicated its important position, and no doubt this occasioned its colonisation by the Athenians in B.C. 437. In the Peloponnesian War it was famous as the scene of the battle in which both Brasidas
2. κατὰ δὲ τὸ εἰώθης τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία \(1\) διελέγετο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν. 3. διανοίγων καὶ παρατίθε μεν, ὅτι ἃν Χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστήναι ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὅτι

\(1\) διελέγετο (\(πρὸ \; αὐτοῦ\), which Meyer retains) DRIVER 13, 61, 103, Syr. P. and H., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; διελέγον, Hilg. with D.

and Cleon fell, Thuc., v., 6-11, whilst for his previous failure to succour the place, Thucydides had himself been exiled (Thuc., i., 26). From the Macedonians it passed eventually into the hands of the Romans, and in B.C. 167, Aemilius Paulus proclaimed the Macedonians free and Amphipolis the capital of the first of the four districts into which the Romans divided the province (Liv., xlv., 18, 29). In the Middle Ages, Popolus, now Neochori: B.D., and Hastings’ B.D., C. and H. The route may well have been one of the most beautiful of any day’s journey in St. Paul’s many travels, Renan, St. Paul, pp. 154, 155.—Ἀπολλωνίαν: to be carefully distinguished from the more celebrated Apollonia in Illyria—apparently there were three places in Macedonia bearing this name. The Antiochene Itinerary gives it as thirty miles from Amphipolis, and thirty-seven from Thessalonica, but the other authorities, for example, the Jerusalem Itinerary, differ a little. The Via Egnatia passed through it, and the name is probably retained in the modern Polis. It is quite possible that the two places are mentioned as having formed St. Paul’s resting-place for a night, see references above.—Θεσσαλονίκην: Saloniki; formerly Therme; the name had been most probably changed by Cassander in honour of his wife Thessalonica, the sister of Alexander the Great. Polyb., ii., 20. Under the Romans it became the capital of the second of the four districts of Macedonia Provincia (Liv., xlv., 29), and later it was made the metropolis of the whole when the four districts were united into one. It was the largest as well as the most populous city in Macedonia, and like Ephesus and Corinth it had its share in the commerce of the Egean. From its geographical position it could not cease to be important; through the Middle Ages it may fairly be described as the bulwark of Christendom in the East, and it still remains the second city in European Turkey. St. Paul, with his usual wisdom, selected it as marking a centre of civilisation and government in the district: “posita in gremio imperii Romani,” as Cicero says. C. and H., p. 247 ff.; Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 151; Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 253 ff.; Schaff-Herzog, Encycl., iv.—ὅπου ἦν ἡ συν.: implying that there was no synagogue at Amphipolis or Apollonia, the former being a purely Hellenic town, and the latter a small place. ὅπου may = ὁ simply, but if distinguished from it implies oppidum tale in quo esset (as in distinction to the other places named): see Wendt and Blass. In Agrippa’s letter to Caligula we have plain evidence of the existence of Jews in Macedonia, O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 180; Schürer, jüdische People, div. ii., vol. ii., E.T., pp. 222, 232. As the name remains in the modern Saloniki, manent Judaica quoque (Blass). C. and H., 250, see also in this connection, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 236.

Ver. 2. κατὰ τὸ εἰώθης: phrase peculiar to St. Luke, only here and in Luke iv. 16. St. Paul follows his usual principle: “to the Jew first.”—ἐπί σάββατα τρία: “for three Sabbath days” or “weeks,” R.V., margin, the latter strongly supported by Zahn, Einleitung, i., 152. This may be the exact period of work within the synagogue. For ἐπί cf. iii. 1, iv. 15, xiii. 31, xvi. 18, etc.; Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 152, used in the “We” sections, and also predominantly, though not exclusively, in the rest of Acts or Luke or either of them; see on Acts xxvii. 20, xxviii. 6; Klostermann, Vindicia Lucanae, p. 53; see also Blass, Gram., p. 133.—διελέγετο αὐτοῖς: he reasoned, rather than disputed, as the word is sometimes rendered—ten times in Acts, seven times rendered by R.V., “reasoned,” cf. also Heb. xii. 5, and twice “discoursed,” xx. 7, 9, once only “disputed,” xxiv. 12, cf. Jude 9. Here the word may point to a conversational interchange between St. Paul and his fellow-countryman (cf. ver. 17 and Mark ix. 34); so Overbeck, Holtzmann, Wendt, on the force of the verb with the dative or ἃν. That such interchange of speech could take place in the synagogue we learn from John vi. 25, 29, Matt. xii. 9. In classical Greek with the dative or ἃν the word means to converse with,
οὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, ἵνα οὖν, διὸ ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. 4. καὶ τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπείσθησαν, καὶ προσεκληρώθησαν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλω, τῶν τε ἐσεβεμένων Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλήθος, γυναικῶν τε τῶν τοῦ ἡσυχίου.

1 o Χρ. Ι., so HLP and most mins., Theophyl., but B has o Χρ. o Ι., so W. H. text, Weiss, Wendt, R.V., Blass in α.; Ν, so Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm. comm. have Ι. Χρ.; AD ch. 1, so Tisch., W. H. marg., so Hilg. with comma after Χ.; Χρ. o Ι., so E 32, 177, 180. Probably the many changes arose from the unusual description in B with the double article.

3 σεβ. Ελλ., AD 13, 40, 51, Vulg., Boh., Gig. have σεβ. καὶ Ελλ., so Lach. This reading is defended by Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 235, and Hilgenfeld, Zwe.Tb., 1896, p. 198, so in 1899, Acta Apost. (but not by Blass in B text); see notes in comment. Wendt (1899) finds a solution of the reading in the wish to express that Paul won converts amongst other Gentiles than the proselytes, γυναικῶν τε, but D, Gig. σεβομένων Ελλήνων πολύπληθος, γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρωτῶν. Probably the reviser took πρωτῶν as referring only to the men, and thought that the expression meant "wives of the chief men" (so too Weiss explains the words), and then altered above to bring out this sense more clearly. πρωτῶν of course could be taken as masc., but better to refer it to γυν., = εὐσχ., xiii. 50, xvii. 12 (Wendt, 1899). Belser, however, pp. 81, 82, strongly supports the originality of D; he points out that in Acts we never have the expression τῶν πρωτῶν used of women, and that the reading in D harmonises with the thought that the influence of these women as wives of the leading citizens may account for the mild treatment of the Apostles.

to argue, and thus in Xen., Mem., i., 6, 1, ii., 10, 1, we have the construction διαλ. τ. τινος or πρὸς τινα to discuss a question with another, so that the word might easily have the meaning of arguing or reasoning about a question, but not of necessity with any hostile intent; even in Heb. xii. 5 it is the fatherly παράκλησις which reasoneth with sons. Blass supports the imperfect as in T.R., Gram., p. 186 παρακλῆσιν, i.e., drawing his proofs from them, or if a discussion is meant, starting from them; Winer-Moulton, xlvii., Grothusius, Overbeck, Kuinoel, Weiss, Wendt take the word with διανοίγων.

Ver. 3. διανοίγων, sc., αὐτὰς, a favourite word with St. Luke, cf. xxvi. 14; here, as in Luke xxiv. 32, 45, he alone uses it of making plain to the understanding the meaning of the Scriptures, "opening their meaning"—καὶ παραπέμπω "and quoting to prove" (Ramsay), i.e., bringing forward in proof passages of Scripture; so often amongst profane writers in a similar way, instances in Wetstein; lit., the word means "to set forth," and this was the older English meaning of allege; in middle voice, to set forth from oneself, to explain; to quote in one's own favour, as evidence, or as authority, "Non other auctor allege I," Chaucer, Hours of Fame, 374.—τὸν Χ. οὗτός έδειπν: "that it behoved the Christ to suffer," R.V., cf. Luke xxiv. 25, 46; now as ever "to the Jews a stumbling-block," see above on p. 113, and cf. xxvi. 23; so also in writing to the Thessalonian Church the Apostle insists on the same fundamental facts of Christian belief, i. Thess. iv. 14.—καὶ διὰ οὕτως κ.τ.λ.: "and that this Jesus whom, said he, I proclaim unto you is the Christ," R.V. adds of before I. The words said he are inserted because of the change of construction, cf. i. 4, xxii. 22, Luke v. 14, specially frequent in Luke. On St. Paul's preaching that "Jesus was the Christ," and what it involved, see Witness of the Epistles, p. 307 ff.

Ver. 4. προσεκληρώθησαν: "there were in addition gathered to them" (Ramsay), giving the verb a passive meaning answering to its form; or "these were allotted to them, associated with them, as disciples [by God]," cf. Ephes. i., 11. The verb is often used in Philo, also found in Plutarch, Lucian, but only here in N.T. Mr. Rendall, while pointing out that the A.V. and R.V. "consorted" gives the impression of outward association only, regards the passive aorist as a middle in meaning, and renders "threw in their lot with Paul and Silas". According to A.V. and R.V., W. H., Weiss, and Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 89, two classes seem to be mentioned besides the Jews, viz., devout Greeks, and some of the chief women. According, however, to Ramsay, comparing A and D (see p. 235, St. Paul),
5. Ζηλώσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπειθούντες ἰουδαίοι, καὶ προσλαβόμενοι τῶν ἁγοραίων τινὰς ἄνδρας πονηρούς, καὶ ὁχλοποίησαντες, ἀδορήσαν τὴν πόλιν· ἐπιστάντες τῇ οικίᾳ Ιάσονος,

we have three classes besides the Jews, viz., proselytes, Greeks, chief women (added as a climax), see critical note, but also McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 247. The difficulty in T.R. and authorities first mentioned is that their rendering restricts St. Paul's work not only to three Sabbaths or weeks, but to the synagogue and its worshippers, whereas from I Thess. i.9, ii.14, it would appear that the Church contained a large number of converted heathens. McGiffert thinks it possible that St. Luke may have only recorded the least important of Paul's labours, just as he only mentions his work in three Macedonian towns, whereas he may easily have laboured over a wider area, 1 Thess. i. 7; but see Paley, Horæ Paulinae, ix. 6, and on the reading, Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 152. In any case it would seem that a small minority of Jews is contrasted with a large number of born Gentiles, so that the Thessalonian Church may have been spoken of by St. Paul as one of Gentile Christians, who had been opposed not only to Christianity, but earlier still to Judaism, 1 Thess. i. 9, 10.—γυν. τε τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὁλίγαι: here, as at Philippi and Berœa, the three Macedonian towns, the prominence assigned to women quite in accordance with what we know from other sources; see above. The mention both here and in ver. 12 that the women were the leading high-born women intimates that the poorer women would follow the men of the lower orders, ver. 5. Dr. Hort regards the women here as the Jewish wives of heathen men of distinction, as in xiii. 50, Judaische Christianity, p. 89, but in xiii. 50 the opposition to the Apostles proceeds from these women of the higher classes, and it seems much more likely that those mentioned here were Macedonian women.

Ver. 5. ἀπειθ., see critical note.—Ζηλώσαντες: the jealousy is apparent, whether the word is read or not (cf. Β), a jealousy aroused not only by the preaching of a Messiah, but also by the success of such preaching.—προσλαβ., cf. xviii. 26 for similar sense of the verb, cf. 2 Macc. viii. 1, x. 15.—τῶν ἁγοραίων . . . πον.: "certain vile fellows of the rabble," R.V.; πον. translated in A.V. "lewed" (A.-S. loewede) means simply "people," hence (1) the common people and (2) the ignorant and rude among the people, cf. Spenser, Shep. Kal. Feb., 245: "But little ease of thy lewd tale I tasted" (Skeat); and in the sense of vicious, Ezek. xvi. 27, A. and R.V. (see Lumby's note in loco—the German Leute is the word nearest akin to it.)—ἀγορ.: hangers-on in the market-place; Blass renders "tabernarii in foro versantes," see instances in Wetstein (Aristophanes, Xen., Plut.), who compares "canalicile" hodie canaille. In Latin, subrostrani, subbasilicani; Germ. Pfästritter, our Loafer, Grimm-Thayer, Farrar, St. Paul, i., 513, and Nösgen, in loco. On the distinction sometimes but probably fancifully maintained between ἁγοραῖος and ἁγόραιος, see Alford on xix. 38; Wendt (1888), in loco; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 69; Grimm-Thayer, sub v. For the accent of πονηρός see also Winer-Schmiedel, u. s.—ἡ οἰκία: in which the Apostles were lodging, or in which the Christian assemblies were held. We know nothing further for certain of this Jason, cf. Rom. xvi. 21 where a Jason is mentioned as a companion of Paul, and amongst his συγγενεῖς. If he was a Jew, as is most probable, we may infer that his Jewish name was Joshua or Jesus, but that he used the name Jason, the nearest Greek equivalent, in his intercourse with Greeks and Hellenists; cf. for a similar change of the two names 2 Macc. i. 7, iv. 7, and cf. Jos., Ant., xii. 5, 1, where we read that Jason's real name was Joshua, but that he changed it into the
πράξεις αποστόλων 

6. μή εὑρότες δὲ αὐτοῦς, ἐστιν τὸν ἱδίον καὶ τινὰς ἀδελφοὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς πολιτάρχας, βοώτες, ὁτι οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες, οὗτοι καὶ ἐνθάδε πάρεισιν, ἢσὺ υποδείκται ἱδίον· καὶ οὗτοι πάντες ἀπέναντι τῶν δογμάτων

former, owing no doubt to his Hellenizing; see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 184, note; Wendt and Zöckler express themselves doubtfully, and hold that the name may be here a Greek name, and its bearer not a Jew at all. *ἀναστατώσαντες*, cf. iv. 1, vi. 12, Friedrich, p. 87— ὑποδέκται: to a public meeting, or to the crowd who shall inflict vengeance on them, there and then (so Weiss, Lumby); C. and H. take it of the free assembly of the people, so Ramsay. A true cause does not need such methods or supporters, “non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis.”

Ver. 6. ἐσύρον: the word indicates the violence of the mob. — πολιτάρχας: the word is an excellent instance of the accuracy of St. Luke; it is not used by any classical author of the magistrates of any city (in classical Greek we have only the form πολίαρχος and πολίταρχος), but an inscription on an arch spanning a street of the modern city has been preserved containing the title (and also containing the names which occur among the names of St. Paul's converts, Sosipater, Gaius, Secundus, see Blass, *C. I. Gr.*, 1907). The arch is assigned to the time of Vespasian, and the entablature preserved by the British consul at the instance of Dean Stanley in 1876 is in the British Museum, see Blass, *loc. cit.*, Speaker's Commentary, C. and H. (small edition), p. 258, Knabenbauer in *loco*, and for other inscription evidence, Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., 151. But more recently Burton (*Amer. Jour. of Theol.*, July, 1898, pp. 598-632) has collected no less than seventeen inscriptions on which the word πολιτάρχας or πολιταρχεῖτες (πολιταρχ-), the latter more frequently, occurs: of these thirteen are referred to Macedonia, and of these again five to Thessalonica, extending from the beginning of the first to the middle of the second century, A.D. The number of the politarchs in Thessalonica varies from five to six (see *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1899, 2, for notice of Burton's article by Schürer), and on spelling, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 82 note.—

Ver. 7. υποδείκται: no notion of secrecy as Erasmus and Bengel, but as in Luke x. 38, xix. 6; only found in these three passages in Luke, and in James ii. 25, cf. LXX, Tob. vii. 8, Jud. xiii. 13 (see Hatch and Redpath for both instances), 1 Macc. xvi. 15, and 4 Macc. xiii. 17, often in classical Greek without any notion of secrecy. — οὗτοι πάντες: the words may be taken as referring not only to Jason and the accused, but with Alford, “all these people,” i.e., Christians wherever found. — ἀναστάτωσαντες: only here in N.T. in this sense (common in LXX and Apocrypha, so also Polyb., i., 86, 3), cf. Ecclus. xxxvi. (xxxiii.) 14. —απέναντι: see on xvi. 4. The word may here refer to the successive decrees of the emperors against treason, and there is no need to refer it in this passage to the decree of Claudius, see on xviii. 2, but rather to the Julian Leges Majestatis.—

β. λέγοντες ἐτέρον εἶναι: this was the charge, the political charge of high treason, brought against our Lord Him by the Jews, Luke xxiii. 2, John xix. 12, 15. The nature of this charge may fairly point to a Jewish source, for the Jews thought of the Messiah as a king, and in their hostility to Paul they could easily accuse him of proclaiming Jesus or another king, another emperor (Ramsay), instead of Caesar; so McGiffert on this passage, “whose trustworthiness can hardly be doubted” (*Apostolic Age*, p. 246). The Epistles to the Thessalonians contain passages which might be as easily perverted in the same direction, 1 Thess. ii. 12, iv. 14, v. 2, 23; 2 Thess. i. 5-8, or the fact that Jesus was so often spoken of as Κύριος, “that deathless King Who lived and died for men” might have given colour to the charge, cf. on the
καίσαρος πράττουσι, βασιλέα λέγοντες έτερον είναι,1 ιησούν. 
8. ετάραξαν δὲ τὸν ὄχλον καὶ τοὺς πολιτάρχας ἀκούοντας ταῦτα. 
9. καὶ λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανόν παρὰ τοῦ ἱάσονος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς. 
10. οἱ δὲ αδελφοὶ εὐθὺς διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἔξερσαν τῶν τε Παύλου καὶ τὸν Σίλαν εἰς Βέροιαν: εὗτος παραγενόμενοι, εἰς

1 Before ιησούν Blass reads τινα ποτε (nescio quem) with Gig., and cod. Lat. Sangermanensis ap. Berger. Cf. xxv. 19.


Ver. 8. ετάραξαν: the people would be disturbed at intelligence which might point to a revolution, and the politarchs, lest they should themselves be liable to the same charge of treason for not defending the honour of the emperor. No charge would be more subtle in its conception, or more dangerous in the liabilities which it involved, cf. Tacitus, Ann., iii., 38.

Ver. 9. λαβόντες τὸ ικανόν = satis accipere (cf. Mark xv. 15, and Wetstein, in loco). Blass regards the phrase as a commercial one, due to the frequency of commercial intercourse, and cf. v. 31, xviii. 15, xix. 38 (xxiv. 24, β); properly a pecuniary surety, or sureties, here security for good behaviour from Jason and the others, that nothing illegal should be done by them, and certainly nothing against the majesty of the emperor. The words have been explained as meaning that securities were given for the production of the Apostles, and that thus Jason and his friend, by sending them off at night, ran a risk of their lives (Chrys., Grotius), or that the Apostles should not be sheltered any longer, or that they should be obliged to depart at once. Evidently the magistrates did not consider the evidence very weighty = ἄπλωσαν αὐτοὺς.

Ver. 10. εὐθὺς... εὗτος: there was need of immediate action, either in obedience to the direct charge of the magistrates that Paul should not come again to Thessalonica, or from danger of a revival of the tumult. That St. Paul left Thessalonica with grief and pain is evident from 1 Thess. ii. 17-20, but he felt that the separation was necessary at least for a time. But still he looked back upon Thessalonica and his work with an ungrudging affection, and his converts were his glory and joy. In the opening words of his First Epistle, i. 7 (cf. 2 Thess. i. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 1), he speaks in a way which not only implies that his own work extended further in and from Thessalonica than the Acts alone enables us to learn, but that the furtherance of the Gospel was due to the Thessalonians themselves. See McGiffert, p. 255, on St. Paul’s quiet hand-to-hand work at Thessalonica. For it was not only in the synagogue that St. Paul laboured, as if the message of the Gospel was formal and official, but amongst those who were working like himself for their daily bread, 1 Thess. ii. 9. 2 Thess. iii. 8, see Ramsay’s note, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 85, on St. Paul’s work at Thessalonica. The phrase “night and day,” 1 Thess. ii. 9, need not imply, as the Speaker’s Commentary, that Paul had only the Sundays for preaching, because his other days were so fully occupied; but the phrase means that he started work before dawn, and thus was able to devote some of the later part of the day to preaching. On the striking parallel between the characteristics of the Thessalonians of St. Paul’s Epistles and the Acts and the characteristics which were marked by St. Jerome in his day, see Speaker’s Commentary, iii., 701.—Βερόιαν (or Βέροια): in the district of Macedonia called Emathia, Ptol., iii., 12, originally perhaps Ρθέρα, its founder (see Wetstein): about fifty miles southwest of Thessalonica. It was smaller and less important than the latter, but still possessing a considerable population and commerce, owing to its natural advantages, now Vergia or Kara Feria, see B.D.* and Hastings’ B.D., Renan, St. Paul, p. 162, and C. and H., small edition, p. 261. According to the Itineraries, two roads led from Thessalonica to Berea. Wetstein quotes a curious passage from Cicero, In Pisonem, xxvi., which may possibly indicate that Paul and Silas went to Berea on account of its comparative seclusion (so Alford, Farrar, Felten): Cicero calls it “oppidum devium”. —εἰς τὴν συν. The Jewish population was at least considerable
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ
ΧVΙΙ.

την συναγωγήν τῶν Ιουδαίων ἀπήεσαν. ΙΙ. οτι τοις εὐγενιστέροις τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλονίκη, οἵτινες ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας, τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφὰς, εἰ ἔχαν ταῦτα οὕτως. Ι2. πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἔξ ᾗ αὐτῶν ἐπίστευαν, καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων εὐγενέστεροι

1 For εὐγενιστέροι D, Par. read εὐγενεῖς, but not Blass or Hilg. Whether τὸ to be retained (W.H., Weiss, Blass) before καθ’ ἡμέραν or omitted is difficult to decide (Wendt): it may easily have fallen out, or may have been added, cf. Luke xi. 3, and at end of verse καθ’ ἡμέραν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστεύεσαν added by B, after 137, Gig., Syr. H. mg., so Hilg.

2 After εἰσὶν D adds τίνες ἐπὶ σκληροτησαν, cf. xxviii. 24; see Ramsay, C. R. E., p. 160 (also Corssen, u. s., p. 444, who thinks that the addition proceeded from anti-Jewish feeling). In the same verse D reads καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνων καὶ τῶν εὐσχημονῶν ἀ. καὶ γ. ἱκανοὶ επιστεύσαν. Here Ramsay holds that D misses a characteristic of Macedonia, viz., the prominent part played by the women, C. R. E., pp. 160, 161. Blass omits καὶ after Ἑλλην. Hilg. follows D here and above.

enough to have a synagogue, and thither Paul, according to his custom, went first.

—ἀπῆεσαν: only here in N.T., cf. 2 Macc. xii. 1, 4 Macc. iv. 8; here it may imply that on their arrival Paul and Silas left their escort, and went into the synagogue.

Ver. 11. εὐγενιστέροι: only in Luke and Paul in the N.T., so in classics the word is used of noble birth, Luke xix. 2, 1 Cor. i. 26 (Job i. 3), or of nobility of character as here, cf. also its use in 4 Macc. iii. 5, ix. 23, 27 (and εὐγενεῖς in 2 Macc. xiv. 42, and several times in 4 Macc.). We may compare the wide and varying use of the Latin ingenium in accordance with the context, its meaning here is that the Bereans were far from the strife and envy of the Thessalonian Jews; see Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 154, 160, 163, on the less favourable attitude of Codex Bææ to the Bereans than the T. R., and critical note, see also above on xiii. 50.

—προθ.: another word only in Luke and Paul, cf. 2 Cor. vii. 11, 12, 19, ix. 2; not in LXX, but once in Eccles. xiv. 23, frequent in classical Greek.—τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν: indicates that St. Paul made a lengthy stay at Bœca also, cf. Luke xi. 3, xix. 47, but elsewhere without the article, with the article peculiar to Luke (see Plummer’s note on Luke xi. 3). On the frequency of καθ’ ἡμέραν in Luke’s writings see Friedrich, p. 9, and above on Hawkins, Hora Synoptica, p. 33. If τὸ is read, see critical note, it particularises the repetition or constancy of the act.—ἀνάκρ.: “examining,” R.V. (the word in St. John v. 39, which A.V. also renders “search,” is ἑρευνάω), cf. 1 Cor. x. 25, 27, used elsewhere by St. Luke of a judicial inquiry or investigation, Luke xxiii. 14, Acts iv. 9, xii. 19, xxiv. 18. The word is only found in Luke and Paul, once in LXX, 1 Sam. xx. 12, in a general sense, and in Susannah, vv. 48, 51, where it is connected with a judicial inquiry, as elsewhere in Luke. In classical Greek used also in the general sense of examining closely, questioning, sifting.—τὰς γραφὰς: Blass explains “locos a Paulo allatos,” but although these were ipso facto included, the term can hardly be so limited, cf. xxiii. 24, 28, and Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 22. “Charter variae religionis, quod se dijudicari patitur,” Bengel.—εὐγενεῖς, Burton, p. 52, cf. Luke i. 29, iii. 15. Wendt rightly points out that the positive praise bestowed on the Jews of Bœca tends in itself to contradict the theory that Acts was written to emphasise the unbelief of the Jews, and to contrast their unbelief with Gentile belief.

Ver. 12. See critical note and Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, u. s. As at Thessalonica, so here the Apostles’ work extended beyond the limits of the synagogue. Ἑλληνίδων: the term relates to the men as well as to the women—the Jewish men had already been included in the first word πολλοί, see Alford, Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler.—εὐσχημόνων, see above on xiii. 50. Blass refers the term to ἄνδρον also, and points out that Sopater of Bœca alone in Acts is named πατρόθεν according to Greek custom, cf. xx. 4 (R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt). See also Orr, Neglected Factors in the Early Progress of Christianity, p. 107.

Ver. 13. οἱ ἁπ. τῆς Θ.: as before in the first journey, the bitter and enduring malice of the Jews followed Paul.
After σαλ. ΝΑΒΕ 13, 40, 61, verss., except Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg., add και επιστευσαν. Meyer thinks the words a gloss and cf. ver. 8. D also reads οτι (ο) λογος του Θεου κατηγγελη εις Βεροιαν και επιστευσαν, so Hilg. and Blass in β. The και επιστ., the reception of the Gospel, was the reason of this turbulent action. At end of verse D, Syr. Pesh. add ου διελιμπανον (cf. Acts viii. 24 β), so Blass and Hilg. In Luke vii. 45 we have διαλειπω, and only in that place in N.T. But διελιμπανω occurs also, Tob. x. 7, ου διελιμπανε θρηνουσα Τωβιαν (but S al.). This may have suggested viii. 24. It may perhaps be noted that διελιμπαναι is a medical word = διαλειπω (Galen).

Ver. 15. καθιστώντες, see critical note, i.e., the Berean brethren. In N.T. only here in this sense, cf. Josh. vi. 23, 2 Chron. xcviii. 15, so also in classical Greek and in later Greek (instances in Wetstein); they accompanied Paul probably for protection as well as guidance (it has sometimes been supposed that disease of the eyes rendered the guidance necessary, but the word is used quite generally); see further additional note at end of chapter and critical note above, Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 159, 160. If we compare xviii. 5 it looks as if Timothy and Silas only overtook Paul at Corinth, and that he had left Athens before they reached that city. But from 1 Thess. iii. 1 it appears that Timothy was with Paul at Athens, and was sent from thence by him to Thessalonica, and this is quite in accordance with Paul's earnest wish that Timothy and Silas should come to him as quickly as possible (if we suppose that they only rejoined him in xviii. 5, they must have taken a much longer time than was necessary for the journey). But if Paul remained alone, as he states, 1 Thess. iii. 1, at Athens, Silas must also have been sent away; and we may well suppose that as Timothy was sent to comfort the Thessalonians for St. Paul's delay in returning to them, so Silas may have
πράξεις ἀποστόλων
καθιστανόντες

been sent to Philippi, with which St. Paul was frequently in communication at this time, Phil. iv. 15. But after their return to Corinth from their mission, they found that St. Paul had already gone on to Corinth, and there they rejoined him. See on the whole subject, Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 233, 240, as against McGiffert, Wendt (1899) and Felten, in loco, Paley, Ηora Ρaulinar, ix., 4.

Ver. 16. ἐκδεχομένου, cf. i Cor. xiii. 33, xvi. 11, rare in classical Greek in this sense.—παρωξύνετο: "was provoked," R.V., only found elsewhere in N.T. in St. Paul's own description of ἄγαπη, i Cor. xiii. 5, and cf. xv. 39 (see note) and Heb. x. 24 for the cognate noun, see on the latter, Westcott, in loco. In LXX both verb and noun are used for burning with anger, or for violent anger, passion, Hos. viii. 5, Zech. x. 3, Deut. xxix. 28, Jer. xxxix. (xxxii). 37; cf. Dem., 514, 10; ἄργισθη καὶ παρωξύθη (Meyer-Wendt).—τὸ πνεῦμα: expression principally used in Paul, cf. i Cor. ii. 11, Rom. i. 9, viii. 16, etc. Blass calls it periphrasis hebraica, and cf. Luke i. 47.—θεωροῦντος, instead of dat. as in T.R., ΝΑΒΕ 4ο, 6τ, τ8ο, Τisch., W.Η., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; D has the dat., so Blass in β, and Hilg., which seems conformity to αυτώ.

1 καθιστανόντες in AB 25, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; D καθιστανόντες, so Hilg. Blass in β follows reading in T.R. After Άγανων D adds παρηλθεν δε την Θεσσαλιαν· εκλυθη γαρ εις αυτους κηρυξαι τον λογον, so Blass in β, and Hilg.; cf. also Ephraem (Harris, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 28, 47, 83). Ramsay, C. R. E., p. 160, thinks that the reviser did not observe that Paul probably sailed direct from the coast of Macedonia to Athens; in other words, he misconstrued a sea voyage for a journey by land. But Harris, u. s., p. 83, holds that Ramsay may be incorrect in this, and that the reviser meant to imply that St. Paul went to Athens by sea, but that he did not go through Thessaly, but coasted by it. It is also possible that παρηλθεν may mean "neglected" Thessaly in the sense that he did not preach to them, and in this sense Harris, p. 84, believes that Blass would find it possible to defend the Lucanitv of the gloss; see also Wendt (1899), p. 288, note.

2 θεωροῦντος, instead of dat. as in T.R., ΝΑΒΕ 4ο, 6τ, τ8ο, Τisch., W.Η., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; D has the dat., so Blass in β, and Hilg., which seems conformity to αυτω.
παρατυγχάνοντας. 18. τινές δὲ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων καὶ τῶν Στωίκων⁴


as almost parenthetical, see below on ver. 19. — διελέγετο: "he reasoned," R.V. (so Ramsay), see above on ver. 2. — ἐν τῇ συν.: on the synagogue see "Athens," F. C. Conybeare, in Hastings' B.D., but St. Paul did not confine himself to the synagogue, although undeterred by their hatred he went first to his own countrymen, and to the proselytes. But probably they were not numerous (see Farrar, St. Paul, i., 533), and the Apostle carried the same method of reasoning into the market-place—as was natural in the city of Socrates, he entered into conversation with those whom he met, as the same philosopher had done four hundred years before. Thus he became an Athenian to the Athenians: see the striking parallel in the description of Socrates, "he was to be seen in the market-place at the hour when it was most crowded," etc., and the words used by Socrates of himself, Plato, Ἀριστ., 31 A, quoted by Grote, viii., 211, 212, small edit., p. 212. F. C. Conybeare, u. s., compares the experiences in Athens of the Apostle's contemporary Apollonius with those of St. Paul; he too reasoned διελέγετο with them on religious matters, Philostr., Vit. Apollonii Tyanae, iv., 19. The words ἐν τῇ συν. are placed in brackets by Hilgenfeld, and referred by Clemen to his Redactor Anti- judaicus, whilst Jüngst retains the words but omits 16b, and with Van Manen and Clemen regards the whole of Paul's subsequent speech to the philosophers as the interpolation of a Redactor, p. 161 ff.— ἐν τῇ ἐγκατεστ. not the market-place like that which fills a bare space in a modern town, but rather to be compared with its varied beauty and its busy crowd to the square of some Italian city, e.g., the Piazza di Marco of Venice. There the Apostle's eye would fall on portico after portico, adorned by famous artists, rich in noble statues, see F. C. Conybeare, u. s., and Renan, Saint Paul, p. 180. On the west lay the Stoa Paraele, whence the Stoics received their name, and where Zeno met his pupils, whilst the quiet gardens of Epicurus were probably not far distant (see on the site of the Agorato which St. Luke refers, "Athens," B. D.², i., 292, 293, and also C. and H., smaller edition, p. 273. Hackett, in loco, for different views as to its site).—κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν: every day, for he could take advantage by this method not only of the Sabbaths and days of meeting in the synagogues, but of every day, cf. the words of Socrates, Plato, u. s., in describing his own daily work of conversation with every one τὴν ἡμέραν διήνυσαν προσκαθίσθησιν. The phrase seems to denote some time spent at Athens. — παρατυγχάνοντας: "chance comers" (like another Socrates), used only here in N. T., but cf. Thuc., i., 22, not in LXX or Apocrypha. Athens was full not only of philosophers, but we can imagine from the one phrase applied to it, Tac., Ann., ii., 55, what a motley group might surround the Apostle, illa colluvias nationum.

Ver. 18. συνβάλλον αὐτῷ: a word peculiar to St. Luke; three times in his Gospel, four times in Acts; it need not have necessarily a hostile sense as in Luke xiv. 31, but simply means that amongst the chance comers in the Agora there were some who "engaged indiscussions" with him (so Blass like Latin, consilia confère, sc. λόγους), a meaning perhaps suggested by the imperfect. Grotius and others take it as "translatio de prūlis sumpta, ut apparat, Luc. xiv. 31. Utitur ita sepe Polybius, quem sequi amat Lucas."—Ἐπικουρείων: so called from Epicurus, 342-270 B.C.; his disciples were known also as the School of the Garden, from the garden in Athens where the master instructed them, in distinction from the disciples of the Porch or the Academy. We must be careful to remember that as in numberless other cases, so the system of the founder suffered at the hands of his successors, and that the life of Epicurus himself was far removed from that of a mere sensualist, or "Epicure" in its later sense. But it was evident that a life which made pleasure and happiness the be-all and end-all of existence, however safeguarded by the conditions imposed at the outset by Epicurus, was liable to degenerate into a mere series of prudent calculations, or a mere indulgence of the senses and appetites. In his determination to rid men of the
superstitious fears which were the chief cause of the miseries of humanity, Epicurus opposed the popular Polytheism, and regarded the gods as living a life of passionless calm far removed from mundane strifes and sorrows, "careless of mankind". The Stoics branded Epicurus as an Atheist, but the materialistic creed of Epicurus and his followers had at all events this merit, that its bold criticism of existing beliefs was serviceable in undermining the prevailing acceptance of a gross and crude mythology, whilst it helped to assert in contradistinction to a paralysing fatalism the doctrine of the freedom of man's will (see F. C. Conybeare, "Epicureans," Hastings' B.D.; Westcott, "Epicureans," B.D.²; Wallace, Epicureanism).

It is possible that the writer scrupled to appear to class ἴδιος among the δαιμόνια. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 242, thinks the clause foreign to Luke's fashion; apparently a gloss, suggested by ver. 32.

man, the Stoic ideal, in spite of its recognition of virtue, became not merely stern and intellectual, but impassive and austere; in aiming at apathy the Stoic lost sympathy with the most ennobling and energetic emotions, and thus wrapped up in the cloak of his own virtue he justified, at least from an ethical point of view, the description which classed him as the Pharisee of Greek philosophy. In addressing an audience composed at all events in part of the representatives of these two great philosophic schools it may be said that St. Paul was not unmindful of his own former training in the early home of Stoicism (see on p. 235). And so in speaking of creation and providence, of the unity of nations in the recognition of all that was true even in Pantheism, St. Paul has been described as taking the Stoic side against the Epicureans, or at least we may say that he in his speech asserts against some of the cardinal errors of the Epicureans the creative and superintending power of God. But to the Stoic and Epicurean alike the Christian Creed would proclaim that All's Love, yet all's Law; to the Stoic and the Pharisee and Sadducee of the world of philosophy, the bidding came to repent and obey the Gospel, no less than to the crowd whom sages and philosophers despised: "Paulus summa arte orationem suam itatem per, ut modo cum vulgo contra Philosophos, modo contra utroque pugnet," Wetstein; see Capes, Stoicism; Lightfoot, Philippians, "St. Paul and Seneca"; Zahn, Der Stoiker Epiktet und seinVerhältniss zum Christenthum; Ueberweg, Hist. of Phil., i., p. 185 ff.; Rendall, Marcus Antoninus, Introd. (1808); Gore, Ephesians, p. 253 ff. — καὶ τίνες θεοὶ: these are generally taken to include the philosophers, and the remarks following are referred to them; sometimes the first question to the Epicureans, and the second criticism to the Stoics. But it has recently been maintained that we
need not refer to the two sects of philosophers this unfavourable criticism on St. Paul; “Epicureans,” Conybeare in Hastings’ B.D. Certainly the οι δὲ has no οι μὲν as if two opposing schools were meant. The punctuation in R.V., which simply states the fact amongst those in the Ἀγορά certain also τινὲς καὶ καλ. of the philosophers, etc., admits of this view that the criticisms were uttered not by the philosophers, but by the curious crowd which thronged the Ἀγορά. Ramsay however takes the verse as marking the opinions of the philosophers, and the use of the word σπερμολόγος by Zeno of one of his followers may help to confirm this.—τί άν θέλοι: “what would this babbler say!” R.V., not future as in A.V.; the άν with optative being used to express what would happen as the fulfilment of some supposed condition. Burton, p. 79, so Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 33 (1853), the condition being if we would listen to him, or if his words have any meaning; optative with άν only in Luke, see Burton, u. s.—σπερμολόγος: primarily an adjective, -ον: as a substantive ο σπερ. of a took or crow, or some small bird, picking up seeds, cf. Arist., Ατ. v. 490; see in Grimm, sub τ.; so Dem. speaks of Aeschines, 269, 19, as σπέρμαλόγος, Latin, seminervibus (so Augustine, Wycliffe, “sower of words”). The accent shows that this latter derivation is incorrect. Hence a man hanging about the shops and the markets, picking up scraps which fell from the loads and thus gaining a livelihood, so a parasite, one who lives at the expense of others, a hanger-on, Eustathius on Hom., Οδυσ., v. 490; see in Grimm, sub τ.; so Dem. speaks of Aeschines, 269, 19, as σπέρμαλόγος. The word thus came to be used of a man who picked up scraps of information, and retailed them at second hand. So Eustathius speaks of rhetoricians who were mere collectors of words and consistent plagiarists &i διόν σπερμολόγοντες; so again he remarks that the word is applied to those who make a show in unscientific style of knowledge which they have got from misunderstanding of lectures (see for these quotations Ramsay, Expositor, September, 1890, p. 222, and the whole article “St. Paul in Athens”). Ramsay maintains therefore that there is no instance of the classical use of the word as a babbler or mere talker, and he sees in the word a piece of Athenian slang, caught up as the Athenians had themselves used it (“sine dubio hoc ex ipso Atheniensium auctor exceptit” Blass), and applied to one who was quite outside any literary circle, an ignorant, vulgar plagiarist. At the same time it is perhaps difficult to find any single word more to the point than “babbler,” A. and R.V. (Tyndall), for, as Alford urges, it both signifies one who talks fluently to no purpose, and hints also that his talk is not his own. We may, however, well owe this rendering to the fact that σπερμολόγος was wrongly derived, as if it meant σεμινατορ, whereas its true derivation is given above. De Wette, Overbeck, Nösgen, Weiss, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Wendt, all so render it. An ingenious attempt has been made to connect the word with the Arethalogi (Juvenal, Sat., xv., 16; Suet, Aug., 74) or praters about virtue, who hired themselves as entertainers for the wealthy Roman nobles at their dinners: “mendax aretalogus,” Juv., u. s.; Zöckler, in loco. For instances of the use of the word see Wetstein, Ramsay, Nösgen, Bethge, Die Paulinischen Reifen, p. 77; Rendall (who agrees with Ramsay), and “Babbler,” Hastings’ B.D.—ξένων δαιμ. δοκεί, see Burton, p. 153; on the personal construction with δοκεί see Burton, p. 153; on the personal construction with δοκεί cf. Gal. ii. 9, Jas. i. 26, etc.—τον ι. καὶ την ἀνάστασιν, see critical note. It is possible that the Athenians thought that Paul was preaching two strange...
In \textit{EAD}, Sah., Boh. we have \textit{Ariion}, but \textit{Ariopon} in BHP, Weiss, W.H., Blass, Hilg.; \textit{η} after \textit{αυτη} omitted in BD, Lach. [W.H.], Blass, Hilg., but retained in R.V. and by Weiss.

deities, Jesus and Resurrection (the latter as a female deity '\textit{Ανάστασις}'), just as they had their own altars erected to Pity, Piety, Modesty, a view which gains support not only from the collocation of the words, but from the use of the article with both, and from the supposition that Paul was held to be a preacher of more than one strange God; so Chrys., \textit{Oecum.}, Selden, and list given by Wendt (1888), \textit{in loco}. Wendt also (1899) inclines to this view, which is adopted by Renan, Overbeck, Holtzmann, Felten, McGiffert, Knabenbauer, \textit{cf.} also the punctuation in R.V., which may imply this view (see Humphry on R.V., \textit{in loco}). As against this view see Hackett's note, p. 213, who thinks it hardly conceivable that the Apostle could express himself so obscurely on the subject as to afford any occasion for this gross mistake (so also Farrar).

The article before \textit{ανάσ.} is taken by Nösgen as referring simply to the general resurrection, a view which he regards as agreeing with the prominence given to the doctrine in ver. 3 τ. It is argued that if \textit{ανάσ.} referred to the resurrection of Jesus we should have \textit{αυτού} which has crept into some copies, but the address itself shows that the Apostle spoke of the resurrection of Jesus as affording a pledge of a general resurrection.

Ver. 19. \textit{επιλαβωμενοι}: as to whether we regard this as done with hostile intent, or not, will depend upon the view taken of the meaning of the Areopagus. If the latter means "the Hill of Mars," to which the Apostle was taken for a quiet hearing and for unimportant discussion, then the former is clearly inadmissible; if, however, the Areopagus meant the \textit{Council of Areopagus}, then that action would seem to have been indicative at least of malice and dislike. The verb in the N.T. is used only in the middle, with accusative or genitive, and most frequently by St. Luke, five times in his Gospel, seven times in Acts, twice by St. Paul, only once by St. Matthew and by St. Mark. In each case it can be determined by the context whether it is used in a favourable or unfavourable sense. So too in LXX (always with genitive), where it is frequently used, the context alone decides. Certainly ix. 27 presents a close verbal parallel in language, as the participle \textit{τυλικ.} is followed as here by \textit{γαγων} (Weiss), but the context there expresses beyond all doubt a friendly action. Grotius (so Weiss, Wendt, Felten, Zöckler, Bethge) attributes friendliness to the action here, and renders "manu leniter prehensum," so too F. C. Conybeare, "Areopagus," Hastings' B.D., renders it "took Paul by the hand," but in three of the four parallels to which he refers \textit{χειρ} is expressed, and for the fourth see above.

But the view taken of the following words will help us to decide, Ramsay, \textit{St. Paul}, p. 245; and \textit{Expositor}, September, 1895, pp. 216, 217.—\textit{επι τον} \textit{Αποστόλον}, Curtius, \textit{Gesammelte Abhandlungen}, ii., p. 528, note, and Ramsay, \textit{Expositor}, u. s., p. 217, point out that \textit{επι} with accusative would be the correct expression for taking any one before an official court, \textit{cf.} ix. 21, xvi. 19, xvii. 6, xviii. 12—a regular Lucan preposition in this sense—\textit{cf.} also Herod., iii., 46, 156; viii., 79. But it does not therefore follow that a regular trial was instituted, as Chrys., Theophylact and others have held, since there is nothing in the context to indicate this. But the form of expression certainly does seem to indicate that Jesus was not taken to the Hill of Mars, as is generally held, but before a court or council. And there is substantial evidence for believing that the term Areopagus (as Blass admits) was not merely local, but that it was sometimes used as = the Council or Court of Areopagus, \textit{cf.} Cicero, \textit{Ad Attic.}, 1, 14, 5; \textit{De Nat. Dorum}, ii., 29; \textit{Rep.}, i., 27. Moreover, there is good reason to believe that the council, although deriving its name from the hill, did not always meet on the hill, and also that it had the power of taking official action in questions bearing upon public teaching in the city (\textit{cf.} Renan, \textit{Saint Paul}, pp. 193, 194, and authorities cited). It is therefore not an improbable inference that Paul would be brought before such a court for inquiry into his teaching; beyond this inference perhaps we cannot go; even to call the inquiry a \textit{προδικασία} (so Curtius) may be to apply a technical term unwarranted by the con-
20. ἴνα εἰσφέρεις εἰς τὰς ἄκοις ἡμῶν· θελόμεθα οὖν γρώναι, τί ἐν θελοὶ ταῦτα εἶναι. 21. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ οἱ ἑπόδημοι οὐ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔτερον εὐκαίριον, η λέγει τι καὶ ἀκόλουχον κατεινηθοῦν.


Text, which bears no trace of a criminal procedure, cf. Curtius, u. s., pp. 528, 529; Ramsay, w. s.: Plumptre and Rendall, in loco.

But where did the council meet for the discharge of such duties as inquiries into the qualification of teachers, as a public court for the maintenance of public order? Probably in the Stoa Basileios; here Demosthenes informs us that some of its duties were transacted (see Expositor, October, 1895, p. 272, and Curtius, u. s., p. 528), and the scene before us is full of the life of the Agora with the corona of people thronging to listen, rather than of the sacred or solemn surroundings of the Hill of Mars, or of the quietude of a spot far removed from the busy life of the market-place.

So too the name “Areopagus” might have been easily transferred to the council sitting in a place other than the hill, so that η βουλή η εξ Α. π. π might easily become Άρειος Πάγος informally and colloquially, and the word as used here by St. Luke may really be another name, cf. Curtius, u. s., pp. 528, 529, and Ramsay, Expositor, September, 1895, p. 216, and Renan, u. s., p. 194, note. But it has further been urged both by Curtius and Ramsay (so also Renan, u. s.) that the Hill of Mars would be a most inconvenient place for public assemblies and speakers, see Ramsay, u. s., p. 213, and Curtius, u. s., p. 529, and even if the spot had been suitable for such purposes, there would have been a want of fitness in the Athenians hanging this στερμολόγος to harangue them on a spot so inseparably associated with the dignity and glory of their city; see also below on vv. 22 and 33. —Στερμολόγος: like the Latin, Possum scire? the question may have been asked in courtesy, or in sarcasm, or ironically; in the repetition of the article the irony may be accentuated.—ἡ υπό σοῦ λαλ.: “which is spoken by thee,” R.V., the Apostle was not speaking about the doctrine, A.V., his words were the doctrine (Luminy). Felten regards the question as courteously put, and sees in it a decisive proof that Paul was not put upon his trial, since a man could not be tried on a charge of which his accusers had no knowledge. But this would not prevent a preliminary inquiry of some kind before the court, prompted by dislike or suspicion.

Ver. 20. ξενίζοντα: rather perhaps startling or bewildering than strange—so too in Polyb., cf. Ι Ρeter iν.12, but see Grimm-Thayer, sub τ. Ramsay renders “something of foreign fashion” as if the words were connected with the opinion that the Apostle was an announcer of foreign gods, cf. also 2 Μacc. ix. 6, Diod. Sic., xii., 53.—τίνα: the rhetorical use of the indefinite τις here strengthening the participle, cf. viii.9, ν. 6, Heb. x. 27.—εἰσφέρεις... ἄκοις: Blass suggests a Hebrewism, but on the life of Greeks we must look no further than the parallel which the same writer adduces, Soph., Αθαν., 147, cf. also Wetstein. The verb is only used here in this sense in N.T.—τί άν θέλοι, see critical note and Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 112: “de rebus in aliquem exitum tendentibus,” Grimm; cf. ii. 12; so Bethge.

interests of life were sacrificed to this characteristic (note imperfect tense), restless inquisitiveness, their great orator, Demosthenes, knew when he contrasted this idle curiosity with the vigour and ability of Philip of Macedon, \textit{Philippic I.}, p. 43. The words go to support the interpretation that there may have been an examination into the Apostle’s teaching, Curtius, \textit{ii. s.}, p. 520. —καυμώτερον: certainly there is, as Blass says, “mirus consensus” as to this characteristic of the Athenians; see instances in Weststein: \textit{Dem.}, \textit{Philippic I.}, 43, and \textit{Philipp. Epist.}, 156, 157; Thuc. iii., 38; Theophr., \textit{Char.}, iii., \textit{περί λογοποίας μὴ λέγατα τι καυμώτερον}; cf. Seneca, \textit{Epist.}, 74. Lit., “some newer thing,” something newer than that which had just preceded it as \textit{new} up to the time of asking. The comparative may therefore indicate more vividly the voracious appetite of the Athenians for news, although it may be also said that the comparative was the usual degree used by the Greeks in the question \textit{What news?} (usually \textit{νεώτερον}); indeed their fondness for using the comparative of both \textit{ νέος} and \textit{καινός} is quite singular (Page, see also Winer-Moultoun, xxxv., 4; Blass, \textit{Gram.}, p. 138). The words of Bengel are often quoted, “nova statim sordebant, \textit{noviora} querebantur,” but it should be noted that he adds “\textit{Noviora autem} querebantur, non modo in iis quaæ gentilia accidit, sed etiam in philosophis,” see for a practical and forcible lesson on the words, F. D. Maurice, \textit{Friendship of Books}, pp. 84, 85.

Ver. 22. \textit{σταθείς}, Lucan, see i. 15. —\textit{ἐν μέσῳ} τοῦ \textit{Α. π.}, \textit{i.e.}, in the midst of the Council or Court of Areopagus, see above on ver. 19, \textit{cf. iv. 7}, Peter stood in the midst of the Sanhedrin. Ramsay pertinently remarks that the words “in the midst of Mars’ hill” are far from natural or clear, and those who adopt them usually omit the word “midst,” and say that Paul stood on Mars’ hill, justifying the expression by supposing that \textit{ἐν μέσῳ} is a Hebraism for \textit{ἐν}, i. 15, ii. 22. But whilst a Hebraism would be natural in the earlier chapters referred to, it would be quite out of place here in this Attic scene, \textit{cf.} also ver. 33, Ramsay, \textit{Expositor}, September, 1895, so too Curtius, \textit{u. s.}, p. 529, in support of the rendering adopted by Ramsay. —\textit{Ἀνδρεὶς Ἀθηναῖοι}: usual way of beginning a speech; strange to allege it as a proof that the speech is not genuine: “according to the best MS. evidence, Demosthenes habitually, at least in some speeches, said \textit{Ἀνδρεὶς Ἀθηναῖοι} without \textit{ὡς}. It is therefore a mistake to note as unclassical the use of the vocative here without \textit{ὡς}, \textit{cf. i. 14, xix. 35}, Simcox, \textit{Language of the New Testament}, p. 76, note.—\textit{κατὰ πᾶντα}: “in all things I perceive that ye are,” R.V., meaning that wherever he looked he had evidence of this characteristic—the A.V. would imply that in all their conduct the Athenians were, etc. The phrase which is common in classics is only found here, in iii. 22, Col. iii. 20, 22, Heb. ii. 5, iv. 15, in N.T.—\textit{ὡς}, see Grimm-Thayer, \textit{sub ὡς}, i., d., Winer-Moultoun, xxxv., 4. —\textit{καινότερον}: “something newer than that which had just preceded it as \textit{netes} (usually \textit{νεώτερον}); indeed their fondness for using the comparative of both \textit{νέος} and \textit{καινός} is quite singular (Page, see also Winer-Moultoun, xxxv., 4; Blass, \textit{Gram.}, p. 138). The words of Bengel are often quoted, “nova statim sordebant, \textit{noviora} quaæerabantur,” but it should be noted that he adds “\textit{Noviora autem quaæerabantur, non modo in iis quaæ gentilia accidit, sed, quod nobilius videtur, in philosophis},” see for a practical and forcible lesson on the words, F. D. Maurice, \textit{Friendship of Books}, pp. 84, 85. Ver. 22. \textit{σταθείς}, Lucan, see i. 15. —\textit{ἐν μέσῳ} τοῦ \textit{Α. π.}, \textit{i.e.}, in the midst of the Council or Court of Areopagus, see above on ver. 19, \textit{cf. iv. 7}, Peter stood in the midst of the Sanhedrin. Ramsay pertinently remarks that the words “in the midst of Mars’ hill” are far from natural or clear, and those who adopt them usually omit the word “midst,” and say that Paul stood on Mars’ hill, justifying the expression by supposing that \textit{ἐν μέσῳ} is a Hebraism for \textit{ἐν}, i. 15, ii. 22. But whilst a Hebraism would be natural in the earlier chapters referred to, it would be quite out of place here in this Attic scene, \textit{cf.} also ver. 33, Ramsay, \textit{Expositor}, September, 1895, so too Curtius, \textit{u. s.}, p. 529, in support of the rendering adopted by Ramsay. —\textit{Ἀνδρεὶς Ἀθηναῖοι}: usual way of beginning a speech; strange to allege it as a proof that the speech is not genuine: “according to the best MS. evidence, Demosthenes habitually, at least in some speeches, said \textit{Ἀνδρεὶς Ἀθηναῖοι} without \textit{ὡς}. It is therefore a mistake to note as unclassical the use of the vocative here without \textit{ὡς}, \textit{cf. i. 14, xix. 35}, Simcox, \textit{Language of the New Testament}, p. 76, note.—\textit{κατὰ πᾶντα}: “in all things I perceive that ye are,” R.V., meaning that wherever he looked he had evidence of this characteristic—the A.V. would imply that in all their conduct the Athenians were, etc. The phrase which is common in classics is only found here, in iii. 22, Col. iii. 20, 22, Heb. ii. 5, iv. 15, in N.T.—\textit{ὡς}, see Grimm-Thayer, \textit{sub ὡς}, i., d., Winer-Moultoun, xxxv., 4. —\textit{καινότερον}: “something newer than that which had just preceded it as \textit{netes} (usually \textit{νεώτερον}); indeed their fondness for using the comparative of both \textit{νέος} and \textit{καινός} is quite singular (Page, see also Winer-Moultoun, xxxv., 4; Blass, \textit{Gram.}, p. 138). The words of Bengel are often quoted, “nova statim sordebant, \textit{noviora} querebantur,” but it should be noted that he adds “\textit{Noviora autem} querebantur, non modo in iis quaæ gentilia accidit, sed, quod nobilius videtur, in philosophis,” see for a practical and forcible lesson on the words, F. D. Maurice, \textit{Friendship of Books}, pp. 84, 85.
22-23.

23. διερχόμενος γὰρ καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν, εὐρον καὶ βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραττο, ἀγνώστων θεῶν. δὲ οὖν ἄγνοοι ὑμεῖς

1 For ἀναθεωρῶν D (Clem.) has διιστορῶν (nowhere found in N.T., not used in LXX or classical Greek).

2 For ἐπεγέγραττο D (Gig.) has ἦν γεγραμμένον, so Hilg., and reads ἀγνώστων θεῶν, see Blass, in loco, for authorities who think this reading original, although in β text he follows T.R. or ... τοῦτον ΝπΕΗΛΡ, Arm., Clem., Ath., Chrys., Cosm., Aug.; ο ... τοῦτο ΝπΑΒΔ, Vulg., Or., Hier., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass; ο ... τοῦτον 61.

strict accordance with similar testimonies from various quarters, cf. Thuc., ii., 40; Soph., O. C., 260; Jos., C. Apion., iii., 11; Pausanias, In Attic., 24; Petronius, Sat., c. 17. The context, ver. 24, where εὐσεβεία, religiosecolitis (Wetstein), is one result of this δεισιδαιμονία, strengthens the view that the adjective is used here in a good sense; cf. the comment on its good use here by St. Chrys., Hom., xxxviii., and Theophylact. There is therefore no reason to suppose that Paul's words were an accommodation to the usual practice of Athenian orators to commence with a mere compliment. At the same time it is possible that with deliberate tact the Apostle made use of a word of doubtful meaning, verbum per se μύσου, which could not possibly provoke hostility at the outset, while it left unexpressed his own judgment as to the nature of this reverence for the divine "with kindly ambiguity," Grimm-Thayer.

Ver. 23. διερχόμενος γὰρ: "for as I passed along," R.V., through the streets, or perhaps "was wandering through" —Renan has passant dans vos rues, see also on ver. 16 above, and also on viii. 40. A.V., "as I passed by," does not give the force of the word, and apparently means "passed by the objects of your devotion." —ἀναθεωρῶν: accurate contemplari, "observed," R.V., only in later Greek, and in N.T. only in Heb. xiii. 7, "considering with attentive survey again and again," see Westcott, in loco: Weiss renders it here "immer wieder betrachtend," cf. critical notes, cf. Diod. Sic., xiv. 109, and references in Grimm.—τὰ σεβάσματα: "the objects of your worship," R.V., Vulgate, simulacra, the thing worshipped, not the act or manner of worshipping. The A.V. margin gives "gods that ye worship," cf. 2 Thess. ii. 4, where A. and R.V. both render "that is worshipped," σέβασμα in text, and R.V. in margin, "an object of worship"; Bel and the Dragon, ver. 27, Wisdom xiv. 20, xv. 17.—καὶ βωμὸν: "I found also an altar," R.V., i.e., in addition to those with definite dedications; only here in N.T., often in LXX, sometimes of heathen altars, Exod. xxxiv. 13, Numb. xxiii. 1, Deut. vii. 5.—ἐπεγέγραττο, cf. Luke xvi. 20; on the pluperfect with augment, Blass, Gram., p. 37, see critical note: Farrar, St. Paul, i., 542, takes the word as implying permanence, and perhaps antiquity, so in Speaker's Commentary as of an ancient decayed altar, whose inscription had been forgotten; Mark xv. 26, Rev. xxii. 12 (Heb. viii. 10, x. 16).—ἀγνώστων θεῶν: "to an unknown God," R.V.: all previous versions like A.V., but there is no definite article, although in inscriptions it was often omitted. For the existence of altars of this kind the testimony of Pausanias and Philostratus may be fairly quoted: Pausan., i., 1, 4 (cf. v. 14, 6), βωμοὶ θεῶν τε ἁμαρτημένων ἀγνώστων καὶ ἀρων, and Philost., Vit. Αφολλον., vi., 2, σωφρόνισταρον περὶ τάπτων θεῶν καὶ λέγειν, καὶ ταύτα Αθήνησιν, οὐ καὶ ἄγνωστων θεῶν βωμοῖς ιδρυνται, see references in Wetstein, and cf. F. C. Conybeare, u.s.; Renan, Saint Paul, p. 173; Neander, Geschichte der Pfanzung, ii., 32 ff.; Wendt, etc. Baur, Zeller, Overbeck have maintained that there could have been no such inscription in the singular number as the plural is so much more in harmony with polytheism, although the last named admits that the authorities cited above admit at least the possibility of an inscription as in the text. To say nothing of the improbability that Paul would refer before such an audience to an inscription which had no existence, we may reasonably infer that there were at Athens several altars with the inscription which the Apostle quotes. A passage in Diog. Laert., Epim., 3, informs us how Epimenides, in the time of a plague, brought to the Areopagus and let loose white and black sheep, and wherever the sheep lay down, he bade the Athenians
to sacrifice τὸ προσήκοντι θεῷ, and so the plague ceased, with the result that we find in Athens many ἄγνωστοι θεοί, see the passage quoted in full in Wetstein; from this it is not an unfair inference that in case of misfortune or disaster, when it was uncertain what god should be honoured or propitiated, an altar might be erected ἄγνωστος θεός. (It is curious that Blass although he writes ἄγνωστος θεός in β thinks that the true reading must have been the plural.) To draw such an inference is much more reasonable than to suppose with Jerome, Tit., i., 12, that the inscription was not as Paul asserted, but that he used the singular number because it was more in accordance with his purpose, the inscription really being "Diis Asiae et Europae et Africæ, Diis ignotis et peregrinis," cf. the inscription according to Occumenius δοκεῖ οὖν Ευρυτέχνη καὶ Λαμψίς θεὸν ἄγνωστον καὶ ξένον. But at the very commencement of his speech the Apostle would scarcely have made a quotation so far removed from the actual words of the inscription, otherwise he would have strengthened the suspicion that he was a mere σπερμολόγος. St. Chrysostom, Hom., xxxviii., sees in the inscription an indication of the anxiety of the Athenians lest they should have neglected some deity honoured elsewhere, but if we connect it with the story mentioned above of Epimenides, it would be quite in accordance with the religious character of the Athenians, or perhaps one might rather say with the superstitious feeling which prompted the formula so often employed in the prayer of Greeks and Romans alike "Si deo si des," or the words of Horace (Epod., v., 1), "At deorum quidquid in coelo regit:" There is no reason for the view held amongst others by Mr. Lewin that the words of the inscription refer to the God of the Jews. But in such an inscription St. Paul wisely recognised that there was in the heart of Athens a witness to the deep unsatisfied yearning of humanity for a clearer and closer knowledge of the unseen power which men worshipped dimly and imperfectly, a yearning expressed in the sacred Vedic hymns of an old world, or in the crude religions of a new, cf. Max Müller, Selected Essays, i., p. 23 ff.; Zöckler, in loco, "Altar," B.D.3; Pumplme, Movements of Religious Thought, p. 78 ff.—ὅν ὅνων ἄγνωστον, see critical notes. If we read δ for ὅν, we may render with R.V., "what therefore ye worship in ignorance": Vulgate, quod colitis. The mere fact of the erection of such an inscription showed that the Athenians did reverence to some divine existence, although they worshipped what they knew not, St. John iv. 22; not "ignorantly worship," as in A.V., this would have been alien to the refinement and tact of St. Paul.—εὐσεβείτε: used here as elsewhere of genuine piety, which St. Paul recognised and claimed as existing in the existence of the altar—the word throws light on the meaning which the Apostle attached to the δεισιδαιμονία of ver. 22; in N.T. only in Luke and Paul, cf. i Tim. v. 4, of filial piety (cf. πีτας), cf. Susannah, ver. 64 (LXX), and 4 Macc. xi. 5, 8, 23, xviii. 2. "That divine nature which you worship, not knowing what it is" (R.V. say).—τοῦτον ἡγάλατον δυν. in these words lay the answer to the charge that he was a σπερμολόγος. Of strange gods. ἡγάλατος, emphatic; Ι whom you regard as a mere babbler proclaim to you, or set forth, the object which you recognise however dimly, and worship however imperfectly. Since the days of St. Chrysostom the verse has been taken as a proof that the words of St. Paul were addressed not to a select group of philosophers, but to the corona of the people. Ver. 24. ὁ Θεός ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος ὁ χάριτος καὶ γῆς κύριος υπάρχει, to
chosen by Paul as a word familiar to his hearers. Both by Aristotle and Plato it had been used as including the orderly disposition of the heaven and the earth (according to some, Pythagoras had first used the word of the orderly system of the universe), and in this passage υφαντος καὶ γῆς may perhaps both be taken or included in the κόσμος, cf. iv. 24, xiv. 15. In the LXX κόσμος is never used as a synonym of the world, i.e., the universe (but cf. Prov. xvii. 6, Grimm, sub v.), except in the Apocryphal books, where it is frequently used of the created universe, Wisdom vii. 17, ix. 3; 2 Macc. vii. 23, viii. 18; 4 Macc. v. 25 (24), etc., Grimm, sub v., and Cremer, Wörterbuch. — οὖτος: " He being Lord of heaven and earth," R.V., more emphatic and less ambiguous than A.V., " seeing that". —υπάρχων " being the natural Lord'' (Farrar), "He, Lord as He is, of heaven and earth'' (Ramsay), see Plummer's note on Luke viii. 41; the word is Lucan, see above on οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς π., cf. Is. xlvi. 7, Jer. x. 16, and 1 Cor. x. 26.—οὖτος ἐν χειροποιητοῖς ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, 25. οὐδὲ ὑπό χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος, αὐτὸς διδοὺς πάσι ζωήν καὶ πνεύμα

quidem aliquid, sed non satis, qui insuper eget," Wetstein, so "cum . . . nullius boni desideret accessionem," Erasmus; a close parallel is found in 2 Macc. xiv. 35 (3 Macc. ii. 9) ; in both passages the word ἀπροσδεής is used of God, and in the former reference is made to the fact that God was pleased that the temple of His habitation should be amongst the Jews, cf. also Ecclus. lii. 21. Blass and Wetstein both quote a striking Pythagorean saying from Hierocles, see in loco, and to this αὐτάρκεια of the divine nature both the Jewish philosopher Philo and the Roman Epicurean Lucretius from their varying standpoints bore witness, see the instances in Wetstein (cf. Psalm li. 9).—Luther takes τινος as masculine, which as Wendt admits corresponds well to the preceding and also to the following πάσι, but it seems best to take it as neuter, of the service which men render, cf. Clem., Cor., i., 1, ἀπροσδεής, ἀδελφοί, ο δεσπότης υπάρχει των απάν των, οὐθὲν οὐδενός χρῆζει εἰ μὴ τὸ ἔξομολογεύσασθαι αὐτῷ, and Epist. ad Diognetum, iii., 5.—αὐτὸς διδοὺς: "seeing he himself giveth," R.V., so Vulgate ipsa, but although αὐτός is so emphatic it was unfortunately ignored in Wycl., Genevan and A.V. The best commentary on the words is in David's words, 1 Chron. xxix. 14, cf. the striking passage in Epist. ad Diognetum, iii., 4.—πάσι: taken as neuter or masculine, but perhaps with Bengel "omnia viventibus et spirantibus, summe προσδεημένοις indiginitibus. De nomine speciatim, v. seq."

—ζωήν καὶ πνεύμα, cf. Gen. ii. 7, not a mere hendiadys, vitam animalem, or spiritum vitalem, but the first word = life in itself, existence; and the second the continuance of life, "per spiritum (hali tum) continuatur vita," Bengel: on the paronomasia, see Winer-Moulton, lviii., 1. For πνεύμα LXX, Ps. cl. 6, Job xxvii. 3, Isa. xlii. 5, Ecclus. xxx. 29 (xxxii. 20), 2 Macc. iii. 31, and vii. 9, etc.—τὰ πάντα: omnia quaecumque, Rom. viii. 32, the expression need not be limited with Bethge to all things necessary for the preservation of life and breath.

Ver. 26. "And he hath made of one every nation of men for to dwell," R.V., so also A.V. takes ετοιμασε separately from κατοικεῖν, not "caused to dwell"; ετοιμασε, cf. ver. 24, he made, i.e., created of one; see Hackett's note.—κατοικεῖν: infinitive of purpose.—ἐφ θυ
καὶ τὰ πάντα. 26. ἐποίησε τὸ ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος ἀνθρώπων, κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς, ὄργανα προτεταγμένους.


2 προτεταγμένους, overwhelming support ἍΒDEHLP, Clem., Chrys., Theodt., Tisch., W. H., R. V., Weiss, Wendt; D* 13 has προτεταγμένους as substantive, see critical note. Lach. wrote πρὸς τεταγμ. γίνεται.

(aἵματος), see critical note. Rendall renders "from one father" as the substantive really understood, the idea of offspring being implied by ἐξ, cf. Heb. ii. 11, xi. 12: Ramsay, "of one nature, every race of men," etc. Such teaching has often been supposed to be specially directed against the boast of the Athenians that they were themselves αὐτόκεφοι (so recently Zöckler, and see instances in Wetstein, cf. e.g., Arist., Vesp., 1076; Cicero, Pro Flacco, xxvii.), but whilst the Apostle's words were raised above any such special polemic, yet he may well have had in mind the characteristic pride of his hearers, whilst asserting a truth which cut at the root of all national pride engendered by polytheism on the one hand, by a belief in a god of this nation or of that, or of a philosophic pride engendered by a hard Stoicism on the other. When Renan and others speak of Christianity extending its hand to the philosophy of Greece in the beautiful theory which it proclaimed of the moral unity of the human race (Saint Paul, p. 197) it must not be forgotten that Rome and not Greece manifested the perfection of Pagan ethics, and that, even so, the sayings of a Seneca or an Epicetetus wanted equally with those of a Zeno "a lifting power in human life". The cosmopolitanism of a Seneca no less than that of a Zeno failed; the higher thoughts of good men of a citizenship, not of Ephesus or elsewhere, but of the world, which were stirring in the towns where St. Paul preached, all these failed, Die Heraclitischen Briefe, p. 91 (Bernays); it was not given to the Greek or to the Roman, but to the Jew, separated though he was from every other nation, to safeguard the truth of the unity of mankind, and to proclaim the realisation of that truth through the blood of a Crucified Jew (Alford). On the Stoic cosmopolitanism see amongst recent writers G. H. Rendall, Marcus Antoninus, Introd., pp. 88, 118, 137 (1898).—τὰς ὀροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας: the first noun is not found elsewhere either in classical or biblical Greek, but cf. Blass, Gram., p. 60. κατοικία: only here in N.T., but frequent in LXX; found also in Polyb., of a dwelling; so in

cf. Gen. ii. 6, xi. 8, etc.; Winer-Moulton, xviii., 4, cf. in Latin, maris facies, Εἰν., v., 768, natura vitus, Ονιδ., Μετ., i., 6. —ὀρίσας προτεταγ. καιρούς: if we read προτεταγματίζεται, see critical note, "having determined their appointed seasons," R. V. καιρ. not simply seasons in the sense used in addressing the people of Lystra, xiv. 17, as if St. Paul had in mind only the course of nature as divinely ordered, and not also a divine philosophy of history. If the word was to be taken with κατοικίας it would have the article and χρόνοι would be more probably used, cf. also προσταγματίζεται. Jer. v. 24, Ecclus. xxxix. 16. It is natural to think of the expression of our Lord Himself, Luke xxi. 24, καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, words which may well have suggested to St. Paul his argument in Rom. ix.-xi., but the thought is a more general one. In speaking thus, before such an audience, of a Providence in the history of mankind, assigning to them their seasons and their dwellings, the thought of the Stoic πρόνοια may well have been present to his mind; but if so it was by way of contrast ("sed non a Stoicis Paulo erat discenda πρόνοια," Blass, in loco). St. Paul owed his doctrine of Providence to no school of philosophy, but to the sacred Scriptures of his nation, which had proclaimed by the mouth of lawgiver, patriarch, psalmist, and prophet alike, that the Most High had given to the nations their inheritance, that it was He Who had spread them abroad and brought them in, that it was His to change the times and the seasons, Deut. xxxii. 8, Job xii. 23, Ps. cxv. 16, Dan. ii. 21, see further the note on πρόνοια, Wisdom of Solomon xiv. 3 (xvii. 2), Speaker's Commentary (Farrar). —τας προθεσιας της κατοικιας: the first noun is not found elsewhere either in classical or biblical Greek, but cf. Blass, Gram., p. 60. κατοικία: only here in N.T., but frequent in LXX; found also in Polyb., of a dwelling; so in
καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν· 27. ζητεῖν τὸν Κύριον, εἰ άρα γε ψηλαφήσειν αὐτῶν καὶ εὐρούσῃ, καίτοιγε 3 οὖν


3 καίτοιγε ΝΡ4, Chrys., Cosm., so Meyer; but καὶ γε BD3 (D* καὶ τε), HLP* 13, 61, 137, 180, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass; AE, Clem. have καῖτοι. Instead of ημῶν Α*L 31, 180 read υμῶν.

Strabo, of a settlement, a colony. Here, as in the former part of the verse, we need not limit the words to the assertion of the fact that God has given to various nations their different geographical bounds of mountain, river or sea; as we recognise the influence exerted upon the morale of the inhabitants of a country by their physical surroundings, St. Paul's words teach us to see also in these conditions "the works of the Lord"—the words of the most scientific observer perhaps of Palestine, Karl Ritter, are these: "Nature and the course of history show that here, from the beginning onwards there cannot be talk of any chance": G. A. Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, pp. 112, 113, and 302, 303 ff.; Curtius, "Paulus in Athen.,” Gesammelte Abhandlungen, ii., 531, 536.

Ver. 27. ζητείν = ὤπως ζητώσι, telic infinitive, Winer – Moulton, xlv. 1.—Κύριον: see previous Θεόν: the more fitting word before this audience—Ramsay renders "the God."—εἰ άρα γε: "if haply," A. and R.V., ἐρα strengthened by γε; in classical Greek we have ἐρα followed by γε, but not ἐρα. This ἐρα and ἐρα γε are generally regarded as = Latin si forte (Blass, Grammatik, p. 211), although Simcox, Language of the New Testament, pp. 180, 181, in admitting this, is careful to point out that it is misleading to regard ἐρα as = forte. Alford (so Page) maintains that the expression here, as in viii. 22, indicates a contingency which is apparently not very likely to happen. On the other hand Rendall holds that the particle here, as in viii. 22, should be rendered not perhaps or haply, but indeed: "if they might indeed feel after him," etc., expressing a very real intention of God's providence, the optative pointing to the fact that this intention had not yet been realised (pp. 66, 110), cf. also Mark xi. 13, and in 1 Cor. xv. 15, εἰπέρ ἐρα (see further Blass, Gram., pp. 254, 267; Burton, pp. 106, 111). With the whole passage, Wisdom xiii. 6 should be compared. On St. Paul's study of the Book of Wisdom at some time in his life see Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 52.

—ψηλαφήσειν, ἀοϊκ αorist, the verb is used several times in LXX for the act of groping in the dark, Deut. xxviii. 29, Job v. 14, xii. 25; Isa. lix. 10; cf. its use also in classical Greek, Odys., ix., 416; so Plato, Phaedr., 90 B, where it is used of vague guesses at truth (Wendt, Page). The word would therefore fitly express the thought of men stretching lame hands of faith and groping, and calling to what they feel is Lord of all. Weiss finds the idea of the word as used here, not in the LXX as above, but in 1 John i. 1, of some palpable assurance, which was everywhere possible in a world made by God, ver. 24, Rom. i. 20, and where men's dwellings had been apportioned by Him. But the word might still be used in the above sense, since the recognition of God in His Creation is after all only a partial recognition, and not the highest knowledge of Him; and the inscription "To an Unknown God" testified in itself how imperfect that recognition had been. For the meaning of the word in modern Greek see Kennedy, p. 156.—καίτοιγε, see critical note. καὶ γε, cf. ii. 18, quin etiam (quamvis καίτοιγε "vix aptum," Blass). The word ψήλαφ. had intimated "et proximum esse Deum et oculis occultum" (Blass, Knabenbauer), and the Apostle now proclaims the nearness of God, not only in creation, in its maintenance and preservation, but in the spiritual being of man: "Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet"—οὗ μακράν: the word implies not mere local nearness, but spiritual, cf. Jer. xxiii. 23, and Ephes. ii. 13. With this we may compare Seneca, Ep. Mor.,
xli., 1. "God is near thee; He is with thee; He is within" (quoted by Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 290). The relation of man to God is a personal relationship: God is not "careless of the single life": ἀνδρὶ ἐνός ἐκάστου ἡμῶν, "from each one of us," R.V. The words may well have struck a responsive chord in the hearts, not only of some in the crowd, but of some of the Stoics who were listening, contradictory and incongruous as their system was, with its strange union of a gross material pantheism, and the expression of belief in the fatherly love and goodness of God (see further Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 298, and Curtius, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., 530, 531).

Ver. 28. St. Chrysostom comments (Hom., xxxviii.): Τί λέγω μακράν, οὕτως ἐγγύς ἐστιν, ὡς χωρίς αὐτοῦ μὴ ζῆν, εν αὐτῷ γάρ ζοῦν κ.τ.λ. . . . καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, δι' αὐτοῦ, λόγα γεννησόμεθα καὶ εσμέν. In the three verbs it has been sometimes maintained there is an ascending scale; in God we possess the gift of life, in Him we move, in Him we are (not "have our being" simply), i.e., we are what we are, personal beings. Bethe and Plumptre may be named as two chief supporters of some such view as this, whilst others regard the words (Bengel, Weiss) as merely expressing what had been already expressed in ver. 25, or as referring simply (so Overbeck, Wendt, Felten) to our physical life and being.—τῶν καθ' υμάς π.: "of your own poets," see Grimm., sub τ. κατά, with the accusative as a periphrasis for the possessive pronoun, see also Winer-Moulton, xxi., 7, xlix. d. Bless takes it as = ὑμετέρως, on the reading see W. H. marg. καθ' ὑμᾶς, though the limited range of attestation prevents them from reading this in the text: "there would be a striking fitness in a claim by St. Paul to take his stand as a Greek among Greeks, as he elsewhere indicates his position as a Roman (xvi. 37; xxii. 25, 28), and as a Pharisee (xxiii. 6)"; W. H., ii., p. 310.—τοῦ γάρ καὶ γένος ἑσμέν: half of an hexameter, the γάρ καί has nothing to do with the meaning of the quotation in the N.T., but see Winer-Moulton, liii. 10. The words are found in Aratus, b.c. 270, *Phanom.*, 5, and Cleantenes, b.c. 300, *Hymn to Ζευς*, 5; for other parallels see Bless, *in loco*, and Wetstein, so that Zöckler may go too far in saying that St. Paul quoted from the former as his fellow-countryman, Aratus being of Soli in Cilicia. Both poets named were Stoics, and the words may have been well known as a familiar quotation, see on Tarsus, chapter lx. 11. In Cleantenes the actual words are rather different, ἐκ σου γάρ γένος ἑσμέν, where origin rather than kinship may be meant. No doubt it is possible to exaggerate, with Bentley, St. Paul's knowledge of classical literature, but on the other hand it is not perhaps an unfair inference that a man who could quote so aptly from the poets as here in 1 Cor. xv. 35, and in Tit. i. 12, could have done so at other times if occasion had required, cf. Curtius, *ubi supra*, Bless, *in loco*, and Farrar, "Classical Quotations of St. Paul," *St. Paul*, ii., *Exc.*, iii. As the words of the hymn were addressed to Zeus, a difficulty has been raised as to the Apostle's application of them here, and it has been questioned whether he was acquainted with the context of the words, or whether he was aware of their application. But he must at least have known that they were not originally written of the God Whom he revealed. If so, however, there seems no more difficulty in supposing that he would apply such a hemistich to a higher purpose, than that he should make the inscription on a heathen altar a text for his discourse.

Ver. 29. γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες: for ὑπάρχειν, see above on ver. 24; is the inference simply that because we are dependent upon God for all things, it is absurd to suppose that the divine nature can be like to the work of men's hands! This is correct so far as it goes, but is not the further thought implied that as men are the offspring of God, they ought not to think that man is the measure of God, or that the divine nature, which no man hath seen at any time, can be represented by the art of man, but rather as conscious of a sonship with a Father of spirits they ought to worship a Father in spirit and in truth! see quotations from Seneca in Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 290: "The whole world is the temple of the immortal gods. Temples are not to be built to God of stones piled on high . . . ." *Fragm.* 123 in Lactant. *Div. Inst.*, vi., 25: "God is near thee; He is with thee; He is within," *Ep. Mor.*, xxv., 47: "Thou shalt not form Him of silver and gold, a true likeness of
28-29.
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29. γένος οὖν υπάρχοντες τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἄφιλομεν νομίζειν χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι το καθ ημεραν, so Βlass in β, and Ηilg. Βlass in β.


1 καὶ νὰς, see note in comment., B 33, W. H. mg. read ημας. After εσμεν D adds το καθ ημαρν, so Blass in β, and Hilg. ποιητών om. D, Gig., Aethro., Irint., Ambr., Blass in β.

2 Blass reads (β) χρυσῷ η αργύρῳ; χρ. δΕΑ, Τheodt.; αργ.ΑΕ τ:3,15,18, et αργυ facta (Βlass, in loco).

God cannot be moulded of this material," Ep. Mor., xxxi., 11. See also the striking parallels from Letters of Pseudo-Heraclitus, Gore, Ephesians, p. 254. For a recent view of the possible acquaintance of Seneca with the Christian teaching of St. Paul see Orr, Some Neglected Factors in Early Christianity, pp. 178 sq. — το θείον: not " godhead," but " that which is divine," R.V. margin, " the divine nature"; probably the word which the Athenians themselves used, Xen., Mem., i., 4, 18, see instances in Grimm, sub ν., of its use in Philo and Josephus, who employ it in the neuter of the one God, Grimm thinks, out of regard for Greek usage. — χρυσῷ η ἀργ. η λίθῳ: (on the form of the word see Blass and critical notes) including, we may suppose, the chryselephantine statues of Phidias in the Parthenon, and a reference to the silver mines of Laurium, and the marble hewn from Pentelicus, cf. Epist. ad Diognetum, ii., 2. — χαράγματι: in apposition to χρύσῳ. χαράσσω, Latin, scμίpo, insculpo, only here in N. T. in this sense. Polyb. uses the words of coins stamped (so in Anth. P., v. 360) το χαραχθεν νόμισμα. — τέχνης και ενθ.: " artis externae, cogitationis internae:" ενθ.: a rare word (in the plural, thoughts, cf. Matt. ix. 4, etc.), but used by Thuc., Εur., and also by Hippocrates. See the remarks of Curtius (Gesammtliche Abhandlungen, ii., 535) on the words, as indicating that Paul was acquainted with the phrases of Greek authors. The passage in Wisdom xiii. 6 should be carefully noted (see ver. 27 above), and also ver. 10, in which the writer speaks of gods which are the work of men's hands, gold and silver to show art in, i.e., a contrast drawn between the past times of ignorance, and the present times with God's summons to repentance, but instead of a finite verb we have the participle ὑπεριδών, and so δέ is omitted in the apodosis; see Rendall, in loco, and Appendix on μὲν οὖν, p. 163, and to the same effect, Blass, in loco.— τις ἀγγέλιοι: simply " the times of ignorance," R.V.,
not “this,” as in Vulgate and all E.V. “Ignorantia objectur Atheniensibus? Hanc ipsi sunt fassi. ἀγνώστης, ignoto; ἀγνοοῦντες, ignorantes, v. 23.”—ὑπεριδέων: “overlooked,” R.V., “winked at,” A.V. The latter rendering occurs three times in LXX, Wisdom xiii. 23, Ecclus. xxviii. 7, and xxx. 11 R.; for the verb ταραχέω Skeat quotes Lever, Serm., p. 81: “For if ye winke at such matters, God wyl scoull upon you,” when the word evidently means to connive at, but not the sense required here, cf. also Chapman, Il., iv., 66. The verb υπεροράν is frequent in the LXX, but rather in the sense of despising, neglecting, Gen. xlii. 21, Deut. xxii. 3, 4, Ps. liv. (lv.) 1, Job xvi. 19, Ecclus. i. 10, 11, 12 R. But here it is used rather as the opposite of ἐφοράν, a verb used in classical Greek of overseeing, observing, as of the divine providence of the gods (cf. in N.T. Luke i. 25, Acts iv. 29); so υπεροράν = (1) to look over, (2) to overlook, i.e., not attend to, to let pass (cf. the use of ὑπερείδειν in LXX, Lev. xxvi. 44 and 3 Macc. vi. 15). Tyndale rendered “regarded not,” with which we may compare: “et cum videas perinde te gerere guasi non videas,” Erasmus. Both Chrys. and Oecum. comment on the words, pointing out that it is not παρείδεν or εἴειν, but ὑπερείδειν, τοινικόν, οὐκ ἐπαίτητε κολάσεως διὸ δείξεις ὑπακοῦεις κολάσεως. With the statement of St. Paul here cf. Acts xiv. 16, Rom. iii. 25. But it must be remembered that παρείδειν, Rom. iii. 25, is by no means the same as ἐδείκνυι (“idem paene est παρείδειν quod ὑπερείδειν, Acts xvii. 30,” Bengel); in considering the strictures of Overbeck against the use of the passage in Romans as a parallel to our present passage, it is not alleged, let it be noted, either here or there that God inflicted no punishment upon the sins of the heathen. Rom. i. 19 is a decided proof of the contrary in the case of the very sin of idolatry which St. Paul condemns in Athens; see the words of Chrys. and Oecum. above, and cf. the comments of Weiss, Wendel, Felten, Plumptre, and McGiffert’s note, pp. 260, 261.—τὰ γὰρ, see above p. 135; “hic dies, haec hora, inquit Paulus,” Bengel, in contrast to the “overlooking” on account of ignorance, and so relatively of excuse (cf. ὑπεριδέων, Rom. iii. 26, i.e., from the N.T. times of salvation to the final judgment).—παραγγέλλει: “commandeth,” but in margin, R.V., ἔταγ., “he declareth”: cf. Friedrich, p. 29, on the constant use of the latter in St. Luke’s writings, but used twice by St. Paul elsewhere, 1 Cor. xiv. 25, 1 Thess. i. 9.—πάνι πανταχοῦ : on this and other collocations with πάνι as frequent in Luke see Friedrich, p. 5. ταραχέω is used in the N.T. four times by St. Luke, cf. Luke ix. 6, Acts xxiv. 3, xxvii. 22 (elsewhere in the Gospels, Mark i. 26, xvi. 20), but it is also used, although only once, by St. Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 17. Wetstein quotes instances of the same collocation in Dem., Philo, and adds: “ex toto terrarum orbe pluri milium Athenas advenarant, adeoque hac ipsa Pauli oratione omnibus praedicatur doctrina Evangelii.”—μετανοεῖν: for all had sinned, and all would be judged; infinitive after verbs dicendi, expressing what they must do, cf. xiv. 15, iv. 18, v. 28, 40. The context requires something more than a reference of the words to the turning from idol worship to the true God (Holtzmann), it points to the change of mind which was demanded of those whose consciences by sin were accuse.
3ο-32. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

τοὺς ἀνθρώποις πάσι πανταχού μεταφεῖν· 31. διότι 1 ἀπεστήσεν ἡμέραν, ἐν ἡ μέλλει κρίνειν 2 τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐν ἀνδρὶ καὶ ὀρίσε, πιστὶν παρασχὼν πάσιν, αναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 32. Ἀκού·

1 καθότι for διότι is supported by ΝABDE, Ath., Bas., Cyr., Theodt., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. For εν ἡ μέλλει κρίνειν D, Gig., Iren. simply κρίναι, so Blass in β, and Hilig.

2 Tisch., R.V., W.H., Weiss read περὶ τοῦτον καὶ ταῖν, so ΝAB.

Ver. 31. διότι—καθότι, R.V., see critical note, only found in St. Luke = quia (Blass) in Luke i. 7, xix. 9. Acts ii. 24, ii. 45, iv. 35 = according as: see Plummer on Luke i. 7, and Blass, Gram., p. 268.—ἀπεστήσεν ἡμέραν: hence the command to repent, cf. 1 Macc. iv. 59 and Blass, in loco.—μέλλει κρίνειν, LXX, Ps. ix. 8, xcvi. (xcvii.) 9; its form here may = xii. 6, "on the point of judging" (Weiss).—ἐν δικαίωσι, so often in LXX, as in instances above.—ἐν δικαίωσιν = δικαιοσύνῃ (as of the moral element in which the judgment will take place), cf. 2 Peter ii. 24 and Rev. xix. 11, cf. Psalms as above, and Ecclus. xliv. 26.

—ἐν ἀνδρὶ: in the person of the man (so Ramsay, Meyer, Alford), not ἀνθρώπος but ἀνὴρ, in viro (cf. 1 Cor. vi. 12, ἐν φυλεῖ κρίνεται); above we have ἀνθρώπος, but here the nobler appellation. We may compare with the Christian doctrine Book of Enoch, xli., 9, although according to other Jewish statements it would seem that God, and not the Messiah, was to judge the dead.—ἡ ὀρίσε: ὀρίσε attraction, cf. ii. 22, see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 225, cf. χ. 42, Rom. i. 18. This word with the general tenor of the address, is entirely in line with the preaching to the Thessalonians in the Epistles written some few months later, cf. 1 Thess. i. 9, 10, iii. 13, iv. 6, v. 2, 2 Thess. i. 7, ii. 12; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 259, and Plumptre, in loco. "Ποίον ἰδεῖ θεός," we might well ask. But the theme there is different. The Christian doctrine of judgment is not here enforced as a proof of the resurrection.

Ver. 32. οἱ ὁμώνυμοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμέρων τῆς οἰκουμένης: in classical Greek to afford assurance, a guarantee, see instances in Wetstein. But it is difficult to say how much St. Paul included in the words— to a Jewish audience he would no doubt, like St. Peter, have insisted upon the resurrection of Christ as a final proof given by God that the claims of Christ were true; but to an audience like that at Athens he might well insist upon the fact of the resurrection of the Man ordained by God as a guarantee that all men would be raised; R.V., "whereof he hath given assurance," "whereof" implied in the Greek: marginal rendering in A.V. "offered faith" is omitted in R.V.; "and He hath given all a guarantee in that He hath raised Him from the dead": so Ramsay. Others have taken the words to mean that God thus affords assurance that He will judge the world righteously in that He hath shown His righteousness by raising Christ, others again connect πιστὶν closely with ἐν ἀνδρὶ (so Bethge). If at this point the Apostle was interrupted he may have intended to pursue the theme further, if not then, on some other occasion. But the fact that the speech contains so little that is distinctively Christian is a strong proof of its genuineness; none would have invented such a speech for Paul, any more than they could have invented his discourse at Lystra, see below on p. 381, and Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 150 and 250, 251. Yet in this short address at Athens the Apostle had preached both Jesus and the Resurrection.
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σαντες δὲ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, οἱ μὲν ἐχλεύαζον· οἱ δὲ εἰπον, Ἀκουσό-

μεθά σου πάλιν περὶ τοῦτου. 33. καὶ οὕτως ὁ Παύλος ἔξηλθεν ἐκ

Rendall, Marcus Antoninus, Introd., pp. 107, 108. "On one point alone were the professors of this school [Stoic] agreed; an external existence of the human soul was out of the question," Lightfoot, Philiipians, p. 323. The idea of retribution beyond the grave would have been equally alien to the Stoic as to the Epicurean, and both Stoic and Epicurean alike would have ridiculed the idea of a resurrection of the body. Zöckler, in loco, while referring the οἱ μὲν without hesitation to the Epicureans, thinks that possibly Platonists rather than Stoics may be represented by the οἱ δὲ. If St. Paul was addressing not only a philosophical but a popular audience, as we have seen reason to believe, it is quite possible that while the majority would laugh at his closing words, Juvenal, Sat., ii., 149, there may have been others who clung to the popular mythology and its crude conceptions, and the Apostle's prediction of a judgment to come may have sufficiently interested them to prompt a desire for further disclosures. — ἀκουσόμεθα σου πάλιν (περὶ τοῦτου, R.V., neuter, we can hardly refer it to the αὐτόν of ver. 31). The words are often taken to imply a polite rejection of the Apostle's appeal, a courteous refusal to hear anything further; or at all events to express a very cold interest in his announcement. But if we adopt the reading και πάλιν (see critical note), "yet again," R.V., the words rather indicate that a real interest had been excited in some of the hearers (so Calvin, Grotius, Weiss, Alford) and that the marked and defined division of opinion was not merely a dramatic device of the author.

Ver. 33. οὕτως : may mean, with this scanty result, or simply, after these events, in this state of the popular mind, with an expectation of being heard again (Alford); "ancipiti auditorum obsequio; nullo edito miraculo": Bengel. — ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν : at the opening Paul stood ἐκ μέσου, ver. 22, τοῦ Α. π.: "the two expressions correspond to and explain each other, ... he went forth from the midst of them' must have been standing 'in the midst of them'"; cf. Ramsay, Expositor, September, 1895, and for the bearing of the words see above on ver. 22. For similar phrase with μέσου as frequent in St. Luke's writings, Friedrich, p. 22. Ramsay thinks that some danger is indicated, but nothing is said of this; the words apparently refer to no trial, although, perhaps, to some kind of preliminary inquiry, see above, ver. 22.

Ver. 34. τινὲς δὲ: may contrast the favourable with the unfavourable, or perhaps merely continuous.—κολληθέντες, see above on v. 13, implies close companionship upon which their conversion followed, see additional note.—Διονύσιος ὁ Α.: "quam doctrinam siccerei rejec-

τριντ, Areopagita vir gravissi accipit". Dionysius was a member of the Council, the words can mean nothing less—it is evident, therefore, that this convert must have been a man of some distinction, as an Areopagite would previously have filled the office of Archon. On the honour attached to the term cf. Cicero, Pro Balbo, xii., and instances cited by Renan, Saint Paul, p. 209, note. It is not improbable that St. Luke may have received from him the draft of St. Paul's address. On the other hand the conversion of a man occupying such a position has excited suspicion, and Baur, Paulus, i., 105, considers that the whole scene on the Areopagus is unhistorical, and owes its origin to the tradition that an Areopagite named Dionysius was converted. So Holtzmann holds that the whole scene was placed on the Areopagus, because, according to report, a member of the Areopagus was converted, Apostelgeschichte, p. 303, similarly Weizsäcker on Dionysius, B.D. 3, Hastings' B.D., Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, i., p. 846; Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 337 and notes below.—Δάμαλις: perhaps Δάμαλις, a heifer, a name popular amongst the Greeks, so Grotius, Wet-

stein, and Renan, Saint Paul, p. 209, note; see critical note above. We know nothing certain about her, but Ramsay makes the interesting conjecture that as the woman is not described as εὐσχήμων (cf. the description of the women at Thessalonica, Berea, and Pisidian Antioch, xiii. 50, xvii. 4, 12), she may have been a foreign woman (perhaps one of the educated Hetairai), as at Athens no woman of respectable position would have been present amongst St. Paul's audience. St. Chrysostom (so St. Ambrose and Asterius) thought that she was the wife of Dionysius, but St. Luke calls her γυνὴ, not ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ. No mention is made of her in D (but see above
33-34. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

μέσου αυτών. 34. τινες δὲ άνδρες κολληθέντες αυτῷ επίστευσαν ·

δν οίς καὶ Διονύσιος ο 'Αρεοπαγίτης, καὶ γυνὴ ονόματι Δάμαρις, καὶ

έτεροι σὺν αὐτοῖς.

Before καὶ ετερ. D (Flor.) add ευσχημων. The words καὶ γυνη ονομ. Δ. are

omitted in D (retained by Blass in β), see comment., and also by Hilg., who adds

eυσχημων after Αρεοπ.

critical note), and Ramsay accounts for this by the view that the reviser of Codex

Bezae was a Catholic, who objected to the prominence given to women in Acts, and that under the influence of this feeling the changes occurred in xvii. 12 (see above) and 34: this prominence assigned to women was, in Ramsay’s view, firstly, pagan rather than Christian, and secondly, heretical rather than Catholic; Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 160, 161; see “Damaris,” Hastings’ B.D., and Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 337.—καὶ έτεροι: a significant contrast to the precise results of the Apostle’s preaching elsewhere, and yet a contrast which carries with it an evidence of truth. Spitta, p. 242, justly remarks that he knows not how the author of the “We” sections, who was not present at Athens, could have represented the activity of St. Paul in that city better than he has done; the idle curiosity of the Athenians, ver. 21, and after a speech received with ridicule and indifference, a scanty result, graphically represented by two names, of which it is a mere assertion to say that they refer to the sub-apostolic age. Spitta thus refuses to allow any justification for Weizsäcker’s rejection of the historical worth of the narrative. Thus in the simple notice of the results of St. Paul’s preaching we gain an indication of the historical truthfulness of the narrative. If anywhere, surely at Athens a forger would have been tempted to magnify the influence of St. Paul’s intellectual power, and to attribute an overwhelming victory to the message of the Gospel in its first encounter with the philosophic wisdom of the world in a city which possessed a university, the greatest of any of that time, which was known as “the eye of Greece, mother of arts,” whose inhabitants a Jewish philosopher (Philo) had described as the keenest mentally of all the Greeks. In answer to the earlier criticism of Zeller and Overbeck, we may place the conclusion of Weiss that the result of St. Paul’s labours is plainly not described after a set pattern, but rests upon definite information, whilst Wendt, who refers the composition of the speech, as we have it, to St. Luke, and regards it as derived from information of a speech actually delivered at Athens, insists equally strongly upon the difficulty of supposing that such slender results would be represented as following, if the speech had been composed with a view of exalting Jewish and Christian monotheism against polytheism. Moreover the narrative bears the stamp of truthfulness in its picture of the local condition of Athens, and also in its representation of St. Paul’s attitude to the philosophical surroundings of the place and its schools. “One must be at home in Athens,” writes Curtius, “to understand the narrative rightly,” and no one has enabled us to realise more fully the historical character and vividness of the scene than Curtius himself in the essay to which reference is made above, of which the concluding words are these, that “he who refuses to accept the historical value of the narrative of Paul in Athens, tears one of the weightiest pages out of the history of humanity” (Gesammelte Abhandlungen, ii., p. 543, “Paulus in Athens” : see further, Knaubenbauer, pp. 308, 309). The character of the people, the moving life of the Agora, the breadth of view which could comprehend in one short speech the crude errors of the populace and the fallacious theology of the schools, “the heart of the world” too generous to ignore all that was best in men’s thoughts of God’s providence and of human brotherhood, and yet too loving to forget that all men had sinned, and that after death was the judgment—we recognise them all. If we turn to the speech itself we find abundant evidence of characteristic Pauline thoughts and teaching (cf., e.g., ver. 27 and Rom. i. 19, ii. 14; ver. 26 and Rom. v. 12, i Cor. xv. 45; ver. 30 and Rom. iii. 25, etc., Zöckler, p. 268, and instances in notes above, McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 259), and it is worthy of note that Weizsäcker, while rejecting with Baur, Zeller, Schwegler, and Overbeck the account of St. Paul’s visit to Athens as unhistorical, fully recognises, after an examination of the Apostle’s method of
dealing with idolatry and polytheism in 
Rom. i. 20, that if we compare with the 
Apostle’s own indications the fine survey 
of the world, and especially of history 
from a monotheistic standpoint, ascribed 
to him by the Acts at Lystra, xiv. 15, and 
and afterwards at Athens, xvii. 24, the latter, 
whatever its source, also gives us a true 
idea of Paul’s method and teaching, Apo-
stolic Age, i., p. 117, E.T. On the whole 
tone of the speech as incredible as a 
later composition, see Ramsay, St. Paul, 
p. 147 ff., whilst no one perhaps has drawn 
up more clearly than Wetstein, see on 
Acts xvii. 25, the consummate skill of the 
speech addressed to an audience com-
prising so many varieties of culture and 
belief. (To the strange attempt of 
Holtzmann to reproduce at some length 
the argument of Zeller, who maintains 
that the scene at Athens was a mere 
counterpart of the scene of Stephen’s 
encounter with his foes at Jerusalem, a 
sufficient answer may be found in Spitta, 
Apostelgeschichte, p. 240.)

If we ask from whom the report 
of the speech was received, since Luke, 
Silas, Timothy all were absent, it is 
possible that a Christian convert like 
Dionysius the Areopagite may have pre-
served it (Zöckler); but a speech so full 
of Pauline thoughts, and so expressive of 
Athenian life and culture, may well have 
been received at least in substance from 
St. Paul himself, although it is quite 
conceivable that the precise form of it in 
Acts is due to St. Luke’s own editing and 
arrangement (see for an analysis of the 
language of the speech Bethge, Die 
Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte, 
p. 82). The results of St. Paul’s work 
at Athens were small if measured by 
the number of converts, although even 
amongst them it must not be forgotten 
that it was something to gain the alle-
giance to the faith of a man holding the 
position of Dionysius the Areopagite 
(see further an interesting account of 
the matter in Expository Times, April, 
1898). But in addition to this, it is also 
important to remember that St. Paul has 
given us “an invaluable method of 
missionary preaching” (Lechler, Das 
Apost. Zeitalter, p. 275), that to the 
Church at Athens Origen could appeal 
against Celsus as a proof of the fruits of 
Christianity (Bethge, p. 116), that its 
failing faith was revived in time of per-
secution by its bishop Quadratus, the 
successor of the martyr-bishop Publius; 
that in the Christian schools of Athens 
St. Basil and St. Gregory were trained; 
and that to an Athenian philosopher, 
Aristides, a convert to Christ, we owe 
the earliest Apology which we possess 
(Athenagoras too was an Athenian 
philosopher), see Farrar, St. Paul, i., p. 
551; Humphry, Commentary on the Acts. 
It is significant that St. Paul never 
visited Athens again, and never ad-
dressed a letter to the Saints at Athens, 
even though it may well have included 
them in his salutation to “the Saints 
which are in the whole of Achaia,” 2 
Cor. i. 1.

CHAPTER XVIII.—Ver. 1. μετά δὲ 
ταῦτα : in continuation of the narrative, 
cf. Luke x. 1.—χαρισματικός : in i. 4 with 
πό, and so usually—only here with εκ, 
departure from Athens emphasised, be-
cause events had compelled the Apostle 
to alter his intended plan (Ramsay, St. 
Paul, p. 240, and Blass, in loco), cf. 1 
Chron. xii. 8 (A al.); 2 Macc. v. 2, xii. 
12, with an accusative of place.—Κόρι-
νθον: Corinth from its position as the 
capital of the Roman province Achaia was 
the centre of government and commerce, 
while Athens was still the great educa-
tional centre of Greece. St. Paul, with 
his keen eye for the most important and 
prominent stations of Roman govern-
ment and the meeting points of East and 
West, might be expected to choose a place 
from whence the influence of the Gospel 
could spread over the whole province. 
Like Ephesus, Corinth lay on the great 
highway between East and West; like 
Ephesus it was, as Professor Ramsay 
terms it, one of the knots on the line of 
communication, the point of convergence 
for many subordinate roads. But Corinth, 
with all its external beauty, its wealth and 
fame, had become a byword for vice and 
infamy, cf. Κορινθιαίσθαι, Κορινθιάζειν, 
Wetstein, 1 Cor. i. 2, and references in 
Farrar, St. Paul, i., 557 ff., and it has not 
been unfairly termed the Vanity Fair of the 
Roman empire: at once the London and 
the Paris of the first century after Christ.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

Ποντικόν γένει, προσφάτως εληλυθότα από της Ιταλίας, και Πρίσκιλλα γυναίκα αὐτοῦ, διά τὸ διατεταχὲναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι


Ver. 2. Ἀκύλαν, cf. νερ. 18, Rom. xνί.3, I Cor. χνι.19,2 Τιμ. iv.19: the Latin Αquila in its Greek form; the name πηαγαίον have been assumed, as often the case, in place of the Jewish name. It is altogether unreasonable to suppose that Luke made a mistake and that this Aquila's name was Pontius Ακύλα, Cic., Ad Fam., x.,33; Suet., ful. Caes., 78. The name, moreover, was also a slave name (Ramsay, p. 269), as a freedman of Μαιενας was called (C. Cilnius) Ακύλα. But it is probable that as the greater part of the Jews in Rome were freedmen, Ακύλα may also have belonged to this class, see Schürer, ii.5.,p. 234, and also further, Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. xxvii., 418; Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 173. —τὸ γένος: "by race," R.V., cf. iv. 36, of Barnabas, and xvii. 24, of Απόλλων: the word need not mean more than this. —Ιουδαίον: the word has been pressed sometimes to indicate that Aquila was still unconverted to Christianity. But the fact that he is called a Jew may simply refer to the notice which follows "that all Jews," etc. Whether Aquila was a Christian before he met St. Paul is very difficult to determine. He is not spoken of as a disciple, and similarity of employment rather than of Christian belief may account for the Apostle's intercourse with him and Πρίσκιλλα, Zahn, Einleitung, i., 189. But the suspicion with which most of his countrymen regarded St. Paul rather indicates that Aquila and Priscilla must at least have had some leanings towards the new faith, or they would scarcely have received him into their lodgings. It is quite possible that, as at the great Pentecost Jews from Rome had been present, cf. ii. 10, Christianity may have been carried by this means to the imperial city, and that such tidings may have predisposed Aquila and Priscilla to listen to St. Paul's teaching, even if they were not Christians when they first met him. If they were converted, as has been supposed, by St. Paul at Corinth, it is strange that no mention is made of their conversion. That they were Christians when St. Paul left them at Ephesus seems to be beyond a doubt. Renan describes them as already Christians when they met the Apostle, so too Hilgenfeld, on the ground that their conversion by St. Paul could not have been passed over, see further "Ακύλα," B.D.; and Hastings' B.D.; Wendt, in loco; Lightfoot, Phil., pp. 16 and 17, Hort, Rom. and Ephes., p. 9.—προσφάτως: here only, lit., lately slaughtered or killed; hence recent, fresh; Latin, recens (Grimm). In LXX, Deut. xxίν.5, Εzek. xi.3, Jud. iv.3,5, 2 Μacc. χίν. 36, so too in Polybius, Westcott on Heb. x. 20 προσφάτους regards all derivations from σφάω (σφάζω) φάω (φένω) φάω (φημί) as unsatisfactory. —Πρίσκιλλαν: in Epistles, Rom. xvi. 3, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, 2 Tim. iv. 9, Prisca, R.V., W.H., Priscilla, perhaps the diminutive, cf. Lucilla, Domitilla. Probably St. Luke used the language of conversation, in which the diminutive forms were usually employed, St. Paul, p. 268. On Bezan text see critical note, Ramsay, u. s., and Church in the Roman Empire, p. 158. In vv. 18 and 26 we have Priscilla mentioned before her husband, and so by
At the commencement of the verse Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor. (Aug.) add το Π. εν τη Ακουλα, and before ομοτεχνον Syr. Harcl. mg., Aug. add ομοφυλον και, so Blass in β (cf. Flor. in ver. 2, salutavit eos); see Belser, Beiträge, p. 84, on the bearing of this reading on the conversion of Aquila and Priscilla. For ομοφυλον Ν*Β, Boh. Orig., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss. Wendt read προσεληνον. τη τεχνη (for acc.), so Βlassin β (cf. Flor. in ver. 2, salutavit eos): see Βelser, Βeitrage, p. 84, on the bearing of this reading on the conversion of Aquila and Priscilla.

St. Paul, except in 1 Cor. xvi. 19. The reason may be that she was of higher social status, and indeed not a Jewess at all, as this seems the best way of accounting for the curious arrangement of the sentence here, the point being to emphasise the fact that Aquila was a Jew. Her name may indicate some connection with the Priscan Gens; whilst Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 420, in an interesting discussion find reasons to connect both her (and possibly her husband) with the Acilian Gens. That she was a woman of education is evident from ver. 26, and it is possible that her marriage with Aquila may afford us another proof among many of the influence of the Jewish religion over educated women in Rome, Rom. xvi. 3. Ramsay dates the edict at the end of 50 A.D. on the ground that although Orosius, Hist., vii., 6, 15, states that it occurred in the ninth year of Claudius, 49 A.D., the historian here, as elsewhere (e.g., cf. the famine) in connection with the events of this reign, is a year too early. Wendt (1899), p. 59, gives 49-50 as the year of the edict. But it must be remembered that the authority of Orosius is not altogether reliable in this case, as there is no proof that he had any direct reference to Josephus, to whom he appeals for his date; see Ο. Ηοlzmann, Νεwtest. Ζitgeschichte, p. 129; Βlass, Πroleg., 23, and Turner, “Chronology of the New Testament” Hastings’ B.D. ΜcGiffert, p. 362, maintains that as the date of the edict is thus unknown, we cannot base any chronological conclusions upon it, cf. Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 634. Meyer maintained that by Chrestus Suetonius meant a Jewish agitator so called, but it is more probable that the historian confused Christus with Chrestus—an unfamiliar name with one in use among both Greeks and Romans. This Chrestus Suetonius speaks of as actually living, as the historian might have heard enough to lead him to regard the commotions between Jews and Jewish Christians in Rome as instigated by a leader bearing this name, commotions like those excited in the Pisidian Antioch, in Thessalonica, and elsewhere; or it may be that he thus indicates the feverish hopes of the Messiah amongst the Jews resident in Rome, hopes so often raised by some pretentious deliverer. But Lightfoot makes the important remark that even in this case we may fairly suppose that the true Christ held a prominent place in
3-5.
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4. διελέγετο δέ εν τῇ συναγωγῇ κατὰ πάντα σάββατον, εὐπθυῖ τε οἱ ὅδοι τοὺς καὶ Ἑλληνας. 5. οὐ δέ κατῆλθον

After διελέγετο (δε) D, Flor. Gig., Vulgel., Syr. Harcl. mg., Blass in β, so Hilg. add ἐπειθεῖ το σωμα του ενοῦν I. If in contrast to ver. 5 it is difficult to see why omitted, nor does the introduction of the name of Jesus seem likely in itself (interpomnis, Flor.) to have persuaded both Jews and Greeks, unless we take ἐπειθεῖ as consative only. ἐπειθεῖ is not found elsewhere in the N.T. Belser thinks that here ἐπειθεῖ means “insinuating” (p. 85), and that the passage in β reminds us of Paul’s own description of his preaching in i Cor. ii. 3 (so Blass). οὐ μονον I. ἀλλὰ καὶ Ελλ., so D and Flor., Blass in β, supported by Belser, u. s.

these reports, for he must have been not less known at this time than any of the false Christs (Philippians, p. 16, note). Such indifference on the part of a Roman of the period is surely not surprising, and the probability is more generally maintained that this Chrestus was really Christ, the leader of the Christians, see Weiss, Einleitung in das N. T., p. 227; Wendt (1809), in loco; Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 47, 254; McGregor, Apostolic Age, p. 362, note, but, on the other hand, Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 306.

Ver. 3. Βασίλειον: the word is peculiar to St. Luke, and although it is found in classical Greek and in Josephus, it is not used in the LXX, and it may be regarded as a technical word used by physicians of one another; the medical profession was called ἡ ἱατρική τέχνη; physicians were ομότεχνοι; thus Dioscorides in dedicating his work to ares speaks of his friendly disposition towards fellow-physicians (ομότεχνοι), Hobart, p. 239, Weiss in Meyer’s Kommentar, Luke i. 6, and also Vogel, Zur Charakteristik des Lukas, p. 17 (1897). On the dignity of labour as fully recognised by Judaism at the time of the Advent, see Edersheim, Jews, chapter xi.: Savingsof the Jewish Fathers, pp. 18, 19, 141 (Taylor, 2nd edit.); Iουνον ταρ’ αὐτόν: “In Alexandria the different trades sat in the synagogue arranged into guilds; and St. Paul could have had no difficulty in meeting in the bazaar of his trade with the like-minded Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 2, 3), with whom to find a lodging,” Edersheim, u. s., p. 89, and see passage from T. B. Sukkah, 5 Ι b, quoted by Lumby, in loco, and on vi. 9—Αργάτο: “at Corinth St. Paul’s first search seems to have been for work,” cf. Acts xx. 34, 35, i Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8, 1 Cor. iv. 11, 12, 2 Cor. xi. 9, Phil. iv. 12. In close connection with this passage cf. “St. Paul a Working Man and in Want,” An Expositor’s Note-Book, pp. 419-438 (the late Dr. Samuel Cox), see also Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 34-36—σκηνοποιοί: only here in N.T. (σκηνοποιοῖς, Symm., Isa. xiii. 20, xxii. 15); much has been said about the word, but there seems no reason to depart from the translation “tent-makers,” i.e., σκηνογράφοι, Aelian, V. H., ii., 1, and so St. Paul is called by Chrysostom and Theodoret, although Chrysostom also calls him σκυτοτόμος, 2 Tim. ii., Hom., iv., 5, 3. It is no doubt true that tents were often made of a rough material woven from the hair of the goats in which Cilicia abounded, and that the name κίλικων (Lat. ciliicum, Fr. cîte, hair-cloth) was given to this material; but the word in the text does not mean “makers of materials for tents.” There is no ground for rendering the word with Renan tapissier, or with Michaelis “Kunst-Instrumentenmacher”. On the curious notion that St. Paul was a landscape painter, which appears to have arisen from a confusion between σκηνογράφοι and σκηνογράφος, and the fact that he is described as ἰενοσώματος, probably a confusion with σκηνοσώματος, see Expository Times, and notes by Ramsay, Nestle, Dec., 1896, Jan. and March, 1897. As it was often enjoined upon a son not to forsake the trade of his father, perhaps from respect, perhaps because a similar trade might be more easily learnt at home, it is likely that Saul followed his father’s trade, which both father and son might easily have learnt at Tarsus. Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol.i., p. 44, E.T. In a commercial city like Corinth the material would be easily obtainable, see critical note.

Ver. 4. διελέγετο δέ . . . εὐπθυῖ: “and he used to discourse . . . and tried to persuade,” so Ramsay, marking the imperfects, see also Hackett’s note.—Ελληνας: proselytes, since they are represented as in the synagogue, cf. xiv. 1. The heathen are not addressed until
απὸ τῆς Μακεδονίας δὲ τῆς Σιλας καὶ τοῦ Τιμόθεου, συνείχετο τῷ πνεύματι
δὲ Παύλος, διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τῶν Χριστὸν ἤτοιν. 6. ἀντιτασσομένων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ βλασφημοῦντων, ἐκτιναξάμενος τὰ ἰμάτια, ἐπεὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν.


ver. 6. McGiffert considers that this notice of work in the synagogue is untrustworthy (p. 268) and at variance with the fact that in St. Paul’s own Epistles there is no hint of it, but cf. 1 Cor. ix. 20, words which we may reasonably suppose had a special application to Corinth, or the Apostle would scarcely have so expressed himself. It would have been strange if in such a commercial centre there had been no Jewish synagogue.

Ver. 5. See note on xvii. 15; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 269, recognises this among the striking points of contact between Acts and the Epistles to the Corinthians. Here Silas and Timothy are said to have been with St. Paul in Corinth, cf. St. Paul’s own statement in 2 Cor. i. 19, to the fact that the same two names occur in the salutations of 1 and 2 Thess., both of which were written from Corinth, see also Paley, Horæ Paulinæ, iv., 6, 7, and viii. 4.—συνείχετο τῷ πνεύματι: “he was wholly absorbed in preaching,” λέγει, so Ramsay; “in teaching the word,” Grimm-Thayer, cf. Wisdom xvii. 11 (cf. 2 Cor. v. 14). The verb occurs frequently in Luke, six times in his Gospel, three times in Acts, twice in St. Paul, only once elsewhere in N.T., but nowhere as in the particular phrase here. It looks as if St. Paul’s preaching in Corinth was specially characterised by “greater concentration of purpose and simplicity of method,” cf. 1 Cor. ii. 2. The philosophic style in which he had addressed the Athenians is now abandoned, and so too, at least primarily, the proclamation of the living and true God, and of the coming of His Son to save His people in the day of wrath, with which apparently he had commenced at Thessalonica, 1 Thess. i. 9, 10. Such methods and truths had their place, but in Corinth “Jesus Christ and Him crucified” was to be preached as the power of God and the wisdom of God, and in both his Epistles all that the Apostle says about the duties of the Christian life is brought into relation with this fundamental truth (see McGiffert, u. s., p. 266). Silas and Timothy found him wholly possessed by and engrossed in the word (so the imperfect, Page, Alford, Wendt). On the other hand it has been maintained that the arrival of Silas and Timothy brought St. Paul help from Macedonia, and that on the account, Phil. iv. 15, 2 Cor. xi. 9, he was able to give himself up to preaching, as he was thus relieved from the strain of working for his bread (so Wordsworth, Lewin, Rendall). But 1 Cor. ix. 1 seems to imply that St. Paul still continued to work for his livelihood at Corinth. Blass seems to find in the uniqueness of the phrase a reason for its alteration; see critical note for his view. Plumptre refers the words to the Apostle’s desire to see Rome, which the Apostle had cherished for many years, and which had been further kindled by finding himself in company with those who came from Rome; and the announcement of a journey to Rome, xix. 21, after the Apostle had been some time in the company of Aquila and Priscilla both at Corinth and Ephesus, is emphasised by Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 255. But on the whole, Ramsay’s interpretation is very striking, p. 252, cf. the remarks of McGiffert much to the same effect, Apostolic Age, pp. 263-266.—διαμαρτ., see above on p. 92.—τον X. I.: “that the Anointed One is Jesus,” cf. xvii. 3, so Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 226. So far the message was evidently for Jews. See critical note for reading in D.

Ver. 6. ἀντιτασσ.: classical use, of an army ranged in hostile array, or of those opposed to each other in opinion, Thuc., iii. 83. So in later Greek, in Polyb.,
καθαρός εγώ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐλαῖς τὰ δέθη πορεύσομαι. 7. καὶ μεταβὰς
ἐκεῖθεν ἤδειν εἰς αἰκίαν τινὸς ἀνδρότατον, σεβομένου τὸν Θεόν,
οὐ δὲ αἰκίαν συνομοροῦσα τῷ συναγῳγῷ. 8. Κρίστου δὲ ὁ ἀρχι-
συνάγωγος ἐπίτυχε τῷ Κυρίῳ σὺν δὲ τῷ αἰκίῳ αὐτοῦ· καὶ πάλλων

1 B* D*, Syr. H.; Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt have Τίτου I. ΝΕ, Vulg., Boh.,
Arm. have Τίτου I., so R.V. Instead of εκεῖθεν D* 137, Flor. read ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκυλα,
not Blass in β, but Hilg.; see Corssen, u. s., p. 428.

2 For doublets in D in this verse, so in Flbr., Blass in β, see Harris, Four Lectures,
etc., p. 60.

generally to oppose, to resist. Ramsay renders "and when they began to
form a faction against him," but cf. Rom. xiii. 2, James iv. 6, 9. Pet. v. 5, Prov. iii. 34.—βλασφ., cf. xiii. 45, or it may be used generally as in xix.
9, and 2 Peter ii. 2.—καθαρός: cf. xiii. 51, note.; cf. Matt. x. 14, and LXX.
Neh. v. 13. "undoubtedly a very exasperating gesture," Ramsay, St. Paul,
p. 256; but we must remember that the opposition at Corinth seems to have been
unusually great, as Ramsay himself points out, u. s., pp. 143, 256.—το αίμα
ὑμών, cf. xx. 26, Hebraistic, cf., e.g., Matt. xxvii. 25, and in LXX, Lev. xx. 16, 2
Sam. i. 16, 1 Kings iii. 37, Ezek. iii. 18, etc., i.e., ἀνθρω., Matt. xxiii. 35. Both
here and in xx. 26 we can scarcely doubt that St. Paul had in mind the words of
the prophet, Ezek. xxxiii. 6.—ἐπί τήν κεφ., i.e., upon yourselves, the head
being used for the person—for other ideas of the word see Wendt (1888), in loco.
De Wette interprets of moral ruin, and others of the eternal σταύρωσις, but we
cannot refine so much upon a figurative phrase. In vv. 5b and 6 Spitta and
Jüngst see the hand of a Reviser, the former holding that the whole passage
runs smoothly with these omissions, whilst Jüngst ascribes also the word
εκεῖθεν, ver. 7, to the Reviser. According to Clemen, 4 and 5b, the preaching in
the synagogue belongs to Redactor Judaicus, the Jewish persecution in ver.
6 to the Redactor Antijuudicus. Hilgenfeld agrees with Spitta in so far that he
ascribes 5b and 6b to "the author to Theophilus".—καθαρὸς εγὼ: scarcely
enough to say "I am pure," have discharged my duty with a clear conscience,
cf. xx. 26, the same idea here, better to punctuate at εγώ, but see Blass, in loco.
—ἐκεῖθεν: from henceforth, i.e., so far as he is concerned. It is evident that
the words did not apply to other places, for in xix. 8 St. Paul goes to the
synagogue according to his wont. The phrase

is found five times in St. Luke's Gospel,
but only here in Acts. It is used once
elsewhere in N.T, and there by St. Paul,
2 Cor. v. 16 (cf. John viii. 11). See
Friedrich, p. 16, and Hawkins, Horae
Synopticae, p. 29.

Ver. 7. μεταβάς εκεῖθεν, i.e., from
the synagogue, cf. Luke x. 7, "he re-
moved," Rendall; "he changed his place
from the synagogue," Ramsay: the verb
is found three times with ἐκεῖθεν in St.
Matthew, and in each place "departed"
R.V., this gives perfectly good sense:
cf. Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire,
p. 158, and critical note.—Τίτου ουν:
if the addition Τίτου or Τιτίου is correct,
there is no need to discuss the possible
identification with the companion of St.
Paul in Gal. ii. 1, etc., see Alford and
Page, in loco, and critical note. The
identification was adopted by Chrysos-
tom and Grotrius, and for a statement of
the evidence on either side see Plumptre,
in loco. It should be remembered that
we have Barsabbas Justus, i. 23, and
Jesus Justus, Col. iv. 11, etc.; see also Lightfoot "Acts of the Apostles," B.D., i.,
32. The house of a proselyte may have
been chosen because it offered easy
access to those who wished to come,
whether Greeks or Hebrews (see Chry-
sostom's comment), but in Paul's thus
going into the house of a proselyte hard
by the synagogue we may see how his
spirit had been stirred. But further: this
Titus Justus was evidently a Roman
citizen, one of the coloni in Corinth, and
thus St. Paul would gain access through
him to the more educated class in the
city, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 256, and
"Corinth," Hastings' B.D., i. 480.—
συνομορούσα: there is no need to sup-
pose that he left his lodgings with Aquila
—this house became Paul's place of
meeting (so in Ephesus, cf. xix. 9, 10);
he had his own synagogue there (Blass);
in classics simple verb διορύχω, διορυγώ;
compound only found here; συνόμορος,
Eccl. writers.
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ΚΩΣΤΟΣ, cf. 1 Cor. i. 14, coincidence with, admitted by McGiffert, p. 269 (so too by Holtzmann), "no reason to doubt that he is the man whose conversion Luke reports," according to tradition he became Bishop of Eginh, Const. Apost., viii., 46. Though a Jew he bore a Latin name, cf. for a parallel case J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., in loco.—αὐξάνω, if we cf. ver. 17 it looks as if in the Corinthian synagogue there was only one person bearing this title, and that Sosthenes succeeded Crispus when the latter became a Christian, see "Corinth" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., i., p. 482, and see also Ramsay, Expositor, April, 1895, and above on xiii. 15: on the reason of St. Paul's baptism of Crispus, Gaius, Stephanas, see B.D., and Hastings' B.D., v. 5. There is certainly no ground for supposing that St. Paul depreciated baptism although he baptised so few in Corinth with his own hands, Speaker's Commentary on I Cor. i. 17. It is evident from this notice that St. Paul's preaching had not been without its effect on the Jewish residents, and probably one reason why the feeling against the Apostle was so strong, was because this influence extended to persons of importance in Corinth; the next words show good results among the Gentile population of the city. —ἐν τῷ οίκῳ, cf. xvi. 15, 1 Cor. i. 16.—ὑπὸ τοῦ, not "εἰσέχεται," who are always so called, but "Ελληνες;" i.e., "chosen people," even in Corinth, proverbial for its vice, Christ has His "chosen people," and in Cenchreae, where all the vices of a seafaring population found a home, "Christianity wrought its miracle," so Renan, Saint Paul, p. 275. But whilst the new faith thus gained adherents chiefly from the lowest social grade, cf. also 1 Cor. i. 26, which indicates that there were some in the higher social ranks and some versed in the learning of the schools who welcomed the Gospel; to a Crispus, a Gaius, a Stephanas, we may add Erastus, the public treasurer of the city, Rom. xvi. 23, an office which in a place like Corinth carried with it considerable influence and position (as even
11. ἐκάθισε τε ἐνιαυτόν καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, διδάσκον ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

12. Γαλλίωνος δὲ ἀνθυπατεύοντος τῆς Ἀχαιῶν, κατεπέστησαν ομοθυμαδόν Ἰουδαίοι τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα,

Renan admits, although he regards him as the only adherent won from the upper classes), and the readiness with which the Corinthian Church responded to St. Paul's appeal for the poor saints indicates that many of its members had some means at their disposal (cf. the striking account of Paul's work at Corinth by McGiffert, p. 267, and Orr, Some Neglected Factors in Early Christianity, p. 108).

Ver. 11. ἐκάθισε, see critical note, "he dwelt," R.V., cf. Luke xxi. 49, but not elsewhere in N.T. in this sense, but constantly in LXX, 1 Macc. ii. 1, 29. Rendall renders "he took his seat," i.e., as a teacher, a Rabbi, and see also the remarks of Ramsay on the way in which St. Paul was evidently regarded at Corinth as one of the travelling lecturers on philosophy and morals so common in the Greek world, "Corinth," Hastings' B.D., p. 482. The word may be purposely used here instead of the ordinary μένειν to indicate the quiet and settled work to which the Apostle was directed by the vision which had calmed his troubled spirit, and had taught him that his cherished plan of revisiting Macedonia must be postponed to preaching the Word in Corinth. During this period 1 and 2 Thess., were probably written. The year and a half is taken to include the whole subsequent residence in Corinth, ver. 18, in which vv. 12-17 form an episode. Men attacked him with a view of injuring him, but without success, and his continuous abode in Corinth was a fulfilment of the promise in ver 10 (indicated perhaps more clearly by τε than by δέ in ver. 11). On ἡμέρας οὖν, ver. 18, see below—the words are taken to mark simply a note of the time spent between the incident of vv. 12-17 and the departure of Paul from the city. In this period the Apostle would have founded the Church at Cenchreae, and his labours seem to have extended still further, for in 2 Cor. i. 1 we read of the saints in the whole of Achaia (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 10) and the household of Stephanas is spoken of as the firstfruits not of Corinth but of Achaia.

Ver. 12. ἀνθ., cf. xiii. 7, another proof of St. Luke's accuracy, Achaia from b.c. 27 (when it had been separated from Macedonia, to which it had been united since b.c. 146, and made into a separate province) had been governed by a proconsul. In a.d. 15 Tiberius had reunited it with Macedonia and Asia, and it was therefore governed by an imperial legatus as an imperial province, Tac., Ann., i., 76. But a further change occurred when Claudius, a.d. 44, made it again a senatorial province under a proconsul, Suet., Claudius, 25. On subsequent changes in its government see Ramsay, "Achaia," Hastings' B.D. Corinth was the chief city of the province Achaia, and so probably chosen for the residence of the governors.—Γαλλίωνος: we have no direct statement save that of St. Luke that Gallio governed Achaia. Gallio's brother Seneca tells us that Gallio caught fever in Asia, Eb. Mon., 254, and took a voyage for change of air (Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 258) (see also the same reference in Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 634, and as against Clemen, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 260), a remark which Ramsay justly regards as a corroboration of St. Luke; on the date see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 258, and Expositor, March, 1897, p. 206; "Corinth," Hastings' B.D., p. 481; Turner, "Chronology of the New Testament," ibid. Gallio could not have entered on the proconsulship of Achaia before a.d. 44, and probably not before 49 or 50: Ramsay thinks during the summer of a.d. 52 (Renan and Lightfoot, a.d. 53), whilst recently Schürer (so Wendt, 1899) places the proconsulship of Gallio between 51-55 a.d., Zw. Th., 1898, p. 41 f. (as against O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, who places it before 49 a.d.). The description of Gallio in Acts is quite consistent with what we know of his personal character, and with his attitude as a Roman official.


Statius, Silv., ii., 7, 32, speaks of him as "dulcis Gallio," and his brother Seneca writes of him: "Nemo mortalium uni tam dulcis est quam hic omnibus," Quast. Nat., iv., Praef., and see other references and testimonies, Renan, Saint Paul, p. 221, and "Gallio," B.D.² It is quite possible that the Jews took advantage of his easy-going nature and affability, or, if he had recently arrived in the province, of his inexperience. Gallio's Hellenic culture may have led to his selection for the post (Renan, u. s., p. 222). The notion that as a Stoic he was friendly disposed towards the Christians, and on that account rejected the accusations of the Jews, is quite without foundation; see Zöckler, in loco. The name of Junius Gallio was an assumed one; its bearer, whose real name was Marcus Annaeus Novatus, had been adopted by the rhetorician, L. Junius Gallio, a friend of his father.—καταπέστησαν, cf. xvi. 22, verb, only found here. Rendall, in loco, renders "made a set assault upon Paul," expressing the culmination of the Jewish hostility in a set assault (not against, as in A. and R.V.).—δυμβ., as in xv. 25.—τὸ βήμα: of the proconsul, probably erected in some public place, a movable seat of judgment.

Ver. 13. λέγοντες: in the set accusation which follows there is probably an indication that the Jews could not stir up the crowd against Paul as at Philippi and Thessalonica, for already he had gained too good an influence over the common people (Weiss).—ἀναπείθει: only here in N.T., "persuadendo excitare, solicitare," it is used of evil persuasion in LXX, Jer. xxxvi. (xix.) 8 and in 1 Macc. i. 11.—παρὰ τὸν νόμον: "contrary to the law": what law? Roman or Jewish? in a certain sense the expression might include both, for as a religio licita the Jewish law was under the protection of the Roman law, and Josephus tells us how leave had been granted to the Jews to worship according to their own law, Ant., xiv., 10, 2 ff. But Paul's teaching was to these Jews the introduction of something illegal, contrary to the religion which they were allowed to practise, and so they sought to bring his teaching under the cognisance of the proconsul (see Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 190). They may therefore have designedly used a phrase which had a double meaning. But whatever their design, Gallio saw through it, and drew a hard and fast distinction between a charge of illegality against the state and of illegality against Jewish, νόμον τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, not Roman law. In this reply Gallio showed that he knew more about the matter than the Jews supposed, and he may have had some intelligence of the Jewish disturbances at Rome about "Chrestus". Both ἄδικημα and σφ. τὸν Θεόν point to the general nature of the charge, as including Paul's efforts to convert not only Jews but proselytes. At least the Jews would try to give their accusation a colour of illegality against the Roman law, for they would themselves have dealt with it if it had been simply connected with their own religious observances, see "Corinth," Hastings' B.D., i., 481.

Ver. 14. μελλόντος: Lucan; see Burton, p. 71, on ὅν, see critical note and Alford, in loco, for its retention.—ἄδικημα, cf. xxiv. 20, only once elsewhere in N.T., Rev. xviii. 5, here it may perhaps mark a legal wrong, a wrong against the state— the word is used in classical Greek of a breach of law ἄδικ. των νόμων, Dem., 586, 11, while ῥαδιούργημα marks rather the moral wrong. ῥαδ., cf. xiii. 10, not elsewhere either in classical Greek or LXX, but cf. Plut., Pyrrh., 6, "if a misdemeanour or a crime": so Ramsay.—κατὰ λόγον: ut par est, merito; cf. use of the phrase in Polyb. and 3 Macc. iii. 14 (παρὰ λ., 2 Macc. iv. 46, 3 Macc. vii. 8).—Ἰουδαῖοι without ἄνδρες perhaps in contempt (so Knabenbauer), but see critical note. —ἵνα ποιήσῃ, cf. Luke ix. 41, and so several times in St. Paul's Epistles, 2 Cor. xi. 1, 4, on the augment and construction see Blass, Gram., pp. 39, 102, Simcox, Language of the New Testament, p. 34, note, and Burton, p. 103.
15. εἰ δὲ ζήτημα· ἠστι περὶ λόγου καὶ ὄνομάς καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ἰδεῖτε αὐτῶν· κρίθης γὰρ ἑκὼν τῶν οὐ βουλόμαι εἶναι. 16. καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενοι δὲ πάντες ὦ Εἰλλήνες Σωσθένην τὸν δραχμανάγων έτύπων εξερεύσαν τοῦ βήματος καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν τῷ Γαλλίῳ ἐμελεν.

1 The plur. ζήτημα read by ΝΑΒDΕ, verss., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass.
3 For απελασθήν τι, D1, Flor., Hilg. απαλασθήν, but not Blass.
4 ΝΑΒ Vulg., Boh., Arm. om. οἱ Εἰλλήνες, so R.V., W.H., Wendt, Weiss; Blass retains (Flor. om. πάντας), so Belser and Hilg. Blass in β reads καὶ οἱ Γαλλίων προστατεύων αὐτόν μη βλέπειν. Flor. "simulat se non videre" (d); Belser holds that this is original, p. 87. Some later MSS. read λουβαίοι.

Ver. 15. If we read the plural ζήτημα we may regard it as expressing contempt: "a parcel of questions," Alford; but if they are questions of word (teaching) not deed (opposite ἔργον, faciam) and of names not things, verba, opposite πράγματα (Blass); i.e., the arguments as to whether Jesus could rightfully or not claim the title of Μessiah, see also Page's note.—νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς: of your law—not Roman law; with the phrase cf. xxi. 28 (xvi. 39 β), xxiv. 22. It is used only once elsewhere in N.T., by St. Paul, Eph. i. 15 (cf. Acts xxvi. 3).—ἐξερεύσαν αὐτοῖς, cf. Matt. xxvii. 4, 24; pronoun emphatic, xiii. 18, 19; so in LXX, Num. xiii. 19, Judg. vii. 17, xxi. 21, etc. Blass quotes two passages from Epictetus, ii. 5, 30, and iv., 6, 41.—κρίθης γὰρ ἑκὼν: omit γὰρ: pronoun more emphatic; they could determine their matters according to their own law; so Lysias, xxiii., 29, Festus, xxv., 19.—οὐ βουλόμαι: "I am not minded," R.V.; the decision while it testifies to the strength of Gallio's character, since unlike Pilate he would not allow himself to be influenced against his better judgment, expresses at the same time his sovereign contempt for the Jews and their religion; to him as to his brother Seneca the Jews were only scelerati ssima gens (Aug., De Civ. Dei, vi., 10). The decision shows no favourable inclination to Christianity itself, but this does not take away from its importance as proving that so far as the Roman authorities were concerned the freedom of speech thus granted would enable the religion of the Christ to make its way through the civilised, i.e., the Roman world; cf. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 260, who sees in his residence at Corinth an epoch in Paul's life not only as regards his doctrine and his presentation of it, but also as regards his aim that Christianity should be spread throughout the empire, an aim made more clear by the imperial policy of which Gallio was the exponent.

Ver. 16. ἐπιλαβόμενοι: probably by his lictors who would be commanded to clear the court. This interpretation of the word is in accordance with the next verse, which describes the crowd of Greeks as prepared to follow up the decision of Gallio by similar treatment of a leading Jew on their own account. See critical note.

Ver. 17. Of hostile action, xvii. 19, xvi. 19.—οἱ Εἰλλήνες, see critical note. If πάντες alone is read it seems clear from the context that only the Jews could be meant, and Weiss supposes that when they had failed so ignominiously they vented their rage on their own leader, Sosthenes, who as head of the synagogue would naturally have been prominent in presenting the complaint to Gallio. Some of the later MSS. insert οἱ Ιουδαίοι after πάντες to make the meaning clearer. Probably confusion arose in the MSS. from identifying Sosthenes either rightly or wrongly with the Sosthenes in 1 Cor. i. i, and therefore οἱ Εἰλλήνες was omitted on the supposition that the Jews were allowed to console themselves by beating a Christian. But not only is it difficult to conceive that Gallio would have allowed them to do this, but there is no occasion to suppose that the Sosthenes here is the same as in 1 Cor. i. 1 (for the name was common), and even if so, he may have become a Christian at a later date. It is much more conceivable that the Corinthians in their hatred of the Jews proceeded to
18. Ο δὲ Παύλος ἐτι προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἰκανός, τοῖς ἁδελφοῖς ἀποταξάμενος ἐξέπλει εἰς τὴν Συρίαν, καὶ εὖν αὐτῷ Πρίσκιλλα καὶ

second as it were the supercilioustreatment dealt out to them by Gallio, and they would naturally fix upon Sosthenes as the leading spirit in the Jewish community. So far as he cared at all, Gallio may have been pleased rather than otherwise at the rough and ready approval of his decision by the populace, see Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 250, and "Corinth," Hastings' B.D., p. 482; Plumptre, in loco, and Wendt (1899). The whole of the section, vv. 12-17, is regarded by Clemen, p. 126, Jungst, p. 165, as an interpolation, but Hilgenfeld puts aside their varying grounds of rejection as unconvincing, and finds it very conceivable that the Jews attempted to hinder the preaching of Paul as is here described (1 Thess. ii. 6). With regard to the whole narrative of Paul at Corinth, vv. 1-17, Spitta, p. 244, concludes, as against Weiss, "recte impf., nam de perfecta navigatione, ver. 22, demum agitur," Blass. If the beating was administered by the Jews, Gallio might well overlook it, as he would regard it as the outcome of some question which only concerned their religion (Weiss). The argument that the notice is intended by St. Luke to show that Paul counselled observance of the law, and did not tempt him to break it, as he was afterwards accused of doing, xxi. 21, is still more irrelevant, for so far nothing has been definitely said as to Aquila's conversion. And if the vow involved any obligation to appear at Jerusalem, it is quite evident that Paul and not Aquila went up to the Holy City. A list of the names on either side is given by Alford, Feltman, Wendt, and amongst recent writers we may add Wendt, Zöckler, Blass, Jungst, Matthias as favouring the view that Aquila is the subject, whilst Weiss, Felton, Ramsay, Hort, Rendall, Page, Knabenbauer, Luckock take the opposite view. What then was the nature and occasion of the vow? Those who connect this vow with the journey to Jerusalem, as if the latter was obligatory in the fulfilment of the former, are justified in regarding the vow as a modified form of the Nazirite vow, Num. vi. 1-21. The man under the Nazirite vow was to drink no wine or strong drink, and to let no razor pass over his head or face. At the end of the time during which the vow lasted, his hair was shaven at the door of the Tabernacle (the Temple), and burnt in the fire of the altar as an offering. But it is to be observed that in this passage the word is κείραμενος, whilst of this completing the Nazirite vow, xxi. 24, the word κείρωσαμαι is used (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 6), and there is evidence (Wordsworth, in loco) that a man who had taken a
'Aquila,\(^1\) κειράμενος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς: εἰς γὰρ εὐχήν.

19. κατήντησε ² δὲ εἰς Ἑφεσον, κακεῖνους κατέλιπεν αὐτοῦ: αὐτὸς δὲ

\(^1\) After Aquila Blass in β reads σε εὐχὴν εἰς Κεγχρεαίς τὴν κεφαλὴν εἰκαρατο, following Flor.; see Belser, pp. 89-92, who strongly opposes Blass, and cf. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 263, and comment.


Nazirite vow in a foreign land was allowed to poll or cut his hair shorter (κείρω), provided that the hair so polled was taken to the Temple and burnt there as an offering together with the hair shorn off at the completion of the vow. That the Jews took upon themselves a modified form of the Nazirite vow is proved from Josephus, B. θ', ii., 15, 1, when they were afflicted by disease or any other distress. Possibly therefore the vow followed upon St. Paul's deliverance from an attack of sickness, and the warm praise bestowed upon Phoebe, the deaconess of the Church at Cenchreae (Rom. xvi-1), for her personal aid to himself may be taken as some confirmation of this. But if we thus place St. Paul's vow here under the category of the vows mentioned by Josephus, the journey to Jerusalem must be immediately connected with it, as the description given by the Jewish historian plainly shows that the vows in question were modified forms of the regular Nazirite vow. It is a very reasonable conjecture that the vow may be connected with St. Paul's danger at Corinth, and with his safe deliverance from it. As one consecrated to the service of the Lord, he would allow his hair to grow until the promise of his safety had been fulfilled and his embarkation from Corinth was assured. The vow was thus analogous to the Nazirite vow, inasmuch as the same idea of consecration lay at the root of each; but it was rather a private vow (Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 91, and Weiss, in loco), and in this case the journey of the Apostle to Jerusalem would not be conditioned by the vow, but by his desire to be present at some great festival, beyond doubt that of the Passover. On the custom amongst other nations to cut off the hair, and to let it grow in votive offering to the gods, see Holtzmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 395, and Page, in loco. Hilgenfeld ascribes the narrative of the incident to his "author to Theophilus," whether the vow refers to Paul or Aquila, and considers that the story is intended to connect St. Paul as much as possible with Judaism. One of the most curious instances of perverse interpretation is that of Krenkel, who thinks that the κείρω may be referred to Paul, who shaved his head to counteract the epileptic fits with which he was afflicted, 2 Cor. xiii. 7, see Zeücker's note.—Κεγχρεαῖς, see notices of the place in Renan, Saint Paul, p. 278, and Hastings' B.D., modern Καλανίκη: the eastern harbour of Corinth, about nine miles distant, connecting the trade with Asia; Lechæum, the other port ("bimaris Corinthi," Horace, Odes, i., 7, 2), connecting it with Italy and the West. Τούτω μὲν σὺν χρώται πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας τοῦ λαχανός, Strabo, viii., 6, p. 380.

Ver. 19. κατήντησε, see critical note.

—εἰς Ἑφεσον: a voyage of two or three days with unfavourable wind. Cicero mentions two occasions when the voyage from Ephesus to Athens took two weeks, Ad Attic., vi., 8, 9; iii., 9, but in both instances extraordinary delays were the cause of the lengthy voyage; on Ephesus see xix. 1. —κακεῖνους καταλ. αὐτοῦ: Ephesus, famous for its commerce, where they might carry on their trade, although it is perhaps somewhat hazardous to regard the city as the centre of the particular trade in which they were engaged. Lewin quotes two passages in support of this, but they both refer to one event, the presentation of a tent by the Ephesians to Alcibiades, "Ephesus" B.D.?—αὐτὸς δὲ: this does not mean that Paul for his part (in contradiction to Aquila and Priscilla) went into the synagogue; such an interpretation seems unnatural. Others explain that Aquila and Priscilla were left in the town, and that the synagogue was outside the town (so Alford), but this does not seem satisfactory as a full explanation,
εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν διελέχθη τοῖς ἱουδαίοις. 20. ἔφη καὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνου μένειν παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὥστε ἐπένευσεν· 21. ἀλλ' ἀπετάξατο αὐτοῖς, εἰπών, "Δεί με πάντως τὴν ἐρχομένην ἥρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα· πάλιν δὲ ἀνακάμψω πρὸς ὅμοιον·


2 Αλλ' απετάξατο αὐτοῖς... "Δεί με πάντως την εορτὴν την ερχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς ἱεροσόλυμαπάλινδεανακάμψω προς υμάς" (cf. xx. 10). Whether we follow the Bezant text or not, Ramsay holds that the shorter reading of the great MSS. still implies a hurried visit to Jerusalem, which could only be for some great occasion—the Feast of the Passover close at hand (so Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 263). Possibly the performance of his vow may have occasioned this urgent desire (Belser). But in xix. 1 D has a further expansion of the text, and speaks of a purposeful but unaccomplished journey of St. Paul to Jerusalem, so that we cannot find in xviii. 22 an intimation of the accomplishment of his vow. But if xix. 1 does refer back to the journey of xviii. 21, Wendt maintains that the original occasion for the addition in that verse may still have been the fact that αὐταῖς was understood of a journey to Jerusalem. For the two additions may proceed from different hands; that in xviii. 21 having been already accomplished for the performance of his vow.

διελέχθη: aorist, not imperfect as in ver. 4; "delivered a discourse to the Jews," so Ramsay, in contrast to the continued stay at Corinth marked by the imperfect; so Alford.

Ver. 20. έπένευσεν: only here in N.T.; but cf. 2 Macc. iv. 10, xi. 15, xiv. 20, frequent in classical Greek. St. Paul must have had some very pressing reason for refusing such an invitation from his own countrymen.

Ver. 21. See critical note. The Feast, as Ramsay maintains, St. Paul, p. 264 (so Ewald, Renan, Zöckler, Rendall, Blass and others), was the Passover, the one which seems most reconcilable with the chronology; others maintain Pentecost, so Anger, Alford, Wieseler, Plumptre—see Alford, in loco, and Turner, Chron. of the N. T., p. 422; Lewin favours Tabernacles.—ἀνακάμψω, cf. xix. 1: used by St. Luke, Luke x. 6, Matt. ii. 12, Heb. xi. 15; used also several times in LXX, Jud. xi. 39 A, 2 Sam. viii. 13, 1 Kings xii. 20, Job xxxix. 4, Sus. 14, and other instances, so in classical Greek, to return to a place, Herod., ii. 8.—τοῦ Θ. θέλ., cf. i Cor. iv. 10, xvi. 17, James iv. 15. Not only amongst Jews and Arabs but amongst Greeks and Romans similar phrases were in vogue, see Meyer's note on James iv. 15; see critical note on β.—ἀηνάχθη, see above on xiii. 13.

Ver. 22. κατελθὼν εἰς Κ., i.e., Caesarea Stratonis, i.e., came down from the
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

τοῦ Θεοῦ θλιθωτος. καὶ ἀνέχθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφεσοῦ. 22.1 καὶ κατελθὼν εἰς Καισάρειαν, ἀναβὰς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατέβη εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. 23. καὶ ποιήσας χρόνον τινά ἐξῆλθε, διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, ἐπιστηρίζων πάντας τῶν μαθητῶν.

1 137, Syr. Harcl. mg., Pesh. read τον δε Ακυλαν εισαγεν εν Εφεσω. αυτος δε εναχθεις εκει—no mention of Priscilla; this would be characteristic of the Bezant reviser, cf. ver. 26, etc.

high sea to the coast, the shore, cf. xxvii. 5 (xxi. 3), so in Homer, and also of coming down from the high land to the coast, see Grimm-Thayer, sub v. ἀναβας, i.e., to Jerusalem, the usual expression for a journey to the capital, cf. xi. 2, xv. 2 (θ), xxv. 1, 9, Matt. xx. 18, Mark x. 32, see Luke ii. 42, xviii. 31, xix. 28, John ii. 13, vii. 8, Gal. ii. 1; cf. xxiv. 1, 22, xxv. 6, where "to go down" is used of the journey from Jerusalem to Caesarea. To suppose that the word is used to indicate simply that they landed in the harbour, or because the town lay high up from the shore, or because the place of assembly for the Church was on high ground, is quite arbitrary, and cannot be set against the usage of the term "going up" and "going down" in relation to Jerusalem; see Hort, Ecclesia, p. 96; Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 264; so Bengel, Neander, Meyer, Hackett, Zöckler, Rendall, Page, Weiss, Weijszäcker, Spitta, Jüngst, Hilgenfeld, Wendt, Knabenbauer, and Belser, Beiträge, p. 89, who opposes here the position of Blass (and if the T.R. in ver. 21 is retained in β certainly "the going up seems, naturally to follow). Blass maintains that Caesarea is meant, but he is evidently led to adopt this view by his desire to retain the reading in D, xix. 1, see Zöckler, in loco, and Ramsay, p. 264, and Belser, u. s., for a criticism of Blass's view. Amongst the more recent critics, Zahn, Einleitung, ii., 343, 350, combats the reasons alleged by Belser, and takes the going up and the Church mentioned to refer to Caesarea and the Church there, not to Jerusalem. This visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem is disputed by McGiffert, although he does not deny with Weijszäcker the whole journey, but admits that the Apostle went as far as Antioch. So too Wendt —this so far as we know was his last visit to a place which was now no longer an effective centre for the Apostle's work, or for the supervision of his new churches.

Ver. 23. τούτων χρόνον τινά: St. Paul would naturally have spent some time in a place so associated with the origin of Gentile Christianity, and with his own labours, the starting place of each of his missionary journeys; on the phrase in St. Luke see Friedrich, cf.
24. Ιουδαῖος δὲ τις Ἀπόλλων ὁ ἀσάληκτος, Ἀλεξανδρεύς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, κατήγγειλεν εἰς ἑφεσον, δυνατός ὦν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς.
25. οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν οδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, ἀδήλες καὶ εὐδειδεψάν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐπιστάμενος.

1 D reads Ἀπόλλων, possibly correct, so Blass in β, and Hilg., but cf. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 268, C. R. E., p. 151, and see below; see also Wendt (1899), p. 308, note, who thinks with Blass that orig. in Acts Ἀπολλών as in D.
2 For Κυρίου ΜABDEL 13, 36, 40, verss., Tisch., W. H., R. V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. read Ιησοῦ. After κατηχ., D (Gig.) reads εν τῇ πατρίδι. For τὴν οδὸν D has τὸν λόγον, but not Blass. For ελάλει D1 has ἀπαλαλεῖ (d, eloquedatur), so Blass in β, and Hilg.; see also below.

Ver. 24. Ἀλεξ., cf. vi. 9, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 226, E.T. At Alexandria the LXX was written and Philo lived; here too was the magnificent mosque of which it was said that he who had not worshipped in it had not witnessed the glory of Israel, Edersheim, History of the Jewish People, pp. 67, 186, 405, 409; on the contact of Jewish and Greek thought in Alexandria, "Alexandria," B. D. 8 (Westcott), What was the exact influence of his Alexandrian training upon Apollos we are not told, but as a cultured Jew of such a centre of Hellenistic influence, it is quite possible that Aquila and Priscilla chose him for the work at Corinth because they thought that his training and learning would attract the attention of a Corinthian audience. Possibly his preaching may have included some Philonian speculations, but the difference between him and St. Paul in their teaching at Corinth may have consisted in outward form and delivery rather than in substance; see Canon Evans, Speaker's Commentary, iii., p. 240. No doubt the subtle Corinthian would admire the eloquence of Apollos and pervert his words, but there is no reason to suppose that Apollos encouraged any such party spirit. On his work at Corinth and the last notice of him, Titus iii. 13, see "Apollos," B. D. 8, and Hasting's B. D., cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 12, for his unambitious and peaceful character, and Plumptre, in loco. The Book of Wisdom was attributed to Apollos by Dean Plumptre, but see on the other hand "Wisdom of Solomon," B. D. 8 (Westcott), and Speaker's Commentary, "Apocrypha," vol. i., p. 413.—λόγος; "learned," R. V., "eloquent," margin; A. V., "eloquent"; the word may include both learning and eloquence. In classical Greek of a man learned, as, e.g., in history (Herod.), but in Plutarch λόγιος, eloquence, and so λόγος, eloquent. Meyer rendered the word "eloquent," so Weiss, Zöckler, Page, Alford, Hackett, Felten, Blass (doctus ap. antiquos), δυνατός referring rather to his learning and acquaintance with the Scriptures: "a good speaker and well read in the Scriptures" (Ramsay). Rendall however takes δυνατός as conveying the idea of eloquence, but in vii. 22 the word cannot mean eloquent as applied to Moses, but rather denotes the wise and weighty nature of his utterances, see Lobeck, Phyrr., p. 198.

Ver. 25. See critical note on the proposed omission of the verse and reading also in D.—κατηχ., cf. Luke i. 4, "taught by word of mouth," R. V., margin; D. adds εν τῇ πατρίδι, and Blass holds that we may learn from this that some form of Gospel teaching had already been known in Egypt. But how far had Apollos been instructed? It is commonly held that he only knew the Baptism of John and nothing further, and that he was imperfectly acquainted with the facts of our Lord's life. But he is said to have taught accurately (ἀκριβῶς) "the things concerning Jesus" (see critical note), and not only so, but, as Blass also points out, the mention of the twelve disciples at Ephesus has previously been taken to mean literally that these men were disciples of the Baptist, and had never
heard of Jesus, whereas the words used to describe them, μαθηταί and πιστεύσαντες, are never used except of Christians. What is the conclusion? That whilst Apollos, like these twelve men, was acquainted with no other Baptism than John's, he may have known quite as much of our Lord's words and deeds as was contained in the Gospel of St. Mark in its mutilated form, xvi. 8, which tells us nothing of Christian Baptism. And if we further ask from what source did Apollos gain this accurate information, Blass answers: "videlicet non sine scripto aliquo Evangelio". If, he urges, it had been otherwise, and Apollos had been instructed by some disciple of the Apostles and not through a written Gospel, the position of things in the text would be reversed, and Apollos would have been imperfectly acquainted with our Lord's life and teaching, whilst he could not have failed to know of Christian Baptism as the admission to Christian churches. Blass therefore believes that before the year 50 (he places the Conference in 45 or 46) written Gospels were in existence, and he evidently leans to the belief that St. Mark's Gospel, or some first edition of it, was the Gospel from which Apollos was instructed (see in loco, and cf. also Philology of the Gospels, p. 30). But the word κατηχ., on this view must be taken not to include but to exclude, at all events mainly, a reference to catechetical teaching, and this from the use of the word in the N.T. is most unlikely. In the majority of the cases, as Blass admits, the word denotes oral teaching, although he maintains that this meaning is not always strictly kept. In the N.T. the word is used only by Luke and Paul, altogether eight times, in six of which it is used with reference to oral instruction, according to Mr. Wright: "Apollos: a study in Pre-Pauline Christianity," Expository Times, October, 1897 (but see also in answer, Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 31). Mr. Wright suggests that Apollos may have derived his knowledge of "the facts concerning Jesus" from one of the many Catechists who were sent out from Jerusalem, and visited in large numbers the capital of Egypt, and by him Apollos like Theophilus was instructed in the way of the Lord. This view certainly gives an adequate meaning to κατηχ., but still it seems strange that a Catechist, even if his chief business was to catechise or instruct in the facts of the Gospel history, should say nothing about Christian Baptism; surely a Catechist would himself be a baptised member of Christ. It is possible that Apollos may have deliberately decided to abide as he was; he may have said that as the Master Himself had fulfilled all righteousness in John's Baptism, so that Baptism was sufficient for the servant. But on this view one has to suppose that no news of the events of Pentecost had reached Alexandria, although Egyptian Jews had been present at the feast. But the news which Apollos may have received had been imperfect, cf. xix. 2, 3, and he had not therefore abandoned his position as a follower of the Baptist, who accepted the teaching that Jesus was the Messiah without knowing fully how that claim had been fulfilled, who had been baptised with the Baptism of the Baptist unto repentance without knowing the higher blessings conferred by membership in the Body of the Risen and Ascended Lord: see further Expository Times, vol. vii., pp. 564, 565; Hermathena, xxi. (1895); Weiss and Zöckler, in loco.—ελάλεικαι εδίδασκεν: Blass prefers D ἀπελάλει, which Wright, μ. s., p. 1τ, renders "repeated by rote".—ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, εf. Rom. xii. ΙΙ, this fervency was shown not only in speaking what he knew, but in teaching it to others, cf. ver. 11, where the same word is used of Paul's instructions. We can scarcely take ἀκριβώς: "accurately," so often in classics, and as agreeing best here with this verse and the comparative in ver. 26; on the use of the word in medical writers see Hobart, p. 251; Weiss, Meyer's Kommentar, Luke i. 3, also compares the similarity between St. Luke's phrase and Galen's dedication of his work to a friend (he also finds a parallel in Jos., C. Apion, i., 10); see also below on
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ
ΧVΙΙΙ.
προσελάβοντο αυτόν, και ακριβέστερον αυτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδόν. 27.1 βουλομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ διαλείψαι εἰς τὴν Ἀχαίαν, προτρεφά-

In D, Syr. Harcl. mg. en de Εφεσίων επιθημουσάς τιν μεταλλοῦν Κορινθίων και ακούσας τούτου παρεκάλου διαλέγεις, καὶ εξέθεντο τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδόν. 27. "βουλομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν τὴν Ἀχαίαν, προτρέψα τινί ἐκ τῶν Κορινθίων προσέλαβον, καὶ ακριβέστερον αὐτοῦ εξέθεντο τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδόν. συγκατανυκτέριοι δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰρήψαν τοὺς συγκατακελεύθεροι συγκατανυκτέριοι τοῦ Ἐφεσοῦ επιδημουμένοι εἰς τὸν Κορινθίῳ και ακούσας τοῦ παρεκάλου διελθεῖν συν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν πατριδὰ αὐτῶν, συγκατανυκτέριοι δὲ αὐτοῦ οἱ Εφεσιοὶ εἰγράψαν τοῖς εἰς Κορινθὼ μαθηταῖς, ὡς αὐτοῦ εὑρείναι τὸν ἀνδρὰ, ὡς εἰπεῖνες εἰς τὴν Ἀχαίαν πολὺ συνεβάλλετο εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας. If the work of a reviser, object seems to be to show more clearly why Απόλλων came to Corinth. επιδημεῖν is Lucan; συγκατανυκτέριοι occurs nowhere in N.T. Belser, pp. 87, 88, argues for the value of the β text here, esp. in the addition εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας, which shows St. Paul had not confined his attention to Corinth. But if original, why omitted? See Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 267; W.H. marg.; Holtzmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 396. 

Ver. 26. παρρησιάζεσθαι, see above on p. 242; whatever was the exact form of the belief of Απόλλων, he had at all events the courage of his convictions. - ακούσας showing that Πρίσκilla and Αυδήλα had not separated themselves from their fellow-countrymen. - προσελάβων, cf. xvii. 5, i.e., for instruction in private. - ακριβεστερον and its employment by Dioscorides. The word occurs in Luke twice, Luke i. 3, Acts xviii. 25, and elsewhere in Matt. ii. 8, and twice in St. Paul, x Thess. v. 2, Eph. v. 15, whilst ακριβεστερον occurs four times in N.T., and each time in Acts, cf. ver. 26, xxiii. 15, 20, xxiv. 22. 

Ver. 27. διελθεῖν εἰς, cf. Luke viii. 22, Mark iv. 35, Latin, traiicere. - προτρέψα: "encouraged him and wrote," R.V., so Chrysostom, Εrasmus, Grotius, Bengel, Felten, Lumb, Ren- dall, Knabenbauer: "currentem incitantes" Bengel. But others refer it to the disciples, "wrote exhorting the disciples," i.e., wrote letters of commendation, 2 Cor. iii., so Luther, De Wette, Ewald, Ζόκκελler, Alford, Wendt, Weiss, Νόsgen, Hackett. Blass thinks that the word can be referred to neither in the sense of κοινωνία, and prefers the rendering in accordance with the Syriac antewoterunt, but cf. Wisdom xiv. 18, 2 Macc. xi. 7 for the former sense, so in classical Greek, only here in N.T., classed not only by Hobart, but also by Vogel, as amongst the medical words in St. Luke, u. s., p. 17. - συνεβάλετο: only here in N.T. in middle, with dative of the person, profuit, so often in Greek authors, especially Polybius; Wisdom v. 8, Xen., Cūr., i., 2, 8; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6, "rigavit A. non plantavit" Bengel. - διὰ τῆς χάριτος, D 137, Gign., Пар., Vulg., Syr. Harcl., so Blass in β. 


Ver. 28. εὐτόνως: "powerfully," only in Luke, cf. Luke xxiii. 10, "vehemently," like Latin, intente, acriter, Josh. vi. (7), 8 (-το, 2 Macc. xii. 23, 4 Macc. vii. 10). R.; found also in classical Greek, and may be one of the "colloquial" words common to the N.T. and Aristophanes, cf. Plutus, 196 (Kennedy, p. 78). But as the word is used only by St. Luke, it may be noted that it is very frequently employed by medical writers, opposed to ἀτόνος.-διακατηλέγχετο: "powerfully confuted," R.V. The word does not prove that Απόλλων convinced them (Α.V. "mightily convinced"), lit., he argued them down: but to confute is not of necessity to convince. The double compound, a very strong word, is not found elsewhere, but in classical Greek διακατηλέγχετο, to refute utterly (in LXX, middle, to dispute), κατηλέγχετο, to convict of falsehood, to believe. - ἐπιδεικνύς: only once elsewhere in N.T., Heb. vi. 17, and in classical Greek as in Plato, to prove, to demonstrate.
Additional note on Acts xviii. 23 (see on xvi. 6).

In a brief attempt to refer to a few difficulties connected with this verse, it is well to bear in mind at the outset that St. Luke never uses the noun Γαλατία (which is twice used by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, Gal. i. 2), but the adjective Γαλατικός, xviii. 23 and xvi. 6, in both cases with the noun χώρα; St. Paul in each case is speaking of the “Churches of Galatia”; St. Luke in each case is speaking of the Apostle’s journeys. How may we account for this different phraseology? If St. Luke had meant Galatia proper, we may believe that he would have used the word Γαλατία, but as he says Γαλατική χώρα he speaks as a Greek and indicates the Roman province Galatia, or the Galactic province; a name by which the Greek-speaking natives called it, whilst sometimes they enumerated its parts, e.g., Pontus Galacticus, Phrygia Galactic, Expositor, pp. 126, 127, August, 1898 (Ramsay), and Hastings’ B.D., “Galatia” (Ramsay), pp. 87-89, 1899; cf. the form of the derived adjective in -ικός in the pair Λακωνική γῆ and Λακωνία. St. Paul on the other hand, speaking as a Roman citizen, used the word Γαλατία as = the Roman province, for not only is there evidence that Gal. could be so employed in current official usage (the contrary hypothesis is now abandoned by Schürer, one of its former staunch supporters, see Expositor, u. s., p. 128, and Hastings’ B.D., ii., 86), but it seems beyond all dispute that St. Paul in other cases classified his Churches in accordance with the Roman provinces, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, Expositor, u. s., p. 125; Zahn, Einleitung, i., 124; Renan, Saint Paul, p. 51; Hausrath, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, iii., p. 135; Clemen, Chron. der Paulinischen Briefe, p. 121. Why then should the Churches of Galatia be interpreted otherwise? Ramsay (“Questions,” Expositor, January, 1899) may well appeal to Dr. Hort’s decisive acceptance of the view that in 1 Peter i. 1 (First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 17, 158) the Churches are named according to the provinces of the Roman empire (a point emphasised by Hausrath, u. s., in advocating the South-Galatian theory), and that in provincial Galatia St. Peter included at least the Churches founded by St. Paul in Galatia proper, i.e., in Phrygia and Lycaonia, although it must be remembered that Dr. Hort still followed Lightfoot in maintaining that the Galatians of St. Paul’s Epistle were true Galatians, and not the inhabitants of the Roman province. “But if St. Peter, as Hort declares, classed Antioch, Iconium, Derbe and Lystra among the Churches of Galatia, must not Paul have done the same thing? Is it likely that 1 Peter, a letter so penetrated with the Pauline spirit, so much influenced by at least two Pauline Epistles, composed in such close relations with two of Paul’s coadjutors, Silas and Mark, should class the Pauline Churches after a method that Paul would not employ?” (Ramsay, Expositor, January, 1899.) The Churches which in this view are thus included in the province Galatia, viz., Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, would be fitly addressed as Galatians by a Roman citizen writing to provincials proud of Roman names and titles (although Wendt (1899) urges this mode of address, Gal. iii. 1, as one of two decisive points against the South Galatian theory). For we must not forget that two of the four Churches in South Galatia were Roman coloniae, Antioch and Lystra, whilst the two others mentioned in Acts xiv. bore an emperor’s name, Claudia-Iconium, Claudia-Derbe. That the title “Galatians” might be so applied to the people of Roman “Galatia” has been sufficiently illustrated by Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 130, and Ramsay, Expositor, August, 1898, cf. Tac., Ann., xiii., 35, xv., 6; Hist., ii., 9; and it is very noteworthy that in Phil. iv. 15 St. Paul in addressing the inhabitants of a Roman colony addresses them by a Latin and not a Greek form of their name, Φιλητοί = Latin, Philippienses, so that in addressing the four Churches of South Galatia, so closely connected with Rome as we have seen, St. Paul would naturally address them by the one title common to them all as belonging to a Roman province, Galatai, Galatians; Ramsay, Expositor, August, 1898; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 177-179.

St. Paul then uses the term Galatia as a Roman citizen would use it, while St. Luke employs the phraseology common in the Αέgean land amongst his contemporaries; he does not speak of Galatia, by which term he would as a Greek mean North Galatia, but of the “Galatic territory” or of the region or regions with which he was concerned; see on
28. εὐτόνως γὰρ τοῖς ἱουδαίοις διακατηλέγχετο ἡ δημοσία, ἐπιδεικνύς ἀπὶ τῶν γραφῶν ἐναὶ τῶν Χριστοῦ ἱστοῖν.

1 δημοσία επιδεικνύς, D 137 has δημ. διαλεγομένος καί, so Blass in B, and Hilg., but apparently superfluous after διακατηλέγχετο (Weiss).

this Expositor, August, 1898, pp. 126, 127, and Hastings' B.D., "Galatia." In xvi. 6 he writes of a missionary tour (see on διήλθον, note, l. c.) through the Phrygo-Galatic region; in xviii. 23 he speaks of a missionary tour through the Galatic region (Derbe and Lystra) and the Phrygian (Iconium and Antioch). It is, moreover, important to note that whether we take Φρυγία, xiii. 23, as an adjective, χώρα being understood, or as a noun, the same sense prevails, for we have evidence from inscriptions of Antioch that Galatic Phrygia was often designated by the noun, "and St. Luke may be allowed to speak as the people of Antioch wrote," Ramsay, Hastings' B.D., ii., p. 90, 1899. See further the same writer's reference to the testimony of Asterius, Bishop of Amasia in Pontus Galaticus, a.d. 400, in favour of the above view, who paraphrases xiii. 23, τὴν Λυκαονίαν καὶ τὰς τῆς Φρυγίας πόλεις, and places the journey through Lycaonia and Phrygia immediately before the visit to Asia, xix. 1; see especially Ramsay, Studia Biblica, iv., p. 16 ff. and p. 90; Hastings' B.D., u. s., as against Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 136.

But further: if the Phrygo-Galatic district thus lay on the road to Ephesus, it is difficult to see how St. Paul could be conceived of as going to a distance of some 300 miles out of his route to Galatia in the narrower ethnical sense of the word; and this is one of the many points which influences Mr. Turner to regard the South Galatia view as almost demonstrably true, Chron. of the N.T.; Hastings' B.D., i., 422 (see also to the same effect, Renan, Saint Paul, p. 52; and Rendall, Acts, p. 275; Salmon, Introd., p. 377). McGiffert (so too Renan, Hausrat) maintains that if the North Galatian theory is correct, and St. Paul is not addressing the Churches founded on his first missionary journey, but only those founded, as we must suppose, during a period of missionary labour in North Galatia, a period inserted without a hint from St. Luke in xvi. 6, it seems incomprehensible why Barnabas should be mentioned in the Galatian Epistle. The Churches in North Galatia could scarcely have known anything about him, especially as ex hypothesis they had been evangelised after the rupture between Paul and Barnabas, Acts xv. 36 ff. If, however, the Churches of the Epistle = the Churches founded in Acts xiii., xiv., then we can at once understand the mention of Barnabas. But Mr. Askwith has lately pointed out with much force (Epistle to the Galatians, p. 77, 1899) that this argument must not be pressed too far. The introduction of Barnabas in the Galatian Epistle does not prove that he was known personally to the Galatians (although it may reasonably warrant the inference that he was known by name) any more than the allusion to him, 1 Cor. ix. 6, proves that he was personally known to the Corinthians, cf. also Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 98.

One more significant and weighty fact deserves mention. In St. Paul's collection for the poor Saints (on the importance of which see xxiv. 17) there is every reason to believe that all the Pauline Churches shared; in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 appeal is made to the Churches of Galatia and Achaia, and the Churches of Macedonia and Asia subsequently contributed to the fund. If by Galatia we understand Galatia proper, and not the Roman province, then the four South Galatian Churches are not included in the list of subscribers, and they are not even asked to contribute. This appears inconceivable; whereas, if we look at the list of delegates, Acts xx. 4, whilst Macedonia and Asia are represented, and Gaius and Timothy represent the Churches of South Galatia, no delegate is mentioned from any North Galatian community (see Rendall: "Pauline collection for the Saints," Expositor, Nov., 1898, and "The Galatians of St. Paul," Expositor, April, 1894; also Weizsäcker, Apostolic Age, i., 272, E.T., and McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 180, Askwith, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 88 ff. (1899)). For the literature of the question see Ramsay, "Galatia," Hastings' B.D., ii., p. 89, 1899; Zahn, Einleitung, i., pp. 129, 130; Wendt (1899), p. 276, and "Galatians, Epistle to the," Marcus Dods, Hastings' B.D., ii., 94. To the list given in the last reference may be added the names of Wendt, O. Holtzmann, Clemens, V. Weber (Würzburg), Page, Rendall, McGiffert,
1 D, Syr. Harcl. mg. read at commencement of verse θελόντος δε του Παυλου κατα την ιδιαν βουλην περιπεσθαι εις Ιεροσολυμα, ειπεν αυτω το πνευμα νυσστρεφειν εις την Ασιαν. διελθων δε τα ανωτερικα μερη. See above on xviii. 21, and Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 266—the supposed failure to pay the visit to Jerusalem is explained by the interpolation of the above statement; cf. Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 48, who quotes Ephrem, in loco. The omission of the notice about Apollos is explained by Weiss, Codex D, p. 93, on the ground that it had no meaning for the reviser, but it may have been accidental because of the other changes. 


in favour of the South Galatian view, and most recently Askwith, Epistle to the Galatians (1899); whilst to the other side may be added Volkm, Schürer, Holsten, who has examined the whole subject closely in his Das Evangelium des Paulus, p. 35 ff. (chiefly in reply to Hausrath's strong support of the opposing view), Zöckler, Julicher, Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. TheoL., p. 186 ff. and p. 353, 1896, Schmiedel, and amongst English writers, Findlay, Epistles of St. Paul, p. 288 ff., and very fully Dr. Chase, Expositor, 1893, 1894.

We can only make a passing allusion to the date or possible date of the Galatian Epistle. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 189 ff., places it at the close of the Apostle's second missionary journey during his stay at Antioch, xviii. 22 (A.D. 55), whilst McGiffert also places it at Antioch, but before the Apostle started on this same journey, not at its close, Apostolic Age, p. 226. Rendall, Expositor, April, 1894, has assigned it an earlier date, 57, 52, and places it amongst the earliest of St. Paul's Epistles, and more recently Zahn has dated it almost equally early in the beginning of 53, and upon somewhat similar grounds, Einleitung, i., p. 139 (the three oldest Epistles of St. Paul according to him being the group of Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, all written in the same year). But on the other hand, Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 43 ff., and Salmon, Introd., p. 376, not only place the Epistle later than any of the dates suggested above, but assign it a place between 2 Corinthians and Romans, arguing from the similarity of subject and style between the three Epistles. Most of the continental critics would place it in the same group, but as the earliest of the four great Epistles written in the earlier period of the Apostle's long residence at Ephesus, Acts xix. 1.

Lightfoot places it apparently on the journey between Macedonia and Achaia, Acts xx. 2, 2 Corinthians having been previously written during the Apostle's residence in Macedonia (so Zahn), Romans being dated a little later whilst St. Paul stayed in Corinth, Acts xx. 2, 3 (Galatians, pp. 39, 55). Dr. Clemen has since defended at great length his view, first put forward in Chronol. der Paul. Briefe, p. 199 ff., that Romans preceded Galatians, in Studien und Kritiken, 1897, 2, pp. 219-270; but see as against Clemen, Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 142; Zöckler, Die Briefe an die Thess. und Galater, p. 71; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. xxxviii.

Mr. Askwith has recently discussed the points at issue between Ramsay and Lightfoot as to the date of Galatians, and in accepting the latter's position as his own, he has shown that this is not incompatible with a firm recognition of the south Galatian theory, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 98 ff. Harnack, Chronol., p. 239, declines to commit himself to any definite date for Galatians, and perhaps this conclusion is not surprising in relation to an Epistle of which it may be truly said that it has been placed by different critics in the beginning, in the close, and in every intermediate stage of St. Paul's epistolary activity, cf. Dr. Marcus Dods, "Galatians," Hastings' B.D.

Chapter XIX.—Ver. 1. See critical note for Bezant reading.—"Απολλω, cf. xx. 1; see Blass, Gram., p. 31, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 95.—τα ανωτερικα μερη: The main road to Ephesus which passed through Colosse and Laodicea was not apparently taken by Paul, but a shorter though less frequented route running through the Cayster valley. This route leads over higher ground than the
other, and St. Paul in taking it would be passing through the higher-lying districts of Asia on his way from Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus. According to Col. ii. 1 the Apostle never visited Colosse and Laodicea, which seems to confirm the view taken above (but see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 94, on Mr. Lewin's view of Col. ii. 1). The expression τὰ ἀνωτ. μέρη is really a description in brief of the same district, "the region of Galatia and Phrygia," mentioned in xviii. 23. If the journey passed through North Galatia, Ramsay contends with great force that the expressions in xviii. 23 καθεξής and πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς would be meaningless, as καθ. would apply not to Churches already known to us, but to Churches never mentioned in the book, and if St. Paul did not visit the South Galatian Churches, how could St. Luke mention "all the disciples"? Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte* (second edition), in loco, takes the term as the equivalent of the places referred to in xviii. 23, but he does not include in these places as far north as Tavium or ArCity of Bythia, Synnada, Apameia, Philadelphia, and Sardis would be visited by the Apostle, and from Sardis he would go down to Ephesus; the expression τὰ ἀνωτ. μέρη would thus in Zöckler’s view include churches founded on the second missionary journey, but the most northerly are excluded as lying too far away, p. 273; see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 93; "Ephesus," Hastings’ B.D., and *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii., 715; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 275. Blass takes the words to mean districts more remote from the sea; Rendall (so Hackett) explains them as referring to the land route through the interior of Asia Minor by way of distinction to the sea route which Paul had before pursued on his way from Ephesus to Jerusalem. Grimm explains as the parts of Asia Minor more remote from the Mediterranean, farther east, and refers only to Hippocrates and Galen for the use of the adjective, which was evidently a very rare one (see Hobart, p. 148); see also Zöckler on xix. 1 and illustrations of Latin expressions similarly used. R.V. renders "the upper country," lit., the upper parts, i.e., inland; A.V., "coasts," i.e., borders, as in Matt. ii. 16, etc., Humphry, *Commentary on R. V.*—

εἰς "Εφεσον: Ephesus and Athens have aptly been described as two typical cities of heathendom, the latter most Hellenic, the heart and citadel of Greece, the former the home of every Oriental quackery and superstition in combination with its Hellenism; the latter inquisitive, philosophical, courteous, refined, the former fanatical, superstitious, impulsive. And yet *Acts* portrays to the life the religious and moral atmosphere of the two cities, no less than their local colouring (Lightfoot, "Acts of the Apostles," B.D. 3, p. 36). Under the empire it was a regulation that the Roman governor should land at Ephesus, and from all quarters of the province the system of Roman roads made Ephesus easily accessible. St. Paul with his wonted judgment fixed upon it as a fitting centre for the message and for the spread of the Gospel. Like Corinth, with which close intercourse was maintained, Ephesus is described as one of the great knots in the line of communication between Rome and the East; see further notes in commentary, Ramsay, "Ephesus," Hastings’ B.D.; "Ephesus," B.D. 3; E. Curtius, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, i., 233 ff.

Ver. 2. μαθ. . . . πιστεύσαντες: Blass points out that both these words are used only of Christians. From St. Chrysostom’s days the men have often been regarded merely as disciples of the Baptist (so McGiffert, p. 286), and Apollos has been named as the person to whom they owed their conversion, whilst amongst recent writers Mr. Wright, u.s., argues that they had been baptised by the Baptist himself. But if we realise the force of the remark made by Blass on the two words, they were men simply in the same immature stage of knowledge. Much difficulty has arisen in insisting upon a personal connection of these men with Apollos, but St. Luke’s words quite admit of the supposition that the twelve men may not have come to Ephesus until after Apollos had left for Corinth, a consideration which might answer the question of Ramsay, p. 270, as to how the Twelve had escaped the
καὶ ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἰς ἑπιταθήσαντο εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 6. καὶ εὐφημούμενοι τοῦ Π. τὰς χεῖρας, ἤλθεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Αγίου

1 Instead of ἐστιν D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Sah. read λαμβανοντιν τινες, so Blass and Hilg. ἐστιν very likely misunderstood; it seems impossible that λαμβανοντιν should be replaced by the difficult ἐστιν.


notice of Apollos (see Felten, p. 351, note).—εἰ, cf. i. 6.—πιστεύειν: “when ye became believers,” or “when ye believed,” R.V., in contrast with A.V.—the question was whether they had received the Holy Ghost at their Baptism, and there is no allusion to any subsequent time. The two aorists, as in R.V., point to one definite occasion.—εἰ Π. Α. ἐστιν: “whether the Holy Ghost was given,” R.V. (cf. John vii.39): (the Spirit was not yet given), A.V., but in margin, R.V. follows A.V. in the passage before us: ἐστιν, accipitur, Bengel. There could not be any question as to the existence of the Holy Ghost, for the Baptist had pointed to the future Baptism of the Spirit to be conferred by the Messiah, and the O.T. would have taught the existence of a Holy Spirit—the meaning is that they had not heard of a promised Baptism of the Spirit by the Messiah had been already fulfilled or not. So δοθέν, εκχυνόμενον may be understood. Alford holds that the stress should be laid on ἀκούσαντες—when we received Baptism we did not even hear of a Holy Ghost.

Ver. 4. εἰς τὸν ἑρχ.: placed first before ἦν, perhaps for emphasis. The phrase had been a favourite one with the Baptist (cf. Matt. iii.1). John’s own words showed that his Baptism was insufficient. ἦν may express both the purport and the purpose (so Alford).

Ver. 5. αἰτούμενοι δὲ: neither grammatical nor in accordance with fact can these words be regarded (as by Beza and others) as part of St. Paul’s words, as if they meant, “and the people when they heard him,” i.e., John.

Ver. 6. καὶ εὐφημούμενοι τοῦ Π. τὰς χ., see above on viii. 16.—διάλογον τε γλ. καὶ προφ.: the imperfects may mean that they began to speak, or that the exercise of the gifts mentioned continued.

The two gifts are discussed in 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10, in an Epistle which was written probably during this stay at Ephesus—no doubt the gifts are specially mentioned because the bestowal of such gifts distinguished Christian Baptism from that of John. McGiffert, p. 286, while admitting the accuracy of the account as a whole, thinks that its representation is moulded, as in viii., in accordance with the work of Peter and John in Samaria; so too Hilgenfeld refers the account to his “author to Theophilus,” who also, in viii. 16, narrates that the bap-
tised Samaritans received the Holy Ghost by the laying on of Peter’s hands. This is in some respects not unlike the older view of Baur, who held that the narrative was introduced to parallel Paul’s dignity and work with that of Peter in x. 44—the first speaking with tongues in
ἐν αὐτοῖς, δόλων τε γλώσσως καὶ προφήτευων. 7. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ πάντες ἄνδρες ὦσεί 1 δεκαύω. 8. Εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐπαρρησίατε, ἐπὶ μήνας τρεῖς διαλέγομεν καὶ πείθων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 9. Ἡ δὲ τῶν ἑκάστους καὶ ἑκάστους, κακολογοῦντες τὴν οδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλῆθους, ἀποστάζει ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφόρηται τοὺς μαθητὰς, καθ' ἡμέραν διαλέγομεν εἰς τῇ σχολῇ.


2 Before επαρρησίακατε D, Syr. H. mg. read συναγώγην μεγάλη; see Harris, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 60, 61. τα before πείρας ΝΑΕΗΛΡ 13, 36, Chrys., retained by T. R., Tisch., but om. by Lach., W. H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass (cf. viii. 12), in accordance with BD.

ii. is narrated in relation to Jews, the second in relation to Gentiles, x., and the third in relation to a kind of middle class, half-believers like the Samaritans! (so Zeller and Schneckenburger). But not only does this require us to identify ii. with x. and xix., the speaking of tongues at Pentecost with subsequent bestowal of the gift, but it seems strange that a narrative should not have been constructed more free from liability to misconception and misinterpretation if the leading purpose of its introduction had been as supposed above.

Ver. 7. ὦσεί, as Weiss admits, excludes any special significance attaching to the number twelve on account of which the narrative would be constructed. See also Knabenbauer, in loco. We know so little about these men that it seems hazardous to attempt to define them more clearly (see Plumptre, in loco).

Ver. 8. The Apostle follows his usual method—to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. διαλέγ., see above ; cf. xvii. 2, "reasoning," R.V. ("discoursing," Rendall).

Ver. 9. ἑκάστους: only here and in Rom. ix. 18, but four times in Hebrews, three times as a quotation from Ps. xcv. 8, and once in direct reference to that passage, iii. 13, cf. Exodus vii. 3, Deut. ii. 30, etc. In Ecclus. xxx. 12 it is found as here with ἀπειθέω, cf. also Clem. Rom., lii. 3, 5—ἀπειθεῖν: "were disobedient," R.V., unbelief is manifested in disobedience, Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 87, 97, cf. Ig., Mag., viii., 2; Polyce, Phil., ii., 1.—τὴν δὲ: "the Way," see on ix. 2.—κακολ., Mark ix. 39, used by our Lord of speaking evil of Him,Matt. xv. 4, and Mark vii. 10, as a quotation from Exod. xxi. 17; in LXX five times, and once in same sense in 2 Macc. iv. 1.

—ἀποστάζει: as in xviii. 7, at Corinth; verb only in Luke and Paul, except Heb. iii. 12, see Friedrich, p. 7, and above on xv. 38, seven times in N.T. with ἀπειθέω and a genitive as here.—ἀφόρηται: except Matt. xiii. 49, xcv. 32 (2), only in Luke and Paul, cf. Luke vi. 22, Acts xii. 2, Rom. i. 1, 2 Cor. vi. 17, quotation, Gal. i. 15, ii. 12; cf. Grimm-Thayer for different shades of meaning, both in a good and bad sense, in classical Greek and also in LXX frequently. It is evidently presupposed that as in xviii. 26 there were still disciples who held fast to the common worship of a Jewish community in the synagogue.—καθ' ἡμέραν: on the days when synagogue worship was held, and so the separation was complete.—ἐν σχολῇ Τυραννύν τινός, see critical note. We cannot tell whether reference is made to the lecture-hall of some heathen sophist hired by Paul or to the Βήθ Ἰαμαδράκ kept by a Jew. Others have thought that Tyrannus, like Titius Justus, xviii. 7, may have been "a proselyte of the gate," but if so, one might expect it to be signified as in the case of Justus. The name was common enough, Jos., Ant., xvi., 10, 3; B. j., i., 26, 3; 2 Macc. iv. 40, and see Plumptre's note, in loco. Overbeck's view is quite possible, that the expression referred to the standing name of the place, so called from its original owner, cf. Hort, Judaism Christianity, p. 93. Probably, if we take the first-mentioned view, in teaching in such a school or lecture-hall the Apostle himself would appear to the people at large as one of the rhetors or travelling sophists of the time, Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 246, 271 (so McGiffert, p. 285, who regards the notice as taken from a trustworthy source). For instances of the use of σχολή as a school of the philosophers for teaching and lecturing see Wetstein,
Τυράννου 1 τυφος. 10. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἐτη δύο, ὡστε πάντας
tοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἄκουσαν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου 2 Ἡσυχ.,
ἰσοδιαίος τοι καὶ Ἑλληνας. 11. Δινάμεις τινός τυχόσος ἐποίη δὲ Θεὸς
tῶν χειρῶν Παύλου, 12. ὡστε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενούντας 3 ἐπιφέρεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ σωμάτων ἐν 
σωματίσθαι, καὶ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν τας νόσους, τα τε πνεύματα

1 τυφος om. NAB 13, 27, 29, 81, Sah., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Vulg. fu.-tol., Tisch., W.H.,
do dekathis. The addition is accepted by Blass, Belser, Nestle, Zöckler as original,
whilst even Wendt sees in it a passage in which D has retained some elements of
the original text otherwise lost, p. 313 (1899), and Weiss, Codex D, p. 110, thinks
that it may have been added according to an old oral tradition, cf. xii. 10. Ramsay,
C. R. E., p. 154, and St. Paul, p. 271, maintains that the tradition is probably
true, and he gives proofs from Martial, ix., 68, xii., 57, and Juven., vii., 222-6, that
the schools opened at daybreak; so that by eleven o'clock the scholars would be
dismissed, and Paul could use the school.


3 επιφ., but αποφ. NABE 13, 36, 49, Vulg., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss,
Wendt. Blass in β has επιφ.

in loco, cf. Latin, auditorium, Zöckler
compares St. Augustine's lecture-hall in
Rome before his conversion.

Ver. 10. ἐτη δύο: exclusive of
the quarter of a year in ver. 8 and in xx.
31 the Apostle speaks of three years'
residence in Ephesus, "in the usual
ancient style of reckoning an intermediate
period by the superior round number,"
Turner, "Chron. of N. T.," Hastings'
B. D., see also Page and Wendt, in loco.
-τετέχοντο: not only the position of
Ephesus, but the fact that it was just the
place which would be frequented for
its famous temple and festivals by
crowds of strangers, both Jew and Greek, from
all parts of proconsular Asia, " Ephesus,
"Hastings' B. D., 1., 720. Nor must we
suppose that St. Paul and his fellow
workers confined themselves literally to
Ephesus. The seven Churches of Asia
may reasonably be referred for their foun-
dation to this period—all of which were
centres of trade, and all within reach of
Ephesus. Timothy, moreover, may well
have been working at Colosse, since in
the Epistle to the Colossians he is mentioned
with Paul in the inscription of the
letter, although the latter had not been
personally known to the Churches of
Colosse and Laodicea, Ramsay, " Co-
lossae," Hastings' B. D., and St. Paul,
p. 274. -Ελληνας: comprising no doubt
Hellenists and Greeks, cf. xi. 20.

Ver. 11. οἱ τὰς τυφο ὡστε καὶ ἔτη ἐτη δύο, ὡστε πάντας
tοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἄκουσαν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου 2 Ἡσυχ.,
ἰσοδιαίος τοι καὶ Ἑλληνας. 11. Δινάμεις τινός τυχόσος ἐποίη δὲ Θεὸς
tῶν χειρῶν Παύλου, 12. ὡστε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενούντας 3 ἐπιφέρεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ σωμάτων ἐν 
σωματίσθαι, καὶ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν τας νόσους, τα τε πνεύματα

ordinary," i.e., extra-ordinary, with which
the deeds of the Jewish exorcists could
not be compared, see Klostermann, Vin-
dicia Lucanae, p. 52, for the same phrase
cf. 3 Macc. iii. 7, and also Deissmann,
Neue Bibelstudien, p. 83; so too in
classical Greek. -πεμπτης: continued to
work," or ex more. Blass.

Ver. 12. οὐτάς τυχ., cf. κκν iii. 2, the
phrase is peculiar to St. Luke, " not the
ordinary," i.e., extra-ordinary, with which
the deeds of the Jewish exorcists could
not be compared, see Klostermann, Vin-
dicia Lucanae, p. 52, for the same phrase
cf. 3 Macc. iii. 7, and also Deissmann,
Neue Bibelstudien, p. 83; so too in
classical Greek. -εποίει: continued to
work," or ex more. Blass.

(twice). see Hatch and Redpath; Zahn,
Einleitung ii., 435, sees in its use here the
use of a medical term, so Hobart, p. 242.—
σωματίσθαι: Latin, samicinctium, only here in N.T.,
aspron worn by artisans at their work,
cf. Martial, xlv., 153. Oecumenius and
Theophylact apparently regarded the
word as simply = handkerchiefs, but the
meaning given is far more likely both
from the etymology of the word and its
use in Martial. For other Latinisms see
Blass, in loco, and Wetstein.—ἀπ’ αὐτῶν,
cf. Luke xii. 58. Heb. ii. 15, here
in connection with sickness, and this use
is very frequent in medical writers, Ho-
bart, p. 47; the word is found with ἀπὸ
both in classical writers and in the LXX.
It should also be noted that here as elsewhere St. Luke distinguishes between natural diseases and the diseases of the demonised, and that he does so more frequently than the other Evangelists, Hobart, pp. 12, 13, so "Demon," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 592, cf. especially Luke vi. 17, viii. 2, xiii. 32, which have no parallels in the other Gospels.—πονηρά: is applied to evil spirits by St. Luke three times in his Gospel and four times in this passage, and only once elsewhere, St. Matt. xii. 45, although the word is very frequent in St. Matthew's Gospel and in the Epistles; the word was constantly used by medical writers in connection with disease, Hobart, u. s. Blass quotes as a parallel to the present passage εἰ αἱ νόσοι ἀπαλλαγής εἰκὸν τῶν σώματων (Plat.) Erx. 401 c.—τὰ τε πνεύματα . . . Were the aprons brought for the healing of the diseases and the banishing of the demons equally? The τε seems to indicate that this was the case (Weiss, Wendl); Blass on the other hand holds that it is not said that the demons were driven out by the sudaria. According to some interpretations of the verse the carrying of the aprons to the sick is only to be regarded as a result of the wonderful impression made by St. Paul's miraculous power; the writer says nothing of the effect of these aprons, although he places both the healing of the diseases and the expulsion of the demons amongst the δυνάμεις of St. Paul. From this point of view the carrying of the sudaria would only illustrate the superstitious practices which showed how often, in the homes of culture, quackery was also found, and the Evangelist gives them no word of commendation, see also note on v. 15. On the other hand we must remember that the miracles are distinctly spoken of as ὅ τις τῶν πνεύματα, and even in the means employed we may perhaps see a possible appeal to the populace, who would recognise that these charms and amulets in which they put such confidence had not the same potency as the handkerchiefs and aprons of the Apostle. But in this accommodation to special forms of ignorance we are never allowed to forget that God is the source of all power and might.

Ver. 13. If we read και after απο (see critical note), it contrasts the Jewish exorcists who endeavoured to gain this power with those like St. Paul who really possessed it.—περιερχόμενοι: "vagabond," A.V., the word as it is now used colloquially does not express the Greek; R.V. "strolling," Vulgate, circumvagantes: Blass renders circumvagantes. The word "vagabond" is used only here in N.T.: in the O.T. we have it in Gen. iv. 12, 14, R.V. "wanderer," and in Ps. cix. 10, R.V. "vagabonds," cf. Milton, Paradise Lost, xi., 16.—εξορκιστῶν: the word points to a class of Jews who practised exorcisms as a profession, cf. Jos., Ant., viii., 2, 5. The usual method of exorcism was the recitation of some special name or spell, and these Jewish exorcists having seen the power which Paul wielded by his appeal to the name of Jesus endeavoured to avail themselves of the same efficacy. It would be difficult to say how far these Jewish exorcists would employ the incantations so widely in vogue in a place like Ephesus, but there is a notable passage in Justin Martyr in which, whilst admitting that a Jew might exorcise an evil spirit by the God of Abraham, he complains that as a class the Jewish exorcists had adopted the same superstitions and magical aids as the heathen, "Exorcist," B.D., i., 1028. In the Didaché, iii., 4, the use of charms and sorceries is expressly forbidden since they led to idolatry.—εξορκιστής: with double accusative = of the one adjured and of the one by whom he is adjured, cf. Mark v. 7 (1 Thess. v. 27), see Grimm-Thayer, sub μ., cf. Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 25 ff., for the constant use of the verb in inscriptions in formule of adjuration as here, see further "Demon" and "Exorcist" for examples of such formule, Hastings' B.D., i., pp. 593, 812, and for the absurdities involved in them.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

13-14.

13. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

14. Ἡσαν δὲ τοὺς... εἰς τὸ τοῦτο ποιοῦτες.

1 τίνες ΜΑΗΛΠ, Vulg., Syr. H., Chrys., so Alford, but Lach., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg., R.V. after B (D), E 36, 180, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm. read τίνος (τίνος in connection with the following ἐστιν... is very difficult), τίνος om. after τίνος, but placed by ΜΑΒΕ 13, 15, 18, 40, Vulg., Arm., after ἐστιν; Meyer follows T.R. In D, Syr. H. mg. εν οἷς καὶ τίνος (Syr. H. mg. has τίνα τίνες) Σκευὰ τίνες ἱερειῶν ἔχοντας τὸ εἰς τοῦτο ποιήσαι, (οὐ) οὗτος εἰχέν τοὺς τοιούτους ἐξορκίζειν. Καὶ εκείνοις ἀρξάντας τὸν διασαμαχομένου ἡμᾶς ἐπίκαλεσθαι τὸ σῶμα λεγόμενον τοιούτως εἰς τοῦ τοῦτον οὖν Π. κηρύσσειν εξελθείν, so Hilg. and so Blass in β, but with ἱερειῶν, Gig., but with ἱεραρχῶν, Αlford, but Lach., W.H., Weiss, Βlass,Ηilg.,R.V. afterΒ (D),Ε36, τινος(τινεςin connection with the following επτα υιοι is very difficult), υιοι om. after τινες, but placed by ΜΑΒΕ 13, 15, 18, 40, Vulg., Βoh.,Αrm. read τινος(τινεςin connection with the following επτα υιοι is very difficult), υιοι om. after τινες, but placed by ΜΑΒΕ 13, 15, 18, 40, Vulg., Arm., after ἐστιν; Meyer follows T.R. Ιη D, Syr.Η. mg. εν τοις και τινος(Syr.Η. πηγ. has υιοιεπτα) Σκευα τινος ιερεως ηθελησαν το αυτο ποιησαι,(οι) εθος ειχαν τους τοιουτους εξορκιζειν. Και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομεν ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες, παραγγελλομεν σοι εν Ιησου ον Π. κηρυσσει εξελθειν,so Ηilg. and so Βlass in β, but with ἱεραρχῶν, Gig., instead of ιερειῶν. Βlass considers that this was orig. both in α and β, then ιερειῶν was written ιεραρχῶν, hence Ιη D, Syr.Η...πηγ.,Gig., and in most ιεραρχῶν, but why should ιερειῶν be inserted at all at all? No doubt the omission of εστιν removes much difficulty. Belser thinks that the omis. is orig., and argues strongly in favour of β text, pp. το3,1ο4, so also Ζόckler, and Ramsay, C. Κ. Ε., p. 153, speaks of D as giving a reading here which is intelligent, consistent, and possible. Ονετbeck conjectured δυο (Gig. has δυο) instead of επτα with reference to ver. το6, on the ground that the numerical signs Β and Ζ might be confused, but as Wendt (1888) points out, it is difficult to explain how a mistake so troublesome for the understanding of the passage could be perpetuated. The greatest difficulty is to explain how εστιν came in if not original, and it is easy to understand that it might be omitted because of αμφοτερων, ver. 16, see Weiss, Codex D, p. 95.

Ver. 14. See critical note. Σκευα: probably a Latin name adapted to Greek, see Blass, in loco, who gives instances of its occurrence, see also Gram., p. 13, and Winer-Schmeidel, p. 75. Ενwald refers it to the Hebrew יִּנְמוּם.—ἐρχόμενος: the description is difficult, as it seems incredible if we take it in its strictest sense; it may have denoted one who had been at the head of one of the twenty-four courses of priests in Jerusalem, or perhaps used loosely to denote one who belonged to the high-priestly families (cf. iv. 6). We cannot connect him with any of the local sacred offices of the Jews in Asia Minor, as Nösgen proposes, for the Jews in the Diaspora had no temple, but synagogues; see reading in D, critical note. Nothing further is known of Sceva, but there is no reason to suppose that he was an impostor in the sense that he pretended to be a high priest. —ὑμεῖς...ποιοῦτες, Lucan, see above on i. το. 10.

Ver. 15. γινώσκω...ἐπίσταμαι: "I know," R.V. for both verbs, but for the former "I recognise," margin, as a distinction is drawn between Paul and Jesus in the formula of adjuration, it is natural to expect a distinction in the reply; γιν. probably denotes a more personal knowledge, ἐπίστ., I know as of a fact. "I Jesus know and about Paul I know," Rendall; Lightfoot would render "Jesus I acknowledge and Paul I know": On a Fresh Revision of N. T. p. 60. Wordsworth also, in loco, holds that ἐπίστ. denotes knowledge of a lower degree such as acquaintance with a fact, and compares the distinction between the two verbs in Jude ver. 10. ἐπίστ. is only once used in the Gospels, Mark xiv. 68. But see also Page, in loco, as to the difficulty in making any precise distinction.—ὑμεῖς placed first here in a depreciatory sense, τίνες in indicating contempt.

Ver. 16. ἐφάλλομεν; only here in L.X.; in LXX, 1 Sam. χ. 6, xi. 6, χνι. 13.—κατακυρ.; only here in Luke; Matt. xx. 25, Μark x. 42, 1 Pet. v. 3; frequent in LXX.—αὐτῶν, see critical note. There is no real difficulty if we read ἀμφότερων after ἐστίν, ver. 14; St. Luke had mentioned that seven of the sons of Sceva made the attempt to imitate Paul, but the incident which he describes introduces two of them only. ἀμφ. cannot be taken distributively, or with Ewald, neuter, as if = ἀμφότερων. —γυμνός: may mean with torn garments, not literally naked, so Grimm-Thayer, sub υ., and Αlford.—ἐκείνου: the pronoun seems to imply that the writer had a definite place before his eyes, although it is not fully described. But it is surely a mark of truthfulness that the narrative ends where it does; a forger, we may well believe, would have crowned the story by a picture of the man, after baffling the imposters, healed by the word
15. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπεν, Τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω, καὶ τὸν Πάυλον ἔπισταμαι· ὅμεις δὲ τίνες ἐστέ; 16. καὶ ἐφαλλόμενος ἐν' αὐτῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ψυχὴν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν, καὶ κατακυριεύσας ἐν' αὐτῶν, ἱσχύει κατ' αὐτῶν, διότι γνωμοὺς καὶ τετραμαθιμοῦσας ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου ἐκείνου. 17. τούτῳ δὲ ἐγένετο γνωστόν πάσιν Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλησί τοῖς κατοικούσι τὴν Ἑφέσον, καὶ ἐπέβαλε φόβος ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐμεγάλυτο τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 18. Πολλοὶ τε τῶν πειστευκότων ἤρχοντο εξομολογοῦμενοι

1 After τον (1), ΝCE 40, 73, 137, Syr. H. Cass. read μεν [W.H.], so Weiss.
4 επεσεν AD, so Hilg., but not Gig. or Blass in β.

or touch of Paul (see Plumptre’s remarks, in loco). The marked contrast between the New Testament in its description of the demonised and their healing, and the notions and practices which meet us in the Jewish Rabbi, may be seen in Eder-sheim’s valuable appendix, Jesus the Messiah, ii., 770 ff., and the same decisive contrast is also seen between the N.T. and the prevailing ideas of the first century in the cures of the demonised attributed to Apollonius of Tyana in this same city Ephesus and in Athens; Smith and Wace, Dictionary of the Christian Biography, i., 136. Ramsay is very severe on the whole narrative, St. Paul, p. 273, and regards it as a mere piece of current gossip; so, too, very similarly, Wendt (1899), note, p. 313, who refers, as so many have done, to the analogy between the narrative in ver. 11 and that in v. 12, 15; in other words, to the parallel between Peter and Paul (which the writer of Acts is supposed to draw on every possible occasion; see intro.). So too Hilgenfeld ascribes the whole section vv. 11-20 to his “author to Theophilus,” and sees in it a story to magnify St. Paul’s triumph over sorcery and magic, as St. Peter’s over Simon Magus in v. 13. Clemen with Spitta, Van Manen, and others regard the whole section as interrupting the connection between vv. 10 and 21—but even here, in ver. 14, Clemen sees in addition the hand of his Redactor Antijudaicus, as distinct from the Redactor to whom the whole narrative is otherwise attributed.


Ver. 18. πολλοὶ τε: the τε shows another immediate result in the fact that those who were already believers were now fully convinced of the pre-eminence of the name of Jesus, and were all the more filled with a reverential fear of His holy name: “many also of those who had believed,” R.V. So Wendt in latest edition.—ἐρχοντες, Bengel.—ἐξομολ.: Rendall renders “giving thanks” to God for this manifestation of His power. But it is usually taken, not absolutely, but as governing πράξεις, cf. Matt. iii. 6, Mark i. 5, James v. 16; Jos., Ant., viii., 4, 6; B. f., v., 10, 5, so in Plutarch several times, “confessing,” cf. also Clem. Rom., Cor., li., 3; Barn., Epist., xix., 12; Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 118, and Mayor on James v. 16; Felten, Apostelgeschichte, p. 361.—πράξεις, cf. Luke xxiii. 51; also in a bad sense. So too in Rom. viii. 13, Col. iii. 9, so often in Polyb. (3 Macc. i. 27). Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 5, maintains that the passage before us shows acquaintance with the technical terminology of magic, and instances πράξεις as a terminus technicus for a magic prescription; see also Knabenbauer’s note in loco.—ἀναγγέλλοντες: instead of continuing secretly practising or approving of the deeds of magic, they declared their wrongdoings. Rendall takes it as meaning that they reported the deeds of those men, i.e.,
καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν. 19. ἵκανοί δὲ τῶν τὰ περίεργα πραξάντων, συνενεγκαίτες τὰς βίβλους κατέκαιον εἰς τῶν πάντων· καὶ συνεφίσμασαν τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ εὕρον ἄργυρίου μυρίας πέντε. 20. οὕτω κατὰ κράτος ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου ἤξενε καὶ εἰς ἑρωοπλῆθεμ, εἰς τῶν, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἔκει, δεὶ με καὶ ἡμῶν ἰδεῖν.

1 D has after κράτος, εἰς ἑραλῆται καὶ ἡ πιστὶς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἤξενε καὶ εἰς ἑραλῇντε. Syr. Pesh. has εἰς ἑραλῆται καὶ ἡ πιστὶς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἤξενε καὶ εἰς ἑραλῇντε. Weiss, Codex D, p. 96, objects that Βlass omits the καί necessary before ἡ πιστ. τοῦ Θ., and adds an impossible καί after Θεοῦ. Belser defends and points out that εἰς ἑραλῆται is Lucan, only found in Luke's writings; but on the other hand, whilst no doubt ἡ πιστὶς is used objectively in Acts, we never have ἡ πιστὶς τοῦ Θεοῦ in Luke's writings.

Ver. 19. ίκανοί δὲ: to be referred probably to the magicians, as the previous verse refers to their dupes: a Lucan word, see above on viii. 11.—τὰ περίεργα: “curious,” Wyclif and A. and R.V. (“magical,” R.V., margin), cf. Vulgate, curiosa (Latin, curious, inquisitive, prying), of a person who concerns himself with things unnecessary and profitless to the neglect of the duty which lies nearest, cf. 1 Tim. v. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 11, so in classical Greek, Xen., Mem., i., 3, 1. The word is also used of things over and above what is necessary, and so of magical arts, arts in which a man concerns himself with what has not been given him to know, cf. Aristaeus, Epist., ii., 18, and the striking passage in Plat., Apol., 19 B, where περίεργα is used of Socrates in an accusatory sense (Wendt, Page); the verb is found in Ecclesiast. iii. 23, and περίεργα, Ecclesiast. xli. 22 S², but the adjective does not occur either in LXX or Apocrypha. But see especially Deissmann, Bibelstudien, u. s., who finds here another instance of acquaintance with the terminology of magic, and illustrates from the papyri. The R.V. margin gives best sense, as “curious” in the passive sense as here need not have a bad or depreciatory meaning, cf. for a good parallel for “curious” = “magical,” Bacon, Essays, 35; and see “Curious,” Hastings' B.D.; Skeat, Glossary of Bible Words.—συνενεγκαίτε: only here in this sense, not in LXX (cf. i. 26).—ἀργ. μυρ. πέντε, sc. δραχμών ἄργ.: the sum is very large, nearly £2000, but probably such books would be expensive, and we must take into account in estimating it the immense trade and rich commerce of Ephesus, and the fact that we need not suppose that all the Christian converts were to be found only amongst the slaves and poorer classes (Nösgen). Such books would certainly fetch a fancy price. It may no doubt be maintained that their measuring all things by money value indicates the Oriental standard of worth, especially in a chapter otherwise so rich and exact in its description of Ephesian localities and life.

Ver. 20. κατὰ κράτος: adverbial, so only here in N.T., cf. Judg. iv. 3, and Jos., Ant., viii., 11, 3, in classical Greek, Xen., Cyr., i., 4, 23, etc. —ὑδ. καὶ λο.: in contrast to the empty superstitions and vanities the continuous growth (imperfect) of the Church.

Ver. 21. διελθών, see on the force of
22. ἀποστέλλας δὲ εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν δύο τῶν διακονοῦντων αὐτῷ, Τιμόθεου καὶ Ἐραστοῦ, αὐτὸς ἐπέσχεχρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν. 23. Ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον τάραχος οὐκ ὁλίγος περὶ τῆς ὀδοῦ. 24. Δημήτριος γὰρ τῆς ὁμάτι, ἀργυροκόπος, τοῦ Ῥαοῦ ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος, παρεῖχε τοὺς ἑκτιτάς ἐργασιῶν οὐκ ὁλίγην.

1 οἱ πρὸ ὀνοματι, so D, Syr. P., Blass, Hilg.
2 ἀργυροὺς om, B, Gig. [W.H.], but retained by Blass in β; παρείχετο N HILP, so W., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; παρείχεν Α*DE 65, 67, 133, so Blass in β, who inserts ο before παρείχε for ος in D, και in Pesh.

the word Ramsay, Expositor, May, 1895, and above on xiii. 6. Ramsay regards this as perhaps the most conclusive of the ten cases he cites of the use of the verb as denoting missionary travel. There is no reason to suppose that Paul paid a visit to Corinth during his stay at Ephesus; vv. 9, 10 intimate that he resided at Ephesus through the whole period. Wendt thinks that the notice of this second visit to Corinth was omitted by Luke because it did not fit in with his representation of the ideal development of the Church. But is there any real argument to be found for it in the Epistles? The passages usually quoted are 2 Cor. ii.1, xii.14, xiii.1. But τρίτον τούτο ἑρχομαι may well express “I am meaning to come,” so that Paul would mean that this was the third time he had purposed to come to them, not that he had come for the third time; and this rendering is borne out by the Apostle’s own words, 2 Cor. xii.14, Paley, Hora Paulina, iv., 11, whilst with regard to 2 Cor. ii.1 the words may simply mean that he resolves that his new, i.e., his second visit, παλιὸν έλθείν, should not be ἐν λύπῃ, for we are not shut up to the conclusion that παλιὸν must be connected with ἐν λύπῃ as if he had already paid one visit in grief; and this interpretation is at all events in harmony with 2 Cor. xii.2, R. V. margin, and with i. 23, R. V. margin, and with i. 23, R. V., see especially “II. Cor.” (Dr. A. Robertson), Hastings’ B. D., p. 494, and compare “Corinth” (Ramsay), ibid., p. 483; see also Farrar, Messages of the Books, pp. 211, 216; St. Paul, ii. 101, 118; Felten, note, p. 364; Renan, Saint Paul, p. 450, note; and in favour of the second visit to Corinth, McGiffert, p. 310, following Alford, Neander, Weizsäcker (so too in early days St. Chrysostom). In 1 Cor. xvi. 5-9 Paul speaks of his intention to go through Macedonia to Corinth, but previously, 2 Cor. i. 16, he had intended to sail from Ephesus to Corinth, then to go to Macedonia, and afterwards to return to Corinth. Why had he changed his plans? Owing to the bad news from Corinth, 2 Cor. i. 23. But although he did not go to Corinth in person, he determined to write to reprove the Corinthians, and this he did in 1 Cor. It is possible that the Apostle’s determination to see Rome—the first notice of the desire so long cherished, Rom. i. 13, xv. 23—may be closely connected with his friendship with Aquila and Priscilla (Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 255, and Plumptre, in loco, Hort, Rom. and Ephes., p. 11).

Ver. 22. ἀποστέλλας . . . Τιμ. καὶ Ἐρ., cf. I Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, 11, Paley, Hora Paulina, iii., 3, 4; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 297, note.—διακ. αὐτώ: for a few instances of διακονεῖν and cognate words used of ministrations rendered to Paul himself, see Hort, Ecclesia, p. 205, cf. Philen., ver. 13.—Ἐραστοῦ: here, as in 2 Tim. iv. 20, the person bearing this name appears as an itinerant companion of St. Paul, and it therefore seems difficult to identify him with the Erastus of Rom. xvi. 23, who is described as “treasurer” of the city, i.e., Corinth, since the tenure of such an office seems to presuppose a fixed residence. That the identification was not impossible is maintained by Wendt as against Meyer, but see “Erastus,” Hastings’ B. D. The name, as Meyer remarks, Rom. xvi. 23, was very common.—ἐν τῇ χρόνῳ: verb, only used by Luke and Paul, and only here in this sense. ἑαυτόν: supplied after the verb; LXX, Gen. viii. 10, 12; in classical Greek, Xen., Cyrr., v., 4, 38.—ἐλ δεῖ νῦν, Blass; but see on the other hand, Alford, in loco. As Asia, not Ephesus, is mentioned, the word may well include work outside Ephesus itself.

Ver. 23. Ἐγένετο δὲ: on the frequency of the formula in Luke’s writings see Friedrich, p. 13, and above on iv. 5.—τάραχος οὐκ ὁλίγος: the same phrase as in xii. 18, nowhere else in N. T., for οὐκ ὁλίγος as Lucan see above, xii. 18.
25. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

1 Blass (so Hilg.) reconstructs in β text, according to Syr. Pesh., υπος συναθροίσας καὶ τοὺς περί τὰ τοιαύτα ἐργάτας, εἶπεν, ἀνδρεῖς, ἐπιταύσθη δι' ἑκ ταῦτης τῆς ἐργασίας ἢ εὐπορία ἡμῶν

25. "οὺς συναθροίσας, και τουσ περί τους εργατας, ειπεν, Ανδρεις, επιστασθετι τι εικ ταυτης της εργασιας η ευπορια ημων

—τῆς οδού: as in ix. 2, xix. 9, xxv. 22; much better than to refer it with Weiss merely to the method adopted by Paul in ver. 26.

Ver. 24. Δημ.: a sufficiently common name, as St. Luke's words show (Blass). There is no ground for identifying him with the Demetrius in 3 John, ver. 12, except the fact that both came from the neighbourhood of Ephesus; see, however, " Demetrius," Hastings' B.D.—Διδυμον, LXX, Judg. vii. 4 (A al.), Jer. vi. 29; on the trade-guilds in Asia Minor cf. Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., p. 105, and " Ephesus," Hastings' B.D.; Church in the Roman Empire, p. 128; Demetrius may have been master of the guild for the year.— ναος ιπρα, 'Αρτέμιδος: "silver shrines of Diana," R.V., i.e., representing the shrine of Diana (Artemis) with the statue of the goddess within (ος καθορε μικρα, Chrys.). These miniature temples were bought up by Ephesians and strangers alike, since the worship of the goddess was so widely spread, and since the "shrines" were made sufficiently small to be worn as amulets on journeys, as well as to be placed as ornaments in houses. There is no need to suppose that they were coins with a representation of the temple stamped upon them, and there is no evidence of the existence of such coins; Amm. Marc., xxii., 13, Dio Cass., xxxix., 20, cf. Bliss and Wendt, in loco. They were first explained correctly by Curtius, Athemische Mittheilungen, ii., 49. Examples of these ναοι in terra-cotta or marble with dedicatory inscriptions abound in the neighbourhood of Ephesus. No examples in silver have been found, but they were naturally melted down owing to their intrinsic value. " Diana." (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., and Church in the Roman Empire, u. s. On the interesting but apparently groundless hypothesis (as Zöckler calls it, Apostelgeschichte, p. 277, second edition) that Demetrius should be identified with Demetrius, the ναοι of an inscription at Ephesus which probably dated from a considerably later time, the very close of the first century, ναολοι being really a temple word, the words ναολοι 'Αρτέμιδος being mistaken by the author of Acts and rendered "making silver shrines of Diana," see Zöckler, u. s.; and Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 112 ff.; and Wendt (1899), p. 317. As Ramsay puts it, there is no extant use of such a phrase as ναοι. 'Αρτ. in any authority about A.D. 57, ναοι simply being the term used in inscriptions found at Ephesus—as Hicks himself allows (Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 122, 123).—ταιετη, see critical note or reading in Bliss. Rendall distinguishes between active voice, xvi. 16, where the slave girl finds work for her masters, whilst here, middle voice, Demetrius finds work for himself and his fellow-craftsmen in their joint employment.—ιπρασιαν "business," R.V., in xvi. 16, 19, "gain"; here the two meanings run into each other, in ver. 25 "business," R.V., is perhaps more in accordance with the context ουκ ολιγην, Lucan, see on ver. 23.—τεχνιτας . . . ιπραταις: "alii erant τεχνιται, artifices nobiliores; alii ιπραται, operarii," so Zöckler and Grimm-Thayer following Bengel. But Blass regards them as the same, cf. reading in D, and Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 128, note. There were no doubt shrines of widely differing value, for the rich of silver made by the richer tradesmen, for the poorer classes of marble and terra-cotta, so that several trades were no doubt seriously affected, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 278, and " Ephesus," u. s., Church in the Roman Empire, p. 128, and to the same effect Wendt (1899), p. 317. The word ιπραται occurs in one of the inscriptions at Ephesus, ιπρα πατησειται προς τα Ποσειδων, Ephesus, u. s., p. 723, note.

Ver. 25. περι τα τοιαυτα, cf. Luke x. 40, 41, for a similar use of περι with accusative, but see W. H., l. c., and 2 Macc. xii. 1.—ευπορια: wealth, or gain,
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ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ  xix.

26. καὶ θεωρεῖτε καὶ ἀκούετε ὅτι οὐ μόνον Ἡ Ἐφεσου, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παύλος οὗτος πείσας μετέτητην ἵκανον ὁ ἥλιον, λέγων ὅτι οὐκ εἰσί θεοὶ οἱ διὰ χειρῶν γινόμενοι. 27. οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο κινδυνεύει ἡμῖν τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἠλθείν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς 'Αρτέμιδος ἱερόν εἰς οὐδὲν 2 λογισθῆναι, μελεῖν τε καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τὴν μεγαλειότητα αὐτῆς, ἣν ἐλθ ἡ 'Ασία

1 Before Ἐφεσου D prefixes εως, so Blass in β (comparing xxiii. 23), and Hilg. After οὗτος D1 adds τις τοτε, Gig., “nescio quem,” so Blass in β, comparing xvii. 7, where we have the same addition in Gig. and β text.


only here in N.T., in classical Greek “in different senses in different authorities,” Grimm-Thayer; in LXX, 2 Kings xxv. 10, but in a different sense (see Hatch and Redpath’s references to its use by Aquila, Symm., and others). Rendall takes it of comfort and well-being, in the old English sense weal.

Ver. 26. οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ: non modo . . . sed.—σχεδὸν, xiii. 44, we cannot take the genitive with ὁ ἥλιον, as Hackett suggests.—Ἀσίας: the Roman province, so Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 278, where he corrects his former interpretation of the word in this passage in Church in the Roman Empire, p. 166; see above on Paul’s work outside Ephesus.—οὗτος: contemptuous.—μετέτητην, cf. Josh. xxiv. 8. The testimony thus borne to the wide and effective influence of the Apostles even by their enemies is well commented on by St. Chrys., Hom., xlii., and see also below.

Ver. 27. τοῦτο . . . τὸ μέρος, sc., τῆς ἐργασίας ἡμῶν, ver. 25, Grimm-Thayer—this branch of their trade, which was concerned with the making of the shrines. Others take μέρος = trade, the part assigned to one.—καθαρεῖν: “the most sensitive part of ‘civilised’ man is his pocket,” Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 277, and the opposition thus naturally came not from the priests as instigators of the riot against Paul, but from the fact that trade connected with the Artemis-worship was endangered; so at Philippi, “when the masters saw that the hope of this was gone,” xvi. 19; see Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 129 ff., as against Hicks. “See how wherever there is idolatry, in every case we find money at the bottom of it, both in the former instance it was for money, and in the case of this man for money; it was not for their religion, because they thought that in danger; no, it was for their lucrative craft, that it would have nothing to work upon,” Chrys., Hom., xlii.—εἰς ἀπελέγχον ἠλθείν: noun, not found either in classical Greek or in the LXX; the verb ἀπελέγχειν is found in 4 Μacc. ii. (cf. Symm., Ps. cxix. 118), and ἅλεγμος is not uncommon in LXX, consutatio, repudiatio (for the phrase cf. Mark v. 26), in contemnium venire, Wetstein; but in redargutionem venire, VULgate.—アルバム: the utilitarian aspect of the appeal stands first, but speciously seconded by an appeal to religious feelings (“non tām pro aris ipsos quam pro focis pugnare,” Calvin).—τῆς μεγ. θεᾶς Α.: St. Luke appears to have retained the precise title of the goddess, according to the witness of the inscription; “Diana” (Ramsay), Hastings’ B.D., p. 605, so Blass, in loco.—τὸ . . . ἱερὸν: the Temple of Artemis was burnt to the ground by the fanatic Herostratus in B.C. 356 on the night of the birth of Alexander the Great, but its restoration was effected with great magnificence, and it was regarded as one of the seven wonders of the world. Its dimensions are given by Pliny, xxxvi., 95. For references, and a description of its worship, see C. and H., p. 422, small edition; Renan, Saint Paul, p. 427; Ramsay, “Diana,” u. s.; Wood’s Ephesus, pp. 4-
26-29.
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καὶ οἱ οἰκουμένης εἴθεται. 28. Ἀκούοντες δὲ καὶ γενόμενοι πλήρεις ὑμνοῦν, ἔκραζον, λέγοντες. Μεγάλη ἡ Ἀρτεμις Ἐφεσίως. 29. καὶ εἴπετο ἡ πόλις οἱ συνήχεισιν ὕμνον τῷ θεάτρῳ συνορκίσαντες Γαῖον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον Μακεδόνας, συνεκδή-


2 After καὶ, β reads after D, Gig., Syr. Pesh. συνεκώθη οἱ τῆς πόλεως (οἰκων), which Blass rejects; apparently for Lat. “confusione,” see Blass, p. xx.; “confusio,” common rendering of οἰκων, Harris, Study in Codex Beza, p. 106; D prob. confute; see also Corssen, G. G. A., p. 430, 1898. ἀοικων = con-
fusio, Phil. iii. 19, Heb. xii. 12.

45; Greek Inscrip. at British Museum, iii., 1890, and for a complete account of the temple, its structure, and literature relating to its history and site, B.D., “Ephesus.” So sumptuous was the magnificence of this sanctuary that it could be said τῆς Αρτέμιδος ναός εν Ἐφέσω μόνος εστί θεών οἰκός, Philo Byz., Spect. Mund., 7, and the sun, so the saying ran, saw nothing in his course more magnificent than Diana’s temple.—εἰς οὐδὲν λόγον, cf. for a similar phrase LXX, Isa. xi. 17, Wisdom iii. 17 and ix. 6 (εἰς om. S), and Dan. Theod., iv., 32. The verb λογίζομαι is also frequent in St. Paul with εἰς and the accusative.—τε καὶ, cf. xxi. 28, not correlative, but “and that she should even,” etc., Simcox, Language of the New Testament, p. 163.—τὴν μεγαλειότητα, see critical note, if we read the genitive, “and that she should even be deposed from her magnificence,” R.V., cf. Winer-Schmiedel, κxx., 6. Grimm- 
Thayer regards the genitive as partitive, αἰiquid de majestate ejus, as if it were inconceivable that all her magnificence should be lost: so Meyer, Zöckler, Weiss, cf. Xen., Hellen., iv., 4, 13; Diod. Sic., iv., 8. But Wendt (as against Meyer) regards τὸ λερόν as the subject; cf. 1 Tim. vi. 5. The word is used, Luke ix. 43, of the majesty of God, cf. 2 Pet. i. 16 (Friedrich, p. 30); in LXX, Jer. xl. (xxxiii.) 9; 1 Esd. i. 5, iv. 40, Dan. vii. 27.—διὶ ἡ Ἡρα: “multitudine erant non efficit veritatem” (Bengel). The temple was built by contributions from the whole of Asia, tota Asia extru-
ente, Pliny, Nat. Hist., xvi., 40, so that the goddess was evidently held in veneration by the whole province, cf. ibid., xxxvi., 21; Liv., iv., 45. According to the testimony of Pausanias, iv., 31, 8; cf. Xen., Anab., v., 3, 4, no deity was more widely worshipped by private persons (Wetstein, Ramsay, Blass), see also Apuleius, 2, quoted by Mr. Page from Wordsworth. For the way in which the imperial government allied itself with the Artemis worship and the revival of paganism in the second century, and the universal honour paid to Artemis by Greek and barbarian alike, cf. Greek Inscriptions of the British Museum (Hicks), iii., pp. 135, 145.—οἰκουμένη, see above on xi. 28. Plumptre points out that the language is almost identical with that of Apuleius (perhaps from this passage): “Diana Ephesia cujus nomen unicum . . . totus veneratur orbis”.

Ver. 28. ἔκραζον: “they cried continuously,” imperfect, see addition in D. —Μεγάλη ἡ Ἀ.: omitting ἡ we have apparently the popular cry, or rather invocation: Great Artemis! as it was actually used in the cultus—the cry was not an argument against Paul’s doctrine, but rather a prayer to the goddess and queen of Ephesus, and so regarded it gives a vividness and naturalness to the scene, Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 135 ff., and “Diana,” 11. 2., p. 105; see D, critical note.

Ver. 29. συγχύσεως: the noun only here in N.T. (συγχώς: only in Luke, see above p. 238), in LXX, Gen. xi. 9, i Sam. v. 11, 1 Sam. xiv. 20, used in classical Greek in the sense of confusion, disturbance; τε, the immediate result was that they rushed (Weiss), ὑμνομαθαδόν, see above i. 14, “with one accord,” uno anno, Vulgate (not simul).—τὸ θεάτρων: no doubt the great theatre explored by Mr. Wood, Ephesus, pp. 73, 74. Afr. vi.; Lightfoot, Contemp. Rev., xxiii., p. 293; the theatre was the usual place for public assemblies in most towns, cf. Jos., B. F., vii. 3, 3; Tac., Hist., ii., 80; Blass, in loco, and Wetstein, and also Pseudo-Heraclitus, Letter vii., 47, condemning the Ephesians for submitting grave and weighty matters to the decision.
of the mobs in the theatre, *Die Heraclitischen Briefe*, p. 65; Gore, *Ephesians*, p. 255. The theatre was capable of holding, it is calculated, 24,500 people, its diameter was 495 feet, and it was probably the largest in the world (Renan). Westein remarks that the position of the places tended in no small degree to increase and foment the tumult, since the temple was in full view of the theatre.—

συναρπάσαντες, cf. vi. 12, i.e., being carried off with them in their rush; we are not told whether they met Gaius and Aristarchus by chance, and seized them as well-known companions of Paul, συνεκδήμους, or whether they searched for them in their lodgings, and seized them when they could not find the Apostle.—'Αρισταρχόν: a native of Thessalonica, cf. xx. 4; he accompanied Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem, and hence to Rome, xxvii. 2. It is possible, as Lightfoot thinks, that the words "Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, being with us" in the latter passage intimate that Aristarchus accompanied Luke and Paul on the former part of this route because he was on his way home, and that leaving Paul at Myra he may have returned to Thessalonica, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 35. But however this may be, it is evident from Col. iv. 10, Philen., ver. 24, that he was with the Apostle at Rome, probably sharing his captivity. ἐ συναχμέλωτός, Col. u. s., can hardly refer to this incident at Ephesus, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 11, "Aristarchus," B.D., or to a captivity in a spiritual sense, as bound and captive to Christ together with Paul; see also Salmon, *Intro.d.*, p. 383.—Μακεδόνας: nothing was more natural than that devoted Christians from Thessalonica should be among St. Paul's companions in travel when we consider his special affection for the Thessalonian Church. With this reading the Gaius here is of course to be distinguished from the Gaius of xx. 4, of Derbe, and from the Gaius of Rom. xvi. 23, 1 Cor. i. 14, a Corinthian. But if we could read Μακεδόνα, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 250, the Gaius here may be identified with the Gaius of xx. 4. In xx. 4 Blass connects Δερβαίον with Timothy, making Gaius a Thessalonian with Aristarchus, Secundus, see *in loco*; but against this we must place the positive statement of xvi. 1, that Timothy was a Lystran.—

συνεκδήμους: used only by Luke and Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 19, not in LXX, but in Plut. and Josephus. The word may look forward to xx. 4 (so Ramsay, u. s.), or we may take it as referring to the part which the two men played as representatives of the Thessalonians, who were carrying with St. Paul the contribution to the Church at Jerusalem (2 Cor. ix. 4). These two men, as Weiss points out, may be our informants for some of the details which follow.

Ver. 30. τού δὲ Π. βουλ.: St. Paul was not the man to leave his comrades in the lurch, and he would have followed them with his life in his hands to face the mob of Ephesus; if we may depend upon the picture of Ephesian life given us in Pseudo-Heraclitus, Letter vii., we can understand the imminent danger in which St. Paul was placed at the mercy of men who were no longer men but beasts, εξ ανθρώπων θηρία γεγονότες (*Die Heraclitischen Briefe*, p. 65 (Bermays), and Ramsay, i. s., p. 280).—δήμον, ver. 33, xii. 22, xvii. 5, so sometimes in classical Greek of the plebs, vulgus—in N.T. only in Acts. Both before and after the riot the passions of the vulgar mob were no doubt a real and serious danger to St. Paul, cf. I Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. i. 8-10. In the former passage the word εθηριομάχησα is generally referred to this danger in Ephesus, the multitude in its ferocious rage being compared to wild beasts, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 230, "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D., and Plumptre's note, *in loco*. With the expression used in I Cor. xvi. 32 we may compare Ignat., *Rom.*, v., 1, and cf. *Ephes.*, vii., 1; *Smyrn.*, iv., 1; so too Pseudo-Heraclitus, u. s., and Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 351, note; Grimm-Thayer, *sub ν.* McGiffert, p. 280 ff., maintains that the word θηριομάχησα refers to an actual conflict with wild beasts in the arena (so Weizsäcker), and that 2 Cor. i. 9 more probably refers to the danger from the riot of Demetrius; but if the literal interpretation of the verb in 1 Cor. is correct, it is strange that St. Paul should have omitted such a terrible encounter from his catalogue of dangers in 2 Cor. xi. 23; see also below at end of chapter.
30—33. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

32. ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλο τι ἐκραζόν: ἦν γὰρ
ἡ ἐκκλησία συνεχισμένη, καὶ οἱ πλείουσα οὐκ ἱδεισαν τίνος ένεκεν
συνελήθεσαν. 33. έκ δὲ τοῦ δόξου προεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον,
προβαλόντων αὐτὸν τῶν 'Ιουδαίων: ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος, κατασείσας

1 Instead of προεβίβασαν ΝΑΒΕ, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V. read
συνεβίβασαν, whilst D'HLP, Chrys. have προβι. (so T.R.). προβι. adds nothing
to προβαλλοντων and the difficulty of συνεβ. might easily lead to change. D* reads
κατεβιβασαν, so Blass in both texts, cf. Hilgenfeld, Zw. Th., pp. 304, 366, 1896,
and note in comment. Gig., Vulg., " detraxerunt ".

Ver. 31. Άσιαρχῶν: " the chief officers of
Asia," R.V., cf. Ταλατάρχης, Βαθυ-
νιάρχης, Συριάρχης, etc.; Mommsen,
Rom. Gesch., v., 318 (Knabenbauer),
officers, i.e., of the province of Asia, and so
provincial, not merely municipal officers.
Each province was in an association for
the worship of Rome and the Empire,
hence Κοινον Άσιας, of which the Άσιarchs
would probably be the high priests. But
in addition to their religious office the
Άσιarchs were called upon to provide
games, partly if not solely at their own
expense, and to preside over them. These
festivals were called Κοινά Άσιας εν
Σμύρνῃ, Λαοδικείᾳ, κ.τ.λ. It is doubtful
whether the office was annual, or whether
it was held for four years; but as an
Άσιarch still retained his title after his
term of office had expired, there may
evidently have been in Ephesus several
Άσιarchs, although only one was actually
performing his duties (cf. the title άρ-
χιερείς amongst the Jews, iν. 6, 23). If
there were a sort of Council of Άσιarchs,
this Council may well have assembled
when the Κοινά Άσιας were being held,
and this might have been the case at
Ephesus in the narrative before us; such
a festival would have brought together a
vast crowd of pilgrims and worshippers
actuated with zeal for the goddess, and
ready to side with Demetrius and his
followers. The title was one of great
dignity and repute, as is evident from
inscriptions which commemorate in
various cities the names of those who
had held the office. Whether the Άσιarchs
were in any sense high priests has been
disputed, but see Polycarp, Mart., cf.
xxi. 2 and xxii.; on the whole subject
" Άσιarch " (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D.
and B. D. 6; St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp,
ii., p. 987, Lightfoot; Renan, Saint Paul,
p. 353; Wendt, p. 318; O. Holtzmann,
Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 102.—Φίλος:
not only does the notice show that St.
Paul had gained at least the toleration of
some of the leading men of the province,
but that the attitude of the imperial
authorities was not unfriendly. We
cannot of course suppose with Zimmer-
mann that the Άσιarchs were friendly
because the Apostle had been less op-
posed to the imperial cultus than to
that of Diana, and that so far the Άσιarchs
stood with him on common ground.

Ver. 32. άλλοι μὲν οὖν: μὲν οὖν pro
bably as often in Acts without any op-
position expressed, but see Rendall, App.,
p. 162; the antithesis may be in δέ of
ver. 33.—έκραζον: “ kept on crying,”
imperfect.—εκκλησία, see below on ver.
39; here of an unlawful tumultuous
assembly.—συγκεχ., see above ver. 29.—
οι πλείους: “ sensu vere comparativo ”
Blass = major pars.

Ver. 33. εκ δὲ τοῦ ό., sc., τινές, cf.
xxi. 16. If we read συνεβίβασαν (see
critical note), and render “ instructed
Alexander," R.V., margin; cf. 1 Cor. ii.
16, and often in LXX, it seems to mean
that the Jews instructed Alexander, a
fellow-Jew, to come forward and dis-
sociate himself and them from any coali-
tion with Paul and his companions
against the Diana worship (απολογείσ
θαι). Erasmus takes the word to mean
that the Jews had instructed him before-
hand as their advocate. συμβιβάζω in
Col. ii. 19, Ephes. iv. 16 = to join to-
gether, to knit together, in Acts xvi.το,
to consider, to conclude, so Weiss thinks
here that it = concluded that Alexander
was the reason why they had come to
together; but the sentence and the context
does not seem to bear out this rendering.
Meyer retains T.R., and holds that Alex-
ander was a Jewish Christian who was
put forward by the Jews maliciously,
hoping that he might be sacrificed to the
popular tumult — hence ἀπολογείσθαι.
4 Ι6
ΧΙΧ. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

τὴν χείρα, ἥθελεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δήμῳ. 34. ἐπιγνώτων ἰ ἰ δι οὐκοδί τοι ἕστι, φωνὴ γένετο μῖα ἐκ πάντων, ὡς ἐπὶ ἄρας δύο κραζόντων, Μεγάλῃ η Ἀρτέμις Ἐφεσίων. 35. Καταστέλλας δὲ ὁ γραμματεὺς τῶν ὄχλων, φησίν, Ἀνδρεὶς Ἐφεσίοι, τίς γὰρ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος δὲ ὁ γινώσκει τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν νεκρόν ὡς σὲ τὴν μεγάλῃς θεᾶς

1 Instead of επιγνώτων, ΝΑΒΔΕΗΛΠ, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. read επιγνότατες, and instead of κραζότων (Hilg.), ΒDΕΗLP, which Lach., W.H., Blass retain in, Tisch., Weiss, Wendt read κραζότατες, following ΝΑ.


This latter view seems to be adopted practically by Blass (so by Knabenbauer), although he reads καταβίβασαν (Luke x. 15), descendere coegerunt, i.e., into the theatre, as he cannot see that συνεβίβασις is intelligible; in which Grimm-Thayer agrees with him, and renders with R.V., margin, as above (see sub ν.).—δὲ δὲ Α.: if ὁ χαλκεύς in 2 Tim. iv. 14 is taken in a wider sense to mean a worker in any metal, it is, of course, possible that Alexander might be so described as one of the craftsmen of Demetrius. But the name was very common, although the omission of τις may be taken to imply that Alexander in ver. 33 was well known in Ephesus (cf. ver. 9 above). We cannot pass beyond conjecture, especially as the notice in Acts, when compared with 2 Tim., contains no further mark of identification than the similarity of name, although the Alexander in the latter passage was no doubt in some way connected with Ephesus, or the warning to Timothy against him would be without force. Against the identification see Meyer-Weiss, Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus, p. 347, and so also Holtzmann, Pastoralbriefe, in loco (who identifies the Alexander in 2 Tim. iv. 14 with the Alexander in 1 Tim. i. 20). Holtzmann's view is that the author of the Pastoral Epistles, whoever he may have been, mistook the notice in Acts, and concluded that the Alexander there mentioned was a Christian, and a treacherous one, who allowed himself to be utilised by the Jews against Paul. The pseudonymous author of 2 Tim. therefore names Alexander χαλκεύς, and refers also to him the ἀλαζοφημίας of 1 Tim. i. 20. —καταστέλλας τὴν χείρα, see on xii. 17.—ἀναλ.: peculiar to Luke and Paul, twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and six times in Acts, so in Rom. ii. 15, 2 Cor. xii. 19. In the last-named passage with same construction as here (see for various constructions Grimm-Thayer, sub ν.).

Ver. 34. επιγνώτων: "when they recognised" by his dress and his features, "when they perceived," R.V. If we read επιγνότες, see critical note, φωνὴ γέν.= "anacoluthon luculentissimum" cf. Mark ix. 20 (Blass).—μία ἐκ πάντων: callida junctura, arresting the reader's attention (Hackett). Alexander was thus unable to obtain a hearing because he was a Jew, a fact which sufficiently justifies the apprehension for Paul entertained by his friends.—Μεγάλη κ.τ.λ., see on ver. 28, the cry in B, and Β text is doubled, which marks its continuance and its emphatic utterance (Weiss).—ὡς επὶ ὥρας δύο κραζ.: probably they regarded this as in itself an act of worship, cf. τ Κings xviii. 26, and Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 142, "Diana," Hastings’ B.D., p. 605. "A childish understanding indeed! as if they were afraid lest their worship should be extinguished, they shouted without intermission:" Chrys., Hom., xili.

Ver. 35. καταστέλλας: only here in N.T. and in ver. 36, "had quieted," R.V., cf. 2 Macc. iv. 31, 3 Macc. vi. 1, Aquila, Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 8, also in Josephus and Plutarch.—ὁ γραμματέως: "the secretary of the city" Ramsay; Lightfoot was the first to point out the importance of the officer so named—called also ὁ Ἐφεσιος γραμ. τοι βασιλεύς; he was the most influential person in Ephesus, for not only were the decrees to be proposed drafted by him and the Strategoi, and money left to the city was committed to his charge, but as the power of the Ecclesia, the public assembly, declined under imperial rule, the importance of the secretary's office was enhanced, because he was in closer touch with the court of the proconsul than the other city magistrates, and acted as a medium of communication between the imperial and municipal government, "Ephesus" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., p. 723, Cities and
... and to the Diana; 36. ἀναντιρρήτων 1 οὐν ὄντων τούτων, δέν ὀστὶν ὁμοίως κατεσταλμένοις ὑπάρχει, καὶ μηδὲν προπετές πράττειν. 37. ἤγαγέτε γὰρ τοὺς ἄνδρας τούτους, οὗτε ἱεροσύλους

1 ΑΝΑΝΤΙΡΡΗΤΩΝ B*L, so W.H. (not Weiss).

Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., 66; St. Paul, pp. 281, 304; Hicks, Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum, iii., p. 154, and Wood’s Ephesus, App., p. 49, often with Asarchs and proconsul; Lightfoot, Contemp. Review, p. 294, 1878. St. Luke’s picture therefore of the secretary as a man of influence and keenly alive to his responsibility is strikingly in accordance with what we might have expected. — τίς γάρ ὁ ἱεροσύλος; “what man is there then?” etc. Rendall: the γάρ looks back to the action of the speaker in quieting the crowd, as if he would say that there is no need for this excitement, for all that you have said about your goddess is universally acknowledged. — νεωκόροις: “temple-keeper,” R.V., “a worshipper,” A.V., culturiciem, Vulgate, lit., “a temple-sweeper” (on derivation see Grimm-Thayer, sub υ.), and so found in classical Greek, a sacristan, a verger, Lat., aridi- tuss, cf. Jos., 7., v., 9, 4, where= worshippers, οὗτος ὁ ἱεροσύλος νεωκόροις ἄγαλμα. The title “Warden of the Temple of Ephesus” was a boast of the city, just as other cities boasted of the same title in relation to other deities. It would seem that the title at Ephesus was generally used in connection with the imperial cultus; in the period of this narrative, Ephesus could claim the title as Warden of one Temple of this cultus, and later on she enjoyed the title of Ἴδρα τῶν νεωκόρων, as the number of the temples of the imperial cultus increased. But there is ample justification from inscriptions for the mention of the title in the verse before us in connection with the Artemis worship. For references, Ramsay, “Ephesus,” Hastings’ B.D., p. 722; Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., 58; Wendt, Blass, in loco; Lightfoot, Cont. Rev., p. 294, 1878; Wood, Ephesus, App., p. 50.—τοῦ Δ., sc., ἵππας: or some such word; the image was believed to have fallen from the sky (heaven, R.V. margin), like that of the Tauric Artemis, cf. Eur., Iph. T., 977, 1384, where we find ὁφαντὸς πτώμα given as the equivalent and explanation of ἤπειρος ἵππας (Herod., i., 11). The worship of Diana of the Ephesians was entirely Asian and not Greek, although the Greek colonists attempted to establish an identification with their own Artemis on account of certain analogies between them. According to Jerome, Praefat. ad Ephesios, the Ephesian Artemis was represented as a figure with many breasts, multiammimia (“quam Graeci poliμαστον vocant”), symbolising the reproductive and nutritive powers of Nature which she personified. This description is fully borne out by the common representations of the goddess on coins and statues. No one could say for certain of what the ἵππας was made: according to Petronius it was made of cedar wood, according to Pliny of the wood of the vine, according to Xen. of gold, and according to others of ebony. For a fuller description of the image, and for some account of the wide prevalence of worship of the goddess and its peculiar character, Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, “Diana of the Ephesians,” Hastings’ B.D., B.D.2; Wendt, 1888, in loco; Farrar, St. Paul, ii., p. 13, and references in Wetstein.

Ver. 36. ἀναντιρρήτων: only here in N.T., but the adverb in x. 29, not in LXX but Symm., Job xi. 2, xxxiii. 13; Polyb., xxxii., 8, 11; on spelling see critical note.—δέον εστίν, 1 Peter i. 6 (1 Tim. ν. 13), cf. Eccles., Prol., vv. 3, 4, 1 Macc. xii. 11, 2 Macc. xi. 18, also in classical Greek.—προπετές: only in Luke and Paul in N.T., 2 Tim. iii. 4, of thoughtless haste (Meyer-Weiss); in LXX of rash talk, cf. Prov. x. 14, xiii. 3, Eccles. ix. 18, Symm., Eccles. v. 1, Clem. Rom., Cor., i., i., of persons.—κατασταλμένοις, see also on ver. 35; only in these two verses in N.T.

Ver. 37. γάρ: “for,” i.e., they had done something rash.—τοὺς ἄνδρ. τούτων: Gaius and Aristarchus, λειρωσίους, “robbers of temples,” R.V., in A.V. “of churches,” the word “church” being applied as often in the Elizabethan age to pagan temples. Ramsay however renders “guilty neither in act nor in language of disrespect to our goddess,” i.e., to the established religion of our city, λειρωσία = Latin, sacrilegium, and here for emphasis the speaker uses the double term οὗτε λειροσ, οὗτε βλασφ., “Churches, Robbers of,” Hastings’ B.D., Ramsay, and St. Paul, pp. 260, 282, 401.
In 2 Macc. iv. 42 we have the same word λεπτομελος, R.V., "Author of the sacri-
lege," "Church-robber," A.V., used of
Lysimachus, brother of Menelaus, the
high priest, who perished in a riot which
arose from the theft of the sacred vessels
by his brother and himself (quoted by
Ramsay, u. s.). Canon Gore, Ephesians,
p. 41, note, however, points out that
the word is used in the former sense of
"robbers of temples," in special connec-
tion with Ephesus by Strabo, xiv., 1, 22,
64 (Bernays); cf. Rom. ii. 22. The cogen-
nate noun is found in inscriptions at
Ephesus, describing a crime involving
the heaviest penalties, Wood, Ephesus,
394, 1878.

Ver. 38. λόγον έχουσιν: no exact
equivalent elsewhere in N.T., but Grimm
(so Kypke) compares Matt. v. 32 (see
also Col. iii. 13).-διψατοί διώγονται:
"the courts are open," R.V., perhaps
best to understand σύνοδοι, "court-
meetings are now going on," i.e., for
holding trials (in the forum or agora);
Vulgate, ενυνεντυς forenses aguntur, the
νερβ being in the present indicative.
Οr ημέραι may alone
Επ. may alone be supplied = court
days are kept, i.e., at certain intervals,
not implying at that particular time,
but rather a general statement as in the
words that follow: "there are proconsuls,
see Page, in loco. For διώνυ, cf. Luke
xxiv. 21, Matt. xiv. 6, 2 Macc. ii. 16, cf.
Strabo, xiii., p. 932, Latin, consentios
agere. Alford, so Wendt (1888), speaks of
the distinction drawn by the old gram-
marians between γυναικειος and γυναικας
as groundless, but see also Winer-
Schmiedel, p. 69.-διπλωτοτες ελευ: the
plural is used: "de eo quod nunquam
non esse solet," Bengel (quoted by Blass
and Wendt), although strictly there would
be only one proconsul at a time. There
is no need to understand any assistants
of the proconsul, as if the description was
meant for them, or, with Lewin, as if there
were several persons with proconsular
power. It is quite possible that in both
clauses the secretary is speaking in a
mere colloquial way, as we might say,
"There are assizes and there are judges"
Lightfoot calls it "a rhetorical plural"
I. T., 1359, κλέπτοντες έκ γης ξόαν και
θυηπόλους, though there was only one
image and one priestess.-διψατοί διώγο
νους: "acuse," R.V. The verb
need not have a technical legal sense as
is implied by "implead " in A.V. So in
LXX it may be used quite generally, or
of a criminal charge, and so in classical
Greek, cf. Wisd. xii. 12 and Exclus.
xxvi. 19. In the N.T. it is used six
times. In Acts with reference to judicial
process, and only once elsewhere by St.
Paul in Rom. viii. 33 in a general sense.
The verb only occurs in the second part
of Acts in accordance no doubt with the
subject-matter; see Hawkins, Hora Syn-
optica, p. 147, note, and Weiss, Einleitung
in das N. T., p. 570, note.

Ver. 39. ει δέ τι περί ετέρων: if we
read περαιτέρω, cf. Plato, Phaedo, p. 107
B, the meaning is anything further than
an accusation against an individual, a
public and not a personal matter: if
they desired to get any resolution passed
with regard to the future conduct of citi-
zens and of resident non-citizens in this
matter, see Ramsay, Epaph. February,
1896, reading περαιτ.-επιλυθήσεται (cf.
Mark iν.34), nowhere else in N.T. (the
νερβ is found in LXX, Aquila, Gen. xi. 8,
xli. 8, 12; Η., Hos., iii. 4; Philo. Jos.).
-τη εννόμω εκκλησία : "the regular
assembly," R.V. Mr. Wood, Ephesus,
App., p. 38, quotes an inscription in
which it was enjoined that a statue of
Minerva should be placed in a certain
spot, κατά πάσαν έννομον εκκλησίαν.
But A.V. has "the lawful assembly":
which is the better rendering? "regular"
seems to restrict us to τομοι εκ-
κλησίας held on stated customary days,
and to exclude from the secretary's
statement any reference to extraordinary
meetings, meetings summoned for special
business, whereas he would be likely to
use a term which would cover all legal
ετέρων επιζητείτε εν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται. 40. καὶ γὰρ κυβερνῶν ἐγκαλεῖται στάσεις περὶ τῆς σήμερον, μηδεὶς εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιλύσεται. 41. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἀπελύσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

1 περὶ ετερων, so ΝΑDΗLP, so Tisch., Hilg., but B (d Gig., Vulg.), so Lach., W.H., Bliss, Weiss, Wendt have περαιτερων, see further Harris, Four Lectures, p. 29, on Ephrem's text. The περὶ ετερων is the correction of a word not found elsewhere in N.T. (so Wendt, p. 320 (1899)). E has περειτερων, * D has σήμερον εγκαλείσθαι στάσεως, anguised edition of Vulg., Gig., but these look like paraphrases. περὶ εν εννόμω εκκλησία επιλυθήσεται. 40. καὶ γινδυνεύομεν εγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον, μηδενός αἰτίου υπάρχοντος περὶ οὐ δυνησόμεθα αποδούναι λόγον τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης.

2 D has σήμερον εγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως, argui seditiosis hodiernae, Vulg., accusati quasi seditiosi hodiernae, Gig., but these look like paraphrases. περὶ εν εννόμω εκκλησία επιλυθήσεται. 40. καὶ γινδυνεύομεν εγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον, μηδενός αἰτίου υπάρχοντος περὶ οὐ δυνησόμεθα αποδούναι λόγον τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης. 41. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἀπελύσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

3 D has σήμερον εγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως, argui seditiosis hodiernae, Vulg., accusati quasi seditiosi hodiernae, Gig., but these look like paraphrases. περὶ εν εννόμω εκκλησία επιλυθήσεται. 40. καὶ γινδυνεύομεν εγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον, μηδενός αἰτίου υπάρχοντος περὶ οὐ δυνησόμεθα αποδούναι λόγον τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης. 41. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπών ἀπελύσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

 meetings. But on the other hand Bliss quotes the phrase given above from the inscriptions, and explains ἐννόμοιεκκλησίαι sunt, qua ex lege certis diebus / ἵσθανίε (so too Wendt, Lightfoot); and if this is correct, “regular” would be the more appropriate rendering, ἐννόμος = νόμιμος. But in Ephesus we have to consider how far the old Greek assembly ἐκκλησία was or was not under the control of the imperial government. In considering this with reference to the special incident before us, Ramsay, with whom Wendt agrees, p. 321 (1899), gives good reason for regarding the “regular” as equivalent to the “lawful” assemblies: i.e., extraordinary assemblies which in the Greek period had been legal, but were now so no longer through the jealous desire of Rome to control popular assemblies, abroad as at home. The ἐκκλησία could not be summoned without the leave of the Roman officials, and it was not at all likely that that sanction would be extended beyond a certain fixed and regular number, Ramsay, Expositor, February, 1896: “The Lawful Assembly,” and “Ephesus,” Hastings’ B.D., p. 723.

Ver. 40. ἐγκαλεῖται στάσεις περὶ τῆς σήμερον A.V. “to be called in question for this day’s uproar,” but R.V., “to be accused concerning this day’s riot,” rendering ἐγκαλεῖται, as in ver. 38, and στάσεις, as in Mark xv. 7. ἐγκαλεῖται being rather the word for uproar or tumult, cf. Vulgate: “argui seditiosis hodiernae”. But a further question arises from the marginal rendering of R.V., “to be accused of riot concerning this day” : so Page, Meyer-Wendt, Zöckler: But Bliss, Weiss, Rendall, so Ramsay: “to be accused of riot concerning this day’s assembly,” sc., ἐκκλησία, although Bliss thinks it still better to omit περὶ τῆς altogether, and to connect σήμερον with ἐγκαλεῖ, cf. iv. 9. —μηδενός αἰτίου ἑπεράχωντος : with this punctuation R.V. renders “there being no cause for it,” taking αἰτίου as neuter, and closely connecting the phrase with the foregoing, so W.H. Overbeck (so Felten, Rendall) takes αἰτίου as masculine: “there being no man guilty by reason of whom,” etc., and Wendt considers that the rendering cannot be altogether excluded. Vulgate has “cum nullus obnoxius sit”. But αἰτίου may be strictly a noun neuter from αἰτίον = αἰτία, and not an adjective as the last-mentioned rendering demands, cf. Plummer on Luke xxiii. 4, 14, 22, and nowhere else in N.T., so Moulton and Geden, who give the adjective αἰτίος only in Heb. v. 9.—περὶ οὐ ὑπαρχόντος: Ramsay (so Meyer and Zöckler) follows T.R. and Bezan text in omitting the negative οὐ before ὑπαρχόντος, but see on the other hand Wendt (1899), p. 322; and critical note. R.V. (introducing negative οὐ, so Weiss and Wendt) renders “and as touching it we shall not be able to give account of this concourse”. —συστροφῆς, Polyb., iv., 34, 6, of a seditious meeting or mob. In xxiii. 12 used of a conspiracy; cf. LXX, Ps. lxxiii. 2, Amos vii. 10.

Ver. 41. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν: the word may imply, as Ramsay thinks, that the secretary thus recognised the meeting as an ἐκκλησία to shield it, as far as he could, from Roman censure. The attitude of the secretary is that of a man
CHAPTER XX.—VER. 1. \textit{μετά δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι τὸν θόρυβον,} προσκαλεσάμενος οὗ τὸν Παύλον μαθητὰς καὶ ἀστασιασμένος ἔξηλθε τορευθῆναι εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν. 2. διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα, καὶ παρακαλέσας αὐτοὺς \textit{παρακ.} ①.

altogether superior to, and almost contemptuous of, the vulgar mob (cf. \textit{oútōs} in D, ver. 38), and there is no apparent desire on his part to deny Paul's right to preach, provided that the Apostle respected the laws and institutions of the city.

On the historical character of the incidents narrated at Ephesus, the graphic description and the intimate knowledge of the life of the city, see Ramsay, \textit{Church in the Roman Empire}, p. 143, and the same writer “Ephesus,” Hastings’ B.D. Every detail tends to confirm the faithfulness of the picture drawn of Ephesian society A.D. 57 (cf. Knabenbauer, p. 340). Wendt also is so impressed with the vividness of the scene as it is narrated, that he considers that we are justified in referring the narrative to a source which we owe to an actual companion of St. Paul, and in regarding it as an historical episode, and he refers in justification to Lightfoot, \textit{Cont. Rev.}, p. 292 ff., 1878; see Wendt’s edition, 1888, pp. 420, 430, and also edition 1899, p. 316, note. Whilst Baur and Overbeck give an unfavourable verdict as to the historical truthfulness of the Ephesian tumult, a verdict which Wendt condemns, Zeller is constrained to acknowledge the very minute details which tell in favour of the narrative, and for the invention of which there is no apparent reason. Amongst more recent critics, Weizsäcker can only see in the story the historian’s defence of Paul and the same tendency to make events issue in the success of his missionary propaganda: 1 Cor. xv. 32 he takes literally, and the tumult recorded in Acts gives us only a faint and shadowy outline of actual reminiscences: nothing is left of the wild beasts except a tumult in the theatre, and the Apostle against whom the violence is mainly directed is himself absent. But as Wendt rightly maintains, 1 Cor. xv. 32 is much rather to be taken as referring figuratively to a struggle with men raging against the Apostle’s life; nor are we shut up of necessity to the conclusion that 1 Cor. xv. 32 and Acts xix. 23 ff. refer to one and the same event (so Hilgenfeld, Zöckler), see note on p. 414. McGiffert, whilst taking 1 Cor. xv. 32 literally (although he inclines to identify Acts xix. with 2 Cor. i. 8, so too Hilgenfeld), admits as against Weizsäcker the general trustworthiness of St. Luke’s account, since it is too true to life, and is related too vividly to admit any doubt as to its historic reality (p. 282). Hilgenfeld too, \textit{Zw. Th.}, p. 363, 1896, agrees that the whole narrative is related in a way true to life, and refers it with the possible exception of \textit{δε ἐπὶ ώρας δύο} in ver. 34 to his good source C: it could not possibly have been invented by the “author to Theophilus”. Even here Clemen and Jüngst can only see an interpolation, referred by the former to Redactor, i.e., vv. 15-41 with the possible exception of ver. 33 to Redactor Antijuudaicus; and by the latter also to his Redactor, i.e., vv. 23-41.

VER. 2. \textit{διελθών}, see above on xiii. 6, “and when he had gone through,” in a missionary progress τὰ μέρη εκεῖνα, i.e., of Macedonia, the places where he had founded Churches, Thessalonica, Berœa, Philippi. From Rom. xv. 19 it would appear that his work continued some time, and that round about even unto Illyricum he fully preached the Gospel.
On the connection of 2 Cor. with this part of Acts, see "2 Corinthians" (Robertson), Hastings' B.D., i., pp. 493, 495; Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 286; and on the coincidence between Acts and Romans, i.e., see Paley, Hora Paulina, ii., 4.—The 'Ellada, i.e., Achaia in its Roman sense (approximately at all events); the stay might have included a visit to Athens, but at all events Corinth was visited. A wider sense of the epithet "Greek" would comprise Macedonia also, and Macedonia and Achaia are thus spoken of in close connection as forming the Greek lands in Europe, cf. xix. 21, and Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 2, 1 Thess. i. 8, "Achaia" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D.

Ver. 3. ποιήσας τε μήνας τρεις, cf. xv. 33, xviii. 23.—Επιβουλής: only in Acts in N.T., see above on ix. 24; the plot may have been formed in the anticipation that it would be easy to carry it out on a pilgrim ship crowded with Jews of Corinth and Asia, hostile to the Apostle; or it may have been the purpose of the conspirators to kill Paul in a crowded harbour like Cenchreae before the ship actually started.—Μέλλ. ανάγ., see on xiii. 13. If we read ἔγεν. γνώμης (genitive) (cf. 2 Peter i. 20), nowhere else in N.T., cf. Thuc., i., 113, δοκεῖ τῇ αὐτῆς γνώμης ἦσαν, see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 260.—Τοῦ υποσ., i.e., the return journey to Jerusalem (Ramsay), but see also Wendt (1899), p. 320.

Ver. 4. συνείπετο δὲ ἄτροφος: only here in N.T., cf. 2 Macc. xv. 2, 3 Macc. v. 48, vi. 21, but frequent in classics.—Εὔχομαι τις Ἀ: among more recent writers Rendall has argued strongly for the retention of the words, whilst he maintains, nevertheless, that all the companions of the Apostle named here accompanied him to Jerusalem. In his view the words are an antithesis to εξέπαιναν on the one hand, as so that whilst on the one hand one party, viz., six of the deputies, travel with Paul to Philippi, on the other hand the other party consisting of two, viz., the deputy and Paul were joined by St. Luke, who henceforth speaks of the deputation in the first person plural, and identifies himself with its members as a colleague. Then from Troas the whole party proceeded to Jerusalem (Acts, pp. 119, 303). In this way οὕτως in ver. 5 is restricted to Tychicus and Trophimus (see also Ramsay, as below), whereas A. and R.V. refer the pronoun to all the deputies, so too Weiss and Wendt. If this is so, the ημᾶς, ver. 5, might refer (but see further below) only to Paul and Luke, as the latter would naturally rejoin Paul at Philippi where we left him, cf. xvi. 17. Ramsay explains (St. Paul, p. 287) that the discovery of the Jewish plot altered St. Paul's plan, and that too at the last moment, when delegates from the Churches had already assembled. The European delegates were to sail from Corinth, and the Asian from Ephesus, but the latter having received word of the change of plan went as far as Troas to meet the others, οὕτως thus referring to Tychicus and Trophimus alone (but see also Askwith, Epistle to the Galatians (1899), pp. 94, 95).

Wendt also favours retention of ἐξεπαινεῖτο τις, but he takes ημᾶς in ver. 5 to exclude St. Paul, and refers it to other friends of the Apostle (as distinct from those who accompanied him through Macedonia "as far as Asia"), viz., the author of the "We" sections and others who only now meet the Apostle and his company at Troas. But this obliges us to make a somewhat artificial distinction between ημᾶς in ver. 5 with ἔχομαι in ver. 6, and ιδέων and ἀνακαλεῖν on the one hand, and ἔγινεν, ver. 6, on the other, as the latter must be taken to include St.
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τὴν Συρίαν, ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας. 4. συνείπετο δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἡσυχαστος Ἰωσήφ. Θεσσαλικοὶ.

1 συνείπετο δὲ ἀπὸ, Βlass follows D and also inserts προσρέθηστο, whilst D omits verb altogether, Syr. H. mg. reads συνειποντο. Apparently D takes μέχρι τῆς Α. with εξιεναι, and the names may have been taken with προσρέθηστο if Βlass is right in regarding this as original; see his Proleg., p. 27.

2 στηρὶ τῆς Ἀσίας om. ΝΒ 13, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aethip., so Tisch., W.H. text, R.V. marg., Weiss; but retained ADEHLP, Syr. P. and H., Arm., Chrys.; (Gig., Wer.) Βlass in β (μέχρι); see also W.H., Apf., p. 97. Wendt also considers that it is probably to be retained, see note in comment.; cf. προελθ., ἵ. s.


Paul, St. Luke, and the whole company, although Wendt justifies the distinction by pointing out that in ver. 13 συνειποντο is used exclusive of Paul (cf. xxi. 22).

Mr. Askwith, u. s., p. 93 ff., has recently argued that συνειποντο in ver. 6 includes not only St. Luke and St. Paul, but with them the representatives of Achaea (who are not mentioned by name with the other deputies) who would naturally be with St. Paul on his return from Corinth, vv. 2, 3, and he would not travel through Macedonia unaccompanied. In 2 Cor. viii. St. Luke, "the brother," according to tradition, whose praise in the Gospel was spread through all the Churches, had been sent to Corinth with Titus and another "brother," and so naturally any representatives from Achaea would come along with them, pp. 93, 94. No names are given because St. Luke himself was amongst them, and he never mentions his own name, p. 96. The fact that Timothy and Sopater who had been with the Apostle at Corinth when he wrote to the Romans (chap. xvi. 21, if we may identify Ησυχαστος with the Ἡσυχαστος Πυρρου Βεροιαίος, Acts xx. 4) are amongst those who waited at Troas is accounted for on the supposition that Timothy and others might naturally go across to inform the Asiatic delegates of Paul's change of plan, and would then proceed with these Asian representatives to Troas to meet the Apostle (p. 94). The presence of Aristarchus and Secundus at Troas is accounted for on the ground that St. Paul, on his way to Achaea, did not expect to return through Macedonia, and so would naturally arrange for the Macedonian delegates, who were not accompanying him into Greece, to meet him somewhere. And the delegates from Thessalonica would naturally cross to Troas with the intention of proceeding to Ephesus (or Miletus), where St. Paul would have touched even if he had sailed for Palestine from Cenchrea (cf. Acts xviii. 18, 19), p. 95. But against this it may be fairly urged that there is no reason to assume that the Macedonian delegates did not accompany Paul into Greece; Timothy and Sopater had evidently done so, and all the delegates mentioned seem to have been together in St. Paul's company, συνείπετο αὐτῷ, ver. 4. In the uncertain state of the text it is difficult to come to any decision on the passage. The words ἁχρὶ τῆς Ἀσίας may easily have been omitted on account of the supposed difficulty connected with the fact that two at least of St. Paul's companions who are named, Trophimus and Aristarchus, went further than Asia, cf. xxi. 26, xxvii. 2, while on the other hand it is somewhat hard to believe that the words could be inserted by a later hand.

On " The Pauline Collection for the Saints and its importance," and the representatives of the Churches in the different provinces, see Rendall, Expositor, November, 1893; Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 287, and "Corinth," Hastings' B.D.; Wendt, p. 325 (1899); Hort, Rom. and Ephes., pp. 39 ff. and 173. Nothing could more clearly show the immense importance which St. Paul attached to this contribution for the poor saints than the fact that he was ready to present in person at Jerusalem the members of the deputation and their joint offerings, and that too at a time when his presence in the capital was full of danger, and after he had been expressly warned of the peril, cf. Acts, xxiv. 17, Rom. xv. 25. On the suggestion for the fund and its consummation see 1 Cor. xvi. 1-8, Acts xx. 16, 2 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 2; A.D. 57-58, Rendall, Lightfoot; 56-57, Ramsay. Such a scheme would not only unite all the Gentile Churches in one holy bond of faith and charity, but it would mark their solidarity with the Mother Church.
προελθόντες ἀνθρώπων καὶ ζεύγων, καὶ τιμίων εὐαγγελίζω τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς ἁγιασμένους ἐν Τρώαν. Εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Φιλίππου ἔδρασεν τὸν ἄγιον Δερβίαν, τὸν ἄγιον Εὐφρενίδαν, τὸν ἄγιον Δεδωνίδαν, τὸν ἄγιον Τιμοθέον, τὸν ἄγιον Τυχικόν, καὶ τὸν ἄγιον Τρόφιμον. 

If we read προσελθόντες as in R.V. (margin), “they came, and were waiting for us at Troas,” cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 287, and Rendall, *in loco.* The introduction of the word is fatal to the idea that Timothy could have been the author of this “We” section.

At Jerusalem; it would be a splendid fulfilment by their own generous and loyal effort of the truth that if one member of the body suffered all the members suffered with it. We know how this vision which St. Paul had before his eyes of a universal brotherhood throughout the Christian world seemed to tarry; and we may understand something of the joy which filled his heart, even amidst his farewell to the elders at Miletus, as he anticipated without misgiving the accomplishment of this διακονία to the saints, a “ministry” which he had received from the Lord Jesus, *Acts* xx. 24. On the coincidence between the narrative of the *Acts* cf. xx. 2, 3, xxiv. 17-19, and the notices in St. Paul’s Epistles given above, see especially Paley, *Hose Paulina*, chap. ii., 1.—Συμπερασμένοις Θερόσ., see critical note; whether he is the same as the Sopater of Rom. xvi. 21 who was with St. Paul at Corinth we cannot say—possibly the name of his father may be introduced to distinguish him, but perhaps, as Blass says, added in this one case “quod domi nobilis erat.”—Γεών Δ., καὶ Τ., see above on p. 414, and Knabenbauer’s note as against Blass.—Τυχικὸς: Ephes. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7 show that Timothy was in Rome at the time of St. Paul’s first imprisonment. He is spoken of as a beloved and faithful minister, and it would appear that as St. Paul was about to send him to Ephesus, he was presumably the bearer of the Epistle which at all events included the Ephesian Church. In Tit. iii. 12 we have another reference which shows the high place Timothy occupied amongst St. Paul’s trusted confidential friends; and from 2 Tim. iv. 12 we learn that he had been a sharer in the Apostle’s second and heavier captivity, and had only left him to fulfil another mission to Ephesus. 

—Τρόφιμος: probably like Tychicus an Ephesian. In xxi. 29 he was with St. Paul at Jerusalem, and from 2 Tim. iv. 20 we learn that he was at a later stage the companion of the Apostle after his release from his first imprisonment, and that he had been left by him at Miletus sick. On the absurd attempt to connect this notice of Miletus in the Pastoral Epistles with *Acts* xx. 4 see Weiss, *Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*, p. 354; Salmon, *Introductory*, fifth edition, p. 401.

Ver. 5. προσελθόντες, see critical note. If we read προσελθόντες as in R.V. (margin), “these came, and were waiting for us at Troas,” cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 287, and Rendall, *in loco.*
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

7. Ἐν δὲ τῇ μετά τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων τῶν μαθητῶν του ἱμάτια δρτών, ὁ Παύλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς, μὲλλών ἐξελθεῖν τῇ ἑωρίῳ, παρέτεινέ τε τὸν λόγον μέχρι μεσονύκτιον. 8. ἦσαν δὲ λαμπάδες ἑκατεν ἐν τῷ ὑπέρμαθεν οὖν Παύλῳ

1 D has τεκτάνιον instead of αχ. η. π., so Blass in β. It may be simply explanatory of the difficult αχ. η. π. (Weiss).

2 τῶν μαθητῶν, according to ΝΑΒΔΕ, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass pag.

3 λαμπάδες, D (not Blass in β) reads ντολαμπάδες. According to Phylarch. ap. Ath. Β.Δ., seems to be a sort of window or look-out (L. and S., edit. 7). This reading is suggestive, but Blass is of opinion that ντολ. "nusquam exstat".

Ver. 6. μετά τὰς ἡμ. τῶν δ., cf. xii. 3, i.e., the Passover. 1 Cor. v. 7 shows us how they would "keep the Feast".

Ramsay's "fixed date in the life of St. Paul," Expositor, May, 1896, depends partly on the assumption that Paul left Philippi the very first day after the close of the Paschal week, but we cannot be sure of this, see Wendt's criticism on Ramsay's view, p. 326, edition 1899, and also Dr. Robertson "I. Corinthians" Hastings' B.D., p. 485. — άχρις ημερών πέντε, so as to include a whole week, and so the first day of the week, cf. 2 Cor. ii. τα, 13, which shows how reluctantly Paul left Troas on his former visit, but see on the other hand, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 295, who thinks that St. Paul would not have voluntarily stayed seven days at Troas.

Ver. 7. "on the first day of the week," μετά being used, the cardinal for the ordinal πρώτου, like Hebrew "נין", in enumerating the days of the month, see Plummer's note on Luke xxiv. 1 and cf. xviii. 12 (so Blass). We must remember that 1 Cor. had been previously written, and that the reference in 1 Cor. xvi. 2 to "the first day of the week" for the collection of alms naturally connects itself with the statement here in proof that this day had been marked out by the Christian Church as a special day for public worship, and for "the breaking of the bread". On the significance of this selection of the "first day," see Milligan, Resurrection, pp. 67-69; Maclear, Evidential Value of the Lord's Day, "Present Day Tracts" 54; and for other references, Witness of the Epistles, pp. 368, 369; Wendt (1899), p. 326. — μήλων: Burton, Moods and Tenses, p. 71. — παρέτεινε, see μῆλον, Arist., Poet., xvi., 5, λόγον, and ix. 4, μῆλον — μεσονύκτιον, cf. xvi. 25.

Ver. 8. λαμπάδες λέων, see critical note and reading in D. The words have been taken to indicate clearly that the accident was not due to darkness coming on through Paul's lengthy discourse (so Weiss and Wendt), whilst Meyer regards them as introduced to show that the fall of the young man was not perceived at once. Others (so Felten) hold that the words mark the joy at the Sacramental Presence of the Lord and Bridegroom of the Church (Matt. xxν. 1), and Nösgen sees in them a note of joy in the celebration of the Christian Sunday (see also Kuinoel). But it is also allowable to see in this notice the graphic and minute touch of one who was an eye-witness of the scene, and who described it, as he remembered it, in all its vividness (Hackett, Blass). We can scarcely see in the words with Ewald an intention on the part of the narrator to guard against any suspicion attaching to the night meetings of the Christians (so Calvin, Bengel, Lechler); the date, as Nösgen says, is too early (so too Overbeck). Lewin also takes Ewald's view, but with the alternative that the lights may have been mentioned to exclude any suspicion in the reader's mind of any deception with regard to the miracle.

Ver. 9. Εὐτυχος: we are not told what position he occupied, but there is no hint that he was a servant. — επί της θυρ.: on the window sill—there were no windows of glass, and the lattice or door was open probably on account of the heat from the lamps, and from the number present—the fact that Eutychus thus sat
at the window points to the crowded nature of the assembly, cf. 2 Kings i.2, where a different word is used in LXX, although ὅραι is also frequently found. —καταφερ. ἐπί: the two participles are to be carefully distinguished (but R.V. does not): "who was gradually oppressed," or "becoming oppressed with sleep," present participle; "being borne down by his sleep," aorist. Rendall takes ἐπί πλείον with κατενεχθείς (so W.Η. margin), "and being still more overcome with the sleep," but the words are usually taken with διαλεγ. See Βengel, Νόsgen, Αlford, Εoltzmann, Weiss, Ramsay, Page on the force of the participles: "sedentem somnus occupavit . . . somno oppressus cecidit," Βengel. καταφέρεσθαι: used only in Luke in Ν.Τ., and in no corresponding sense in LΧΧ, a medical term, and so much so that it was used more frequently absolutely than with ὕπνος in medical writings, and the two participles thus expressing the different stages of sleep would be quite natural in a medical writer.—βαθεί: one of the epithets joined with ὅραι by the medical writers, see Βengel, Νόsgen, Αlford, Εoltzmann, Weiss, Ramsay, Page on the use of γεύομαι in Heb. vi.4 as suggesting that here too reference is made to the participation of the Eucharist: but, on the other hand, in Acts x. 10 (see Βlass, in loco) the word is used of eating an ordinary meal, and Εwendt refers it to the enjoyment of the Αγαθά (cf. also Knabenbauer, in loco). Weiss urges that the meaning of simply "tasting" is to be adopted here, and that the shows that Paul only "tasted" the meal, i.e., the Agape, and hurried on with his interrupted discourse, whilst Λewin would take γεύοσις absolutely here, and refer it to a separate ordinary meal; although he maintains that the previous formula κλάσας τον ἐρτόν must refer to the Eucharist. In LXX the verb is

1 D, Εig., so Βlass in β, βαιρει pro βαιρει.
8 Before ἐρτόν Ν*ABCD* 13, so Τisch., Η.Η., R.V., Weiss, Εwendt add τον.
Τε ημιλατος έξης άνθης, ουτως δειδήνων. 12. ήγαγον δε τον παιδα ξώνα, και παρεκλήθησαν ου μετρίως. 13. ήμεις δε προελθόντες ετι το πλοιον, ανήχθησαν εις την Ασσον, εκείνων μελλοντες ευλαμβάνει τον Παύλον, ουτω γαρ η διατηρηματος, μελλων αυτον

1 Instead of ηγαγον D has αποταξαμεν δε αυτων ηγαγε τον γενεσεων ξώνα. Blass and Hilgenfeld, however, read ηγαγον in the β text. But Wendt thinks that ηγαγον may not be a mere error, and that Paul is conceived of in D as himself bringing the boy alive at the scene of departure, and thus conferring comfort, Wendt (1899), p. 327.


frequent, but there is no case in which it means definitely more than to taste, although in some cases it might imply eating a meal, e.g., Gen. xxv. 30; for its former sense see, e.g., Jonah iii. 7. In modern Greek γευματίζω = to dine, so γεύμα = dinner.—αύξειν τε διμι.: on St. Luke's use of ικανόν with temporal significance see above on p. 215, cf. with this expression 2 Macc. viii. 25. διμι.: only in Luke in N.T., cf. Luke xxiv. 14, 15, Acts xxiv. 26; here, "talked with them," R.V., as of a familiar meeting, elsewhere "communed," R.V.; so in classical Greek, and in Josephus, and also in modern Greek (Kennedy); in LXX, Dan. i. 19: άμφικρατος αυτοῖο δ θ., "the king communed with them." In the passage before us the alternative rendering "when he had stayed in their company" is given by Grimm-Thayer, sub v.—ερχεσθαι διηνησας, cf. Polyaeon, iv., 18, κατά την πρωτον άνθην την ξώνα (Weinstein); only here in N.T., found in Isa. lix. 12, but not in same sense as here.—ξώνα, cf. xx. 7, after a participle, as often in classical Greek, Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 175, see also xxvii. 17, and Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 190 (1893).

Ver. 12. ήγαγον: the subject must be supplied; probably those who had attended to the boy, and who, now that he was sufficiently recovered, brought him back to the room. Rendall thinks that the expression means that they took the lad home after the assembly was over. The comfort is derived from the recovery of the boy, as is indicated by ξώνα, and it is forced to refer it to the consolation which they received from the boy's presence, as a proof which the Apostle had left behind him of divine and miraculous help (so Wendt, Weiss); see also D, critical note, and Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 291. —ξώνα: the word is pointless unless on the supposition that the accident had been fatal. It is in fact impossible to deny that a miracle is intended to be narrated; otherwise the introduction of the whole story is meaningless, as Overbeck insists against Baur and Renan. The word άνθης, the action of Paul, the word ξώνα all point to an actual death, whilst the vivid details in the narrative also indicate the presence of an eye-witness as an informant. Schneckenburger has shown exhaustively, as Zeller admits, that an actual raising of the dead is intended; but we are asked to see in the narrative only an attempt to set off the raising of Eutychus against the raising of Tabitha at Joppa, a parallel between Paul and Peter; so Baur, and recently Overbeck and Weizsäcker. But the conclusion of Overbeck is disappointing in face of the fact that he dwells (p. 333) most pointedly upon the difference between the narrative here and in ix. 36—how in this latter case we have the expectation of the miracle emphasised, whilst here it is entirely wanting; how too the laudatory description of Tabitha may be contrasted with the simple mention of the name, Eutychus here.—ου μετρίως: often in Plutarch, cf. 2 Macc. xvi. 38. On Luke's use of ου with an adjective, to express the opposite, see Lekebusch, Apostelgeschichte, p. 62; Klostermann, Vindiciae Lucanae, p. 52; and four times in "We" sections (twelve times in rest of Acts, rare in rest of N.T.), xx. 12, xxvii. 14, 20, xxviii. 2; Hawkins, Horæ Synopticae, p. 153.

Ver. 13. άνθης, i.e., without Paul.—"Ασσον: south of Troas in the Roman province of Asia, and some miles east of Cape Lectum. The opposite coast of Lesbos was about seven miles distant. Its harbour gave it a considerable importance in the coasting trade of former days. A Roman road connected it with
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14. ὡς δὲ ἦπιν εἰς τὴν Ἀσσον, ἀναλαβότες αὐτὸν ἡλικον εἰς Μιτυλήνην: 15. κακείδειν ἀποπλεύσαντες, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ κατηντήσαμεν ἀντικρύ Χίου 2. τῇ δὲ ἔτερᾳ παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον.

1 ὑπέβαλεν CDH. Βlass, Η.Ι.; this is more fitting to the sense than the imperfect (Wendt), but the latter tense, ἦπιν, is read in ΝΔΕΒ 4ο, 100, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss.

2 Instead of ετερα B 15, 19, 73, has the remarkable reading εσπερφ, which Weiss accepts, W.Η. marg. But Wendt (1899), p. 428, discusses and rejects, on the ground that the charge was introduced by a scribe who did not take κατην αντικρύ Χιου as meaning a station for the night at Chios, and therefore represented the next station as the stopping place for the night of the same day.

Τroas and the Troad coast. The sculptures from the Temple of Athena erected on the hill on which Assos itself was built form some of the most important remains of archaic Greek art: most of them are now in Paris. "Assos," (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., B.D.3. Steph. Byz. describes Assos as situated ἐν υψηλού και οξέος και δυσανόδου τόπου. -ἀναλαμβάνειν: assumere in naves; cf. Polyb., xxx., 9, 8. The only other instance at all parallel in N.T. is 2 Τim. iv. 11, where we might render "to pick him up on the way," Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 437. -μετατεταγ.: with middle significance, cf. vii. 44, xxiv. 23; Winer-Moulton, xxxix., 3. -πεζεύειν: "to go by land," R.V. (margin, "on foot"): "de terrestri (non necessario pedestri) itinere," Blass; a much shorter route than the sea voyage round Cape Lectum. The land journey was about twenty miles, Itin. Anton., B.D.3. Probably Paul took the journey in this way for ministerial purposes; others suggest that he did so for the sake of his health, others to avoid the snare of the Jews, or for a desire for solitude. But it may be questioned whether this somewhat lengthy foot journey would be accomplished without any attendant at all. It does not follow, as has been supposed, that the ship was hired by Paul himself, but that he used its putting in at Assos for his own purpose.

Ver. 15. κακείδειν, see on xvi. 12, xiv. 26. -κατηντήσαμεν, cf. xvi. 1, xviii. 19, 24, "we reached a point on the mainland." Ramsay, ἀντικρύ Χ. over against, i.e., opposite Chios; often in Greek writers, only here in N.T., but W.H., Weiss, ἀντικρύς, 3 Μacc. v. 16 (Neh. xii. 8, see Hatch and Redpath). On κατάτατταν εἰς, and κατάτατταν ἀντ. as here, see on xvi. 1, xviii. 19; Klostermann, Vindicia Lucanae, p. 49. -Χίου: The island Chios (Scio) in the ΑΕgean was separated from the Asian coast by a channel which at its narrowest was only five miles across. The ship carrying St. Paul would pass through this picturesque channel on its way south from Mitylene. An interesting comparison with the voyage of St. Paul may be found in Herod's voyage by Rhodes, Cos, Chios and Mitylene, towards the Black Sea (Jos. Ant., xvi., 2, 2). Amongst the seven rivals for the honour of being the birthplace of Homer, the claims of Chios are most strongly supported by tradition. On the legendary and historic connections of the places named in this voyage see Plumptre, in loco, and "Chios" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D. -τῇ δὲ ἔτερᾳ: (see critical note). Wetstein calls attention to the variety of phrases, τῇ ἐτ., τῇ ἐπιούσῃ, τῇ ἐχο. The phrase before us is found in xxvii. 3, so that it only occurs in the "We" sections and nowhere else in Acts, but the expression "the next day" occurs so much more frequently in the "We" sections than in any other passages of the same length that we might expect a larger variety of phrases to express it, Hawkins, Horae Synop., pp. 153, 154; and Klostermann, Vindicia Lucanae, p. 50. -παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σ.: "we struck across to Samos," Ramsay, cf. Thuc., iii. 32, where the verb means "to cross over to Ionia" (see Mr. Page's note, and...
καὶ μεῖναις ἐν Τρογυλλίῳ, τῇ ἑχομένῃ ἕλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον. 16. ἐκρινεὶ γάρ ὁ Παύλος παραπλεύσαι τὴν Εφεσον, ὅπως μὴ γενήται ἀδύτῳ χρονοτριβηθῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀτίας ἀπεκδεχόμενος γάρ, εἰ δυνατὸν ἢ ἄντι, τῇ ἑμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς γενέσθαι εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα.

καὶ μεῖναις ἐν Τ., so DHLP, Syr. P. H., Sah., Chrys., so Meyer, Alford, Blass in β, and even by Weiss (not by Wendt), Introd., p. 57, and Codex D, p. 109; cf. xi. i. Corssen, too, regards favourably, G. G. A., p. 441, το 9; c/xxi. Ι. its omission, and therefore retains it. Weiss cannot see any reason for the words may, however, have been omitted because in the text Τρογυλιφ, so Βlass in β, see note in loco, Τρωγυλιω W. H. and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 47.


corssen, too, regards favourably, G. G. A., p. 441, το 996, supported by Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 294, Belser and Zöckler. Weiss cannot see any reason for the omission, R.V. only in marg., W. H. describe as Western and Syrian; these authorities read τη δε εχομ. Ramsay's interesting note, C. R. E., p. 155, should also be consulted in favour of the retention of the words. Τρωγυλιφ, so Blass in β, see note in loco; Τρωγυλιφ W. H. and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 47.

the passage quoted also in Wetstein, and L. and S.). On the frequency of this and other nautical terms in Acts cf. Klostermann, u. s., p. 49.—καὶ μεῖν. ἐν Τρ., see critical note.—Μίλητον: practically the port of Ephesus. The latter city had long gained the pre-eminence once enjoyed by Miletus, the former capital of Ionia, Pliny, N. H., v., 31; cf. Herod., v., 28-36, for the revolt of Miletus against Persia and its disastrous consequences. Miletus had been the mother of some eighty colonies. Here Thales and Anaximander were born. The sitting up of the Menander had altered its position even in St. Paul's day; and now it is several miles from the sea; Lewin, St. Paul, ii., 90; Renan, Saint Paul, p. 501; Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 480.

Ver. 16. ἐκρινε (see critical note) ... παραπλεύσαι τὴν "Ε., "to sail past Ephesus," R.V., i.e., without stopping there. The words have sometimes been interpreted as if St. Paul had control over a ship which he had hired himself, and could stop where he pleased, so Alford, Hackett, Rendall. But if so, there seems no definite reason for his going to Miletus at all, as it would have been shorter for him to have stopped at Ephesus, or to have made his farewell address there. According to Ramsay the probabilities are that Paul experienced at Troas some delay in continuing his journey. In starting from Troas he had therefore to choose a vessel making no break in its voyage except at Miletus, or a vessel intending to stop at Ephesus, perhaps as its destination, perhaps with a previous delay elsewhere. He determined for the former by the shortness of the time, and his desire to reach Jerusalem. He may no doubt have been also influenced to some extent by the thought that it would be difficult to tear himself away from a Church which had so many claims upon him, and by the reflection that hostilities might be aroused against him and his progress further impeded (cf. McGiffert, p. 339, who thinks that the author's reason for St. Paul's desire not to visit Ephesus "is entirely satisfactory").—χρονοτριβ.: nowhere else in N.T. or in LXX, but in Arist., Plut.—γενήται ἀδύτῳ, cf. xi. 26 for construction.

ἐκρινε ἐν εὐχαρίστῃ γάρ: if the verb expresses as the imperfect intimates the whole character of the journey (Blass, Gram., p. 216), the repeated long delays at first sight seem inexplicable, but we know nothing definitely of the special circumstances which may have occasioned each delay, and we must not lose sight of the fact that the Apostle would have to guard against the constant uncertainty which would be always involved in a coasting voyage. Whether St. Paul reached
17. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου τέμπας εἰς Ἐφεσον, μετεκαλέσατο τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας. 18. ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν, εἶπε τῶν αὐτῶν, Ἰησοῦς ἐπὶ τῆς Ασίας ἐπέβην, εἰς τὴν ἀνθρώπουν, τῶν πολλῶν δακρύων καὶ πειρασμῶν, τῶν συμβάντων μοι ἐν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

1. After αὐτὸν (A) D (E, Gig., Vulg.) add ὁμοσπονδία τῶν αὐτῶν, so Blass in β text. Harris, Four Lectures, etc., p. 61, thinks conflation here of a and β, so Gig. is double and reads "cum convenisset ad eum simulque essent".

2. After Από (A) D adds τρεῖς μῆνας καὶ πλείον, the form of the phrase does not look original; τριετια occurs in xx. 31 and nowhere else in N. T. Vogel, it may be potted, classes it as one of the medical words in Luke's writings; see on ver. 31. For the D has τότε τις, nowhere else in N. T.; but τότε six times in N. T., twice in Luke, only once in LXX.

Jerusalem in time we are not told. St. Chrysostom maintained that he did, see also Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 296, 297; McGiffert, p. 340 (on the other hand, Weiss, Renan, Felten). Mr. Turner, Chron. of N. T., p. 422, holds that the Apostle probably reached Jerusalem just in time, while Farrar sees in xxiv. 11 an intimation that he arrived on the very eve of the Feast. The Pentecostal Feast was the most crowded, most attended by foreigners, cf. ii. 1.

Ver. 17. Απὸ δὲ τῆς Μ. α.: Apparent-ly the Apostle could reckon on a stay of some days at Miletus. If we take into account the landing, the despatching a messenger to Ephesus, and the summoning and journeying of the elders to Miletus, probably, as Ramsay thinks, the third day of the stay at Miletus would be devoted to the presbyters.—μετακαλέσατο: "called to him," R. V., cf. ii. 39 (and see on vii. 14, only in Acts), indicating authority or earnestness in the invitation.—τοὺς πρεσβ., see on xii. 25, and also below on ver. 28. For Pauline words and phraseology characterising the addresses, see following notes.

When Spitta remarks (Apostelgeschichte, p. 252 ff.) that the speech at Miletus is inferior to no part of Acts, not even to the description of the voyage in chap. xxvii., in vividness of expression and intensity of feeling, he expresses the opinion of every unbiased reader. He justly too lays stress upon the fact that while criticism admits the forcible and direct impression derived from the speech, it fails to account for it in the most natural way, viz., by the fact that whilst for the addresses delivered in the Pisidian Antioch and in Athens we are dependent upon a report derived from hearsay, we are here in possession of the testimony of an eyewitness, and of a hearer of the speech (p. 252). Spitta (p. 254) defends the speech against the usual objections. It is disappointing to find that Hilgenfeld is content to regard the whole speech as interpolated by his "author to Theophilus." Clemen refers the whole speech to his R. or to R.A.; thus whilst ver. 19a is referred to R, 19b with its reference to the plots of the Jews is ascribed to R.A. (Redactor Antiju-daicus): Jüngst ascribes ver. 19b from the words καὶ δακρύων... "loué; to the Redactor, but the previous part of the chap. xxii. to ταπεινοφροσύνης, ver. 19, to his source A. So ver. 38 with its reference to ver. 25 is referred to the Redactor; whilst Clemen refers ver. 38a to his R.A., 38b to R. A.

Ver. 18. ὑμείς: "ye yourselves," R. V., ἰησοῦς, emphatic, cf. x. 37, xv. 7.—ἀπὸ τ. α.: to be connected with what follows, although it is quite possible that the word may hold a middle place (Alford), connected partly with ἐπίστ. and partly with ἐπεσταλμένοι. ἐπισταλμένοι: "set foot in Asia," R. V., only in Acts, except Matt. xxii. 5, also with the dative of place, Acts xxvi. 1, but the local meaning is doubtful (LXX, Josh. xiv. 9). Rendall renders "I took ship for Asia," but although the expression elsewhere refers to a voyage, cf. xxii. 2, 4, 6, xxvii. 2, it is not always so used, e.g., xxv. 1.—τοῦ μεθ' ὦ ... ἐγενέσθαι, cf. vii. 38 (versor cum), ix. 19, Mark xvi. 10. Bethge points out that the phrase is always used of intimate association and contrasts the less intimate significance of τοῦ. See also critical note and reading in D.

Ver. 19. Σουλαίων: the word occurs
six times in St. Paul's Epistles of serving God, the Lord, Christ, i Thess. i. 9, Rom. xii. 1 (R., margin, τῷ κυρίῳ), iv. 18, xvi. 18, Ephes. vi. 7, Col. iii. 24 (once in Matthew and Luke, of serving God, Matt. vi. 24, Luke xvi. 13). and cf. St. Paul's expression σωλώματος of himself, Rom. i. 1, Gal. i. 10, Phil. i. 1, Tit. i. 1.—οὐδὲν τὰ δικαιώματα ὑμᾶς διδάξαι ὑμῖν καὶ διδάσκειν τὰς ταυτάτους τοιαύτα ὑμῖν: this use of τάξις may be called eminently Pauline, cf. Ephes. i. 3, 8, iv. 2, vi. 18, 2 Cor. viii. 7, xii. 2, i Tim. iii. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. ii. 15, iii. 2 (see Hackett's note). ταπεινός, a word which may justly be called Pauline, as out of seven places in the N.T. it is used five times by St. Paul in his Epistles, and once in his address in the passage before us; Ephes. iv. 2, Phil. ii. 3, Col. ii. 18, 23, iii. 12 (elsewhere, only in 1 Peter v. 5). It will be noted that it finds a place in three Epistles of the First Captivity, although used once disparagingly, Col. iii. 18. In pagan ethics ταπεινός was for the most part a depreciatory characteristic, although some few notable exceptions may be quoted, Trench, Synonyms, i., 171 ff. In the LXX and Apocrypha it has a high moral significance and is opposed to θρίαμβος in all its forms. The noun is not found either in LXX or Apocrypha, and the adjective ταπεινόφρων (1 Peter iii. 8) and the verb ταπεινόφρονεῖν (not in N.T.), although each found in LXX once, the former in Prov. xxix. 23 and the latter in Ps. cxv. 2 (cf. instances in Aquila and Symmachus, Hatch and Redpath), cannot be traced in classical Greek before the Christian era, and then not in a laudatory sense. The noun occurs in Jos., B. J., iv., 9, 2, but in the sense of pusillanimity, and also in Epictet., Diss., iii., 24, 56, but in a bad sense (Grimm-Thayer). But for St. Paul as for St. Peter the life of Christ had conferred a divine honour upon all forms of lowliness and service, and every Christian was bidden to an imitation of One Who had said: πράγαμε τοῖς κατ' αὐτόν τῷ κυρίῳ, Lightfoot on Phil. ii. 3; “Ethics” (T. B. Strong), Hastings' B.D., i., s66; Cremer, Wörterbuch, sub v. ταπεινός—σαρκικός, cf. ver. 31, 2 Cor. ii. 4, Phil. iii. 18. “Lachryma sanctae . . . cum hanc tamen consistit gaudium”: Bengel. St. Paul was no Stoic, for whom ἀστείον was a virtue, the accompaniment of wisdom and the passport to perfection; see Rom. xii. 15: “in every age the Christian temper has shivered at the touch of Stoic apathy.” Here the word refers not to the Apostle's outwards trials which were rather a source of joy, but to his sorrow of heart for his brethren and for the world, ἀπειθώ γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπῶν, Chrysostom.—πείρασμα, cf. St. Paul's own words, 1 Thess. iii. 3, Phil. i. 27, 2 Cor. i. 6, vi. 4-10, 2 Cor. xi. 26, καθότις ἐκ γνώσεως (Gal. iv. 14). In our Lord's own life and ministry there had been “temptations,” Luke iv. 13, xxii. 28; and a beatitude rested upon the man who endured temptation, James i. 12 and 2. The noun is found no less than six times in St. Luke's Gospel, but only here in Acts. It occurs four times in St. Paul's Epistles, and may be fairly classified as Lucan-Pauline (Bethge). On its use in N.T. and LXX see Hacket, Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 21 ff., and compare Mayor, Epistle of St. James, i., 2.—πείρασμα τοῦ Ι.: evidently classed amongst the πειρασμῶν, Hatch, u. s., although we must not suppose that St. Luke tells us of all the Apostle's dangers, trials and temptations here any more than elsewhere. Nothing of the kind is mentioned in connection definitely with the Ephesian Jews, “sed res minime dubia, xxi. 27,” Blass. The noun has not been found in any classical author, but it occurs in Dioscorides, Pref., i., see Grimm, sub v., and several times in LXX, six times in Ecclus. and in 1 Macc. ii. 52. 

Ver. 20. ὑπεστειλάμην: “how that I shrank not from declaring unto you anything that was profitable,” R.V., cf. ver. 27, where βουλήν follows the same verb διδαχῆς, here followed by οὐδέν; on the construction see Page's note, in loco. The verb means to draw or shrink back from, out of fear or regard for another. In the same sense in classical Greek with οὐδέν or μηδέν: “locuto Demothenica,” Blass and Wendt, cf. also Jos., B. J., i., 20, 21; Vita, 54; in LXX, Deut. i. 17, Exod. xxiii. 21, Job xiii. 8, Wisd. vi. 7, Hab. ii. 4; see Westcott on Heb. x. 38. It is used once in Gal. ii. 12 by Paul himself. It is possible that the verb may have been used metaphorically by St. Paul from its use in the active voice as a nautical term to reef or lower sail, and there would be perhaps a special appropriateness in the metaphor, as St. Paul had just landed, and the sails
'Ιουδαίοι τε καὶ Ἐλληνικοὶ τὴν εἰς Ἰπράξεις Ἀποστόλων
καὶ πίστιν τὴν εἰς τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.
και νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι τῷ Θεῷ, τα ἐν αὐτῇ συνεντήσωτα μοι μὴ εἰδώς, πλὴν ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγίου κατὰ πάντα διαμαρτύρεται λέγω, ὅτι δεσμὰ καὶ ἐλθεῖς μένουν.

1 τοῦ Θεοῦ, om. art. ΒΒΒΕΕ, Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass; after πιστιν

of the ship may have been before his eyes in speaking, to say nothing of the fact that the word would become familiar to him day by day on the voyage (see Humphry, Plumptre, Farrar); but it is not well to press this special metaphorical usage too far here, especially as the word is frequently used elsewhere of military rather than nautical matters (see Lightfoot’s note on Gal. ii. 25, and the use of the verb in Polybius).—τὸν σωφ. cf. 1 Cor. vii. 35, x. 33; Pauline: "the things profitable for their salvation," a message not always agreeable, but which nevertheless the Apostle spoke with the same ταφερεία (ταφερεταδει, Page) which characterised him. Blass compares also the whole phrase ταφερεται ηθωσι with συνεφερει κεινας, Dem., i., 16.—συναντήσοντα μοι: publice et privato, δημ. κατ’ οίκους: publice et privato, another and a further glimpse of the Apostle's work at Ephesus: publicly in the synagogue and in the school of Τyrannus, privately as in the Church in the house of Αφυila and Ρriscilla, 1 Cor. viii. 3. ix. 26.

Ver. 21. διαμάρτ., see above on p. 92; Lucan - Pauline. — μεταν. καὶ πίστιν, cf. the earliest notes in the preaching of Jesus, Mark i. 15, and these were equally the notes of the preaching of St. Peter and St. Paul alike. Whether Paul was preaching to Jews or Gentiles, to philosophers at Athens or to peasants at Lycstra, the substance of his teaching was the same under all the various forms, cf. xiv. 15, xvii. 30, xxvi. 20. It is quite arbitrary to refer paragraphs of πίστιν to the Gentile and of μετανοία to the Jew.—ἐλαθεν, Pauline, cf. Rom. i. 16, ii. 9, 10, iii. 9, 12, 1 Cor. i. 24.

Ver. 22. καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ: the exact phrase occurs again in ver. 25, and only once elsewhere in words ascribed to Paul, xiii. 11 (Ἰδοὺ νῦν, twice in Paul only, 2 Cor. vi. 2).—δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι: "bound in the spirit," compulus animo, Blass; so δεδεμένος in classical Greek, Xen., Cyr., viii. 11, 12; Plato, ΡΕΦ., viii., p. 567 ε, cf. xix. 21, xviii. 25, 1 Cor. v. 3. The fact that the Holy Spirit is specifically so called in ver. 23 seems to decide for the above rendering in this verse; but see Weiss on ver. 23; Ramsay also renders "constrained by the Spirit." Possibly πνεύμα is named as that part of the man in closest union with the Spirit of God; cf. Rom. viii. 16, so that the sense is not affected. If we compare with xix. 21 the expression presents an advance in the Apostle's thought—his purpose becomes plainer, and the obligation more definite, as the Spirit witnesses with his spirit. The expression may mean that the Apostle regarded himself as already bound in the spirit, i.e., although not outwardly bound, he yet knows and feels himself as one bound. For St. Paul's frequent use of πνεύμα cf. Rom. i. 9, viii. 16, xii. 11, 1 Cor. ii. 11, v. 3, 4, xiv. 14, etc. Oecumenius and Theophylact take πνεύμα with εἰρήνη, i.e., bound, as good as bound, I go by the leading of the Spirit to Jerusalem; but this seems forced. Paley, Ηορα Ραυλινα, ii., 5, remarks on the undesigned coincidence with Rom. xv. 30.—συνεντήσωτα μοι: the verb is found only in Luke in N. T. (except Heb. vii. 10 as a quotation, Gen. xiv. 17), and only here in this sense, cf. Eccles. ii. 14, ix. 11, also Plut., Sulla, 2; Ρολυβ., xx., 7, 14; middle, τὰ συνεντύνουσα. On the rarity of the future participle in Greek, and its use in this passage "an exception which proves the rule," see Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 126.

Ver. 23. πλὴν ὅτι: The collocation is found nowhere else in N. T. except in Phil. i. 18, only that (so Alford, Lightfoot, W. H., see Lightfoot, l. c., for parallels), i.e., knowing one thing only, etc., "I do not ask to see the distant scene;
24. "αλλ'ουδενός λόγον ποιούμαι, οδιδέ εχω την ψυχήν μου τιμίαν εμαυτώ, ως τελειώσαι τον δρόμον μου μετα χαράς, και την διακονίαν ην ελαβον παρά του Κυρίου ήσου, διαμαρτύρασθαι το ευαγγέλιον της χάριτος του Θεού. 25. και νυν ιδιού εγώ οδιδα, δι' οδιδεί δρεθετε το πρόσωπον μου υμείς πάντες, εν οις διήλθων κηρύσσων την την βασιλείαν του Θεού.

One step enough for me," so from step to step κατά πόλιν, on his journey, St. Paul was warned and guided, cf. xxii. 4. κατά πόλιν, Lucan-Pauline; κατά used several times by Luke, alone amongst the synoptists, in his Gospel and in the Acts with this distributive force in connection with πόλις; Luke viii. 1, 4, xiii. 22, cf. xv. 21; in the text, as also in Titus i. 5; the only other passage in which the collocation occurs in N.T., the phrase is adopted by St. Paul.—δεσμα και θλίψεις: δεσμα in St. Luke; Luke viii. 29, Acts xvi. 26, but it is noticeable that the two nouns are found together in Phil. i. 17, and in 2 Cor. i. 8. Θλίψεις is used of the affliction which befell the Apostle in Asia, including that of public danger, as well as illness and mental distress. On the variation between masculine and neuter in δεσμός and in other nouns see Blass, Gram., p. 28.—μένουσιν: only twice in N.T., with accusative of the person, here and in ver. 5.

Ver. 24. See critical note. "But I hold not my life of any account, as dear unto myself," R.V., reading λόγου for λόγον, omitting εις εκεν και μου. Both verbs εις εκεν and τοιούτως are found in similar phrases in LXX, Tobit vi. 16, Job xxii. 4, so also in classical Greek (Wetstein). The former verb is used in N.T. as = habere, asimare, cf. Luke xiv. 18 and by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 29.—ώς τελειώσω, see critical note. "So that I may accomplish my course," R.V., "in comparison of accomplishing my course," margin. Difficulty has arisen because this is the only case in the N.T. in which ώς appears in a final clause, Burton, p. 85 (but see W.H., Luke ix. 52, and Viteau, Le Génés du N. T., p. 74 (1893)). The whole phrase is strikingly Pauline, cf. Phil. iii. 12, where the same verb immediately seems to suggest the δρόμος (Alford), Gal. ii. 2, 1 Cor. iv. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 7.—μετα χαράς, see critical note, cf. Phil. i. 4, Col. i. 11, Heb. x. 34. The words are strongly defended by Ewald.—την διακονίαν, see above on p. 422 "saepe apud Paulum," cf. Rom. xi. 13. Apostleship is often so designated, Acts i. 17, 25, xxii. 19, 2 Cor. iv. 1, and other instances in Hort, Ecclesia, p. 204. —διαμαρτ., cf. vi. 4, where the διακ. του λόγου is the highest function of the Apostles.

Ver. 25. και νυν, see on ver. 22.—οδιδα: no infallible presentiment or prophetic inspiration, but a personal conviction based on human probabilities, which was overruled by subsequent events. The word cannot fairly be taken to mean more than this, for, in the same context the Apostle himself had distinctly disclaimed a full knowledge of the future, ver. 23. And if oδιδα is to be pressed here into a claim of infallible knowledge, it is difficult to see why it should not be also so pressed in Phil. i. 25, where the Apostle expresses his sure conviction τουτούνιος οδιδα of a release from his Roman imprisonment, cf. xxvi. 27 where Paul uses the same verb in expressing his firm persuasion of Agrippa's belief, but surely not any infallible knowledge of Agrippa's heart. For a full discussion of the word
24-27.
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είαι τοῦ Θεοῦ. 26. 1 διὸ μαρτυρομαι ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ, ὅτι καθαρὸς ἦμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων. 27. εὖ γὰρ ὑπεστελάμην τοῦ


2 Instead of οὖ γὰρ ὑπεστ. τοῦ μὴ ἀναγ. ὑμῖν Gigg., Lucif., so Blass in b, read καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν κηρ.· Gigg., Lucif. also omit ὑμῖν, but Blass retains with emphasis as last word in verse, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Alford, following ΝBC(D) 13, 81, Vulg.

see amongst recent writers Steinmetz, 

Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus, p. 14 ff. (1897); Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 436. — οὕτως δὴ εἴη: "shall no longer see," see Rendall, whereas A. and R.V. rendering "no more," οὕτως, give the impression that St. Paul definitely affirms that he would never return. Rendall compares Rom. xv. 23, but on the other hand Acts viii. 39 seems to justify the usual rendering. The Apostle's increasing anxiety is quite natural when we remember how even in Corinth he had thought of his journey to Jerusalem with apprehension, Rom. xvi. 30, Paley, Hora Paulina, ii., 5. On the inference drawn by Blass from this passage as to the early date of Acts, see his remarks in loco, and Proleg., p. 3, and to the same effect, Salmon, Introd., p. 407, fifth edition. — διήλθον: the word taken in the sense of a missionary tour, see xiii. 6, indicates that representatives not only of Ephesus but of other Churches were present, hence ὑμῖν πάντες, διήλθον κηρύσσων, coalescing into a single idea; the Apostle could not say διήλθον ὑμᾶς, and so we have ὑμῖν substituted. If the word is Lucan it is also Pauline, and that too in this particular sense, cf. τοῦ Cor. xvi. 5. — Μαρτυρομαι: only in Luke and Paul, and in both cases in Acts referred to Paul, here and in xxvi. 22, Gal. v. 3, Ephes. iv. 17, 1 Thess. ii. 12, "I protest," properly "I call to witness," but never = μαρτυρώ in classical Greek; in Judith vii. 28 we have the fuller construction, of which this use of the dative here is a remnant, Lightfoot, Gal., v., 3. The verb occurs once more in τ Μacc. ii. 56 S (but AR, al.). — ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ: Attic, τῇμέρον, ἰ., ἐν with pronom. prefix (cf. Matt. xxviii. 15 but ἡμέρας [W. H.]), the very day of my departure; the exact phrase occurs twice elsewhere, but both times in Paul's writings, 2 Cor. iii. 14, W. H., Rom. xi. 8, quotation; "Hoc magnam declarandi vim habet." Bengel. Several times in LXX, cf. Jos., Ant., xiii., 2, 3, found frequently in classical Greek. — καθαρὸς από, ε. / xvi. 6, where a similar phrase is used by St. Paul; the adjective is found seven times in St. Paul's Epistles, but only here and in xvii. 6 in Luke's writings. In LXX, cf. Job xiv. 4, Prov. xx. 9, Tobit iii. 14, Susannah, ver. 46; in Psalms of Solomon, xvii. 41, and, for the thought, Ezek. iii. 18-20. In classics for the most part with genitive, but in later Greek with ἀπό, see however Blass, Gram., p. 104, and instances from Demosthenes; and Deissmann for instances from papyri, Neue Bibelstudien, pp. 24, 48; Ramsay, "Greek of the Early Church," etc.; Expository Times, December, 1898, p. 108. Only a Paul
μὴ ἀναγγείλαί ὑμῖν πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 28. προσέχετε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ ἐν ὧν ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Πνεύμα τοῦ Ἁγίου ἐστε ἐπισκόπους, τομαίαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα περεποιησότατο

1 τοῦ Θεοῦ, so Vulg. 68, Syr. H. (Syr. Pesh. MSS.), Epiph., Bas., Ps.-Ath., Theod.-Mops., Cyr.-Al.: τοῦ κυρίου AC*DE, 13, 15, 36, 40, 69, 110, 118 (eight others), Gиг., Sah., Boh., Syr. H. mg., Arm., Irīnt., Const., Ath., Did., Chrys., Jer., Lucif. Here W.H., Weiss have Θεου, so Bengel in later editions; Tisch., R.V. marg., Blass, Wendt, HILG. κυρίου; τοῦ κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ CHL, most mss., Slavonic, Theophil.; and there are other variations. Against Θεου it is objected that St. Paul would not apply the word to Christ, although we have in Clem. Rom., Cor., ii., 7; Ignat., Ephes., i., 1; Rom., vi., 3; Tert., Ad Uxor., ii., 3; Clem. Alex., Quis divae salut., xxiv., similar language; but there are also passages in the N.T., e.g., Rom. ix. 5, Tit. ii. 13, in which there is at least a very considerable amount of evidence for referring Θεος to Jesus, "and when it is objected that these are disputed passages, it is just to remind the objector that this will exclude his original statement as well as the rebuttal of it" (Warfield). The evidence in its favour comes to us afforded by a strong combination (cf. too the intrinsic evidence in its favour from Ps. lxxxiv. 2, W.H., App., 99); so far from the unusual nature of the phrase being regarded as fatal to its genuineness, it might be fairly maintained that Θεου as it is the more difficult reading is also on that very ground recommended to our confidence. We should also give weight to the fact that the words εκκλησια του Θ., which find a place in this address full of Pauline expressions, are found no less than eleven times in St. Paul's Epistles, but that εκκλ. ου κυριου is not found at all in the N.T. (we have αιμα του Κ. once in 1 Cor. xi. 27). Weiss endeavour to solve the difficulty by taking ιδιου, masc., the blood of his own; cf. Rom. viii. 32. But while disagreeing with this solution, Hort, in W.H., App., 99, thinks it by no means impossible that ιωυ dropped out after του ιδιου (its insertion solves every difficulty (so too Rendall)). Hort, reading δια του αιματος του ιδιου, renders "through the blood that was His own," ε.ε., His Son's, following ΝABCDE 13, 36, 40, Vulg., so too Weiss, R.V.; cf. the language which finds repeated expression in the Apost. Const., and embodies a conception familiar to us in one of our Ember Collects (τεμτυ). See further W.H., s. s.; Dr. Ezra Abbot, Bibliotheca Sacra, p. 313 ff. (1876); Page, in loco; Wendt (1899), p. 335; Warfield, Textual Criticism, pp. 184-189, 5th edit. Mr. Page, Classical Review, p. 317, 1897, warmly approves of the note of Dr. Bliss on Acts xx. 28, and of his support of the reading κυριου, on the ground that Θεου would be anachronism when substituted for it in δια του αιματος κυριου: but is this explanation so certain? Dr. Hort indicates that the prevalent instinct would be to change τον Θεου into τον κ., and not vice versa, as the fear of sanctioning "Monarchian," or (in later times) "Monophysite" language would outweigh any other doctrinal impulse.

could say this with fitness; we could not dare to say it, Chrys., Hom., xlv. Ver. 27. ὑμίν, see above on ver. 20.—την β. τοῦ Θεοῦ, see on ii. 23, and cf. especially Ephes. i. 11 for the phrase, and iii. 4 for the thought. No Epistle excels that to the Ephesians in the richness of its thoughts, and in its conception of a divine purpose running through the ages; no Epistle dwells more fully upon the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, or exhorts more touchingly to diligence in keeping the unity of the Spirit, or insists more practically upon the sanctifying power of the One Spirit, and the sense of a divine membership in every sphere of human life. The rich and full teaching of the

Epistle is addressed to men who are able to understand the Apostle's knowledge of the mystery of Christ; in other words, to those to whom he had announced more fully than to others the counsel of God. The Ephesian Epistle may have been an encyclical letter, but it was addressed principally to the Ephesians as the representatives of the leading Church of the province of Asia. See amongst recent writers Gore, Ephesians, pp. 42, 43; and Lock, "Ephesians," Hastings' B.D., p. 718.—ὑμίν: emphatically at the end, W.H.; this revelation had been made to the presbyters before him, and the responsibility would rest with them of communicating it to others when their spiritual father had left them.
28-29.
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διά τοῦ ἱδίου αἵματος. 29. εγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰσχειλεύονται μετὰ τὴν ἐφεξῆς μου λύκει βαρέις εἰς φράσις, μὴ φειδώμενοι τοῦ

Ver. 28. τεροῦτη... ἐκακοῦ (cf. 1 Tim. iv. 16), Luke xvii. 3, xxi. 34, Acts v. 35, viii. 6. In LXX with ἐκακοῦ, Gen. xxiv. 6, Exod. x. 28, Deut. iv. 9. "Non tantum jubeteos gregi attendere, sed primum sibi ipsis; neque enim aliorum salutem seduluo unquam curabit, qui suam negliget... cum sit ipsis pars gregis," Calvin, in loco, and also Chrys. (Bethge, p. 144).—ποιμνίω: the figure was common in the Ο.Τ. and it is found in St. Luke, xii. 32, in St. John, in St. Peter, but it is said that St. Paul does not use it, cf. however Ephes. iv. 11, where, and nowhere else, he writes καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκακοῦ... τοῦ... ἔθετο, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 28, 1 Tim. i. 12, ii. 7, 2 Tim. i. ii. There is no ground whatever for supposing that the επισκόπους here mentioned were not ordained, as the words τὸ Π. το "Αγ. ἐθέτο may be used without any reference whatever to the actual mode of appointment. Dr. Hort allows that here the precedent of vi. 3-6 may have been followed, and the appointment of the elders may have been sealed, so to speak, by the Apostle's prayers and laying-on-of-hands, Ecclesia, pp. 99, 100. The thought of appointment by the Holy Spirit, although not excluding the ordination of Apostles, may well be emphasised here for the sake of solemnly reminding the Presbyters of their responsibility to a divine Person, and that they stand in danger of losing the divine gifts imparted to them in so far as they are unfaithful to their office.—τεροῦτη: "to tend" as distinct from πλακεῖν "to feed," although the act of feeding as well of governing is associated also with the former word; see on John xxi. 16. The figurative pastoral language in this passage was probably not unknown as applied to Jewish elders, Ederheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 282; Hort, Ecclesia, p. 101.—ἐπισκόπως: the word, which occurs five times in the N.T., is applied four times to officers of the Christian Church: in this passage, again at Ephesus in 1 Tim. iii. 2, at Philippi in Phil. i. 1, at Crete in Titus i. 7; and once to our Lord Himself, 1 Peter ii. 25 (cf. the significant passage, Wisdom i. 6, where it is applied to God). In the LXX it is used in various senses, e.g., of the overseers of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12, 17; of taskmasters or exactors, Isa. lx. 17; of minor officers, Neh. xi. 14; of officers over the house of the Lord, 2 Kings xi. 18; and in 1 Macc. i. 51 of overseers or local commissioners of Antiochus Epiphanes to enforce idolatry, cf. Jos., Ant., xii., 5, 4. In classical Greek the word is also used with varied associations. Thus in Attic Greek it was used of a commissioner sent to regulate a new colony or subject city like a Spartan "harmost," cf. Arist., Αv., 1032, and Boeckh, Inscr., 73 (in the Roman period ἐπιμεληταῖ); but it was by no means confined to Attic usage. In another inscription found at Thera in the Macedonian period mention is made of two ἐπισκόποι receiving money and putting it out at interest, and again at Rhodes, in the second century B.C., ἐπισκόποι are mentioned in inscriptions, but we do not know their functions, although Deissmann claims that in one inscription, I. M. A. c., 731, the title is used of a sacred office in the Temple of Apollo, but he declines to commit himself to any statement as to the duties of the office: cf. also Loening, Die Gemeindererfassung des Urchristenthums, pp. 21, 22; Gibson, "Bishop," B.D.; Gwatkin, "Bishop," Hastings' B.D.; Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 57; Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 95. M. Waddington has collected several instances of the title in inscriptions found in the Ηαυδάν, i.e., the south-eastern district of the ancient Bashan (see the references to Le Bas-Waddington in Loening, u. s., p. 22, note, and Gore, Church and the Ministry, p. 402), but none of these give us precise and definite information as to the functions of the ἐπισκόποι. But it is important to note that M. Waddington is of opinion that the comparative frequency of the title in the Ηαυδάν points to the derivation of the Christian use of the word from Syria or Palestine rather than from the organisation of the Greek municipality (Expositor, p. 99, 1887). It has been urged that the officers of administration and finance in the contemporary non-Christian associations, the clubs and guilds so common in the Roman empire, were chiefly known by one or other of two names, ἐπιμελητής or ἐπισκόπος, Hatch, B.L., p. 36, and hence the inference has been drawn that the primary function of the primitive ἐπισκόπος in the Christian Church was
the administration of finance; but Dr. Hatch himself has denied that he laid any special stress upon the financial character of the ἐπίσκοποι, although he still apparently retained the description of them as "officers of administration and finance," see Expositor, u. s., p. 99, note, thus adopting a position like that of Professor Harnack, who would extend the administration duties beyond finance to all the functions of the community.

But however this may be (see below), there is certainly no ground for believing that the title ἐπίσκοποι in the Christian Church was ever limited to the care of finance (see the judgment of Loening on this view, v. p. 173, note, that such a limitation was justified by the secular use of the term. If indeed we can point to any definite influence which connects itself with the introduction of the title into the Christian Church, it is at least as likely, one might say more likely when we consider that the Apostles were above all things Jews, that the influence lies in the previous use in the LXX of ἐπίσκοπος and ἐπισκοπή, and the direct appeal of St. Clement of Rome, Cor., xlii., 5, to Isaiah (LXX) lx. 17 in support of the Christian offices of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι may be fairly quoted as pointing to such an influence. But whatever influences were at work in the adoption of the term by the early believers, it became, as it were, baptised into the Christian Church, and received a Christian and a higher spiritual meaning.

This one passage in Acts xx. 28 is sufficient to show that those who bore the name were responsible for the spiritual care of the Church of Christ, and that they were to feed His flock with the bread of life (see the striking and impressive remarks of Dr. Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 266). This one passage is also sufficient to show that the "presbyter" and "bishop" were at first practically identical, cf. vv. 17 and 28, Steinmetz, Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus, p. 175, 1897, and that there is no room for the separation made by Harnack between the two, see his Analecta su Hatch, p. 231, or for his division between the "patриarchal" office of the πρεσβύτερος and the "administrative" office of the ἐπίσκοπος (Loening, u. s., pp. 23-27; Sanday, Expositor, u. s., pp. 12, 104; Gwatkin, u. s., p. 302). In the Pastoral Epistles the identity between the two is even more clearly marked, although Harnack cannot accept Tit. i. 5-7 as a valid proof, because he believes that vv. 7-9 were interpolated into the received text by a redactor; cf. also for proof of the same i Tim. iii. 1-7, 8-13, v. 17-19; i Pet. v. 1, 2, although in this last passage Harnack rejects the reading ἐπισκόποι (and it must be admitted that it is not found in MB, and that it is omitted by Tisch. and W. H.), whilst he still relegates the passages in the Pastoral Epistles relating to bishops, deacons and Church organisation to the second quarter of the second century, Chron., i., p. 482, note. In St. Clement of Rome, Cor., xlii., 4, xliiv., 1, 4, 5, the terms are still synonymous, and by implication in Didacht., xv., 1 (Gwatkin, u. s., p. 302, and Gore, u. s., p. 409, note). But if we may say with Bishop Lightfoot that a new phraseology began with the opening of a new century, and that in St. Ignatius the two terms are used in their more modern sense, it should be borne in mind that the transition period between Acts and St. Ignatius is exactly marked by the Pastoral Epistles, and that this fact is in itself no small proof of their genuineness. In these Epistles Timothy and Titus exercise not only the functions of the ordinary presbyteral office, but also functions which are pre-eminent over those of the ordinary presbyter, although there is no trace of any special title for these Apostolic delegates, as they may be fairly called. The circumstances may have been temporary or tentative, but it is sufficiently plain that Timothy and Titus were to exercise not only a general discipline, but also a jurisdiction over the other ministers of the Church, and that to them was committed not only the selection, but also the ordination of presbyters (Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 151 ff.; Bright, Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life, p. 28 ff., 1898; Church Quarterly Review, xlii., pp. 265-302).—τὴν ἐκκ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, see critical note.—περιεποιήσατο, cf. Psalm lxiv. 2. It has been thought that St. Paul adopts and adapts the language of this Psalm; in comparing his language with that of the LXX we can see how by the use of the word ἐκκλησία instead of συναγωγή in the Psalm he connects the new Christian Society with the ancient...
γρηγορείτε, μνημονεύοντες οτι τρειτιαν νύκτα και ημέραν ουκ ἐπευάζων μην μετα δεκαρίων νυκτέων ενα έκαστον. 32. και τανυν παρατίθεμαι ὑμίν, αδελφοί, τω Θεώ και τω λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αυτοῦ, τῷ δυνάμει ἑπικοδομήσας καὶ δοῦναι ἡμῖν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἠγιασμένοις

πάσιν. 33. ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσίου ἢ ιματισμοῦ ὀδηγοῦ ἐπεθύμησα.
34. αὐτῶν ἢ γινόσκετε ὅτι ταῖς χρείαις μου καὶ τῶν οἴκων μετε ἐμοῦ

1 ή δὲ omit. after αὐτῶν, W. H., R. V. on overwhelming evidence. After χρείαις μου Blass adds πασιν in β; D has πασιν.

times in the Corinthian Epistles (only twice elsewhere in N.T. in 2 Pet.)

Ver. 30. καὶ ἐξ ὑπὸν ἀντῶν: ἀντῶν adds emphasis, “from your own selves”. The Pastoral Epistles afford abundant evidence of the fulfilment of the words, cf. 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. i. 15, ii. 17, iii. 8, 13. To some extent the Apostolic warning was effectual at all events in Ephesus itself, cf. Rev. ii. 2; Ignat., Ephes., vii., 2.—ἀναστήσονται: common word in Acts, see on v. 17, used here perhaps as in v. 36.

—βιοστραμμένα, cf. LXX, Deut. xxxii. 5. The verb is found twice in Luke ix. 41 (Matt. xvii. 17), xxiii. 2, three times in Acts (xiii. 8, 10, and once again by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 15, in a similar sense, cf. Arist., Pol., iii., 16, 5, viii., 7, 7; Arrian, Epict., iii., 6, 8.—ἀποστασίας τοὺς μαθητάς: “the disciples,” R.V. with art. meaning that they would try and draw away those that were already Christians, μαθ., always so used in Acts. ἀναστήσατε to tear away from that to which one is already attached; used by St. Matt. xxvi. 51, and elsewhere only by St. Luke xxii. 41, Acts xxii. 1; compare with the genitive of purpose after ἀντιστασία, 2 Chron. xx. 23.


Ver. 31. γρηγόρω: the pastoral metaphor continued; verb used four times by St. Paul, and it may well have passed into familiar use in the early Church by the solemn injunction of our Lord on the Mount of Olives to watch, cf. also Luke xiii. 37, 1 Pet. v. 8, Rev. iii. 2, 3, xvi. 15, and the names Gregory, Vigilantius, amongst the early converts. —μεταλαλέω: the three years may be used summarily i.e., as speaking in round numbers, or literally. It would have seemed out of place in such an appeal to say “two years and three months,” or whatever the exact time may have been. The intention was to give a practical turn to this watchfulness: triennium celebris, Beng. The word is regarded by Vogel as a decided employment of a medical term by Luke from Dioscorides, see also to the same effect Meyer-Weiss, Evangelium des Lukas, note on i., 1. The word is found only here in N.T., not at all in LXX, but used by Theophr., Plut., Artem.—νῦν: perhaps placed first because it corresponded more closely to the idea of watching against attacks, or perhaps because it emphasised the ceaselessness of the Apostle's labours, cf. xxvi. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10, 1 Tim. v. 5, 2 Tim. i. 3.—μετὰ δεκάτων, cf. 2 Cor. ii. 4, Chrys., Hom., xiv. “Quod cor tamen saxatum, ut hicse laetiriam non emolliatur qui non fleat finte Paulo?” Corn. a Lapide, see also Farrar, St. Paul, ii., 283.—νοομένων: only here in Acts, but seven times in St. Paul's Epistles, but nowhere else in N.T., “admonish,” R.V. In classical Greek it is joined both with παρακαλεῖν and κολαζέιν; St. Paul too used it in gentleness, or “with a rod.” In LXX, Job iv. 3; Wisd. xi. 10, xii. 2.—ἐν ἑκατοντος, 2 Cor. xi. 29 and John x. 3; ἑκατοντος twice in St. Luke's Gospel, iv. 40, xvi. 5, six times in Acts, five times in St. Paul's Epistles (only once elsewhere in N.T., Matt. xxvi. 22, but not in T.R.).

Ver. 32. καὶ νύκτα, see above on iv. 29.—παρατίθ., cf. xiv. 23.—τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χ. αὐτῶν: as in the fourth Gospel, John i. 14-17, so here and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, we find great stress laid on χάρις, but we cannot conclude with Stier and others that in the word λόγος we have any reference here to the Word of St. John's Gospel, although the similarity between St. John's doctrine of the Word and St. Paul's conception of our Lord's Person is very close elsewhere; the thought here is however closely akin to that of St. James i. 21 (Heb. iv. 12). In his earliest Epistle the Apostle had spoken of the Word, i Thess. ii. 13, δὲ καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν. The Word here is able to build up and to give, etc., which certainly seems to ascribe to it a quasi-personal character, even more so than in 2 Tim. iii. 15, where the Apostle uses a somewhat similar phrase of the O.T. Scriptures, τὰ δύναμεν (the same verb as here) σε σωτήριν κ.τ.λ. The same phrase as here occurs in Acts xiv. 3, which points to its derivation from one imbued with Paul's words and habits of thought, if not from the Apostle himself (Alford). Weiss and others refer τῷ δύναμεν τῷ Θεῷ (Kypriac, see critical note), cf. Rom. xvi. 25, Ephes. iii. 20, Gal. iii. 21, on the ground that although ζυγισθηκότα (οικοδ.) may re-
πάντα υπέδειξαμίν, ὅτι οὕτω καταδεικνύει τῶν δικαιωμάτων, μημονεύει τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν, "Μακάριον ἄπτε διδόναι

1 Lach. and Blass add πάντα to the previous verse, so Overbeck, Nösgen, Bethge (Wendt doubtful). For τῶν λόγων LP read τὸν λόγον; Bengel τὸν λόγον; no doubt changes made because only one saying is quoted. D1, Gig. read μακαριον εἰπον εἰς τὸν λόγον περὶ τον λαμβανοντα; cf. Const. Apost., iv., 3, μακαριον εἰπον εἰς τὸν λόγον περὶ τον λαμβανοντα.
μάλλον ἡ λαμβάνει". 36. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν, θεῖς τὰ γόνατά αὐτοῦ, σὺν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς προσηύξατο. 37. ἵππως δὲ ἐγένετο κλαυθμὸς πάντων· καὶ ἐπιπεσόντες ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ Παύλου κατεφίλου αὐτοῦ. 38. διυνώμενοι μάλιστα ἐπὶ τὸ λόγον τις ἐρήμετε, ὅτι εὐκείμην μᾶλλος τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ θεωρεῖν. προέπεμπον δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.

of Solomon, Ryle and James edit., p. 73; on ἀντίληψις, H. and R., sub. ν. In classical Greek used in middle voice with genitive as here.—τῶν ἀσθενῶν, cf. 1 Thess. ν. 14, for a similar precept. The adjective need not be limited to those who sought relief owing to physical weakness or poverty, but may include all those who could claim the presbyters' support and care, bodily or spiritual, cf. Rom. xii. 13. The usage of the gospels points to those who are weak through disease and therefore needing help, e.g., Matt. x. 8, Mark vi. 56, Luke ix. 2, John v. 3, so also by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 26, 27, 2 Tim. iv. 20, although there are instances in LXX where the word is used of moral rather than of physical weakness. When the word is used of moral or spiritual weakness in the N.T., such a meaning is for the most part either determined by the context, or by some addition, e.g., τῇ πίστει, Rom. xiv. 1.—μηνυμονεύειν τε: the verb is used seven times by St. Paul in his Epistles, once by St. Luke in his Gospel, Luke xvii. 32, and twice in Acts in the words of St. Paul, cf. ver. 31. Twice in the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome we find a similar exhortation in similar words, chap. xiii. 1 and xlvii. 7, and in each case the word may refer to a free combination of our Lord's words (cf. Luke vi. 30, xiv. 14), so too in St. Polycarp, Epist., iii. 3. From what source St. Paul obtained this, the only saying of our Lord, definitely so described, outside the four Gospels which the N.T. contains, we cannot tell, but the command to "remember" shows that the words must have been familiar words, like those from St. Clement and St. Polycarp, which are very similar to the utterances of the Sermon on the Mount. From whatever source they were derived the references given by Resch, Agrapha, pp. 100, 150, show how deep an impression they made upon the mind of the Church, Clem. Rom., Cor., ii. 1, Did., i., 5, Const. Ap., iv. 3, 1; cf. also Ropes, Die Spriche Jesus, p. 136. In thus appealing to the words of the Lord Jesus, St. Paul's manner in his address is very similar to that employed in his Epistles, where he is apparently able to quote the words of the Lord in support of his judgment on some religious and moral question, cf. I Cor. vii. 10, 11, 12, 25, and the distinction between his own opinion, γνώμη, and the command of Christ, ἐντατγή (Witness of the Epistles, p. 319). τε: Weiss (so Bethge) holds that the word closely connects the two clauses, and that the meaning is that only thus could the weak be rightly maintained, εἰς, by remembering, etc., διὰ being causal. But however this may be, in this reference, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν, "how he himself said," R.V. (thus implying that the fact was beyond all doubt), we may note one distinctive feature in Christian philanthropy, that it is based upon allegiance to a divine Person, and upon a reference to His commands. The emphatic personal pronoun seems to forbid the view that the Apostle is simply giving the sense of some of our Lord's sayings (see above). Similar sayings may be quoted from pagan and Jewish sources, but in Aristotle, Eth. Nicom., iv. 1, it is the part τοῦ ελευθερίου to give when and where and as much as he pleases, but only because it is beautiful to give; in friendship, generosity and benevolence spring from the reflection that such conduct is decorous and worthy of a noble man, Eth. Nicom., ix. 8. In Plato's Republic there would have been no place for the ασθενεῖς. Even in Seneca who sometimes approaches very nearly to the Christian precept, when he declares, e.g., that even if we lose we must still give, we cannot forget that pity is regarded as something unworthy of a wise man; the wise man will help him in tears, but he will not weep with him; he helps the poor not with compassion, but with an impassive calm. —μακάριον: emphatic in position, see critical note. Bengel quotes from an old poet, cf. Athenæus, viii. 5, μακάριος, εἰπερ μεταβίσως μηνείν ... ἀνόητος δὲ διόδου, οὕτως δ' ὁ λαμβάνων. The lines are by no means to be regarded as the best expression of pagan ethics, but the μακάριον, which occurs more than thirty
times on the lips of our Lord, bids us aim at something altogether higher and deeper and fuller than happiness—blessedness. In Judaism, whilst compassion for the poor and distressed is characteristic of a righteous Israelite, we must still bear in mind that such compassion was limited by legality and nationality; the universality of the Christian precept is wanting.


Ver. 36. θείς τα γόν., see above on p. 203.


Chapter XXI.—Ver. 1. άραξάνθηκαλ, see above on xiii. 13. —<i>καταστολή</i>, cf. xx. 30, “were parted from them,” R.V. The word expresses a separation difficult and painful; it adds to the pathos of the scene, and marks the close affection which could not bear the thought of a parting, “divulsi ab eorum complexu,” Blass (see Chrys., comment. in loco).

—<i>καθάλθη</i>, see on xvi. 11. —Κόρν, Stanchio or Stanko, an island of great trading importance off the coast of Caria, south of Miletus and Samos, and north of Rhodes. Historically it had several points of connection with the Jews, cf. 1 Macc. xv. 23, Jos., Ant., xiv. 7, 2, and 10, 15, B. f., i., 21, 11, and owing to its commerce it became one of the centres of Jewish life in the Aegean. It lay about forty nautical miles from Miletus, and it was famous as the birthplace not only of Hippocrates, but of Apelles, and as being one of the great medical schools of the ancient world. See further “Cos” (Ramsay), Hastings’ B.D., and B.D. 2; Farrar, *Saint Paul*, ii., 284; Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 96; cf. Strabo, xiv., 2, Hor., Od., iv., 13, 13, Tac., Ann., xii., 61. C. and H. think that the chief town of the same name at the east of the island is referred to in the narrative before us. The place must have had, as C. and H. note, a special interest for St. Luke.—<i>Ρόδον</i>: off the south coast of Caria. According to the proverb the sun shone every day on Rhodes, and it might well be called the sunny island of roses. Her coins, stamped on one side with Apollo’s head radiated, and on the other with the rose-flower, bear their witness to the brightness and fertility of the island. Moreover, it was a seat not only of commerce but of learning. St. Paul does not appear to have landed, but only to have touched at the island. The great Colossus representing the sun, counted as one of the wonders of the world, lay prostrate, having been broken down by an earthquake, Pliny, N. H., xxxiv., 18; Strabo, xiv., 2. In the time of the Peloponnesian War Rhodes had been famous, for its strong navy, as its timber was abundant. A notice of Jewish residents in Rhodes meets us in 1 Macc. xv. 23. On subsequent history see the excellent account in C. and H., small edit., p. 357; Farrar, *Saint Paul*, ii., p. 285. —<i>Πάταρα</i>: a seaport on the Lycian coast, now in ruins, but probably a place of some importance and splendour. C. and H. say that Patara was to the city Xanthus what the Piraeus was to Athens. On the modern discoveries in Pataera see C. and H., small edit., note p. 560, cf. Herod., i., 182, Hor., Od., iii., 4, 63, Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 99. O. Holtzmann, *Neuest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 101. “The voyage may be taken as typical of the course which hum...
ἐν Πάταρα. — 2. καὶ εὐρόντες πλοίων διαπέρων εἰς Φοινίκην ἐπιβάντες ἄνεχθημεν. — 3. ἀναφαίνεται δὲ τὴν Κύπρον, καὶ καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐάρσιον, ἐπέλθομεν εἰς Συρίαν, καὶ κατῆλθομεν εἰς Τύρον. — ἔκεισε γὰρ ἣν τὸ πλοίον ἀποφορτίζομεν τῶν γομῶν. — 4. καὶ ἀνεύροντες τοὺς μαθηταῖς, επεμείναμεν αὐτὸν ἡμέρας ἕξιν τῶν Πνευμάτων, μὴ τὰς ἀναβαίνεις εἰς Παύλου ἑλέγον διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, μὴ ἀναβαίνεις εἰς Παταρά D (Gig., Wer., Sah.) add καὶ Μυρα, so Blass in β, and Hilg., another accurate geographical touch; cf. xx. 15 and Ramsay, C. R. E. F., p. 153, and St. Paul, p. 297; but after a long discussion of the passage in Expositor, March, 1895, Ramsay decides against the originality of the reading, but see also Zöckler, Greifswalder Studien, p. 138, who declines to be persuaded by these recent arguments urged by R. Wendt thinks that it may be original, p. 338 (1899), so Corssen, G. G. A., p. 441. Weiss, Codex D, p. 109, while accepting D in xx. 15, finds here assimilation to xxvii. 5. On the other hand the words may have been omitted in view of Paul's haste in xx. 16 (Wendt). See also Schmiedel, Enc. Bibli., 1., 54.

For άναφαίνεται ΜΒ esto 66, Tisch., Weiss, Blass, but -φανεντες ΑΒ C E Η L P, Lach., Tisch., Alford. κατηλθομεν for κατηχομεν δΣΑΒΕ Vulg., Boh., Syr. H., For αναβαίνεις σΑΒC, mins., Tisch., Weiss, Blass, Weiss, read επιβαίνεις. — τρεῖς of ships took every year,” Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 297, and cf. the illustrations from Roman history in C. and H., p. 560 note. — Ver. 2. They went at Patara on board a ship about to start on the direct Syrian course,επιβαίνεις, cf. xx. 18. — Ver. 3. — "when we had come in sight of," R.V., Doric form of 1st aorist active, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112, here a technical word (only in Luke, cf. Luke xix. 11, but in a different sense), i.e., after we had rendered Cyprus visible (to us) = facere ut appararet (Blass); Virgil, Aeneid, iii., 275, 291, see also Rendall's note in loco (for the opposite idiom, ἀποκρύπτειν, cf. Thuc., ν., 65). — καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐάρσιον: sailing south-east they would have passed close to Paphos in Cyprus. — ἔπλεομεν ἐπάραταν, imperfect. aorist. — κατῆλθομεν finem de notat (Blass). — εἰς Τύρον: now a free town of the R. province of Syria, Strabo, xvi., 2, in honour of its ancient greatness; it is still a place of considerable commerce and consequence, still famous for its fabrics and its architecture. At present it numbers amongst its five thousand inhabitants a few Jews, the rest being Mohammedans and Christians. Besides O.T. references, see 1 Macc. xii. 49, 2 Macc. iv. 18, 44, and further for its history, C. H., small edit., p. 383, Hamburg, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 7, 998, Schaff-Herzog, Encyclopedia, iv., "Tyre". — ἔκεισε: the adverb may be used here with something of its proper force, but in xxii. 5, the only other place in which it occurs in N.T., simply εἰς έκεία, Simcox, Language of the New Testament, p. 179. Page (in loco) renders "for there the ship was unlading her cargo," ἔκεισε being used because of the idea of movement and carrying into the town contained in the "unloading" — ἔναρχον: taken sometimes as the present for the future, Burton, p. 59, but see also Winer-Moulton, xlv., 5, and Wendt (1888) in loco (Philo, De Fratrum et Pan., 5; and Athenæus, ii., 5, of lightening a ship in a storm). — γόμον γέμω: so in classical Greek, Herod., Dem., etc., in LXX of the load of a beast of burden, Exod. xxiii. 5, 2 Kings v. 17; in N.T. only elsewhere in Rev. xviii. 11, of any merchandise. — Ver. 4. — ἀνεύροντες τοὺς μαθηταῖς: more than simply to find, quarendo reperire, Blass; "having found out," as colloquially "having looked up"; only in Luke, cf. Luke ii. 16, but in middle, 4 Macc. iii. 14. — τοῦς μαθ.: W. H. The article indicates that the existence of the disciples was known, but it was difficult to find out their whereabouts in a great town, cf. xv. 3, 41.— ἐπεμείναμεν: see on 48. — ἡμέρας ἕξιν: the period would at all events enable Paul to enjoy a first day of the week with the Church. Apparently he and his went on in the same ship, ver. 6, evidently it was a trading vessel of the larger size, as it took this time to unload; on the genuine- ness of the narration here see Salmon, Introd., p. 300. — σα ποῦ Π.: there is no contradiction between this state-
 فلاشياً. 5. أين ينشأ ١ كنوز ظريفة للكنوز، ظلّوا رخاء ستة عشر يومًا، وفعلاً نحببتهم، فاقتصرت مذابحهم، وناشيتهم في كل مكان، في وجدوا ما خذلته بريقاء، وكلاً نحن ن.Use the same words when we أ(NS) 2، 6. 6 - 6. 

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

Ιερουσαλήμ.

5. ότε δε εγένετο ١ ημέρα, εξηλοντός τιμωμένος, έπερεμπτότων ημών πάντων την γνώμη και τίμων της τάξεως, και δίνητο διά τό γνώτα διά τόν αιγιαλόν ουράνιομέθεα. 6. καὶ δαπανώμενοι άλλήλους, άνεβημεν εἰς τό

1 ημέρας άξιομάτων, CHLP, so Tisch., W.H. marg.; but έξηλοντιμών ημών AB* E 68, W.H. text, Weiss. At beginning of verse, instead of oτε ... τας ημερας d, so Blass in b, has sequenti die...το δε εξηλοντιμών.

2 προσευξάμεθα άλληλους, άνεβημεν εἰς τό θεού το πλοίον, so Wendt (probably); but Ν*BE 68, 73, Chrys., so Lach., W.H., R.V., Weiss άνεβημεν.

ment and St. Paul's assertion that he was proceeding to Jerusalem under the same divine guidance. That the prophets at Tyre should foresee the Apostle's danger was only in accordance with his affectionate regard for him; it might well prompt them to dissuade him from such perilous risks. There is therefore no occasion to suppose that the clause has been interpolated into the "We" source. Hilgenfeld refers οίτινες...ιερ. (ver. 4), as also the whole of ver. 9, τούτω δὲ...τροφ. to his "author to Theophilus," on the ground that this writer had already spoken of Paul's tribulations as awaiting him in city by city, xx. 23, and that the notices in vv. 4 and 9 here are added by him in confirmation. But Hilgenfeld (with Clemen and Jüngst) retains νν. 10-14, the episode of Agabus, as belonging to the "We" source, and sees a fitness in the prophecy of Agabus foretelling, after the manner of the O.T. prophets, in the last station before Jerusalem, the imprisonment of the Apostle, whilst Paul in spite of all entreaties is unmoved in his determination. But (1) it is quite arbitrary to refer the whole speech at Miletus (see above, chap. xx.) to the "author to Theophilus," and (2) although it was quite fitting that the warning of danger should be more vivid on its approach, yet one fails to see why the more definite symbolical act of Agabus should exclude previous intimations of danger on the part of affectionate friends speaking of the Holy Ghost. In ver. 9 nothing is said as to the prophecies of the daughter of Philip and Paul's imprisonment, but see below.

Ver. 5. άπασπάζομαι: only here in N.T., in Tobit x. 13 S (AR al.); Hieremius, p. 194; here of salutations at departure, as simple verb in ver. 7, of salutations on arrival (1 Macc. xii. 17). — το πλοίον: article indicates that it was the same ship (ver. 2 without the article) which...
πλοίον, έκείνον δὲ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὰ Ιδα. 7. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῖον διανύσαμεν άπὸ Τύρου κατηρτήσαμεν εἰς Πτολεμαίδα, καὶ ἀσπαζόμενοι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐμείσαμεν ἡμέραν μιᾷ παρ' αὐτοῖς. 8. τῇ δὲ ἑπαύριον ἐξελθόντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Παύλον ἠλθομεν εἰς Καισαρείαν καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τοῦ δυτος ἐκ


was going on to Ptolemais.—εἰς τὰ Ἰδα, cf. John xvi. 32, xix. 27, cf. β text v. 18, xiv. 18 (τὰ Ἰδα not in Synoptists, but cf. Luke xviii. 28), in LXX, Esther v. 10, vi. 12, 3 Macc. vi. 27, 37, viii. 7.

Ver. 7. διανύσαμεν: “and when we had finished the voyage from Tyre we arrived at Ptolemais,” R.V. (so in effect A.V.), but Page (so Wendt) renders “but we having (thereby) completed our voyage (i.e., from Macedonia, xx. 6), came from Tyre to Ptolemais,” on the ground that διανύω would not be used of the short journey to Ptolemais from Tyre.—Πτολεμαίδα: the ancient Accho and the modern Acre, Arab. Akka: St. θεαν d’Acre, mentioned here for the last time in Scripture. About thirty miles south of Tyre. In Judg. i. 31 it was assigned to Asher, but it was never taken by Israel, and was always reckoned as belonging to the Philistine towns, and later by the Greeks as belonging to Phoenicia. In its stormy history it was held in succession by Babylonians and Persians (Strabo, xvi., 2, 25), and on the first division of Alexander’s kingdom it was assigned to Ptolemy Soter (Ptolemy I.), from whom it may have derived its name (so Hamburger). Schürer however refers the name to Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus), and others to Ptolemy Lathurus. In the Syro-Egyptian wars its importance as a military station was manifested, since the power which held it could close the road down the Syrian coast to Egypt. To the Jews it was always hostile, 1 Macc. v. 15, Jos., Ant., xii., 8, 2, i Macc. xii. 45, Jos., Ant., xiii., 6, 2, and later in history when the Jewish War broke out against Rome, the Jews, two thousand in number, were slaughtered in Ptolemais, Jos., B. J., ii., 18, 5. After falling to the Parthians, it finally passed under the dominion of Rome, but although it was called colonia Ptolemais under the Emperor Claudius, Pliny, v. 19, it does not seem to have possessed the actual privileges of a colony (Schürer). See on its earlier and modern history, Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 1, p. 47; “Acco,” Hastings’ B.D., “Accho,” B.D. 2; Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 90, E.T. It was only separated from Tyre by a short day’s voyage, if the wind was favourable. Here Herod landed on his return from Italy to Syria, Jos., Ant., xiv., 15, τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς: a Christian Church at Ptolemais; founded perhaps by Philip the Evangelist. It is also very possible that a Church may have existed there ever since the dispersion after the death of St. Stephen, Acts xi. 19. On the times which St. Paul probably visited it see “Ptolemais” B.D.

Ver. 8. Φ. τοῦ εὐαγγ.: the title, as Wendt and Hilgenfeld think, may have been given to Philip on account of his evangelising work, cf. viii., 12, 40; “the Evangelist”: the honourable title gained by some signal service to the Gospel; and the two incidents noted in his career, his preaching to the Samaritans, and to the Ethiopian eunuch, each mark an advance in the free development of the Church (Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 299). He had originally been set apart for other work, vi. 2, but both he and St. Stephen had been called to higher duties, and it is not sufficient to say that he was called an “evangelist” to distinguish him from Philip the Apostle, for that would have been done sufficiently by calling him “one of the Seven”. The word only occurs twice elsewhere in the N.T., Ephes. iv. 11, 2 Tim. iv. 5. In the former passage the Evangelists are placed between the Apostles and Prophets on the one hand, and the Pastors and Teachers on the other. The latter two offices suggested those who were attached to a settled community, whilst the Apostles and Prophets were non-local. Between the two pairs stood the Evangelists, whose work like that of Philip was to preach the Word. But it is to be carefully noted that as the title is used of the work of Philip, “one of the Seven,” and of that of Timothy, an Apostolic delegate, 2 Tim. iv. 5, it may have denoted an employment rather than an office, “a work rather than an order,” and it
might be truly said that every Apostle was an Evangelist, but that not every Evangelist was an Apostle. At the same time their work may well have been more restricted locally than that of the Apostles, cf. Theodoret on Ephes. iv. 11, and also Eusebius, H.E., ii. 3, iii. 37, itinerant work of an Evangelist, "Evangelist," B.D. 3. The title is not found in the Apostolic Fathers or in the Didache, and the latter omission Harnack would explain on the ground that the "Apostles" in the Didache were just Evangelists; but it would seem, if we admit the reference to 2 Tim. iv. 5, that the title was already in general use, and that it was not limited to Apostles. Meyer sees in the Evangelists those who transmitted orally the facts of our Lord’s life and teaching, before the existence of written Gospels; but however tempting this view may be, we can scarcely define the Evangelists’ work so precisely, and still less thus distinguish it from that of the Apostles; but see, however, as favouring Meyer’s view, "Evangelist," Hastings’ B.D. Ewald’s remarks on Philip as an Evangelist are still of interest, Die drei ersten Evangelien, i., 48 ff.: on the mistake which confused this Philip with Philip the Apostle, see Salmon, Introd., 313.—els K.: on two occasions St. Paul had already visited Caesarea, ix. 30, xviii. 22, and he would probably have met Philip previously; but we have no knowledge of any previous meeting between St. Luke and Philip. We can conceive something of the importance of such a meeting when we remember the advantage which the latter’s knowledge of the events in the early history of the Church would possess for the future historian. Philip’s presence in Caesarea at once connects itself with the notice in viii. 40, and thus indicates a unity of authorship in the whole book.—δυτικά τῶν ἑπτά: the notice shows us how the early part of the book is taken for granted by the writer of the latter part (so Lightfoot and Salmon). This is surely more intelligible and satisfactory than to refer the words to the "author to Theophilus," or to regard it with Clemen as a later addition perhaps by his R., who already betrayed, xiv. 8, a knowledge of the sources of the first part of the book, or perhaps by R.J., who then connected Historia Petri and Historia Pauli. Jüngst refers the notice in viii. 40 to a Reviser who thus seeks to connect the Philip of chap. viii. with Caesarea, and so to identify him with the Philip here.

Ver. 9. παρθένοι: an unwedded life might enable them to wait on the Lord without distraction, and thus to be more free for the exercise of their gift of prophecy, but nothing is said of any separate order, or anything to lead us to suppose that they did not share the home life of their father, or that they had devoted themselves to God by any special vow (see however in support of this latter view Felten, Knabenbauer, Plumptre, C. and H.). St. Jerome, Epist., v., 8, cviii., 8, in relating the story of Paula mentions how she saw at Caesarea the house of Cornelius now turned into a Christian church, and the humble abode of Philip, and the chambers of his daughters, the four virgins "which did prophesy".—προφητεύουσαι, cf. Joel ii. 28, 29, Acts ii. 17, xix. 6, 1 Cor. xi. 5, xiv. 24, although nothing is said of their possessing the power of prediction, or foretelling anything concerning Paul. Since women were forbidden to teach it would seem that the prophet as such was not a teacher; Bigg, Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, p. 29. But whilst there is no reason to suppose that they prophesied in the church, although even Felten supposes that in Churches not founded by Paul different rules might have prevailed, they would be able to speak and to teach in private or at home especially amongst the women both Jews and Gentiles, to whom in the East men would have had no access (Luckock, Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke, ii., p. 214). This verse is regarded by Hilgenfeld as an addition made by the "author to Theophilus" (so Renan). Spitta however thinks that something ought to have been said as to the nature of the prophecies uttered by the four daughters, but that instead of this we have the notice of Agabus in ver. 10. He therefore believes that the "We" section was interrupted at ver. 10, and that the verses following are interpolated from his inferior source B. The reference to weeping in ver. 13 is much more natural if we presuppose the presence of women, so he therefore reads.

"they prophesied with tears over the fate of Paul" (p. 339); so somewhat similarly Jüngst (p. 177).

Ver. 10. ἡμὰς πλεῖον: "many days," R.V., "some " margin; literally "more days," the phrase is used vaguely with what Ramsay calls Luke's usual defective sense of time, cf. xiii. 31, xxv. 14. The phrase is also found in xxvii. 20, so that it occurs twice in the "We" sections and twice in the rest of Acts, but nowhere else in N.T., see Hawkins, Hora Synoptica, p. 151, Klostermann, Vindicia Lucana, p. 53. Often in LXX. Weiss thinks that the phrase here, cf. ver. 4, shows that Paul had given up all idea of reaching Jerusalem for Pentecost; but see on the other hand Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 297, and Salmon, Introd., p. 300: probably the Apostle had several days to spare when he reached Caesarea, and he would naturally calculate his time differently when he had made a prosperous voyage, so that there is no contradiction with xx. 16. —προφ. οὐσία. Α.: probably the same who is mentioned in xi. 25, since he too came from Jerusalem. It has seemed strange to Blass and to others that St. Luke mentions Agabus here so indefinitely, but in this "We" section it would seem that St. Luke refers to Agabus in this vague way because this was the first time that he had seen the prophet (unless we accept D in xi. 28). It is therefore quite unnecessary to regard the mention of his name in xi. 28 as an interpolation. Agabus is evidently enabled not only to declare the will of God, but also to predict the future.

Ver. 11. ἀρας τὴν ἐςῃν: the symbolic action by Agabus reminds us of the O.T. prophets, cf. 1 Kings xxii. 11, Isa. xx. 2, Jer. xiii. 1, Ezek. iv. and v. Agabus as a dweller in Jerusalem would know something of that bitter feeling against Paul, and would wish to warn him.—παραδ. εἰς ἄ., cf. the words of our Lord, Luke ix. 44, xi. 7: phrase frequent in LXX both in Psalms and Prophets, cf. Ecclus. iv. 19, xi. 6; 1 Macc. iv. 30.

Ver. 12. παρεκ. ημείς: St. Luke joins in the entreaty.—οὐδέπ., i.e., the Christians of Caesarea, including of course the inmates of Philip's house; not in LXX or Apocr., but in classical Greek.—τοῦ μὴ ἀναβ., Burton, p. 159.

Ver. 13. Τί ποιεῖτε κλαί.: what do ye, weeping! (as we might say "what are you about!" etc.), cf. Mark xi. 5. (Acts xiv. 15).—συνθ.: in Attic Greek, to break, to break in pieces, and so ἀναθρύπτω is used of (1) breaking in pieces, (2) breaking in spirit, enervating τὰς ψυχὰς, cf. Plat., Rep., 495 E.; here συνθ. means to weaken the Apostle's purpose rather than to break his heart in sorrow.—ἐγὼ, emphatic, I for my part.—οὗ μόνον in N.T., rather than μὴ μόνον with the infinitive, Burton, p. 183.—ἀνέπλημμα ἦν: the exact phrase only once elsewhere in N.T., and there used by St. Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 14 (cf. 1 Pet. iv. 5): "qui paratus est, ei leve onus est." Bengel. Ewald compares this firm determination and courage of St. Paul with our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem, cf. Luke ix. 51.

1 Instead of αποστημον, so Blass in β, and Hilg. Blass proposed απασπασμενοι; but did not put in text; see Ramsay's criticism of Blass on this passage, Expositor, March, 1895.

2 Instead of αγονες κ.τ.λ. Blass in β text (following D, Syr. H. mg.) οντος δε γην ημε προς ου εξευςθυμεν, κα παραγενομενοι εις τινα κωμην εγενομεθα παρα Mnason K. μαθητη αρχ. κακειδεν εξευςτες ιλινομεν εις 1. From the trans. given in comment. it would appear that the Caesarean disciples accompanied Paul on a journey of no less than sixty-four miles to Jerusalem to introduce him to Mnason, who lived in the Holy City. But the improbability of this has been justly urged by Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 128 (so too Salmon, Hermathena, xxi., p. 239; Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 343), not only on account of the long distance, too long for one day, but also because Paul might presumably have relied upon the hospitality of private friends, already known in Jerusalem, to say nothing of the brethren referred to in ver. 17. But the β text makes Paul rest at the house of Mnason, not at Jerusalem, but at some village on the way, and the Caesarean disciples might naturally accompany Paul to a village known to them, but not to Paul, where their fellow-disciple (Mnason) dwelt. The originality of the β text is supported not only by Belser and Zöckler, but by Holtzmann, Th. Zs., p. 81, 1896, and Hilgenfeld; but, on the other hand, see Corssen, G. G. A., p. 438, 1896, and Weiss, Codex D, p. 101; Page, Classical Reviewer, pp. 318, 319 (1897), Wendt (1899), p. 342, and Schmiedel, u. s. Wendt cannot see why, if β text was original, it could have been altered into T.R., whereas if we note that the arrival of Paul at Jerusalem is only notified in ver. 17, the lodging with Mnason might well have been placed previously at some village on the route. But if we give the proper force to ανεβαινομεν, ver. 15, the a text properly understood (as Zahn admits) implies the same fact as is brought out in β, νυκτ., that Mnason entertained the company, not at Jerusalem, but on the evening of the first day of their journey thither; ver. 16, they set about the journey; ver. 17, they came to Jerusalem, see especially Ramsay, Expositor, March, 1895, and his preference for the “Eastern” as against the “Western” reading (although Zöckler is still unpersuaded by Ramsay's arguments, Greiffenwalder Studien, p. 138).

Ver. 15. ανεβ.: A.V., “took up our baggage,” but the latter word is not used now in a passive sense for luggage or impedimenta, as in O.T., Judg. xviii. 21, 1 Sam. vii. 22, Isa. x. 18, cf. Shakes., Tempest, v. 1, 3: “Time goes upright with his carriage” (burden); see also Plumptre's interesting note on the word. R.V., reading εστω, renders “we took up our baggage,” margin “made ready our baggage,” τα προς την δωτηριαν λα-ren. D. B., Chrys., Ramsay renders “having equipped horses,” Xen., Hell., v., 3, 1, and see St. Paul, p. 302: the journey on foot, some sixty-four miles, was scarcely probable for Paul, especially if, as it would seem from D, it was accomplished in two days. Grotius took it as = “sarcinas jumentis imponere,” as if utroqu. Xen., Hell., vii., 2, 18. Hackett and Rendall refer the word to the packing up of the valuable alms which St. Paul was carrying to Jerusalem, but this interpretation seems fanciful, although Hackett supposes that the contribution might have consisted in part of raiment or provisions. Belser still more curiously refers it to getting change in the current money of Palestine for the alms collected in the coin of various lands. —ἀνεβ.: imperfect,
17. ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, ἄρμενος ἔδεατο ἡμᾶς οἱ ἀδελφοί. 18. τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἶπαν ὁ Παύλος σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰάκωβων, πάντες τε παρεγένοντο οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. 19. καὶ ἀπασχολοῦντο ἄνωτέρω, ἔφης δὲ καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐντολήν ἐν τοῖς ἑθεσιν διὰ τῆς διακονίας οὗτος. 20. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἔδοξαντο, εἶπον δὲ τῷ Κύριῳ, ἑπόμενος εἰς ἡμᾶς, καὶ πάντες ἔμφυται τοῦ κόμου
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Ver. 16. ἐγενετο παρ' ἐξων: A. and R.V. render "bringing them with Mnason with whom we should lodge," but Meyer-Wendt, so Fage and Rendall, render "bringing us to the house of Mnason," etc., cf. also Spitta, Apostelgeschichte, p. 234. This is in more accordance with Codex D, on which see critical note = ἐγενετο παρ' ἐξων, see on xviii. 27, ἄξιδεία.

Ver. 17. There is no good reason to doubt that they were in time for the Feast; it is a legitimate inference from the tarrying at Cæsarea: possibly the presence of Jews from Asia may be taken, as Rendall points out, to indicate that the time of the Feast was near at hand. —ἀγγέλων: only here, significantly; omitted in i. 41 (R.V., W.H.); 2 Macc. iv. 12, x. 33 A, 3 Macc. iii. 15, v. 21, so in classical Greek. Even if the welcome only came, as Wendt supposes, from those who were comparatively few amongst many in Jerusalem, St. Paul found himself a brother amongst brethren. —ἐδέξασθε, see on xviii. 27, ἐπιθέρμασι.

Ver. 18. τῇ ἐπιούσῃ, three times in "We" sections, twice in rest of Acts; nowhere else in N.T. (in vii. 26 with ἡμέρα), Hawkins, u.s. —σὺν ἡμῖν: the writer thus again claims to be an eyewitness of what passed; it may well have been the occasion for the reception of the alms collected from the Churches. —Ἰάκωβων: on the authoritative position of St. James as further shown here see Hort, Ecclesia, p. 105, and Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood, p. 147. Nothing is said of the Apostles, and they may have been absent from Jerusalem on missionary work or at least the chief of them. They would scarcely have been included under the term πρεσβ., as Wendt supposes.

Ver. 19. ἀσπάσασθαι: used of farewell greetings, xx. 1, xxi. 6, and of greetings on arrival, xviii. 22, xxi. 7, for its use here cf. 1 Macc. x. 5. —ἐγενετο, see on x. 8, etc. —καθ' ἐκ Θεοῦ: "one by one," R.V., cf. Ephes. v. 33. —διακονίας, see note on vi. 1, 2.

Ver. 20. ἐδοξαζότα: "recte imperf. quia finis verbo εἶπαν indicatur," Blass. —Θεωρείς: the word seems to imply that Paul had already become cognisant of the fact by his own observations in his ministerial work. —ἀδελφός: St. Paul is recognised as an ἀδελφός not only by St. James but by the assembled elders (see also Weiss, in loco). —Ἰουδάω, see critical note. —μυριάδες, cf. Luke xii. 1, of a large but indefinite number (cf. 1
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υπάρχουσι. 21. κατηχήθησαν δὲ περὶ σοῦ, ὅτι ἀποστασίαν ἔδωκας ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων τοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἑκάστας ἱσχύοντας ἰουδαίους, λέγων μὴ περιτέμνεων αὐτῶν τὰ τέκνα, μηδὲ τοὺς ἰδίους περιπατεῖν. 22. τί οὖν ἦστι; πάντως δὲ πλῆθος συνελθὼν ἀκούστων γὰρ ὅτι ἅλθον. 23. τῶν οὖν ποιήσον ζ διὰ φόβον ἣν ἦδεν ἄνδρες τέσσαρες εὐχὴν ἔχοντες 2 ζ φάντασμάτων. 24. τούτως παραλαβόντων ἀγνισθήσεθι σὺν αὐτοῖς, καὶ διὰ τούτου 4 εἰς αὐτοῖς, ἵνα εὐρήσωται τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ γνωσότας δὲ ἃν κατηχήθησαν περὶ σοῦ οὐδὲν ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ στοιχεῖς καὶ

1 D1, Gig. κατηχησαν, diffamaverunt, instead of κατηχήθησαν, not Blass.
3 εὗρσωνται ACcorr. ΒΕΗΛ, εὕρεσονται, A13, 27, Thedr. ; Blass in β reads εὗρεν autem with D.

Cor. iv. 15), referring to the number of believers not only in Jerusalem but in Judaea present in large numbers for the Feast. The word cannot refer to Jewish Christians in a wider sense, as Overbeck took it, because they would not need to be informed of Paul's teaching relative to the Mosaic law.—ζηλωταί του ν., cf. Gal. i. 14, Tit. ii.14, Ρet. iii.13 (2 Μacc. iv. 2, we have the same phrase, cf. 4 Μacc. xviii. 12). The extreme party of the Pharisees prided themselves on the title" zealots of the law, zealots of God"; it was a title which St. Paul himself had claimed, Lightfoot, Gal.i.14.

Ver. 21. κατηχήθησαν: the word seems to imply definite instruction, not merely audierunt, Vulgate. Hort refers to the term as implying here assiduous talking and lecturing, Ἰουδαίικη θρησκεία, p. 107.—ἀποστασίαν, cf. 1 Macc. ii. 15 (Σ ἀπόστασαν) when the officers of Antiocchus Epiphanes, in the time of Mattathias, tried to compel the people of Modin to forsake the law and to sacrifice upon the idol altar.—μὴ περιτέμνεων: these words and those which follow were an entire perversion of St. Paul's teaching, just as his enemies gave a perverted view of the Apostle's supposed intrusion with Trophimus into the temple, ver. 29.

The exemption from the Mosaic law was confined to Jewish converts, xvi. 3, i Cor. vii. 18.—τῶν ιουδαίων, cf. vi. 14, xv. 1.—περιτέμνεων: only here in Luke, but often in the Epistles in this sense, cf. Mark vii. 5.

Ver. 22. τί οὖν ἦστι, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26, cf. vi. 3 in β text.—δὲ πλῆθος συνελθὼν, see critical note.—ἀκούστων, i.e., the Judaizing Christians referred to in κατηχήθησαν, ver. 26. The words refer, not to an assembly of the whole Church, or to a tumultuary assembly, ver. 27, but to an assembly of the Judaizing Christians as above.

Ver. 23. εἰσίν ημῖν, cf. xviii. 10. The four men certainly seem to have been members of the Church at Jerusalem, i.e., Jewish Christians,—ἐφ' αὐτῶν, see critical note, the Nazirite vow lies upon them as an unfulfilled obligation. If we read αφ' it would mean him to affirm that the now had been taken by them of their own will, on their own initiation, cf. Luke xii.57, 2 Cor. iii. 5, John v. 19, 30, etc., see further Grimm-Thayer, suō v. αὐτόν, ii., 2 d, aa; and Rendall, in loco. Blass however renders ψ' "qua vocum in se recerpertum," so that it is difficult to distinguish very definitely.

Ver. 24. παραλαβόντων, cf. ver. 26, xv. 39 (xvi. 33): take in a friendly way, associate thyself with them as a companion.—ἀγνισθήσετι σὺν αὐτοῖς: the advice is characteristic of the Apostle who had lived as St. James had lived, Eusebius, H.E., ii., 23, and it certainly seems to demand that St. Paul should place him—

Ver. 25. ἡμείς, cf. reading in β text, but in any case ἡμείς is emphatic, intimating that St. James and the Church at Jerusalem could not condemn St. Paul's attitude towards Gentile Christians, since they had themselves consented to place these Gentile Christians on a different footing from that of the born Jews who became Christians. —ἔπεστις, see critical note, cf. xv. 20 (Zöckler). —μηδὲν τουῦτὸν τῷρ, see critical note. —Wendt with Schürer objectsto the whole reference to the Apostolic Conference, and sees in the verse the hand of a Redactor, as in xvi. 4 (see note, p. 346, edit. 1899). But the reference may well imply that St. James on his part was quite prepared to adhere to the compact entered into at the Conference with regard to

self on a level with the four men and take upon himself the Nazirite vow, cf. Num. vi. 3. The σὺν αὐτοῖς can hardly be explained otherwise. But how far the obligation of the vow extended in such a case is not clear (Edersheim, Temple and its Services, p. 326), and the time specified does not seem to allow for the commencement and completion of a vow on the part of the Apostle, although we cannot satisfactorily explain such expressions as the one before us, cf. Ἰησοῦς, xxiv. 18, on the supposition that St. Paul only associated himself with the company of the four votaries and incurred the expenses of their sacrifices. Dr. Hort suggests that the Apostle may have been himself about to offer sacrifices in the Temple in connection with some previous vow, or that in connection with the Gentile offerings which he had brought to Jerusalem and safely delivered (as it would seem) he may have proposed to offer a solemn peace-offering in the Temple, cf. καὶ προσφέρας, xxiv. 17, and Rom. xv. 16, Fudaistic Christianity, pp. 103, 110; on the verb προσφέρας see also Hort's First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 87.—δαπάνησον επ' αὐτοῖς: "be at charges for them," R.V., spend money upon them. It was considered a meritorious act thus to defray the expenses of their sacrifices for poor Nazirites; Josephus, Ant., xix., 6, 1, how King Agrippa on his arrival at Jerusalem acted thus with a view to conciliate popular favour, Edersheim, u. z., p. 326, Renan, Saint Paul, p. 519, Kypke, Observ., ii., 113; cf. Mishna, Nazir, ii., 6. J. Weiss supposed that the money would have been furnished out of the contributions brought by Paul, and that such em
Gentile Christians, and that he expects St. Paul on his side to show that he has no desire to disparage the law in the eyes of Jewish Christians.

Ver. 26. τότε ὁ Παύλος: St. Paul's conduct was another illustration of the rule laid down for himself when writing to Corinth, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 20. This is in itself an answer to the captious criticism which doubts the truth of his action on this occasion, cf. amongst recent writers Hilgenfeld (1896). The vow of Acts xviii. 18 is sufficient to show us that there is no reason to suppose that the Apostle was merely acting a part in following the advice of St. James. McGiffert discusses the question at length, p. 340 ff., and concludes that the Apostle may well have done just what he is reported to have done; and further, that as a simpler explanation of Paul's arrest would have answered every purpose, the explanation given may fairly be assumed to be the true one. Renan, Saint Paul, p. 517, also accepts the narrative as an illustration of St. Paul's own principle referred to above in 1 Cor. ix. 20, so too Wendt, J. Weiss, Pfeiderer. It seems strange that Wesley should have gone so far in the opposite direction as to believe that the Apostle actually suffered for his compliance with the wish of St. James, ver. 33, cf. Speaker's Commentary, in loco. —διαγγέλλω: "declaring," R.V., i.e., to the priests, not omnibus edicens (Grotius, so Grimm), "to signify" as in A.V., makes the participle future; verb only used by St. Luke in N.T. (Rom. xi. 17, quotation from LXX), 2 Macc. i. 33 (cf. its use in the sense of publication, Ps. ii. 7, lviii. 13, cf. 2 Macc. i. 33, iii. 34, Ecclesiast. xliii. 2). —τὴν έκπ. τῶν ή, του αγ., i.e., the seven days, ver. 27, which remained until the period of the vow was fulfilled, when the sacrifice was offered. Others however take τοιούτου with ελογια, "he entered in . . . (and remained) until the offering," etc.—οπέρ ενος ἐκάστου αὐτῶν: there is no need to suppose with Nösgen that these words mean that the period of the full accomplishment of the vow was different in each of the four cases—at all events the whole period of "purification" did not extend over more than seven days.

Ver. 27. αἱ ἑπτά ημέραι: it does not appear that the seven days were enjoined by the law—not even in Num. vi. 9; indeed it would appear from Jos., B.J., ii., 15, that a period of thirty days was customary before the sacrifice could be offered. There is no need to suppose with Nösgen that these words mean that the period of the Nazirite vow should include a period of seven days, but as there is admittedly no reference to any such ordinance elsewhere, it is precarious to depend too much upon it. It seems impossible to refer the expression to the seven days observed as the Feast of Pentecost; the article before επτά ημ. refers to the "days of purification" just mentioned, see further critical note and Knabenbauer for summary of different views.—οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς 'Α. Ἰ.: "the Jews from Asia," R.V., cf. vi. 9, where we
28. κράζοντες, Ἀνδρεὶς Ἰσραήλιται, βοηθεῖτε· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς ὁ κατὰ τὸν λαὸν καὶ τοῦ κόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου τούτου πάντας· πανταχοῦ διδάσκω· έτι τε καὶ Ἕλληνας εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸ ιερόν, καὶ 2 κεκοιμήκη τὸν ἄγιον τόπον τούτον. 29. (ήσαν γὰρ προεωρακότες Τρόφιμον τὸν Ἐφέσον ἐν τῇ πόλει σὺν αὐτῷ, δυνόμενον δια τὸ τὸ ιερὸν εἰσήγαγεν ὁ Παύλος.) 30. έκκυθη τῇ πόλει διῆ, καὶ έγένετο συνδρομὴ τοῦ λαοῦ· καὶ επιλαβόμενοι του Παύλου, ἐλκὼν αὐτὸν λέγων τοῦ ιεροῦ· 1 πανταχῇ ΝΑΒCDE (W.H. and Blass in β -χα), so Weiss ; var. often in classical Greek.

1 For κεκοίμηκε D¹ has κεκοιμήθην, D² κεκοιμήκη, but Blass follows T.R.

2 άνθρωπος, D has νομιμοί, not Blass.

read of the Jews of Cilicia, etc., who disputed with Stephen.—θεασάμ., cf. xxiv. 18, where St. Paul tells us how these Jews had found him in the Temple purified, i.e., with the Nazirite vow upon him, and in the act of presenting offerings—not of creating a disturbance, as his enemies alleged. These Jews, who were of course not believers, may have come from Ephesus, and were full of enmity against the Apostle for escaping them there, cf. xx. 3—they had come up to worship at Pentecost.—συνέχεον, see on ix. 22.—ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, cf. xii. 1.

Ver. 28. "Ἀνδρεῖς Ἰσρ.: the title which would remind them of the special dignity and glory of their nation, of its hopes and obligations.—βοηθεῖτε: as if against some outrage, or perhaps as if to apprehend Paul, or to attack him—in doing anything to admit the Gentiles, Ἔλληνας, to God's fold, St. Paul was exposing himself to the hatred of these unbelievers amongst his countrymen, 1 Thess. ii. 16, Hort, 'Judaistic Christianity,' p. 107.—οὗτός: contemptuous.—κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ: the name for Israel, see on iv. 25, the same charge in almost the same words had been brought against St. Stephen, vi. 13; "before the Jewish authorities blasphemy was alleged, before the Roman, sedition".—πάντας πανταχοῦ, πανταχῇ or τῇ W.H., cf. xvii. 30, 1 Cor. iv. 17,—πανταχῇ: only here. The three words show the exaggerated nature of the charge; on St. Luke's characteristic use of τός and kindred words see p. 51.—ἐτι τα καὶ, connecting thus closely the alleged act of introducing Gentiles into the Temple with the foregoing, as an illustration that Paul did not confine himself to preaching against the Holy Place, but had proceeded to defile it by his action; but cf. Simcox, 'Language of the N.T.,' p. 163, "and further hath brought Greeks also," cf. xix. 27.—"Ελληνας: only one man, Trophimus, had been actually seen with Paul, so that we again note the exaggerated charge, and even with regard to Trophimus, ἄνθρωπος, they only conjectured—they had no positive proof.—κέκοιμηκέ: perfect, "sed manet pollutio," Blass, in loco, see also Gram., p. 194.

Ver. 29. τον 'Εφέσ.: if some of these Jews, as is very probable, came from Ephesus, they would have recognised Trophimus. The latter had not only come "as far as Asia," xx. 4, but had evidently accompanied Paul to Jerusalem; on the statement and its bearing upon 2 Tim. iv. 20, see Salmon, 'Introduct.,' p. 401, and Weiss, 'Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus,' p. 354.—προεωρακότες: antea videre, in classical Greek nowhere as here, but referring to future, or space, not to past time; Blass, in loco, compares 1 Thess. ii. 2, Rom. iii. 9, for πρό.—εἰς τὸ ιερόν, i.e., from the Court of the Gentiles (into which the uncircumcised Greeks like Trophimus and others might enter) into the inner Court, open to Jews only. The punishment for such transgression by a Gentile was death, even if he was a Roman citizen, Jos., B. J., vi. 2, 4. At the foot of the stair by which "the Court" in the strict sense of the word was approached there was a railing bearing notice in Greek and Latin with the prohibition and the punishment due to its violation. For one of these inscriptions discovered and published in 1871 by Clermont-Ganneau see Revue archéologique, xxiii., 1872, Schürer, 'Jewish People,' div. i., vol. ii., p. 74, and div. ii., vol. i., p. 266. E.T. (where other references are given), Ebersheim, 'Temple and its Services,' p. 24, Plumptre, 'Acts,' in loco, Blass, in loco, cf. Jos., Ant., xiv., 11, 5, B. J., v., 5, 2.
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καὶ εἶδον ἐκλείσθησαν οἱ θύραι. 31. ζητοῦντων δὲ αυτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ἀνέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης, ὅτι δὴ συγκέχυται ἱεροσαλήμ. 32. δὲ ἐξαυτῆς παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους, κατέδραμεν επ' αὐτοὺς. οἱ δὲ ἱδόντες τὸν χιλιάρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἀπελάβατο τὸν Παύλον.

33. τότε ἐγγίσας οἱ νυμφικοὶ τοῦ Ιεροῦ σαλίμ, ἀποκταίνοντες τὸν Παύλον, ἀπέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης, ὅτι συγκέχυται ἵνα κατασφάλισθησαν τα ἱερατικά. 32. δὲ εξαυτῆς παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους, κατέδραμεν επ' αὐτοὺς. οἱ δὲ ἱδόντες τὸν χιλιάρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἀπελάβατο τὸν Παύλον. 33. τότε ἐγγίσας οἱ νυμφικοὶ τοῦ Ιεροῦ σαλίμ, ἀποκταίνοντες τὸν Παύλον, ἀπέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης, ὅτι συγκέχυται ἵνα κατασφάλισθησαν τα ἱερατικά. 32. δὲ εξαυτῆς παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους, κατέδραμεν επ' αὐτοὺς. οἱ δὲ ἱδόντες τὸν χιλιάρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἀπελάβατο τὸν Παύλον. 33. τότε ἐγγίσας οἱ νυμφικοὶ τοῦ Ιεροῦ σαλίμ, ἀποκταίνοντες τὸν Παύλον, ἀπέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης, ὅτι συγκέχυται ἵνα κατασφάλισθησαν τα ἱερατικά. 32. δὲ εξαυτῆς παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους, κατέδραμεν επ' αὐτοὺς. οἱ δὲ ἱδόντες τὸν χιλιάρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἀπελάβατο τὸν Παύλον. 33. τότε ἐγγίσας οἱ νυμφικοὶ τοῦ Ιεροῦ σαλίμ, ἀποκταίνοντες τὸν Παύλον, ἀπέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης, ὅτι συγκέχυται ἵνα κατασφάλισθησαν τα ἱερατικά. 32. δὲ εξαυτῆς παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους, κατέδραμεν επ' αὐτοὺς. οἱ δὲ ἱδόντες τὸν χιλιάρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἀπελάβατο τὸν Παύλον.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

καὶ ἐπισήματο τίς· δι'e, καὶ τί ἐστι πεποιημένος. 34. ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο τί ἐβοῶν ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ· μὴ δυνάμενος δὲ γνώμαι τὸ ἀσφαλές διὰ τὸν θόρυβον, ἐκλείσας ἄγεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν. 35. σὺς δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναβαθμούς, συνέβη βαστάζεσθαι αὐτὸν ὧδε τῶν στρατευτῶν διὰ τὴν βίαν τοῦ ὄχλου. 36. ἡκολούθει γὰρ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαὸς 4 κραζέ· ἄρα αὐτὸν.

37. Μάλλον τε ἐισάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν ὁ Πάουλος λέγει τῷ χιλιάρχῃ, Εἰ ἔστι μοι εἰπέν τι πρὸς σέ; ὁ δὲ ἐφη. Εὐλημνησί


2 εβοῶν HLP, Chrys.; επεφωνοῦν ΝABDE, Tisch., W.H., etc., as above. δυναμενος δε ΗLP, Chrys.; επεφωνοῦν ΝABDE, Tisch., W.H., etc., as above. δυναμενος δε ΗLP, Chrys.; επεφωνοῦν ΝABDE, Tisch., W.H., etc., as above.

3 επὶ τοὺς ἀναβ., D has εις (ad hoc esse in gradus d).

4 Instead of κραζεν (DHLP, Syr. H., Chrys.), which seems to be a gramm. emend., ΝABE, Syr. Pesh., Theophl., same auth. as in ver. 34 have κραζοτεν.

5 D προ αιρε has αναιρεσθαι (Gig., Sah. add τον εχθρον ημων, cf. xxiv. 18, xxviii. 19).

the camp which it occupies (so in LXX = Heb. יבכ יבכ תְנַכְּפָא Judges iv. 16, viii. 10, I Macc. v. 28). In this passage may = the castle itself, as A. and R.V., or perhaps the barracks in the castle. A Macedonian word according to Phryn., but see Kennedy, Sources of N.T. Greek, pp. 15, 16, and also for its meaning here, Schürer, Jewish People, div. i., vol ii., p. 55, E. T.

Ver. 35. ἐγένετο ὑπό, cf. ver. 17, and Luke xxiv. 22, Grimm, sub γίν., 5, 6. ἐβοῶν the steps which led up to the fortress from the Temple area. Β.θ., ν., 5, 8, describes the surroundings of the scene vividly, and the καταβάσεις which led down from Antonia to the Temple; see above on ver. 31, and O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 138.—συνεβη βαστάζει: the σύν is not superfluous (see Meyer-Wendt and Hackett), it indicates the peril of the situation; the pressure of the people became increasingly violent as they saw that St. Paul would escape them, and compelled the soldiers to carry him, that he might not be torn from them altogether, so that the carrying was not merely "propter angustias loci". βαστάζει, cf. iii. 2, see Schürer, u. s.

Ver. 36. ἡκολούθη, imperfect, "kept following".—Αἴρε αὐτὸν: the cry was continuous; it was the same cry which had been raised against another and a greater prisoner Who had been delivered to the Romans as a malefactor, cf. Luke xxiii. 18, John xix. 15, and also Polycarp, Martyr, iii., 19.

Ver. 37. παρεμβ., see on ver. 34.—εἰ, cf. i. 6.—Εὐλημνησί; no need to supply λαλεῖν, cf. Xen., Cyr., vii., 5, 31; so in Latin, Graecē nescire, Cic., Pro Flacco, iv., Vulgate, literally, Graecē nosti?

Ver. 38. οὐκ οὔσα εἰ, cf. Arist., Avv., 280 (Blass). Vulgate, Eras. render Nonne tu es...? but emphasis on οὐκ "Thou art not then" (as I supposed). No doubt the false prophet to whom reference is made by Josephus. Whilst Felix was governor he gathered the people around him on the Mount of Olives to the number of 30,000, and foretold that at his word the walls of the city would fall. But Felix attacked him and the impostor fled although the majority (πλείστοι) of his followers were captured or slain, Jos., Β.θ., ν., 8, 6, Josephus states that 400 were killed and 200 wounded, so that he evidently contradicts himself and his numbers are untrustworthy. For the various attempts to reconcile these different notices, cf. Krenkel, Ιosephus und Lukas, p. 243. But apart from this, there is no positive discrepancy with St. Luke. It is possible that the chiliarch as a soldier only reckoned those who were armed, whilst Josephus spoke of the whole crowd of followers. Evidently the Roman officer thought that the Egyptian had returned after his flight, and that he
γινώσκες; 38. οὐκ ἂρα σὺ εἰ ὁ Ἁγίωτας ὁ πρὸ τοῦτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνεστάτωσα καὶ ἔβαγαν εἰς τὴν ἐρήμον τοὺς τετρακισχίλιους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων; 39. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, 'Εγώ ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἰμι 'Ιουδαῖος; Ταρσεύς, τῆς Κιλικίας οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης. δέομαι δὲ σου, ἐπιτρέψον μοι λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν λαόν.

1 Instead of Τ. τῆς Κ. οὐκ ασήμου πόλεως πολ. D has εἰς Ταρσον δὲ τῆς Κ. γεγενημένος, so Blass in B text, and Hilg.; instead of επιτρέψον D has συγχωρήσαι (cf. Gig.), so Blass in B text, and Hilg.

was now set upon by the people as an impostor (so also Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 180, note, E.T.). There is no sign whatever that St. Luke was dependent upon Josephus, as Krenkel maintains, but it is of course quite possible that both writers followed a different tradition of the same event. But St. Luke differs from Josephus in his numbers, there is no connection in the Jewish historian, as in St. Luke, between the Egyptian and the Sicarii, and whilst Josephus mentions the Μount of Οlives, St. Luke speak of the wilderness; Belscher, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, pp. 68, 69, Heft i., 1896, "Egyptian, The" (A. C. Headlam), Hastings' B.D.—Δ... ἀναστ. καὶ ἐξαγ.: "stirred up to sedition and led out," R.V., this rendering makes the first verb (used only in Luke and Paul) also active, as in other cases in N.T. where it occurs, Acts xviii. 6, Gal. v. 12. The verb is not known in classical writers, but cf. LXX, Dan. vii. 23, and also in the O.T. fragments, Aquila and Symm., Ps. x. 1, Iviii. ii. 11, Isa. xx. 3 (Grimm-Thayer).—<nowiki>'Εγώ ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἰμι 'Ι. . . Βάρος δὲ . . . ;': there is no strict antithesis, "I am indeed a Jew of Tarsus" (and therefore free from your suspicion); but without speaking further of this, and proceeding perhaps to demand a legal process, the Apostle adds "but I pray you," etc. Mr. Page explains, from the position of μὲν: "I (ἐγώ) as regards your question to me, am a man (ἄνθρωπος μὲν), etc., but, as regards my question to you, I ask (Βάρος δὲ . . . ).," reading in B. On St. Paul's citizenship see note below on xxii. 28. St. Paul uses ἄνθρωπος here, but ἄριφ, the more dignified term, xxii. 3, in addressing his fellow-countrymen; but according to Blass, "vix recte distinguitur quasi illud (ἄνθρωπος) ut ap. att. sit humilium," cf. Matt. xviii. 23, and xxii. 2.—λαλήσαι: Blass has a striking note on Paul's hopefulness for his people, and the proof apparent here of a man "qui populi sui summo amore imbutus nunquam de eo desperare potuit," Rom. ix.—xi.—Ιουδ. not only Ταρ., which would have distinguished him from Αιγ., but Ιουδ., otherwise the chiliarch from his speaking Greek might have regarded him as no Jew, and so guilty of death for profaning the Temple.—οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως: litotes, xx. 29, on Tarsus see ix. ττ. The city had on its coins the titles μητρόπολις αὐτόνομος. For ἄσημος, cf. 3 Μacc. iii. 1, and in classical Greek, Eurip., Ion., 8. οὐκ ἄσ. Ἐλλήνων πόλεω, i.e., Athens (Wetstein), see further xxii. 27. Hobart (so too Zahn) mentions ἄσημος as one of the words which show that Luke, when dealing with unprofessional subjects, shows a leaning to the use of professional language; ἄσημος is the technical term for "a disease without distinctive symptoms," and Hippocrates, just as Luke, says, μὲ τέλων οὐκ ἄσημος, *Epis.*, 1273. So again in xxiii. 13, ἀναδιδόναι, a word applied to the distribution of nourishment throughout the body, or of blood throughout the veins, is used by Hippocrates, as by
Luke, l.c., of a messenger delivering a letter, Epis., i. 275 (see Hobart and Zahn); but it must be admitted that the same phrase is found in Polybius and Plutarch. Still the fact remains that the phraseology of St. Luke is here illustrated by a use of two similar expressions in Hippocrates, and it should be also remembered that the verb with which St. Luke opens his Gospel, ἐπιτεθείη, was frequently used by medical men, and that too in its secondary sense, just as by St. Luke, e.g. Hippocrates begins his treatise De Prisma Med., ἄκος ἐπιτρέπους περὶ λαυρητῆς λέγειν ἢ γράφειν (see J. Weiss on Luke i. 1); so too Galen uses the word similarly, although it must be admitted that the same use is found in classical Greek and in Josephus, c. Αφιόμ., 2.

Ver. 40. ἐπιτεθείη: because he no doubt saw that Paul's purpose was to inform and pacify the people, so that there is nothing strange in such permission to speak.—κατεσεῖσε, see on xi. τ. 7.

"What nobler spectacle than that of Paul at this moment! There he stands bound with two chains, ready to make his defence to the people. The Roman commander sits by to enforce order by his presence. An enraged populace look up to him from below. Yet in the midst of so many dangers, how self-possessed is he, how tranquil!" Chrys., Hom., xlvii.-πολλῆς δὲ σιγῆς γεν., cf. Virg., Aen., i., 148-152, ii., 1; but probably the phrase means not "a great silence," but rather "aliquantum silentii" (Blass), xxii. 2, cf. Xen., Cyri., viii., 2. 5ς. ἐβάπτισθαῖν: in W. H. Εδ., see Intro., 408; so as to gain the attention, and if possible the hearts, of the people, by using the language of the people, the Aramean dialect of Palestine (Grimm-Thayer however points out that this is not rightly described as Syro-Chaldaic, it was rather Chaldee): see also Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., E.T., pp. 47, 48.

Chapter XXII.—Ver. 1. ἀνδρεῖς δ. καὶ π., cf. vii. 2. So St. Stephen had addressed a similar assembly, in which had been Saul of Tarsus, who was now charged with a like offence as had been laid to the charge of the first Martyr. Those whom he addressed were his brethren according to the flesh, and his fathers, as the representatives of his nation, whether as Sanhedrists, or priests, or Rabbis. The mode of address was quite natural, since St. Paul's object was conciliatory: τούτο τιμής, ἕκαστο γνωστότητος, Chrys., Hom., xlvii.—ἀκούσατε: "hear from me," cf. John xii. 47, a double genitive of the person and thing, as in classical Greek, or "hear my defence," cf. 2 Tim. iv. 16.—ἐπιστευγμένας: five times in St. Paul's Epistles, once elsewhere in Acts xxv. 16, in a strictly legal sense (cf. 1 Peter iii. 15). Used with the verb ἐπιστεφόμενος of defending oneself against a charge, Wisd. vi. ro, Xen., Mem., iv., 8, 5. In 2 Macc. xiii. 26 the verb is also used of Lysias ascending the rostrum and addressing the people in defence.


Ver. 3. γεγενν. εν Τ., see above p. 202.—ἀνατεθ.: although by birth a foreign Jew, yet brought up in Jerusalem, and so belonging to his hearers. It was important for the Apostle to emphasise this, as his close association with Jerusalem had a significant bearing on his future life. The comma best after Γαμ., so that each clause begins with a participle, but Weiss places comma after
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τη Εβραϊκή διαλέκτως, ΧΧΙΙ. 1-4.

και πατέρες, ἀκούσατε μοι τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀνόητης ἀπολογίας. 2. Ἀκούσατες δὲ ὑμεῖς τῆς Εβραϊκής διαλέκτου προσεφώνει ἀλλοτρίων, μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἁπάντιαν. 3. καὶ φησίν, Ἐγώ μέν εἰμι ἄνήρ Ἰουδαίος, γεγεννημένος εἰς Ταρσοῦ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατραμμένος δὲ εἰς τὴν πόλιν ταύτη παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλίλλην, πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκριβείαν τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου, ζηλωτὴς ἡπάντιαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἦσετε σημέρον. 4. δὲ ταύτη τὴν ὄθον ἔδειξα ἄξιος θανάτῳ, διεσμών καὶ παραδίδοντες εἰς φυλακὰς

1 την, but all good authorities την.
2 προσεφώνει ΝΑΒΠ, most verss., Tisch., R.V., W.H., Wendt, Weiss; L, Syr. Harcl. have προσεφώνεον; whilst DEH προσφώνει, so Blass in β, and Hilg.
3 μεν ον. ΝΑΒDΕ, Vulg., Sah., Arm., Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, W.H., Blass, R.V.; Meyer retains with ΗLP, Boh., Syr. H., Aethutr., but it may have been added after ΧΧΙΙ. 39.

ταύτη (so De Wette, Hackett). Probably Paul went to Jerusalem not later than thirteen, possibly at eleven, for his training as a teacher of the law. ἀνατέθηκε: only in Luke, cf. Acts vii. 20, 21, Luke iv. 16 (W.H. margin), "educated," so in classical Greek, 4 Macc. x. 2, xi. 15, but in latter passage AR τρεφόταν. In Wisd. vii. 4 we have ἐν σωφρόνους ἀνατραπόν (A ανατραπ.).—παρὰ τοὺς πόδας: the more usual attitude for teacher and taught according to the N.T. and the Talmud; according to later Talmudic tradition the sitting on the ground was not customary until after the death of Gamaliel L., J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., on Luke ii. 46; cf. also Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i, p. 326, E.T., and Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, pp. 14, 15, 2nd edit.; even if the later tradition was true, the scholar standing would still be at the feet of his teacher on his raised seat.—κατὰ ἀκριβείαν: noun only here in N.T., but cf. xxvi. 5, "according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers," R.V., and so practically A.V. For a comment on the words cf. Jos., Ant., xvii., 2, 4, Vita, 38, and B. Ζ., ii., 8, 18. Φαρισαῖοι οἱ δοκοῦντες μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξήγησαν τά νόμιμα: Ederseim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., 314, note on ἀκριβεία as used by Josephus and St. Paul, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i, p. 54, E.T. Whether therefore τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου (3 Macc. i. 23) included anything besides the Mosaic law or not, the words before us at least refer to the strictness upon which the Pharisees prided themselves in the observance of the law. In Gal. i. 14 St. Paul speaks of being a zealot of the traditions handed down from his fathers, πατρικῶν, where the traditions are apparently distinguished from the written law, Jos., Ant., xiii., 16, 2, and 10, 6; but the "oral law" which the scribes developed was apparently equally binding with the written Torah in the eyes of the Pharisees, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 10, 11, E.T., but cf. also Lightfoot, u.s. The word πατρῴου would appeal to the hearts of the people, who loved the Torah as the chief good, but St. Chrysostom's words are also to be remembered: "all this seems indeed to be spoken on their side, but in fact it told against them, since he, knowing the law, forsook it" Hom., xlvii. —ζηλωτής υπάρ. του Θεου: St. Paul might have called himself a zealot of the law, or a zealot of God (Lightfoot, u. s.), cf. 2 Macc. iv. 2, ζηλ. των νόμων, sued of Phinehas, 4 Macc. xviii. 12.—καθὼς πάντες ... σημέρον: he recognises that their present zeal was a zeal for God, as his own had been, ἄλλος αὐτῷ ἐπίγνωσιν, Rom. x. 2: argumentum concilians, Bengel.

Ver. 4. ταύτη τὸν ὄθον, see above ix. 2.—ἄξιος θανάτου: sometimes taken to mean not that he prosecuted the Christians "unto death" (for if this was the meaning the following participles would sound feeble), but that this was his aim; ver. 20 and xxvi. 10, however, seem fully to justify the former meaning.—ψυλάκας:
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

Πάντα δὲ καὶ ἄρχωνος ἡμών, 5. οὐκ ἔστω μαρτυρεῖν μοι, καὶ πάντα τὸ προεσθιαντὸν· παρ' ὑμῖν καὶ ἐπιστολὰς ἔχοντες πρὸς τοὺς ἄδελφους Εἰς Δαμασκὸν ἐπορεύομαι, ἄξων καὶ τοὺς ἔκειτο δύνας ἐκεῖνον εἰς ἑρωυλαήματος, ἣν τιμωρηθοῦσι. 6. ἔγενε δὲ μιᾷ περιπολίᾳ καὶ ἐγγίζοντο τῇ Δαμασκῇ περὶ μεσημβρίαν ἐξαίην ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ περιαστράψαι φῶς ἵκαλ' ἐπὶ ἑμῖν. 7. ἔπεσον τὸ εἰς τὸ ἢδαφός, καὶ ἠκούσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι, Ἰακώβ, Ἱακώβ, τί δὲ σοι ποιήσω; 8. ἐγώ δὲ ἄκριβήν, Τίς εἰς Κύριε; ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος δὲ διέκοιμης. 9. οἱ δὲ σπών ἐμοί ἄνεσί· καὶ έμφοβοι εγένοντο· τὴν δὲ φωνήν οὐκ ἠκούσαν τού λαλοῦντος μοι. 10. εἶπον δὲ, Τί ποιήσω, Κύριε; καὶ δὲ Κύριος εἶπε πρὸς με, Ἀναστάς πορεύου εἰς Δαμασκὸν· κακεὶς σοι λαλήθησαι περὶ πάντων δὲν τέκναί σου ποιήσαι. 11. δὲ δὲ οὕτω ἐνέβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου, χειραγωγοῦμενος υπὸ τοῦ ἐδαφοῦς, καὶ ἠκούσαν φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι, Ἰακώβ, πώς με διώκεις; ἐγώ δὲ εἶπεν τῷ Κύριῳ, Τίς εἰς, Κύριε, εἶπεν πρὸς με, Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος δὲ διέκοιμης. 12. οἱ δὲ σπών ἐμοί ἄνεσί· καὶ έμφοβοι εγένοντο· τὴν δὲ φωνήν οὐκ ἠκούσαν τού λαλοῦντος μοι. 13. καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖνον ἔκειτο δύνας περὶ μεσημβρίαν· τίς ἔστω μιᾷ, περὶ πάντων δὲν τέκναί σου ποιήσαι.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

5-16.

τον συνόντων μοι ήλθον εἰς Δαμασκόν. 12. Ἄνανιας δὲ τις, ἀνήρ εὐσεβής κατὰ τὸν κόσμον, μαρτυρούμενος υπὸ πάντων τῶν κατοικούντων ιουδαίων, 13. ἠλθὼν πρὸς με καὶ ἐπιστάτη τῷ Σαουλῷ ἀδελφῷ, ἀνέβλεψεν. καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ώρᾳ ἄνεβλεψε εἰς αὐτόν. 14. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατο σε γνωται τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον, καὶ ἀκούσαι φωνῆν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. 15. διὸ ἦσας μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἄνθρωπος, ὦ εὐφρακας καὶ ἱκουσας. 16. καὶ νῦν τί μᾶλλος; ἀναστάτηκας καὶ ἀνέ-


2 After ἄνεβλεψεν Blass in β omits εἰς αὐτόν, so d, Sah., Hilg. (Schmiedel also omits), but see Wendt, note, p. 355 (1899).
λοωετος τας Αμαρτιας σου, ένιακαλεςεμος το δρομα του Κυρίου. 17. ἐγένετο δέ μοι ὑποστρέφαμεν εις ἱερουσαλήμ, και προσευχόμενον μου έν τῷ ιερῷ, γενοσθοι μεν ἐν ἑκατοντας, 18. καὶ 2 ἵδον αὐτὸν λέγοντα μου, Σπεύσον καὶ ἐξελθε ἐν τάξει εἰς ἱερουσαλήμ: διότι οδ παραδέχονται σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ. 19. καὶ ἦσον, κόρη, αὐτοὶ ἐπιστανται, δι' ἑγὼ ἦμην φυλακιζομεν καὶ δέρων κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς τοὺς πιστεύωντας ἐπὶ σε. 20. καὶ δι' ἑξεχείτο τὸ αἷμα Ἰστεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρος σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦμην ἐφεστήκὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν τῇ 4 ἀναρέσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ φυλάσσων τὰ ιμάτια τῶν άναιρούντων.

1 Instead of К. ἩΒΕ, verss., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg., have αὐτῶν.

2 οίδον AΒΕΗ LP, Vulg., Chrys., Lach., W.H., Weiss; Tisch. after ν 18, 36, 180, d has οἴδον (οἴδον, so Blass in β, and Hilg.).

3 Instead of εξεχείτο ΡΑΒ*. W.H., Weiss, Wendt have εξεχύνετο: Blass. -νετο with ΒΕ. Στέφ. om. A 68, but no other authorities.


tioned at all, and the commission comes directly from the mouth of the Lord. It might be sufficient simply to say "quod quis per alium facit id ipse fecisse putatur," but before the Roman governor it was likely enough that the Apostle should omit the name of Ananias and combine with the revelation at his conversion and with that made by Ananias other and subsequent revelations, cf. xxvi. 16-18. Festus might have treated the vision to Ananias with ridicule, Agrrippa would not have been influenced by the name of a Jew living in obscurity at Damascus (Speaker's Commentary).

Ver. 17. Ἰγν. δι' αὐτοῦ ἶδον: refers to the first visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem after his Conversion, Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 84, 93, 125. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 60, refers it to the second visit, (1) because the reason for Paul's departure from Jerusalem is given differently here and in ix. 29. But may not St. Luke be describing the occurrence in relation to the Jews and the Church, and St. Paul in relation to his own private personal history, St. Luke giving us the outward impulse, St. Paul the inner motive (Hackett), so that two causes, the one natural, the other supernatural, are mentioned side by side? cf. Acts xiii. 2-4 (so Lightfoot, Felten, Lumby). (2) Ramsay's second reason is that Paul does not go at once to the Gentiles, but spends many years of quiet work in Cilicia and Antioch, and so the command of the vision in vv. 20, 21, is not suitable to the first visit. But the command to go to the Gentiles dates from the Apostle's Conversion, quite apart from the vision in the Temple, cf. ix. 15, xxvi. 17, and the same commission is plainly implied in xxii. 15; the words of the command may well express the ultimate and not the immediate issue of the Apostle's labours. On ἵδον, Luke seventeen times, Acts twenty-one, and ἵδον followed by infinitive, see Hawkins, Hora Synoptica, p. 30, and Plummer's St. Luke, p. 45. For the reading in xii. 25, ὑπέστ. εἰς τω ιερῷ, and its bearing on the present passage see Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 63, 64, and also above, xi. 29, xii. 25. —προσευχ. . . . τῇ ἱερῷ: there was a special reason for the mention of the fact before St. Paul's present audience; it showed that the Temple was still for him the place of prayer and worship, and it should have shown the Jews that he who thus prayed in the Temple could not so have profaned it, Lewin, St. Paul, ii., p. 146.—ἐν ἑκατοντας, x. 10. For the construction see Burton, p. 175, Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 58, Blass, Gram., p. 247.

Ver. 18. σπεύσον καὶ ἵδον: implying danger, cf. ix. 29.—σου μαρτ. grounded upon the occurrence before Damascus, and so a striking testimony.

Ver. 19. Κόρη, ix. 5.—αὐτὸς ἵδον: Paul seems as it were to plead with his Lord that men cannot but receive testimony from one who had previously been an enemy of Jesus of Nazareth; the words
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

17-23.

21. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς μὲν, Πορείου, ὅτι ἔγε τὴν μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶν 1 εἰς σὲ.

22. ἦκον δὲ αὐτὸς ἁχρὶ τοῦτο τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐπήραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν λέγοντες, ἀπε ἄπ τῆς γῆς τοῦ τοιοῦτον· οὐ γὰρ καθήκον ἐξαποστελῶν ζητῶν. 23. κραυγαζόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, καὶ πιπτοῦσιν εξαποστειλω, but W.Η. marg. αποστειλω, so B; D has εξαποστειλῶ, but Blass in β = T.R.

1 εξαποστελῶ, but W.Η. marg. αποστελῶ, so B; D has εξαποστελῶ, but Blass in minusc. show imperf. not understood.

2 καθήκον, D4, but καθήκεν ABCDEHL (Blass). Other var. καθήκει, καθήκαν in minusc. show imperf. not understood.


too are directed to his hearers, so that they may impress them with the strength of the testimony thus given by one who had imprisoned the Christians.—δέρων: on the power of the Sanhedrim outside Jerusalem see on p. 151.—κατὰ τὰς συν., cf. viii. 3, xx. 20, and for such punishments in the synagogue see Matt. x. 17, xxii. 34, Mark xiii. 9, Luke xxi. 12, cf. Luke xii. 11, Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, p. 374.

Ver. 20. τοῦ μ. σου: he identifies himself with his testimony like that of the martyr is borne to Christ; on the word see p. 67; the term is here in a transitional stage from "witness" to "martyr," cf. also Rev. xvii. 6: Hackett quotes the Christians of Lyons, towards the close of the second century, refusing to be called "martyrs" because such an honourable name only belonged to the true and faithful Witness, or to those who had sealed their testimony by constancy to the end, and they feared lest they should waver: Εuseb., Hist., ν., 2.—και αυτός, cf. viii. 13, xv. 32, xxi. 24, xxiv. 15, 16, xxv. 22, xxvi. 36, here it is placed in sharp contrast to the preceding words about Stephen (with whose witness he was now identified). On και αυτος as characteristic of Luke in his Gospel and Acts see Hawkins, Hora Synoptica, p. 33, as compared with its employment by the other Synoptists, sometimes it is inserted with emphasis, Plummer on Luke i. 16.—σωρεῖν., see note on viii. 1.

Ver. 21. εἰς ἥγη: the mere mention of the Gentiles roused their fury, and they saw in it a justification of the charge in xxi. 28; the scene closely resembled the tumultuous outbreak which led to the murder of St. Stephen.

Ver. 22. διὰ τῆς γῆς, present tense, a continuous cry.—καθήκον: only used by St. Paul elsewhere in N.T., cf. Rom. i. 28. The imperfect, καθήκεν, see critical note, implies that long ago he ought to have been put to death "for it was not fit," etc., non debebat (or debuerat) vīne, Winer-Moulton, xli. 2. καθ- = προσήκον Att. In LXX, Deut. xxi. 17, Ezek. xxi. 27 (32), and other passages, also several times in Books of Macc. (see H. and R.).

Ver. 23. κραυγαζόντων δὲ (τε, Weiss, Wendt, W.Η.), only here in Acts (cf. Luke iv. 41, but doubtful: W.Η. read κράζοντα), six times in St. John, and four times in his narrative of the Passion of the cries of the Jewish multitude, cf. especially xix. 15, so too in 2 Esdras iii. 13, in classical Greek rare (Dem.), used by Epict., Diss., iii., 4, 4, of the shouts in the theatres.—μουτ. τὰ ἱμάτια: not throwing off their garments as if preparing to stone Ραul (for which Ζόκλερ compares vii. 58, and see Plato, Rep., 474 A), for the fact that the Apostle was in the custody of the Romans would have prevented any such purpose. The verb may be used as a frequentative, μοτεῖν, factare, μέτειν, jacere, while some of the old grammarians associate with it a suggestion of earnestness or effort, others of contempt, Grimm-Thayer, sub v. (for the form in LXX cf. Dan., Theod., ix., 18, 20). The word here rather means "tossing about their garments," a manifestation of excitement and uncontrollable rage, cf. Ovid, Am., iii., 2, 74, and also instances in Wetstein, cf. Chrys., who explains μοτεῖοντες, κειτεῖοντες. Dean Farrar refers to Pal. Explic. Fund, 1879, p. 77, for instances of the sudden excitability of Oriental crowds, and for similar illustrations see Hackett, in loco.—κονιορτὸν βάλλ.: best taken as...
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τα ιμάτια, και κονιορτονβαλλόντων εις τὸν ἀέρα, 24. ἐκλέασεν αὐτὸν ὁ χιλιαρχὸς ἀγεσθαί εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, εἰτέν μάστιξιν ἀνετάζεσθαι αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἐπηγγ. δι' ἥν αἰτίαν οὕτως ἐπέφωνον αὐτῷ. 25. δὲ δὲ πρὸσεκύρισεν αὐτὸν τοὺς ἱμάτιαν, εἰπὼν πρὸς τὸν ἑστῶτα ἑκάτοναρχὸν ὁ Παύλος, Ἐι ἀνθρωπόν Ρωμάιον καὶ ἀκατάκριτον ἐξέστιν ὑμῖν μᾶστιξιν; 26. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ ἑκάτοναρχος, προσελθὼν ἀνήγειε τῷ χιλιαρχῷ λέγων, ὁ ἄρα τί μέλλεις ποιεῖν. 27. προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ χιλιαρχὸς

another sign of the same rage and fury, a similar demonstration; this is preferable to the supposition that they threw dust into the air to signify that they would throw stones if they could. εἰς τὸν ἀέρα seems to imply the interpretation adopted; the dust could scarcely have been aimed at Paul, for he was out of reach; but see 2 Sam. xvi. 13.

Ver. 24. ὁ χιλ., see xxi. 31.—παρεμ., xxi. 34.—ἐίπαιν: whether the chiliarch understood Paul's words or not, he evidently saw from the outcries of the mob that the Apostle was regarded as a dangerous person, and he probably thought to obtain some definite information from the prisoner himself by torture.—μάστιξιν, cf. 2 Μacc. vii. 1, 4 Μacc. vi. 3, ix. 2, etc., and 1 Kings xii. 11, Prov. xxvi. 3, and in N.T., Heb. xi. 36; the Roman scourging was a terrible punishment; for its description cf., e.g., Keim, Geschichte Jesu, iii., p. 390 (for Jewish scourgings see Farrar, St. Paul, ii., Excurs. xi.).—ἀνετάζεσθαι: not found in classical Greek, but ἀνετάζεσθαι used specially of examination by torture. It is found in the active voice in Judg. vi. 29 A, and Susannah, ver. 14.—ἐπιείρ. : "shouted against him," R.V., see on xxi. 34, and 3 Macc. vii. 13—only here with dative.

Ver. 25. προσεκύρισεν: "and when they had tied him up with the thongs," R.V., i.e., with the figurations which kept the body extended and fixed while under flogging; Vulgate, "cum astrinxissent eum loris"; but προσεκύρισεν is rather "stretched him forward with the thongs," i.e., bound him to a pillar or post in a tense posture for receiving the blows, see critical note.

Blass takes προσεκύρισεν as an imperfect. cf. xxviii. 2.—τοῖς ιμάσιν: referring to the thongs usually employed for so binding, and this seems borne out by ver. 29 ἑπεφώνα. not "for the thongs," as in R.V. margin, so Lewin, Blass, Weiss and others, as if = μάστιξ. Grimm admits that the word may be used either of the leathern thongs with which a person was bound or was beaten, but here he prefers the latter.—τὸν ἑστῶτα ἑκάτοναρχὸν: the centurion who presided over the scourging, just as a centurion was appointed to be in charge over the execution of our Lord; on the form ἑστῶτα, only here in Acts, see Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 36, and see Μoulton and Geden, sub υ. ἑστῶτα, and above on x. τ.—εἰ: "in interrogatio subironica est, confidentia plena," Blass (so Wendt).—και: "and that too," δύο τα εγκλήματα καὶ τὸ ἑκάτον ἑκατονταρχον καὶ τὸ Ρωμαίον, Chrys., cf. xvi. 37. The torture was illegal in the case of a Roman citizen, although it might be employed in the case of slaves and foreigners: Digest. Leg. 48, tit. τ. 8, c. 1. "Et non esse a tormentis incipiendum Div. Augustus constituit." At Philippi St. Paul had probably not been heard in his protest on account of the din and tumult: "nunc quia illa negotium est cum Romanis militibus, qui modestius et gravius se gerebant, occasione utitur" Calvin.


Ver. 28. τολλοῦ κεφ., cf. LXX, Lev.
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είπεν αὐτῷ, Λέγε μοι, εἰ σὺ 'Ῥωμαῖος εἰ; οὐ δὲ ἔφη, Ναι. 28. ἀπεκρίθη τὸ χιλιάρχος, Ἐγὼ πολλοῦ κεφαλαίου τῆν πολιτείαν ταύτην ἐκπολίσαμην. οὐ δὲ Παύλος ἔφη, Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι. 29. εὐθέως οὖν ἀνέστησαν ἄντι αὐτοῦ οἱ μάλλοςι αὐτὸν ἀντάξειαν. καὶ οἱ χιλιάρχοι δὲ ἀφοβήθησαν, ἐπιγνοῦν δι' ἦν 'Ῥωμαίος ἦστι, καὶ δι' ἦν αὐτὸν διδάσκοντος.


2 In ver. 28 D reads καὶ ἀπεκρίθης ὁ Χ. εἰπεν εγὼ οἰδα πολλοῦ κεφ., so Blass in β, with Bede, so Hilg. (adding γαρ after εγώ). Alford thinks possibly original, πολλοῦ being a gloss. After εἰπεν above, Blass in β adds (before εγὼ γαρ οἰδα) οὐτος εὐχερέως Ρωμαίον σέ αυτὸν λέγει, on the authority of Bede tam facile dici sit. R. esse? Cod. Dubl. (Berger) quam facile, so Boh. (Tisch.); Belser, p. 126, defends for vividness and clearness, but neither εὐχερέως or εὐχερής occur in N.T although both are classical, and each occurs in LXX.

3 After δεδ. 137, Syr. H. mg., Sah. add καὶ παραχρημα ελύσεν αὐτὸν, so Blass and Hilg. (but see Werdent, p. 51 (1899), regards as secondary).

v. 24 (vi. 4), Num. v. 7; Jos., Ant., xii., 2, 3 (used by Plato of capital (κατάπληκτος), as opposed to interest). Mr. Page compares the making of Baronets by James I. as a means of filling the exchequer.—τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην: “this citizenship,” R.V., jus civitatis, cf. 3 Macc. iii., 21, 23, so in classical Greek. Probably A.V. renders “freedom” quite as we might speak of the freedom of the city being conferred upon any one. On the advantages of the rights of Roman citizenship see Schürer, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 277, 278, E.T., and “Citizenship,” Hastings’ B.D.—ἐκτησάμην: Dio Cassius, Lx., 17, tells us how Messalina the wife of Claudius and the freedmen sold the Roman citizenship, and how at one time it might be purchased for one or two cracked drinking-cups (see passage in full in Wetstein, and also Cic., Ad Fam., xii., 36). Very probably the Chiliarch was a Greek, Lysias, xxiii., 26, who had taken the Roman name Claudius on his purchase of the citizenship under the emperor of that name.—ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι: “but I am a Roman even from birth”; “item breviter et cum dignitate,” Blass. St. Paul’s citizenship of Tarsus did not make him a Roman citizen, otherwise his answer in xxi. 39 would have been sufficient to have saved him from the present indignity. The words may have been by manumission, Philo, Leg. ad C., 23, or for some service rendered to the state, Jos., Vita, 76, or by purchase, but on this last supposition the contrast here implied would be rendered less forcible. However the right was obtained, it is quite certain that there is nothing strange in St. Paul’s enjoyment of it. As early as the first century B.C. there were many thousands of Roman citizens living in Asia Minor; and the doubts raised by Renan and Overbeck are pronounced by Schürer as much too weak in face of the fact that it is precisely in the most trustworthy portion of Acts that the matter is vouched for.

Ver. 29. καὶ . . . δὲ, cf. iii. 24, Luke ii. 35, Matt. x. 18, xvi. 18, John vi. 51, xv. 27, Rom. xi. 23, 2 Tim. iii. 12, and other instances, Grimm-Thayer, sub υ., δέ. —ἀφοβήθη, cf. xvi. 38, and the magistrates of Philippi. He seems to have broken two laws, the Lex Porcia and the law mentioned above, ver. 26.—ἐντ. δι' ἦν 'Ῥωμαίος ἦστι: the punishment for pretending to be a Roman citizen was death, and therefore St. Paul’s own answer would have been sufficient, Suet., Claudius, 25.—δι’ ἦν αὐτὸν διδάσκοντος: on the construction usual in Luke see i. 10. The words may be best referred to the binding in ver. 25 like a slave; this is more natural than to refer them to xxi. 33. If this latter view is correct, it seems strange that Paul should have remained bound until the next day, ver. 30. No doubt it is quite possible that the Apostle’s bonds were less severe after the chiliarch was aware of his Roman
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3ο. Τη δε επαύριον βουλόμενος γνώσει το ἀσφαλές, το τί κατηγορεῖται 1 παρὰ τῶν ιουδαίων, ἡμουν αὐτὸν 2 ἐντὸ τῶν δεσμῶν, καὶ ἐκλευσεν 3 ἑλθεὶν τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ 4 ὅλον το οὐντδρον αὐτῶν · καὶ

1 παρὰ, but το τὸ ΝΑΒΟΕ, Τisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass.
2 σεσυν δεσμῶν, explanatory gloss, om. ΝΑΒΟΕ, verss., Chrys., W.H., R.V.

citizenship, and that the later notices, xxiii. 18, xxiv. 27, xxvi. 29, xxvii. 42, may contrast favourably with xxi. 33.

Ver. 30. το τί κατηγ. παρὰ τῶν Ι.: exegetical of το ἀσφαλές, cf. iv. 21 for the article, and Luke i. 62, ix. 46, xiv. 48, xxii. 2, 4, 23, 34, 37, 40; also 1 Thess. iv. 1, Rom. viii. 26, Matt. xiv. 18, Mark ix. 10, 23. The usage therefore is more characteristic of St. Luke than of the other Evangelists, Viteau, Le Grec du N.T., p. 67 (1893), Hawkins,Hora Synoptica, p. 38. — παρὰ, if retained, cf. Winer-Moulton, xlvii., 5 b, who takes it to mean "on the part of the Jews," i.e., they had not as yet presented any accusation. — ἡμουν αὐτὸν: according to ver. 29 it looks as if the chiliarch immediately knew of St. Paul's Roman citizenship released him from his severe bondage. Overbeck, Weiss, Holtzmann therefore refer τῷ ἐπαύριον only to οὐντδρο, γνώσαι, and not to ἡμουν καὶ ἐκλευσεν, but the order of the words cannot be said to favour this, and Wendt (1899) rejects this interpretation. The words may possibly mean that he was released from the custodia militaris in which he had been placed as a Roman citizen, although he had been at once released from the chains, cf. xxi. 33. In ver. 10 of the next chapter he apparently stands before the Council not in any way as a prisoner, but as one who stood on common ground with his accusers.—καταγ., i.e., from Antonia. — σὺν (ἐδεικ. · το σύν Σ. Α. Ν. E. T., Hilgenfeld, Ζιν. Τ., p. 357 ff. (1896), so Wendt, Clemen, Jüngst. J. Weiss and Spitta regard the whole scene before the Sanhedrim as an interpolation extending from xx. 30-xxii. 10. But most of the objections to the passage may be classed as somewhat captious, e.g., objection is made to the fact that on the second night of his imprisonment St. Paul is assured by Christ that he should testify at Rome, xxiii. 11; why should such a communication be delayed to the second night of the imprisonment? it belongs to the first night, just as we reckon dreams significant which occur in the first night of a new dwelling-place! So again it is urged that the vision of the Lord would have had a meaning after the tumult of the people in xxii., but not after the sitting of the Sanhedrim in xxiii. But if ver. 10 is retained there was every reason for Paul to receive a fresh assurance of safety. In xxiii. 12-35 we have again Hilgenfeld's source C, and in this too Hilgenfeld finds a denial of the preceding narrative before the Sanhedrim, on the ground that Paul's trial is not represented as having taken place, but as only now in prospect. But vv. 15, 20 may fairly be interpreted as presupposing a previous inquiry, unless we are to believe, as is actually suggested, that ἀκριβέστερον may have prompted the author of Acts to introduce the account of a preceding hearing.

CHAPTER XXIII.—Ver. 1. ἀτενίσας, see on chap. i. 10, "looking steadfastly." R.V. The word denotes the fixed steadfast gaze which may be fairly called a characteristic of St. Paul. On this occasion the Apostle may well have gazed steadfastly on the Council which condemned Stephen, and although many new faces met his gaze, some of his audience were probably familiar to him. There is no need to suppose that the word implied weakness of sight (Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 38). — ἀνδ. ξέλι: the omission of πατέρες suggests that he
addressed the assembly not as judges but as fellow-countrymen. On ἀδελ. see on i. 15. It is of course possible, as Chrysostom observes, that he did not wish to appear ἐκκαθαρισθέντος before the chil-arch.-συνείδησις: the word occurs no less than thirty times in N.T., R.V., so also in John viii. 9, but i Cor. viii. 7, συνείδησις, R.V., and of these no less than twenty times in St. Paul's Epistles, twice in Acts, on both occasions by St. Paul, three times in 1 Peter, and five times in Hebrews. It may therefore be almost reckoned as a Pauline word. It does not occur at all in the Gospels (but cf. John viii. 9), but it need hardly be said that our Lord distinctly appeals to its sanction, although the word is never uttered by Him. The N.T. writers found the word ready to their use. In Wisd. xvii. 10 (11) we have the nearest anticipation of the Christian use of the word, whilst it must not be forgotten that it first appears at least in philosophical importance amongst the Stoics. (In Eccles. x. 20 it is used but in a different sense, and in Ecclus. xii. 18, but in the latter case the reading is doubtful, and if the word is retained, it is only used in the same sense as in Eccles. x. 20.) It is used by Chrysippus of Soli, or Tarsus, in Cilicia, Diog. Laert., vii., 8, but not perhaps with any higher meaning than self-consciousness. For the alleged earlier use of the word by Bias and Periander, and the remarkable parallel expression ἄγαθη συνείδησις attributed to the latter, see W. Schmidt, Das Graecen, p. 6 (1886), and for two quotations of its use by Menander, Grimm-Thayer, sub v.; cf. also Davison, The Christian Conscience (Fernley Lectures), 1888, sec. ii. and vi.; Cremer, Wörterbuch, sub v.; Sanday and Headlam, Rom. ii. 15, and for literature "Conscience," Hastings' B.D. For the scriptural idea of the word cf. also Westcott, additional note, on Heb. ix. 9.- ἀρχηγός: however loosely the word may have been used at a later date, it seems that when St. Paul spoke, and when he wrote to the Philippians, it embraced the public duties incumbent on men as members of a body, cf. E. Hort, Ecclesia, p. 137, Lightfoot on Phil. i. 27 (iii. 20), cf. Jos., Vita, ii. St. Paul was a covenant member of a divine πολιτεία, the commonwealth of God, the laws of which he claims to have respected and observed. The word is also found in LXX, Es. viii. 13 (H. and R.), 2 Macc. vi. 1, xi. 25, and four times in 4 Macc. Lightfoot, u. s., parallels the use of the verb in Phil. by St. Paul from Clem. Rom., Cor., xxi., 1, and Polycarp, Phil., iv., 5. But Clem. Rom., u. s., vi., 1, has the phrase τοῖς ἀνθρώποις δόλως πολιτευμένοις, referring to the O.T. Saints, and so St. Peter and St. Paul. To this latter expression Deissmann, Bibelstudien, i., p. 211, finds a parallel in the fragment of a letter dating about 164 B.C. (Pap., Par., 63, coll. 8 and 9), τοῖς θεοῖς πρὸς οὔτε δόλως καλ... δικαίως (πολι)τευσάμενοι.—τῷ Θεῷ: in another moment of danger at the close of his career, 2 Tim. i. 3, the Apostle again appeals to a higher tribunal than that of the Sanhedrin or of Caesar. For the date of the object cf. Rom. xiv. 18, Gal. ii. 19.—ἀρχηγός ἀρχής τῆς θεοῦ, emphatic, because the Apostle wished to affirm that he was still in his present work for Christ a true member of the theocracy, cf. Rom. ix. 1 ff.
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στόμα. 3. τότε δὲ Παύλος πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπε, Τότενε σε μέλλει δ' θεὸς, τοιχε κεκατημένε καὶ σι υ καθή κρίνων με κατά τον νόμον, καὶ παραρμώνει κελεύεις με τόπτεος; 4. οί δὲ παραστώτας εἶπον, Τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ θεοῦ λοιδορεῖς; 5. ἔφη τε δ' Παύλος, ΟὐΚ ἴδεμ, αδελφοί, ἐπὶ ἐστιν ἀρχιερεῖς γέγραπται γάρ, "Ἀρχιερέα τοῦ λαοῦ

1 Blass reads in β text (with approval of Belser) οὐτως ερμαθαίς τε ἀρχιερεῖς τοῦ θεου λοιδορῶν; sic insil in sacerdotem Dei male dicendo, Cypr.

146.—τότενε: because Paul had forgotten that he was before his judges, and ought not to have spoken before being asked, cf. Luke vi. 29, John xviii. 22, 2 Cor. xi. 20, 1 Tim. iii. 3, Titus i. 7. The act was illegal and peculiarly offensive to a Jew at the hands of a Jew, Farrar, St. Paul, ii., p. 323.

Ver. 3. Wetstein sees in the words the customary formula of malediction among the Jews. But we need not regard Paul's words as an imprecation of evil on the high priest, but only an expression of the firm belief that such conduct would meet with punishment, cf. Knabenbauer, in loco. The terrible death of Amanias was a fulfilment of the words. On the paronomasia and other instances of the same figure see Blass, Gram., p. 292.—τοιχε κεκον., cf. Matt. xxiii. 27, Luke xi. 44, the expression may have been proverbial, in LXX, cf. Prov. xxi. 9. A contrast has been drawn between St. Paul's conduct and that of our Lord under provocation, as, e.g., by St. Jerome, Adv. Pelag., iii., 1, but there were occasions when Christ spoke with righteous indignation, and never more severely than when He was condemning the same sin which St. Paul censured—hypocrisy.

—καὶ σι', emphatic, cf. Mark iv. 13, Luke x. 29. καὶ at the commencement of a question expressing indignation or astonishment (Page).—καθή κρίνων, later form for καθῆκα, cf. for the phrase Luke xxii. 30.—παρανομών: only here in N.T., but cf. LXX, Ps. lxv. 4, cxviii. 51; the verb also occurs several times in 4 Macc.

Ver. 4. τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ θεοῦ: of God, emphatic, i.e., sitting on the judgment-seat as God's representative, cf. Deut. xvii. 8 ff., and also the name Elohim, by which the priestly and other judges were sometimes known, Exod. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, 9, Psalm lxxxi. 1.

Ver. 5. οὐκ ἴδεν: the subject of ἴδον is not expressed as in A. and R.V., in the Greek it is simply "I wist not that it was the high priest (who spoke)". If it be said that St. Paul could scarcely have been ignorant that Ananias was high priest, we must bear in mind that not even the high priest wore a distinctive dress when not engaged in actual service (Edersheim, Temple and Its Services, p. 67, with reference to this same passage), if we are not prepared to accept the view of Chrysostom and Occumenius amongst others, that the Apostle, owing to his long absence from Jerusalem, did not know the high priest by sight, or to suppose that his weakness of eyesight might have prevented him from seeing clearly (so Lewin, Plumptre). The interpretation that St. Paul spoke ironically, or by way of protest, as if such behaviour as that of Ananias on his nomination to office by Herod of Chalcis was in itself sufficient to prevent his recognition as high priest, is somewhat out of harmony with the Apostle's quotation of Scripture in his reply, nor are the attempts to translate οὐκ ἴδον as = non agnosco or non reputabam successful. See further Ζόεκler's summary of the different views, Apostelgeschichte, 2nd edition, in loco.—αδελφοί: the word indicates St. Paul's quick recovery from his moment of just anger to a conciliatory tone.—γέγ. γάρ: in this appeal to the law, St. Paul showed not only his acquaintance with it, but his reverence for it—another proof of his wisdom and tact. —ἀρχοντα του λαου συν θεου λαου: LXX, Exod. xxii. 28, the Apostle apparently only quotes the latter part of the verse; in the Hebrew we have "thou shalt not revile God (margin, the judges), nor curse a ruler of thy people". Cf the ruling principle of the Apostle's conduct, Rom. xiii. 1-7 (1 Pet. ii. 13-17).

Ver. 6. γνωθι . . . το θεον . . . το βηθερον. On ἴδον . . . ἴδον: see Simcox, Language of the N.T., pp. 71, 72. That Pharisees and Sadducees alike had seats in the Sanhedrim during this period is borne out not only by the N. T., but by Jos., Ant., xx. 9, 1, B. J., ii., 17, 3, Vita, 38, 39. It is possible that the Pharisees might have attracted the attention of the Apostle by their protest against the be-
3-6. **ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ**

σοι οὐ μετέχως κακως** 

6. Γνως δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ὅτι τὸ ἐν μέρος ὅτι Ἰαθδοκαίως, τὸ δὲ ἔτερον Ἰαπροαίων, ἐκατερ ο εἰς τὴν συνεδρίαν. Ἄνδρες ἄδελφοι, ἐγώ Ἰαπροαίως εἰμι, ὁτέος Ἰαπροαίως. περὶ ἄλλους

1 *ekrason*, but imperfect *ekrason* ΛBC 36, Syr. Pesh.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (see note ed. 1899). Blass has *ekrason*, but plural *Faparai* in ΛABC, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Tert., and other authorities as above, with Blass also, perhaps altered into sing., because one only thought of the relation of father and son (Wendt). B, Sah., Tert. omit *eγω* before *κρινωμαι*; Lach. and Tisch. retain, but other authorities above with Blass omit (but W.H. in marg.); it may have been added in accordance with xxiv. 21.

The natural text continues with further analysis of the passage, discussing the implications of Paul's statement and the setting of the narrative. It references various scholars' interpretations, noting that Paul's claim as a Pharisee has been criticized but is considered truthful in expressing his convictions. The passage suggests that Paul's action met with divine approval and may have played a role in leading others to see the resurrection as a fulfillment of the hope they shared with Jesus in the person of the risen Jesus.

Additional points covered include the manner of the apostle's appeal, the possible reasons behind his actions, and the context in which his claim as a son of a Pharisee is understood. The text also explores the implications of the resurrection for the Pharisees and the development of Christianity in relation to Judaism.
και ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγώ κρίνομαι. 7. Τούτο δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλῆσαντος, ἐγένετο στάσις τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, καὶ ἐσχιζθη τὸ πλῆθος. 8. Σαδδουκαίοι μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι ἀναστάσεως, μητὲ ἀγγελὸν μὴτί πνεῦμα. Φαρισαίοι δὲ ὀμολογοῦσι τὰ ἀμφότερα. 9. ἐγένετο δὲ κραυγὴ μεγάλη καὶ ἀναστάσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων διεμάχοτο λέγοντες, οὐδὲν κακὸν εὑρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ· εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησον αὐτῷ ἢ ἀγγελὸν,

1 Instead of λαλησαντος W.Η., Weiss, Wendt, following B, read λαλουντος; Tisch., Meyer, Blass have λαλησαντος with T.R., following CHLP, Syr. H.; R.V. (W.Η. marg.), with Lach. and Hilgenfeld, has ειποντος, so Ν-ΑΕ, Vulg., Syr. Pesh.; Ν* reads ειπαντος. For εγενετο B* (Syr. H.) has επεπεσεν, so W.Η. marg.

3 After Σαδδ. Β, Vulg., Sah. omit μεν, so W.Η. (text), Weiss, Blass; but retained by Tisch., R.V., W.Η. marg., Hilg. Instead of μηδε as in T.R. (so Meyer, Wendt, Blass), μητε in δSΑΒCΕ, so Tisch., W.Η., Weiss, Hilgenfeld. In edit. 1899 Wendt decides to follow T.R., and to read μηδε, although he admits that ΜS. authority is against him. μηδε is supported by ΗLP, Chrys., Theophyl. But μητε may have been altered to μηδε to suit τα αμφότερα. Instead of τα αμφ. Blass in β (Sah., Flor.) reads ειναι αναστασιν και αγγελον και πνευμα.


in supposing that this dissertation took place in the Assembly; it may have been no sudden result, because the Apostle had evidently said much more than is mentioned in the preceding verse (see above), and there is good evidence that one of the fundamental differences between the two sects was concerned with the question which St. Paul had raised, Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, i., 315; 108. Ant., xviii., 1, 4; B. Ε., ii., 8, 14.—σχιζθη το πλ., ΑΕ 13, H. Εν., 11, 39, and instances in Wetstein.

Ver. 8. ἀγγελον . . . πνεῦμα: are joined together by the speaker as one principal conception, so that the following ἀμφότερα presents no difficulty, see Winer-Moulton, η., 6, Page, in loco. πνεῦμα would include the spirits of the dead, to one of which Paul would appear to have appealed, xxii. 7, 18 (Weiss). On the denial see Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 13, E.T., cf. also the remarks of Dr. A. B. Davidson, "Angel," Hastings' B.D., as to the possible sense of this denial and its possible limitation, with which we may compare Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Zodiacums, ii., 7, 1046.—ἀμαλ., i.e., as part of their religious creed, their confession and open profession of faith: "but the faith of the Sadducees is well described by negations".

Ver. 9. κραυγη μητ. "there arose a great clamour," R.V., so A.V. in Ephes. iv. 31; the noun also denotes not only the loud cry of partisan applause as here, but of joyful surprise, Luke i. 42, of grief, Rev. xxi. 4, of anger, Ephes. v. 2, Westcott on Heb. ν. 7, cf. LXX, Exod. xii. 30, Judith xiv. 19, 2 Macc. xv. 29.—ἀναστατησεν, characteristic, see on v. 17.—γραμματιστες, the professional lawyers exercised considerable influence in the Sanhedrim, belonging chiefly to the Pharisees, but also numbering in their ranks some Sadducean scribes, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., pp. 178, 319, E.T. The scene may therefore be placed to the writer's accuracy.

—διεμάχοτο: only here in N.T., cf. LXX, Dan. x. 20, Ecclesiast. viii. 1, 3, 11. R., frequent in classics. Overbeck and Holtzmann can only see in this scene a repetition of chap. v. 33.—εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα: "And what if a spirit hath
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μὴ θεομαχῶμεν. 10. τολῆς δὲ γενομένης στάσεως, εὑλαβηθεὶς ὁ χιλιαρχὸς μὴ διαστασθῇ ο Παύλος ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, ἐκλευτὸ το στρατεύμα καταβάν αὐτῶν ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν, ἀγειν τε εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.

11. Τῇ δὲ ἐπικοί συκτῇ ὑπ’ αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος εἰπε, Θάρσε, Παύλε· ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, δια κυρίου τῆς παρεμβολῆς, εὐλαβηθείς ὁ χιλιαρχὸς μηδιασπασθῇ. Παύλος ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, ἀγειν τε εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.


If omitted, αρπασαι would depend upon καταβαν, and αγειν upon εκελευσε.

Παύλος om. ΝΑΒC*Ε, versss., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wndt, Blass (although retained in Flor. and byFillg.).

1 Instead of γεν. ΝΑΒ 98*, read γεν. ; Lach., Alford, Fillg. follow T.R., but Tisch., Weiss, Wndt, W.H., R.V., Blass read γεν. εὐλαβηθείς retained by Meyer as the rarer word in N.T., but φοβηθείς ΝΑΒCE, Chrys., and authorities above, so Hilgenfeld.

2 After γειν., W.H., following B., Boh., Arm., Aeth. read τές συστροφῆς των ἄνθρώπων; so authorities in ver. 11 except Blass. The latter reads with T.R. τές συστροφῆς των ἀνθρώπων, so L.(HP), Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Gia., Lucif. (see also Fillg.).
14, 21, and once by St. Mark, xiv. 71, cf. the use of the verb in LXX, Jos. v. 21, 1 Macc. v. 5. In N. T. the noun ανάθεμα is only found in Luke and Paul, see Lightfoot on Gal. i. 8, Sanday and Headlam on Rom. ix. 3. For instances of similar bindings by oath, Jos., Vita, iiii., and a similar combination of ten men to murder Herod, Ant., xv., 8, 3, 4. Of whom the band consisted we are not told, although probably Ananias would not have scrupled to employ the Sicarii, Jos., Ant., ix. 2. The conspirators seem to have affected to be Sadducees, ver. 14, but Edersheim evidently holds that they were Pharisees, and he points out that the latter as a fraternity or "guild," or some of their kindred guilds, would have furnished material at hand for such a band of conspirators, Jewish Social Life, p. 227. — τοίς αρχ., cf. i. 23, see critical note, cf. iv. 23, see critical note on reading in β (Blass).—ανάθεμα άνθρωπι: "we have bound ourselves under a great curse," thus representing the emphatic Hebrew idiom, cf. v. 28, and for the same phrase cf. Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 17. The conspirators may have been instigated by the knowledge that the Sanhedrim could no longer inflict capital punishment, and from despair of obtaining the sanction of the Roman authorities for violence against Paul. It is quite certain that sentence of death must at all events be ratified by the procurator. Another serious restriction of the Jewish powers lay in the fact that the Roman authorities could step in at any moment and take the initiative, as in the case of Paul. Moreover the incidents before us illustrate the strange fact that the chilarch of the Roman force stationed in Jerusalem seems to be able to summon the Sanhedrim for the purpose of submitting to it any question upon which the Jewish law had to be learnt, cf. xxii. 30, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 188 ff., with which, however, should be compared O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, pp. 175, 176.—γεύσασθαι: "to taste nothing," R.V. "Hoc certe tam praepostorum concilium nunquam probassent sacerdotes, si qua in illis fuisset gutta rectique affectus, imo sensus humani," Calvin. Edersheim quotes a curious illustration of the rash vow before us, which shows how easily absolution from its consequences could be obtained, Jewish Social Life, p. 229, J. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.

Ver. 15. νύν οὖν: only in Acts in N.T., where it occurs four times, frequent in LXX. — ἐμφασίζετε: "signify" in A. and R.V.; this rendering apparently conveys a wrong idea, for it implies that the Council had the authority, whereas this lay with the Roman officer, cf. xxiv. 1, xxv. 2, 15. In LXX, Esther ii. 22, 2 Macc. iii. 7, xi. 29.—σὺν τῷ σὺν.: with the whole Council, including both those who had previously inclined to favour Paul as well as his opponents; the former could not object to the pretext that further inquiries were to be made into Paul's position, especially when the Sadducees urged such an inquiry. —δια τῶν, Burton, p. 87.—δό μη μαλακίας: this use of δό with the participle expressing the pretext alleged by another, often in Luke, cf. Luke xvi. 1, xiii. 14, Acts xxiii. 20, xxvii. 30, Viteau, Le Grec du N.T., p. 189 (1893), but we may also
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πρὸ τοῦ ἔγγισα τοῦ, ἐπομοί ἔσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν αὐτὸν. 16. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ ὦ ὑιὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς Παύλου τῆν ἐνδέκεις, παραγενόμενος καὶ εἰσέλθων εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀπῆγγελε τῷ Παύλῳ. 17. προσκαλεσάμενος δὲ ὁ Παύλος ἐν τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων, ἔφη, Τῷ παναίτις τοῦτον ἀπάγαγε πρὸς τὸν χιλίαρχον. ἔχει γάρ τι ἀπαγγελθαι αὐτῷ. 18. ο μὲν ὁ παραλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἦγαγε πρὸς τὸν χιλίαρχον, καὶ φησιν, ὁ δέσμιος Παύλος προσκαλεσάμενος με ἱρώτησε τοῦτον τὸν παναίτις ἄρα καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν ἀπήγγειλε τῷ Πάυλῳ.

Ver. 16. ὁ υἱὸς τῆς αδελφῆς: whether he and his mother lived in Jerusalem, as Ewald conjectured, we are not told. Probably not, as the mother is not otherwise mentioned. Paul's nephew may have been a student in Jerusalem, as the Apostle had been in his earlier days. Ebersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 227, gives an interesting account of the way in which the young man as a member of the Pharisaic "Chabura," or guild, might have gained his knowledge of the conspiracy. At the same time nothing is told us in the text, and we cannot wonder at the comment "quisis fuerit, unde rescierit, ignoratur" (Blass).

Ver. 17. τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, cf. Hackett's note, which gives a formal justification from Philo for the assassination of apostates.

Ver. 18. o μεν παραλαβών αὐτὸν: used by Paul five times of himself in his Epistles, here for the first time in Acts with reference to him.

Ver. 19. ἐπιλαβόμενος: "ut fiduciam adolescenciae confirmaret," Bengel, so Knabenbauer; on ἐπιλ. see note, xvii. 5g.-της χειρος αυτου, cf. Luke viii. 54, Winer-Moulton, xxx. 8 d; see Calvin's note on the humanitas (as he calls it) of the centurion in thus receiving the young man.-ἀναχ.: used also in xxvi. 31, but not by Luke in his Gospel, although found in the other Evangelists.-κατ' ιδίαν επυν.: "asked him privately," R.V., as suggested by the order of the Greek.

Ver. 20. ενεδρ.: only in Luke in N.T., Luke xvii. 5, John ix. 22, so in classical Greek in middle, cf. 1 Sam. xii. 13, Dan. (Th.) ii. 9.-τοῦ ἑρωτῆσαι: the word certainly points to a certain equality with the person asked (not αἰτέω), see above on ver. 15—but still a request, not a demand.-μιλλοτές, see critical note; if plural, the clause intimates the pretext put forward by the conspirators; if singular, it is perhaps more in accordance with the deference of the youth, who would refer the control of the proceedings to the chiliarch.

Ver. 21. ἐνδρ.: only in Luke in N.T., Luke xi. 54, with the accusative also in classical Greek, and several times in LXX, 1 Macc. v. 4. Jos., Anti., v. 2, i2.-καλ ὑν, see on xx. 22.
θάνετό, τί ἐστίν ἡ ἄργυρος προσφέρετο; 20. εἶπε δέ, ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνήθος τοῦ ἐρωτήσαι σε; ἰδίως δὲ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ συνέδριον καταγάγεις τὸν Παύλον, ὥς μελλόντες! το αἰρετότερον παραδώτον περὶ αὐτοῦ. 21. οὗ τὸν μὴ πιστεύεις αὐτοῖς· ἐναρθήσου γὰρ αὐτῶν ἕξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες πλείους τεσσαράκοντα, οἵτινες ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑαυτῶς μήτε ἰσοπον ἐμέτισι νόμο ὃς ὁ Παῦλον ἄνδρον· καὶ νῦν ἑτοῖμοι εἰς προσδέξησθαι τὴν αὐτῷ ἐπαγγελίαν. 22. οὗτοι δὲ αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν, ὅτι τινῖς τῶν ἐκατοντάρχων εἶτε, ἐτοιμάσατε στρατιῶτας διακοσίους, ὡσ τοῦ καισαρείου, καὶ ἱππεῖς εβδομῆκον, καὶ δεξιολάβους μελλοντες ἐτοιμάσατε:

only once elsewhere in Acts, xxiv. 15, probably in same sense as here, so R.V. text. In the Gospels, the word is found once in Mark xv. 43 (= Luke xxiii. 51), and five times in Luke, four times translated in R.V. as here; Luke ii. 25, 38, xii. 36, xxii. 51, cf. also Tit. ii. 13, Jude ver. 21, and Wisd. xviii. 7, 2 Macc. viii. 11. In classical Greek two meanings as in N.T.: (1) to accept, receive favourably, (2) to wish for or expect a thing.—ἐπαγγελίαν: only here in N.T. of a human promise, see above on i. 4, cf. 1 Esd. i. 7, Esther iv. 7, 1 Macc. x. 15.

Ver. 22. ἐκατοντάρχος, Judith xi. 9 (but S al.), "to divulge," here only in N.T., but in classical Greek, and in Philo. As in i. 4, transition to oratio recta, cf. Luke v. 14, Mark vi. 9, etc., very common in Greek prose, Winer-Moulton, lxii., ii., 2, Blass, Gram., p. 280.

Ver. 23. See critical note; if we place τίνις before δάκα, Blass, Weiss, Knabenbauer take it of two centurions whom he could specially trust, see their notes in loco, and Blass, Gram., p. 174. In Luke vii. 19 the order is different, Blass compares Hermann, Vis., i., 4, 3, δύο τινις ἄνδρες (but see on the other hand Page's note, and Wendt, edit. 1899).—ἐτοιμάσατε: here only in Acts, but frequent in Luke's Gospel, more so than in Matthew or Mark, in John only twice. On the aorist imperfect see Winer-Moulton, xliii., 3, "have immediately... in readiness to march."—στρατ. διακ.: milites gravis armaturae. Blass brackets the first διακ., and καὶ before ἰσοπον, and instead of ἐβδομηκον he reads ἕκατον with 137, Flor., Syr. H. mg., Sah., so Hilg.
διακόσιους, ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας τῆς νυκτὸς 24. κτήνη τε παραστήσαι, ἵνα ἐπιβιβάσατε τὸν Παύλον διασώσωσι πρὸς Φήλικα, τὸν ἡγεμόνα 25. γράψας ἐπιστολὴν περιέχοσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον 26. Κλαύδιος λυσίας τῷ κρατίσῳ ἡγεμόνι Φήλικι, χαίρειν. 27. τὸν ἄνδρα τούτον συλληφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ιουδαίων, καὶ μέλλοντα ἀναφείειθαι ὅπ' αὐτῶν, ἐπιστὰς τοὺς συμμετέχοντας 3 ἐξειλόμηναυτὸν, μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαίος

In β text Blass reads κτήνος, Par., Syr. P. and H., Prov., and before διασώσωσι the words Δια νυκτος, so Flor., Syr. H. mg. Belser approves as precise notes of exact information. Blass adds (so Hilg.) after τον ἡγεμόνα the words EIS KAISE, with 137, and continues ἐφοβήθη γερ., μποτε ἀρπάζοντες αὐτὸν οἱ Ιουδαίοι αὐτοκτονίων, καὶ αὐτοὺς μεταβὰ εὐγελίσα ἐχὶ ὁ χειριστὰς εἰληφὼν, 137, Gig., Wer., Par., Vulg., Syr. H. mg.

1 περιέχοσαν, so Meyer, Blass, Hilgenfeld, with AILP; but εχοσαν ΝΑΒΕ 61, 137, so R.V., and other authorities as above.

3 εξειλόμηναυτὸν, Tisch., W. H., Blass, Weiss. Instead of μαθὼν Blass in β reads (Gig.) Bοωνντα και λεγοντα αυτον ειναι Ρωμαιον.

Saint Paul, p. 532, Overbeck for various interpretations, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 69. A reads δεξιοβόλους (Syr. Pesh. jaculatoria dextra, Art. jaculatorior), which would be a correct interpretation if we understood the word of javelin-throwers or slingers.---κτήνη (κτάομαι): jumenta, Vulgate, almost always in plural, property in general, herds or flocks, cattle; in LXX, where it is very frequent, and in N.T. it is used of beasts of burden or for riding, cf. Luke x. 34, Rev. xviii. 13, sometimes quite generally in LXX, as in 1 Cor. xv. 30—31, or: only in Luke and Acts in N.T., Luke x. 34, xiv. 35, in each case in same sense; so in classical Greek and LXX. The reason why the plural κτήνη is used εἰς satis perspicuit (Blass); the word has sometimes been taken to apply to the soldiers, as if they were all mounted, but taking the word in relation to Paul, one or more beasts might be required for relays or for baggage, so Weiss, Wendt, Hackett, or, as the prisoner was chained to a soldier, another κτήνος would be required (Kuinoel, Felten).---διασώσωσι: five times in Acts, once in Luke's Gospel, only twice elsewhere in N.T., "ut P. salum perducereant," Vulgate, frequent in LXX, cf. its use in Polyb. and Jos., see further on xxvii. 44.—Φήλικα, see on xxv. 3.—τὸν ἡγεμόνα: used of a leader of any kind, or of an emperor or king; in N.T. of the procurator, of Pilate, Felix, Festus, so by Josephus of Pilate, Ant., xviii., 3, 1, of governors more generally, Luke xxii. 12, 1 Pet. ii. 14, etc.

In ρε. 25. περιέχοσαν, see critical note above.—τύπον: " form," R.V., a précis or summary of the contents of a letter, 3 Macc. iii. 30. Such a letter would be called elogium, Alford, in loco, Renan, Saint Paul, p. 532. It is quite true that τύπος does not demand that the letter should have been given verbally, and in an oft-quoted passage, Plato, Politi., 3, p. 414, ἐν τύπῳ is contrasted with βι άξριβειας, but the letter bears the marks of genuineness, e.g., the part which Lysias claims to have played, and the expression " questions of their law " (see below). Moreover St. Luke might have easily learnt its contents, as there is reason for supposing that Lysias would have been read in open court before Felix, as containing the preliminary inquiry, and that a copy may have been given to Paul after his appeal, see Bethge, Die Paulinischen Reden Apostelgeschichte, p. 226.

Ver. 26. κρατίσῳ, see note on i. τ.---χαίρειν(λέγει or κελεύει), cf. χν. 23.

Ver. 27. ἄνδρα, not ἄνθρωπον: Bengel and Wendt take the word to indicate a certain degree of respect.---κτήνος: used in various senses, but in all four Gospels of the capture of Jesus, and in Luke, where the word is frequent, often of the capture of prisoners, Acts i. 16, xii. 3, xxvi. 21, Luke xxii. 54 (Plummer) so in LXX.—μέλλοντα ἀναί.: " was about to be killed," R.V.---ἐξειλόμηναυτὸν: the word seems
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ΧΧΙΙΙ.

εστι. 28. βουλόμενος δέ γνώσαι τὴν αἰτίαν δ' ἰν ἐγκαλοῦν αὐτῷ, κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν. 29. δ' εὑρὼν ἐγκαλοῦμενόν τεράτων τοῦ ἱμαρτον, μηδέν δὲ ἐξελευν δοσμὸν ἡ δοσμῶν ἐγκλήμα ἔχοντα. 30. μηνυθείσης δὲ μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα μελέτων ἔσεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἱουδαίων, ἐξαυτής ἐπεμψα πρὸς σέ, παραγείλας καὶ τοὺς κατηγόρους λέγειν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ οὐκ. 6 Ἐξειλόμην.

1 επιγνωσε ΝΑΒ 13, other authorities as in ver. 27, so also in R.V. and Wendt. 2 κατηγαγον . . . αυτων Β* 61 om. [W.Η.], R.V. marg. om. 3 μελέτων, Blass in β om. (Gig.); τοῦ τομοῦ Μωυσεως και Иησουτινος, so Blass in β, with 137, Gig., Syr. H. mg.; 2 text continues: μηδέν δὲ ἡμεν τανατον πρασσοντα (Gig.), εξειλομενα αυτον μολις τη βια, 137, Syr. H. mg. (Gig.), so Hilgenfeld.

4 το προς αυτον, om. τα B, Syr. Pesh., Arm., so W.H., R.V., Weiss. For the three words Lach., Tisch., with ΝΑΕ, other authorities as above, εξαυτης ΒΗΛΠ, Syr. Pesh., Sah., Boh., so W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; but Lach., Tisch. read εξ αυτου with ΝΑΕ, Syr. H., Arm. 5 ερρωσο om. AB 13, Sah., Boh., Aethro, Gig., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, R.V. in text; Blass brackets in β; ΝΕΛ d, Syr. P. H., Arm., for “military brevity,” whilst ver. 28 could not have been written by Lysias since he would have written an untruth. It is quite conceivable that the Roman would not only try to conceal his previous hastiness, but to commend himself to the governor as the protector of a fellow-citizen. Spitta omits ver. 28 in the letter, and Jüngst also ver. 29. But Jüngst equally with Hilgenfeld declines to omit the whole letter as Clemen proposes.

Ver. 29. ζητημάτων, cf. xviii. 14, 15, “a contemptuous plural” (Page).—βγκλημα ἔχοντα: phrase only here in N.T., criminis reum esse, accusari, as in classical Greek, cf. Thuc., i., 26; the noun occurs again in xxv. 16, but not elsewhere in N.T., not found in LXX.

Ver. 30. A mingling of two constructions, Blass, Gram., p. 247, Winer-Moulton, lxiii., 1, 1. 6ωνια: on the future infinitive denoting time relatively to the time of the principal verb see Burton, pp. 48, 52.—ἐξαντης: epistolary aorist, cf. 1 Cor. v. 11, Phil. ii. 28, Ephes. vi. 22, Col. iv. 8, Philem., ver. 11; Burton, p. 21. ἐξαντης, see critical note.—λεγων τα προς αυτον, cf. xiii. 38, omitting τα, see critical note.—σω εις: coram, cf. xxiv. 20, 21, xxv. 9, 26, xxvi. 2, 1 Cor. vi. 1 (1 Tim. vi. 13), Winer-Moulton, lxvii.
31. Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιώται, κατὰ τὸ διαστασαμένον αὐτοῖς, ἀναλαβόντες τὸν Παύλον ἠγαγον διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς εἰς τὴν Ἀντιπατρίαν.
32. τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐσάντες τούτο ἵππεις πορεύσατε ὀπιστεύοντα τῇ νυκτί, ἀναλαβόντες εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν. 33. οἵτινες εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν, καὶ ἀναδόντες τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῷ ἡγεμόνι, παρέστησαν καὶ τὸν Παύλον αὐτῷ. 34. ἀναγνώσας δὲ ὁ ἡγεμὼν, καὶ εἰσερχόμενος ἐκ τούτων ἔσχατος οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐκ τῆς Κ. Ἐπερώτησε "Επαρχίας ἐστιν, καὶ οἱ κατήγοροι σου παραγένομαι. Ἐκλέκτης τε αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ πραιτορίᾳ τοῦ Ἡρώδου φυλάσσεσθαι.

1 ΝΑΒΕ om. art. before νυκτός, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, R.V.
2 At the beginning of the verse Blass in β reads (Gig.) τῇ δὲ επαύριον εσάντες τουτοι των στρατιωτων (νυστρεφειν) εις την παρεμβολην μετα μονων των ιππων ηλθον εις την Κ. Instead of παραγένομαι ΝΑΒΕ, Tisch., W. H., R. V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. read επερχομαι.
3 ο ἡγεμὼν om. ΝΑΒΕ; other authorities above.
4 επαρχίας ΝΑΒΕ, so W. H., Weiss, Wendt; Blass has -ιας, so Hilg.

Ver. 31. οἱ μὲν οὖν . . . τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον: Rendall, appendix on μὲν οὖν, p. 162. Page finds the antithesis in μετά διὰ, xxiv. 1, referring the five days there not to Paul's arrival in Caesarea, but to his despatch from Jerusalem by Lysias, "so then the soldiers, etc. . . . but after five days . . ." (see also note below).—ἀναλαβόντες, cf. xx. 13.—διὰ (τῆς) νυκτὸς: "by night," this use of διὰ with genitive of time passed through (cf. i. 3) is comparatively rare, Luke v. 5, Heb. ii. 15, except in almost adverbial phrases as here, cf. v. 19, xvi. 9, xvii. 10, Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 140.—ἐλε τὴν Ἀντιπατρίαν: founded by Herod the Great, on the road from Jerusalem to Caesarea, not apparently as a fortress but as a pleasant residence, giving it its name in honour of his father, most probably on the site now called Rás el 'Ain, "the spring-head," and not where Robinson placed it, on the site of the present Kefr Saba. The more modern site, the discovery of which is due to Conder, is more in accordance with the abundant supply of water referred to by Josephus. It is to be noted that while Josephus in one passage identifies Antipatris with Kefr Saba, in another his description is more general, and he places it in the Plain of Kefr Saba (for notices cf. Ant., xiii., 15, i. xvi. 5, 2, B. F., i., 21, 9). They were now more than half way to Caesarea, and the road traversed the open plain so that they were no longer in danger of surprise, G. A. Smith, Historical Geography, p. 165, B. D. 3. Hastings' B. D. (Conder). On the Greek article in notices of stations on journeys, peculiar to Acts, see Blass, Gram., p. 149, cf. xvii. 1, xx. 13, xxxi. 1, 3 (but xx. 14 no article).

Ver. 32. τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον: not necessarily the morrow after they left Jerusalem, but the morrow after they arrived at Antipatris. In this interpretation διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς might be taken to mean by night in distinction to by day, so that they may have occupied two nights on the road, see Hackett's note, in loco.—ἐσάντες, Lucan, see xxvii. 32, 40; xxviii. 4.—ἐλε τὴν παρεμβολήν, here "to the castle" A. and R. V., the barracks in Antonia.—ἐπερώτησε, Lucan (Friedrich, p. 8), cf. i. 12.

Ver. 33. οἵτινες: "and they when they . . ." R. V., sc. ἵππεις.—ἀναδόντες: not elsewhere in N. T., or in LXX in this sense, of delivering a letter. Zahn, following Hobart, sees in the phrase ἀναδ. τὴν ἐπιστολὴν a phrase characteristic of a medical man, since Hippocrates, Epis., 1275, uses the verb instead of διδόναι or ἀποδιδόναι of a messenger delivering a letter, and thus shows a leaning common to the Greek medical writers of employing a verb already
familiar to them in a professional way; but it must be remembered that both Polybius and Plutarch use the verb in a similar sense.

Ver. 34. ἀναγνώρισεν, see reading in β text. πόλεως: of what kind of province, imperial or senatorial, as the governor desired to complete the report, cf. ver. 27. Blass takes it as simply = τίνος, as in iv. 7.—It appears that during the first century, although perhaps with variations from time to time, Cilicia formed part of the great Roman province Syria-Cilicia-Phoenice, cf. "Cilicia" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D. A procurator of Judea like Felix was only subordinate to the governor of Syria inasmuch as the latter could bring his supreme power to bear in cases of necessity. The military command and the independent jurisdiction of the procurator gave him practically sole power in all ordinary transactions, but the governor could take the superior command if he had reason to fear revolutionary or other serious difficulties. Schürer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 44 ff., E.T.—παραχώρει: the word is used to describe either a larger province, or an appendage to a larger province, as Judea was to that of Syria, see Schürer, θετυισθ. People, diν. i., νο1. ii., p. 44 ff., and Grimm-Thayer, sub υ.

Ver. 35. διακούσομαισου: "I will hear thy cause," R.V., the word implies a judicial hearing (cf. LXX, Deut. i. 16 [Job ix. 33]), and so in classical Greek of hearing thoroughly. The word is used of a judicial hearing, Dio Cassius, xxxvi., 53 (36), and Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 57, gives examples of similar usages on Egyptian papyri, 2nd to 3rd century A.D.—πραιτωρίου: "palace," R.V., Herod's palace at Caesarea, where the procurator resided; it was not only a palace but also a fortress, and would contain a guard-room in which Paul would be confined. The word "palace" might well express its meaning in all the passages in which it occurs in the Gospels and Acts (but on Phil. i. 13 see Lightfoot, in loco). The Romans thus appropriated palaces already existing, and formerly dwelt in by kings or princes, cf. Cicero, Verr., ii., 5, 12, 30, Grimm-Thayer, sub υ., and Lightfoot, On a Fresh Revision of N.T., p. 49. It seems from the context that the place could not have been far from the quarters occupied by Felix, since Paul could be easily sent for.—μεθαπεύτερον καὶ βήτηρος: the kind of custodia depended on the procurator, and no doubt the elogium had its effect; custodia satis levibus (Blass).

CHAPTER XXIV.—Ver. 1. τέτειχα: most probably to be reckoned from the arrival of St. Paul at Caesarea, not from his apprehension in Jerusalem, or from his start from Jerusalem on the way to Caesarea. This latter view is that of Mr. Page, who takes μεθαπεύτερον, xxiii. 31, as answered by the ὅδε in this verse. But ὅδε, xxiii. 32, seems quite sufficiently to answer to μεθαπεύτερον in the previous verse. Wendt reckons the days from the arrival of Paul at Caesarea, and regards the day of the arrival of the high priest as the fifth day, cf. Mark viii. 3. μεθαπεύτερον: = Matt. xvi. 21, Luke ix. 22, τη τρίτηήμ., see below, ver. 11. On the truthfulness of the narrative see also on same verse.—κατέβη: "came down," R.V., i.ε., from the capital.—Ἀπαντήσας, see on xxii. 2. If we read πρεσθ. τίνων, see critical note, "with certain elders," R.V., i.ε., a delegation of the Sanhedrin.—ρήτορος Τ. τερτ.: "an orator, one Tertullus," R.V., ρη. here = causidicus, a barrister; here the prosecuting counsel συνήγορος (as opposed to σύνδικος the defendant's advocate), see note, Blass, in loco. "Τερτ.: a common name, diminutive of Tertius; but it does not follow from the name that he was a Roman, as both Greeks and Jews often bore Roman names. Blass speaks of him as a Jew "erat Judacus et ipse" (so Ενwald, Βethge), whilst Wendt (1899) inclines against this view, although if the words in ver. 6, κατά τὸν ημετέρον νόμον, are retained, he admits that it would be correct; in addition to this the expression ἀνάφησα τούτων, ver. 3, seems in Wendt's view to indicate that the speaker was not a Jew (so too Wetstein). Tertullus was apparently one of the class of hired pleaders, often employed in the provinces by those who were themselves ignorant of Roman law. The trial may have been conducted in Greek, Lewin, St. Paul, ii., 684, Felten, in loco.—ἀνεφάσαν, cf. xxv. 2, 15, the verb appears to be used in these passages as
σαν τό ηγεμόνι κατά τού Παύλου. 2. ελθόντος δέ αυτοῦ, ήρξατο κατηγορεῖν τό Τέρτυλλος, λέγων, 3. Πολλής εἰρήνης τυγχάνοντες διά σοῦ, καὶ κατορθωμάτων γυμνομένων τού ἐδεί τούτῳ διά τῆς σῆς προνοίας πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ, ἀποδεχόμεθα, κράτιστε Φήλιξ, μετὰ πάσης εὐχαριστίας. 4. ίνα δέ μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖον σε ἐγκόπτω,

1 αυτοῦ om. B, so Weiss (w. H.), Wendt perhaps.


3 For ἐγκόπω ΝΑΒΕ have ἐγκόπως, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilgenfeld (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 54). Blass reads κοττω (fatigans, Syr.; molestus;征求), cf. Cicero, De Oratore, ii., 19, 13, or it might mean re recte facta, cf. Cic., De Fin., iii., 14 (see also in Wetstein; the word is found in 3 Macc. iii. 23, R); but διορθώματο, see critical note, in Arist., Plut. = corrections, reforms (cf. R. V.), so διορθώματο, in Polyb., Vulgate, muta corrigitur. In LXX διορθώματο is used of amending, Jer. vii. 3, 5. —προνοίας: foresight, cf. Roman. xiiii, 14, nowhere else in N. T.; cf. for a close parallel to its use here 2 Macc. iv. 6, referred to above (Lumby). It is possible that the word may be a further proof of the sycophancy of the orator: twice the Latin providentia, A. and R. V. "providence," was used of the emperors on coins, and also of the gods (Humphry on R. V.), "hoc vocabulum saepe diis tribu-erunt," Bengel, in loco. —πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ ἀποδεχ., so A. and R. V., "non in os solum laudamus" (Wetstein); but Meyer joins πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ with what precedes (Lach.), and in this he is followed by Weiss, Wendt, Page and Blass. For similar phrases in Plato, Aristotle, Philo, Josephus, see Wetstein.

πάντη: only here in N. T., but cf. Eccles. i. 22, 3 Macc. iv. 1, cf. Friedrich, p. 5, on Luke's fondness for πάνται and kindred words. —πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ, see above on ver. 1 and also ver. 10. If he had been a Jew Wetstein thinks that he would have said τό ἔθνος τῷ ἡμετέρῳ, but see Blass, in loco., on ἂνοιο "in sermone elegante et coram alienigenis".

—ἀνοιο: only in Luke and Acts; for its meaning here cf. II. 41, 1 Macc. ix. 71 (S al.), so in classical Greek. —ἐργ.: except Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12, elsewhere in N. T. only in St. Paul's Epistles (frequent); the word is also found in Esth. (LXX) viii. 13, Eccles. xxxvii. 11, Wisd. xvi. 28, 2 Macc. ii. 27, and for other references see Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 73, and Grimm-Thayer, sub ν. —There was very little, if anything, to praise in the administration of Felix, but Tertullus fastened on the fact of his suppression of the bands of robbers who had infested the country, Jos., Ant., ii., 22. Fascist, LXX, Esther, ii., 22. Blass takes it here = χάρτην δεκάρων, see also Wetstein.

Ver. 2. ήρξατο: he began with a captatio benevolentiae after the usual oratorical style, cf. Cicero, De Oratore, ii., 78, 79, on the exordium and its rules. —If obtaining such artificial support was not as Calvin calls it "signum malae conscientiae," it may well indicate the weakness of the Jews' cause, and their determination to leave nothing untried against Paul.

Ver. 3. πολλής εἰρ. τυγχ.: the governors specially prided themselves on keeping peace in their provinces (Wetstein). On the phrase see 2 Macc. vi. 10, κατορθωμάτων: "very worthy deeds," A. V., the word might mean νεατε facta, cf. Cic., De Fin., iii., 44 (see also in Wetstein; the word is found in 3 Macc. iii. 23, R), but διορθώματο, see critical note, in Arist., Plut. = corrections, reforms (cf. R. V.), so διορθώματο, in Polyb., Vulgate, multa corriguntur. In LXX διορθώματα is used of amending, Jer. vii. 3, 5. —προνοίας: foresight, cf. Rom. xiiii, 14, nowhere else in N. T.; cf. for a close parallel to its use here 2 Macc. iv. 6, referred to above (Lumby). It is possible that the word may be a further proof of the sycophancy of the orator: twice the Latin providentia, A. and R. V. "providence," was used of the emperors on coins, and also of the gods (Humphry on R. V.), "hoc vocabulum saepe diis tribuerunt," Bengel, in loco. —πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ ἀποδεχ., so A. and R. V., "non in os solum laudamus" (Wetstein); but Meyer joins πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ with what precedes (Lach.), and in this he is followed by Weiss, Wendt, Page and Blass. For similar phrases in Plato, Aristotle, Philo, Josephus, see Wetstein.

πάντη: only here in N. T., but cf. Eccles. i. 22, 3 Macc. iv. 1, cf. Friedrich, p. 5, on Luke's fondness for πάνται and kindred words. —πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ, see above on ver. 1 and also ver. 10. If he had been a Jew Wetstein thinks that he would have said τό ἔθνος τῷ ἡμετέρῳ, but see Blass, in loco., on ἂνοιο "in sermone elegante et coram alienigenis".

—ἀνοιο: only in Luke and Acts; for its meaning here cf. II. 41, 1 Macc. ix. 71 (S al.), so in classical Greek. —ἐργ.: except Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12, elsewhere in N. T. only in St. Paul's Epistles (frequent); the word is also found in Esth. (LXX) viii. 13, Eccles. xxxvii. 11, Wisd. xvi. 28, 2 Macc. ii. 27, and for other references see Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 73, and Grimm-Thayer, sub ν. —There was very little, if anything, to praise in the administration of Felix, but Tertullus fastened on the fact of his suppression of the bands of robbers who had infested the country, Jos., Ant., ii., 22. Fascist, LXX, Esther, ii., 22. Blass takes it here = χάρτην δεκάρων, see also Wetstein; the word is found in 3 Macc. iii. 23, R); but διορθώματο, see critical note, in Arist., Plut. = corrections, reforms (cf. R. V.), so διορθώματο, in Polyb., Vulgate, muta corrigitur. In LXX διορθώματα is used of amending, Jer. vii. 3, 5. —προνοίας: foresight, cf. Rom. xiiii, 14, nowhere else in N. T.; cf. for a close parallel to its use here 2 Macc. iv. 6, referred to above (Lumby). It is possible that the word may be a further proof of the sycophancy of the orator: twice the Latin providentia, A. and R. V. "provid-
parakalē akouīsai se ἥμων συντόμως τῇ οῇ ἐπιεικείᾳ. 5. εὐρόντες γάρ τὸν ἄνδρα τούτου λοιμόν, καὶ κινούντα στάτην 1 πᾶσι τοῖς ἱσοδομοῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, προστατάτην τε τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἵρεσεως, 6. καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπείρασε βεβηλώσαι· καὶ καταραθμὸν

1 The plural στάτης for στάσις is supported by ΝΑΒΕ 13, 40, 61, 68, Vulg., Boh., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Blass in β text with Gig. adds ὥστε μονον τὴν γενεια μὴν ἀλλὰ σχεδον πασῆ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ.

trading upon the influence of his infamous brother Pallas he allowed himself a free hand to indulge in every licence and excess, Tac., Hist., v., 9, and Ann., xii., 54. Schürer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 172–181, E.T.

Ver. 4. άπε: autem, " inuit pluradici potuisse in laudem Felicis," Bengel.—άγγέλτω, impedire, as if Felix was so busy in his reforms that Tertullus would not interrupt him, but see critical note, cf. Rom. xv. 22, Gal. v. 7.—τῶι πλείων, cf. iv. 17, xx. 9; in 2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9, with the opposite verb προκόπτω.—συντόμως: so in classical Greek, with λέγειν, εἰπείν: in Jos., c. Απίων., i., 6, with γράψαι and διδάσκειν, see Wetstein on Rom. ix. 28, cf. 2 Macc. ii. 31, for the adjective and for the adverb, Prov. xiii. 23, 3 Macc. v. 25; "est hæc communis oratorum promissio" (Blass).—κινούντας: ταραχήν: not against the Romans but amongst the Jews themselves—such a charge would be specially obnoxious to Felix, who prided himself on keeping order.—την οἰκ.: the Roman empire, see on p. 270, cf. xvii. 6, and xxi. 28; see addition in β text.—προκαθαρήκη: the τε closely connecting the thought that the prisoner does all this as the leader, etc., literally one who stands in the front rank, so often in classical Greek, in LXX, Job xv. 24, AB.—τῶν Ναζ.: "the disciple is not above his Master," and the term is applied as a term of contempt to the followers of Jesus, as it had been to Jesus Himself, Who was stamped in the eyes of the Jews as a false Messiah by His reputed origin from Nazareth, John i. 46, vii. 41, 42; see for the modern employment of the same amongst Jews and Mohammedans Plumptre, in loco, and further, Harnack, History of Dogma, i., 301, E.T. Blass compares the contemptuous term used by the Greeks, Χρηστιανοί, xi. 26.—ἀλφασώω, see above on v. 17, all references to the question of law, xiii. 6, 29, were purposely kept in the background, and stress laid upon all which threatened to destroy the boasted "peace" (Weiss).

Ver. 6. ἐπείρασε: the charge could not be proved, cf. xxi. 28, but the verb here used is an aggravation not a modification of the surmise (ἐνόμιζον, ver. 29) of the Jews.—βεβ., cf. Matt. xii. 5 (βαίνω, βήλω, βεβήλωσις, threshold), Judith ix. 8, 1 Macc. ii. 12, iv. 38, 44, 54, 2 Macc. x. 5, etc., and frequent in LXX, cf. Psalms of Solomon i. 8, and βεβήλωσις, four, βεβήλωσις, three times. —Probably Tertullus wanted to insinuate that the prisoner was punishable even according to Roman law, see above on xxi. 29; but Tropimus as a Greek and not Paul would have been exposed to the death penalty,
καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμετέρον νόμον ἰθελήσαμεν κρίνειν. 7. παρελθὼν δὲ λυσίας ἐκ χειρῶν μετὰ τολλῆς βίας έκ τῶν χειρῶν ἰμῶν ἀπῆγαγε, 8. κελεύσας τοὺς κατηγόρους αὐτοῦ ἐρχεσθαι έπὶ σε. παρ' οὖ διωρησάμεν αὐτὸς ἀπαντάς τερι πάντων τούτων ἐπιγνώναι δὲ ἰμαῖς κατηγορούμεν αὐτοῦ. 9. συνέθετο δὲ καὶ οἱ Ιουδαίοι, φάσκοντες ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν.

1 T.R. καὶ . . . ὑπὲρ σε (ver. 8) is supported by E, Vulg., Gig., Syr. Ρ. and Η.; Blass retains, R.V. marg. But the whole is omit. by ἙκΑΒΕΗΡ 61 (many others), Sah., Boh., so Lach., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt; Alford places in dark brackets. The words, however, have been recently defended by Zöckler, H. Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, and Belser, following Blass in his two texts. It is possible that the abruptness of εκρατήσαμεν may have prompted a desire for additions and completeness, and it is difficult to understand the omission of the disputed words if they were original. If we retain them, παρ' οὖ refers to Lysias, but not only is it somewhat strange that a professional orator should throw blame upon the Roman chiliarch, but it is also difficult to see how Lysias could in any way bear testimony against Paul in relation to accusations with regard to which he had professed himself ignorant, and after the hearing of which he had concluded that the prisoner had done nothing worthy of death or bonds. Moreover, the omission of any reference on Paul's part to Lysias in ver. 20 raises another difficulty, if Tertullus had appealed to the evidence which the Roman could give (Wendt, τ. 1899). On the other hand the decision of Felix in ver. 22, and the postponement for the arrival of Lysias, have been held to prove the genuineness of the doubtful words. It is possible that there may be some antecedent corruption or abridgment in the text. For further variations see W.H., App., p. 100.

2 συνεθέτο R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass (instead of συνεθετο), with ἙκΑΒΕΗΡ.

to say nothing of the fact that the charge was only one of suspicion. Schurer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 74, note, and references in chap. xxii., ver. 29. εκρατήσαμεν: the word could be used "de conatu vel mero vel efficaci," and so Bengel adds "aptum igitur ad calumniam." The orator identifies himself with his clients, and ascribes to the hierarchy the seizing of Paul, as if it was a legal act, whereas it was primarily the action of the mob violence of the people, xxi. 30; frequently used in same sense as here by Matthew and Mark, but not at all by St. John, and only in this passage by Luke, cf. Rev. xx. 2, LXX, Ps. lv., Mt., Judg. viii. 12, xvi. 21 (A al.).—και κατὰ τὸν τέλειόν σε, ver. 8, see critical note, omitted by R.V. in text, retained by Blass and Knabenbauer, so in Vulgate. Zöckler amongst others has recently supported Blass, and for the same reason, viz., because if the words are retained the judge is asked to inquire of Paul, and thus the Apostle becomes a witness as well as a prisoner. But, on the other hand, Paul though still a prisoner is allowed to speak for himself before both Felix and Festus. If the words are retained, παρ' οὖ would refer to Lysias, and this would be in agreement with the remarks of Felix in ver. 22. Certainly εκρατήσαμεν seems very bald without any sequel, and this may have caused the insertion of the words; but the insertion was a bold one, although we can understand that the Jews would have been incensed against Lysias, who had twice protected Paul from their violence. The omission of the words if they formed part of the original text is no doubt difficult to explain. Φιλ. κρίνειν, cf. xxi. 31, 36, xxii. 22, xxi. 12, passages which give us a very different idea of the wishes of the Jews. Ver. 7. μετὰ τοῦ βίας: another statement directly at variance with the facts, xxi. 32. Ver. 8. ἀνακ.: not an examination by torture, which could not be legally applied either to Paul or to Lysias as Roman citizens, but in the sense of a judicial investigation—in this sense peculiar to Luke, cf. iv. 9, and Plummer on Luke xxiii. 14. cf. xxv. 26 below. A.V., "by examining of whom thyself," etc., which is quite misleading whether we retain the words omitted above in R.V. or not, because this rendering reads as if Felix was to examine the accusers, whereas the relative pronoun is in the singular, παρ' οὖ.

Ver. 9. συνεθετο: in R.V. συνεθεθ.,
"joined in the charge," cf. xviii. 10, so in classical Greek; in LXX (Deut. xxxii. 27), Ps. iii. 6 AS, Zach. i. 15, here only in N.T.—ἀπήγγέλτως, cf. xxiv. 19, Rom. i. 22, dictantes, but sometimes with the notion of alleging what is untrue, to pretend, cf. LXX, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 8. The verb is found elsewhere, Gen. xxvi. 20, 2 Macc. xiv. 27, 32, 3 Macc. iii. 7.

Ver. 10. On the language of the speech see Bethge, p. 229.—This short apology before Felix is not without its traces of Paul's phraseology, e.g., ἐλπίδα ἔχων, ver. 15, with which we may compare Rom. xv. 4, 2 Cor. iii. 12, x. 15, Ephes. ii. 12, 1 Thess. iv. 13, in all of which we have the phrase ἐλπίς (only once elsewhere in N.T., x John iii. 3); προσδεχόμεναι in ver. 15, with which we may compare Tit. ii. 13, προσφοράς, ver. 17, cf. Rom. xv. 16; ἴτων, ver. 17, with Gal. i. 1 (ὃδε with genitive of time, only once elsewhere in N.T., Mark ii. 1), and more especially ἄφωνον συνείδ., cf. i Cor. x. 32, Phil. i. 10, and for συναίσθησις, see xxiii. 1 (cf. Nösgen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 54, and Alford, Acts, Introd., p. 14). Wendt regards the whole speech as a free composition of the author of Acts, and even this view contrasts favourably with what Wendt himself calls the wilful attempts to refer different words and phrases in the speech to various Redactors, see for illustrations of this arbitrariness his note on p. 369 (1890).—νεύσαντος: in N.T., elsewhere only John xiii. 24. Friedrich draws attention to the frequent mention of beckoning, or making signs, as characteristic of Luke's writings, p. 26, cf. Luke i. 22 and 62 (διανεύω, ἐννεύω), v. 7 (κατανεύω); Acts xiii. 16, xxvi. i, xxiv. 10, etc.—Εκ τολλών ἴτων: in view of the constant change of procurators a period of five to seven years would quite justify St. Paul's words. Ewald argued for ten years from the statement, Tac., Ann., xiv., 54, that Felix had been joint procurator with Cumanus before he had been appointed sole procurator of Judæa, Samaria, Galilee, Peræa. But no mention is made of this by Jos., Ant., xx., 7. If, however, so it is argued, Felix had occupied a position of importance in Samaria in the time of the rule of Cumanus without being himself actually joint procurator, this would perhaps account for Jonathan the high priest asking that he might be appointed procurator after the departure of Cumanus (Jos., Ant., xx., 8, 5, B. J., ii., 12, 6); such a request is difficult to understand unless Jonathan had some ground for supposing that Felix would be acceptable to the Jews. But the description of Tacitus, l.c., is also difficult to understand, since we naturally ask what was the relative rank of Felix and Cumanus? or were there two procuratorial districts? and the statement of Josephus seems clearly to intimate that Felix was first appointed to the province after the departure of Cumanus, and that he went to Palestine as his successor, B. J., ii., 12, 6, cf. Ant., xx., 8, 5, Schürer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 173 ff., and "Felix," Hastings' B.D.—Both Tacitus and Josephus are taken to imply that Felix succeeded Cumanus in 52 A.D. as procurator, Ann., xii., 54, Jos., Ant., xx., 7, 1. But if O. Holtzmann and McGiffert are right in placing St. Paul's imprisonment in Caesarea in 53-55 A.D., it seems scarcely intelligible that St. Paul should speak of the "many years" of the rule of Felix, unless on the supposition that Tacitus is right and that Felix had ruled in Samaria and Judæa whilst Cumanus had ruled in Galilee. Harnack, Chron., i., 236, following Eusebius, assigns the eleventh year of Claudius, 51 A.D., as the year in which Felix entered upon office, and thinks that a procuratorship lasting from 51-54 might be described in St. Paul's words, but, as Wendt justly points out (1890), the expression πολλά έτη is much more fitting if spoken some years later. Schürer follows Josephus, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 173 ff., and so more recently Dr. A. Robertson, "Felix," Hastings' B.D., and Dr. Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 635 (so also article, Biblical World, Nov., 1897), whilst Wendt, p. 58 (1899), would appear to incline to the same view. But it is to be noted that St. Paul speaks of Felix as κριτής, and in this expres-
For γνώναι: ΝABE, Tisch., W.H., and other authorities in ver. 10 read επιγνώναι. ηʾ om. with all better authorities, cf. iv. 22. δεκαδύο (instead of δεκαδύο) ΝABE, and other authorities above. 415 for εν ΝABEH, and other authorities, as above.

tion it may be possible to find a point of reconciliation between the divergencies resulting from a comparison of Josephus and Tacitus. Felix may have held an office during the procuratorship of Cumanus which may have given him some judicial authority, although of course subordinate to the procurator, whilst on the other hand his tenure of such an office may well have prompted Jonathan's request to the emperor that Felix should be sent as procurator (a request upon which both Schurer and Zahn lay such stress). Τhe phrase πόλλα έτη may thus be further extended to include the tenure of this judicial office which Felix held earlier than 52 a.d., see also Turner, "Chronology," Hastings' B.D., i., 418, 419, M&Giffert, Apostolic Age, p. 358, O. Holtzmann, Neust. Zeitgeschichte, p. 128. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 313. Gilbert, Student's Life of Paul, p. 219 ff., 1899.—επιτή, see above, p. 480; on the addition δικαιον, defended by St. Chrysostom (so E, Syr. Η.), Blass remarks "continet adulationem φuae Paulum parum deceat, φuidquid dicit Chrysostomus".—τώ έθνειτούτω: St. Paul is speaking of the Jews as a nation in their political relationship, in addressing a Roman governor, not as God's people, λαός.—ευθυμότερον: ad verb only here in Ν.Τ., not in LΧΧ, but in classical Greek, for the adjectives see xxvii.36 (2 Μacc. xi.26), and the verb ευθυμείν, νερ.22.—St. Paul also begins with a captatio benevolentia, but one which contains nothing but the strict truth; he might fairly appeal to the judicial experience of Felix for the due understanding of his case.—τα περί εμαυτού: for the phrase τα περί τινος as characteristic of St. Luke, three times in Gospel, eight times in Acts (six times in St. Paul's Epistles and not in other Gospels, except Mark v. 27, R.V.), cf. Hawkins, Hora Synoptica, p. 38, Friedrich, p. 10 (so Lekebusch and Zeller).—ἀπολογούμαι: only in Luke and Paul, Luke xii. 11, xxi. 14, Acts xix. 33, xxv. 8, xxvi. 1, 2, 24; Rom. ii. 15, 2 Cor. xii. 19, each time in Acts, except xix. 38, with reference to Paul: R.V. "I make my defence"; see Grimm-Thayer, sub υ., for the construction of the verb, in classical Greek as here, Thuc., iii., 62, Plat., Phaedo, 69 D. In LXX, cf. Jerr. xii. 1, 2 Macc. xiii. 26.

Ver. 11. δου. σου γνώναι: "seeing that thou canst take knowledge" (ἐπιγ.), R.V., the shortness of the time would enable Felix to gain accurate knowledge of the events which had transpired, and the Apostle may also imply that the time was too short for exciting a multitude to sedition.—ου πλείους εισί μου ἡ δεκαδύο: on ου πλείους see ver. 1 and critical note.—The number is evidently not a mere round number, as Overbeck thinks, but indicates that Paul laid stress upon the shortness of the period, and would not have included incomplete days in his reckoning. It is not necessary therefore to include the day of the arrival in Jerusalem (δέ ή points to the day as something past, Bethge), or the day of the present trial; probably the arrival in Jerusalem was in the evening, as it is not until the next day that Paul seeks out James (Wendt). The first day of the twelve would therefore be the entry in to James, the second the commencement of the Nazirite vow, the sixth that of the apprehension of Paul towards the close of the seven days, xxii. 27: the seventh the day before the Sanhedrim, the eighth the information of the plot and (in the evening) Paul's start for Caesarea, the ninth the arrival in Caesarea, and, reckoning from the ninth five days inclusively, the day of the speech of Tertullus before Felix would be the thirteenth day, i.e., twelve full days; cf. xx. 6, where in the seven days are reckoned the day of arrival and the day of departure (Wendt, in loco). Meyer on the other hand reckons the day of St. Paul's arrival in Jerusalem as the first day, and the five days of xxiv. 1 from his departure from Jerusalem for Caesarea; and, reckoning from the fifth day inclusively, the speech of Tertullus before Felix was the thirteenth day, i.e., twelve full days; cf. xx. 6, where in the seven days are reckoned the day of arrival and the day of departure (Wendt, in loco). Meyer on the other hand reckons the day of St. Paul's arrival in Jerusalem as the first day, and the five days of xxiv. 1 from his departure from Jerusalem for Caesarea. For other modes of reckoning see Wendt's note, Farrar, St. Paul, ii., 338, Alford, Rendall, and Lumby, in loco. Weiss points out that it is simplest to add the seven days of xxi. 27 and the
 För επισύστασιν HLP, Chrys. (Meyer), ΝΑΒΕ 13, 40, and other authorities as above read επιστασιν.

2 For ουτε ΝΒ 61 read ουδε; R.V. with other authorities as above, but not Hilgenfeld. For νῦν ΝΑΒ read νυν, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilgenfeld.

five days of xxiv. 1, but we cannot by any means be sure that xxii. 27 implies a space of full seven days: "varie numerum computant; sed simplicissimum est sine dubio, e septem diebus, xxii. 27, et quinque, xxiv. 1, eum colligere," so Blass, but see his note on the passage.—προσκυνήσων, cf. xx. 16, the purpose was in itself an answer to each accusation—reverence not insurrection, conformity not heresy, worship not profanity.

"To worship I came, so far was I from raising sedition," Chrys. There were other reasons no doubt for St. Paul's journey, as he himself states, ver. 17, cf. Rom. xv. 25, but he naturally places first the reason which would be a defence in the procurator's eyes. Overbeck and Wendt contend that the statement is not genuine, and that it is placed by the author of Acts in St. Paul's mouth, but see on the other hand Weiss, in loco. It seems quite captious to demand that Paul should explain to the procurator all the reasons for his journey, or that the fact that he came to worship should exclude the fact that he also came to offer alms.

Ver. 13. ουτε: ουδε, R.V. (so Blass, Gram., p. 260, Simcox, Ζ. Ν. Τ., p. 165): the Apostle after denying the specific charges made against him in Jerusalem, now proceeds further to a general denial of the charge that he had been an agitator amongst the Jews throughout the empire.—παραστήσαι: argumentis. Only here in N.T. in this sense, but in classical Greek, Philo, Jos., Epictet.—νυν, see critical note.

Ver. 14. ομολ: "verbum forense idemque sacrum," Bengel. "Unum crimen confiteatur," vix., that of belonging to the sect of the Nazarenes, "sed crimen non esse docet".—κατὰ τὴν δδον ἐν λέγ. αἱρεσιν: "according to the way which they call a sect," R.V. For δδον see ix. 2, and for the reading in β text critical note. αἱρεσιν: a word of neutral significance, which Tertullian had used in a bad sense. For St. Paul Christianity was not αἱρεσις, a separation from the Jewish religion, but was rather πλήρωσις, cf. xiii. 32.—τῶ πατρ. Θεώ, cf. xxii. 3. The Apostle may have used the expression here as a classical one which the Roman might appreciate, cf. θεοί πατρόι, Thuc., ii., 71; ΑΕn., ix., 247, and instances in Wetstein. (On the distinctions between πατρός and πατρ-
12-16.
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τοις κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις, 15. ἀπίστα ἕχων εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτωι προσδέχονται, ἀνάστασιν μᾶλλον ἐσπεράθη. 2 νεκρῶν, δικαίως τε καὶ ἄδικως. 16. εἰς τούτῳ ἐδότος ἁμαρτίας, ἀπρόσκοπον συνείδησιν ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν καὶ τοὺς

1 After καὶ Ν*BE read τοὺς εὖν, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; Blass in β text follows T.R. (Steph.) and omits εὖν. (On the force of κατα and εὖν see Wendt (1899), in loco.)

2 After εὐσεβεῖς, νεκρῶν is om. by NaNBC 13, 40, 61, 68, Vulg., Sah. Boh., Arm., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; Blass (but retained by Hilg.).


καίνος, Gal. i. 14, see Syn., Grimm-Thayer.) Moreover St. Paul could appeal to the fact that liberty had been given to the Jews by the Romans themselves to worship the God of their fathers (see Alford's note, in loco).—λατρεύω: "so serve I," R.V., see on vii. 42; if it is true that the word always describes a divine service like λατρεία, and that this idea appears to spring from the conception of complete devotion of powers to a master which lies in the root of the word (Westcott), no verb could more appropriately describe the service of one who called himself δουλος of God and of Christ.—πάσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν ν. κ.τ.λ.: "all things which are according to the law," R.V., "iterum refutat Tertullum, ver. 6," Bengel; "and which are written in the prophets," R.V. The mention of the prophets as well as of the law shows that a reference to the Messianic hopes is intended.

Ver. 15. ἀπίστα ἕχων, cf. xxiii. 6: St. Paul speaks of the hope as a frequent possession, οἱ ἑαυτοῦ ἐρει "so be on your own work," R.V., see on xxiv. 3; if it is true that the word always describes a divine service like λατρεία, and that this idea appears to spring from the conception of complete devotion of powers to a master which lies in the root of the word (Westcott), no verb could more appropriately describe the service of one who called himself δουλος of God and of Christ.—πάσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν ν. κ.τ.λ.: "all things which are according to the law," R.V., "iterum refutat Tertullum, ver. 6," Bengel; "and which are written in the prophets," R.V. The mention of the prophets as well as of the law shows that a reference to the Messianic hopes is intended.

Ver. 15. εἰς τούτῳ: "herein" is rather ambiguous, A. and R.V.; the expression may be used as = propter eum, as the result of the confession of faith in vv. 14, 15, cf. John xvi. 30 (Xen., Cyr., i., 3, 14). Rendall takes it = meanwhile (so apparently Wetstein), τρία ὡς, i.e., in this earthly life; "hanc spem dum habeo," Bengel. If we read καί, not δὲ, perhaps best explained "non minus quam illi," Blass, "I also exercise myself," R.V., ἀσκά, cf. 2 Macc. xv. 4; ἀσκησία, 4 Macc. xii. 22; ἀσκησίας, 4 Macc. xii. 11; so in classical Greek, laborare, studere, Soph., Elect., 1024.—ἀπρόσκοπον: only by Paul...
ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΙ ΔΙΑΠΑΝΤΟΣ. 17. ΣΙ ΕΤΩΝ ΒΕ ΠΛΕΙΩΝ ΠΑΡΕΝΕΡΗΜΑ ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΥΝ ΠΟΙΗΣΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΘΕΝΟΙ ΜΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΑΣ. 18. ΕΝ ΟΙΣ ΕΔΡΟΝ ΜΕ ΗΓΝΙΣΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΙΕΡΩ ΟΥ ΜΕΤΑ ΔΧΟΛΟ ΟΔΗ ΜΕΤΑ

1 R.V. transposes ταρεγ., placing it after μου, with Βε BC, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass (but not Hilg.), who places it after προσφοράς; A omits.

2 εν αίς ΗΠΑΒΗ, Βlass in β text, Τisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. αις may have been changed into αις on account of the immediately preceding προσφοράς; but the fem. may also have been changed into οις, because no definite reference is made to offerings in xxii. 27, where the tumult took place, and the expression εν οις would express a more general reference to ver. 17. See note below, and also Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 193, 228; Wendt (1899), note, in loco.

in N. T., cf. 1 Cor. x. 32, where used actively, and cf. Ecclus. xxxii. (xxiv.) 21, 3 Macc. iii. 8. In Phil. i. 10 Light-foot points out that the word may be taken either transitively or intransitively, although he prefers the latter. Mr. Page in his note on the word in this passage commends A.V. "void of offence" as including the two images, not offending, upright, προσ σὺν τον Θεόν: not causing offence, προσ συν τοις ἀνθρώποις. "Ad Deum et homines congruit quod sequitur eleemosynas et oblationes," Bengel. —διά παντός, see Plummer on Luke xxiv. 53. cf. Acts ii. 25, x. 2, Matt. xviii. 10, Mark v. 5, Heb. ii. 15, emphatic here at the end of sentence, implying that the Apostle's whole aim in life should free him from the suspicion of such charges as had been brought against him.

Ver. 17. πλειών: "many," R.V., but margin, "some," so Rendall: if xvii. 22 refers to a visit to Jerusalem (see note) at the close of the Apostle's second missionary journey, the number expressed by πλειών would not exceed four or five. —ηγνισμένον: see above on collection for the Saints at Jerusalem. ἔλεη.: not elsewhere used by Paul, who speaks of κοινωνία, διακονία ἐλεον τούς ἄγνους, see on x. 2. —παρεγενόμην, Lucan, but cf. also 1 Cor. xvii. 3, for the word again used by St. Paul.—εις το θένοι μου: quite natural for St. Paul to speak thus of the Jewish nation, for the Jewish-Christian Church naturally consisted of Jews, cf. Rom. ix. 3. For this allusion in Acts to the great work of the collection, and its evidential value, as corroborating the notices in the Epistles, see above on p. 422, and Paley, H.P., chap. ii., x. On this use of εις cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 13, Rom. xv. 26, and see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 113.—καὶ προσφοράς: no mention is made of offerings as part of the purpose of St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, but we know that he came up to Jerusalem to worship, ver. 11, and to be present at the Feast of Pentecost, xx. 16, and even if he did not present some offering in connection with that Feast (as thank-offering as Böhme supposed), Dr. Hort's view may well commend itself that the Apostle wished to make some offering on his own account, or it may be a solemn peace-offering in connection with the Gentile contribution for the Jewish Christians, and its acceptance, see on xxvi. 26, and also Weiss, in loco. The position of προσφ. seems against the supposition that we can take it simply with ἐλεη., and in combination with it, as if both words referred to the collection for the Saints. Jüngst would omit the words καὶ προσφ. . . . ιερῷ altogether, whilst even Hilgenfeld regards vv. 17-21 as an addition of his "Author to Theophilus".

Ver. 18. εν οις, see critical note. If we read εν αίς = "amidst which," R.V., "in presenting which," margin, with reference to προσφοράς, including not only the offerings in connection with the Apostle's association of himself with the poor men in the Nazirite vow, but also offerings such as those referred to in ver. 17. εν αίς = inter quae (Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 193, 228), i.e., in reference to these matters generally, cf. xxvi. 12. —ηγνισμένον, cf. ver. 5: "they found me," indeed, as they have said, but ου μετά δχολου κτ.λ.; a direct answer to the charge of profaning the Temple: he had gone there for worship and sacrifice, "then how did I profane it?" Chrys., Hom., L. —προσφοράς: the expression is generally taken to refer to the offerings involved in the association with the vow, xxvi. 26, but it may also include other acts of worship and purification in the Temple.
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τοῦ θορύβου, τινες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ἱουδαίοι, 19. οὖς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρείναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἰς τί ἔχον πρὸς με. 20. ἡ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι εἶπάτωσαν, εἰ τί εὗρον ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀδίκημα, οὐκάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συνε-

δρίου. 21. ὁτι περὶ μᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς, ἦς ἐκραξα ἐστώς ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἕγω κρίνομαι σήμερον ὁ δέ ὁμών.


3. For ἐκραξα (Lach., Hilgenfeld) the form ἐκκραξα is found in ΝΑΒC 13, 40, 61, Chrys., Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss; redupl. form only here in N.T., but often in LXX; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 104.

ΧΧΙV. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

1. Ακούσας δὲ ταύτα ὁ Φήλιξ ἀνεβάλετο αὐτοῦ, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, εἰτῶν, Ὄταν Λυσίας ὁ χιλιάρχος καταβι, διαγνώσαι τὰ καθ’ υμᾶς. 23. διαταξάμενός τε τῷ ἐκατοντάρχῳ τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παύλον, ἔχειν τε ἁνεσιν, καὶ μηδένα κωλύειν τῶν ἱδίων αὐτοῦ ὑπηρετείν ἡ προσέρχεσθαι αὐτῷ.

2. Διά τῆς ημέρας τινός παραγενόμενος ὁ Φήλιξ τὴν Δρουσίλλην γυναῖκα τοῦ Φήλικος Ιουδαίαν, μετεπέμψατο τὸν Παύλον, καὶ ἴνα τὸν λόγον ἀκούσῃ αὐτῷ. Τὰ περί τῆς οδοῦ διαγνώσην, οταν ὁ χιλιάρχος Λυσίας καταβή, διαταξάμενος τῷ εκατοντάρχῳ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ Παύλου, ἔχειν ἁνεσιν, καὶ μηδένα κωλύειν τοῖς ἱδίων αὐτοῦ ὑπηρετείν, ἡ προσέρχεσθαι αὐτῷ.
 kèwse o aútō peri tith tis eis 1 Xriston pítswes. 25. diálegeméndou de aútō peri diakísvnhs kai égrkrateías kai toí krimatos2 tou mónostos éesebai, embofós genómewos ἐ ἡμισ άπεκριθή, Tô vûn èxon tovou kai rov de metalaβwv metakalésmwai se 26. ãma de kai ãptwv, òti khýmatos doðízonta aútô úpto tou Paulou, òtpws

1 After Xhristov κ*ΒEL 61, Vulg., Gig., Boh., Sýr. H., Chrýs. add Ἰησοῦν, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendl, but om. by Blass in β text, so by Meyer.

2 C 15, 31, 40, 180, Arm., Chrýs. read του μελλ. κρίμatos, but text retained as in T.R. by all edd. om. om. by Blass in β text, so by Meyer. Instead of text Blass in β, so Hilg. with E. Gig., Vulg. (Cassiod.) read kai rh de epitíbes meta-
kalésmwai se.


tus," as Suetonius calls him, Claud., 28), and her son by him, Agrippa by name, perished under Titus in an eruption of Vesuvius, Jos., u. s. It has been sometimes thought that his mother perished with him, but probably the words συν τῇ γυναίκι in Josephus refer not to Drusilla, but to the wife of Agrippa (so Schürer); "Herod" (Headlam), Hastings' B.D., The Herods (Farrar), p. 192 ff.—τῇ γυν. αυτοῦ, see critical note, the addition of ἰδια before γυν. (omit. αυτοῦ) perhaps to emphasise that Drusilla, though a Jewess, was the wife of Felix, or it may point to the private and informal character of the interview, due to the request of Drusilla. Possibly both ἰδια and αυτοῦ were additions to intimate that Drusilla was really the wife of Felix, but it or may point to περί δικαιοσύνης και εγκρατείας και του κρίματος του μέλλων ἐσεσθαι, ἐμφοβος γενόμενος ὁ ἡμισ άπεκριθή, Τὸ νῦν ἔχουν τούτον καιρόν δε μεταλαβών μετακαλέσομαι se. 26. ãma de kai ãptwv, òti khýmatos doðízonta aútô úpto tou Paulou, òtpws

Latin, temperantia, Vulgate, castitate. The presence of Drusilla by his side was in itself a proof how Felix had failed in this virtue also, ἐγκρ. being specially applicable to continence from sensual pleasures (Wetstein); opposed to it is ἀκράτεια, 1 Cor. vii. 5 (= ἀκράτεια), "incontinence," Arist., Eth., vii., 4, 2.

In N.T., Gal. v. 23, 2 Pet. i. 6 (bis), cf. Tit. i. 8. The word is found in Ecclesiast. xviii. 15 S, 30, 4 Macc. v. 34. St. Paul gives a double proof of his courage in reasoning thus not only before Felix but before his wife, for like another Herodias her resentment was to be feared.

τοῦ κρίματος του μελλ.: "the judgment to come," R.V., preserving the force of the article omitted in all E.V. except Rhem.: "ubi etiam illi, qui nunc judices sedent, judicandi erunt" (Wetstein).—εμφ. γεν., see on x. 4, cf. the attitude of Antipas with regard to the Baptist, Mark vi. 30.—Τὸ νῦν ἔχον, cf. Tob. vii. 11 (B1 ἔχον), and for instances in Greek writers see Wetstein.—καὶ ὡς μεταλ. cf. Polyb., ii., 16, 15. μεταλαβόντες καιρ. ἀρμόττοντα (Allord, Blass). So far as we know, no more convenient season ever came, see reading in β text.

Ver. 25. τελ. δικαλ.: Paul does not gratify the curiosity of Felix and Drusilla, but goes straight to the enforcement of those great moral conditions without which, both for Jew and Greek, what he had to say of the Messiahship of Jesus was unintelligible; how grievously Felix had failed in righteousness the events of his period of government proved, cf. Tac., Ann., xii., 54, "cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus," through the evil influence of Pallas, Tac., Hist., v. 9. —ἀγγελ.: R.V. margin "self-control,"
to see further Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 187 (1893).—χρήματα: the mention of "alms," ver. 17, had perhaps suggested the thought that Paul was in a position to purchase his freedom with money, and it was also evident to Felix that the prisoner was not without personal friends, ver. 23. Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 280, points to ver. 17, and to the fact that Felix could not be unaware that Paul was a man of wide influence and supported by many friends, as a sufficient answer to the supposed improbability urged by Pfeiderer that Felix could hope for much from a poor tent-maker and missionary. Spitta thinks that *Philippians* may have been written from Cæsarea, and that therefore (Phil. iv. 10) Felix had double cause to suppose that the poor command of money; but without endorsing this view as to the place of writing of *Philippians*, it may be suggested that St. Paul's friends at Philippi might have helped to provide financial help for the expenses of his trial: Lydia, e.g., was not only ready with large-hearted hospitality, but her trade in itself required a considerable capital: see on the other hand the view of Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 312. It is urged, moreover, that a poor man would never have received such attention or aroused such interest. But St. Luke himself has told us how Herod desired to see the Son of Man, who had not where to lay his head, and the same feeling which prompted Herod, the feeling of curiosity, the hope perhaps of seeing some new thing, may have prompted the desire of a Agrippa or a Drusilla to see and to hear Paul.—οὐχί . . . δοθ.: "sic thesaurum evangelii omisit infelix Felix," Bengel. When Overbeck expresses surprise that Felix did not deliver Paul to the Jews for money, he forgets that Paul's Roman citizenship would make such an action much more dangerous than his detention.—διό και: characteristic of Luke and Paul, and common to Luke's Gospel and Acts, cf. Luke i. 35, Acts x. 29, Rom. iv. 22, xv. 22, 2 Cor. i. 20, iv. 13, v. 9, Phil. ii. 9, only twice elsewhere in N.T., Heb. xi. 12, xiii. 12; "ut illicereteum ad se pecunia temptandum," Blass, Knabenbauer.—πυκνότερον, cf. Luke v. 33, 1 Tim. v. 23; and LXX, Esther viii. 13, 2 Macc. viii. 8, 3 Macc. iv. 12. The comparative here is "versus comparativus": *quo sepius*, Blass. Nothing could more plainly show the corruption of the Roman government than the conduct of Felix in face of the law: "Lex Julia de repetundis praecipit, ne quis ob hominem in vincula publice coniiciendum, vincirendum, vincirendo... aliquid acceperit," *Digest.*, xli, 11, 3 (Wetstein); see further on ver. 3.—Φήλιξ: only in Luke, see above xx. 11; imperfect denoting frequent occurrence.

Ver. 27. *Diētías δὲ πληρ.:* on the question of chronology see below, cf. xx. 30, and for *τριετία*, xx. 31; on *διετία* in inscriptions see two instances in Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 86. *Πληρ.:* perhaps indicating that two full years are meant. Weizsäcker throws doubt upon the historical character of this imprisonment, and thinks that the episode is merely introduced by the writer of Acts, who in his ignorance of the name of the procurator doubles the incident before Felix and Festus; but Wendt declines to value so lightly the definite notices and accounts in Acts, and adds that the delay of the trial under a procurator devoid of a sense of duty was no improbable event. The recall of Felix has been assigned to very varying dates, Lightfoot naming 60, Wendt (1899) 61, Schürer, at the earliest 58, at the latest 61, probably 60, Ramsay 59, whilst McGiffert, following the Chronology recently advocated by O. Holtzmann (with a few earlier writers), places it as early as 55 (Harnack 55-56, following Eusebius, whilst Blass has also defended the Eusebian date). Both McGiffert and Holtzmann fix upon 55 because before the end of this year Pallas, the brother of Felix, was in disgrace; and yet, according to Josephus, Felix escaped the accusations brought against him by shielding himself behind his brother Pallas, whom Nero was then holding in special honour, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 8, 9, Tac., *Ann.*, xii., 14. "Either Josephus is in error," says O. Holtzmann, *Neust. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 128, "or Festus went to Palestine in 55". But there is good reason for thinking that Josephus was in error in stating that Felix escaped by his brother's influence, then at his height, Jos., w. s. It is no doubt true that the influence of Pallas may have been very substantial.
Instead of θέλων τε χάριτας καταθέσται τοῖς Ἦουδαῖοι θείλες, κατάλλητε τὸν Παύλον δεδεμένον.

But if the intervention of Pallas was subsequent to his fall, what becomes of the synchronism between his disgrace and the recall of Felix? But further, Pallas, according to the statement of Tacitus, *Ann.,* xiii., 14, was disgraced before the fourteenth birthday of Britannicus, in Feb. 55, but, if so, how could Felix have reached Rome at such an early period of that year? Nero came to the throne on 13th Oct., 54, and we have to suppose that the order for recall was sent and the return journey of Felix to the capital accomplished in spite of the winter season which made a sea voyage impossible (Ramsay, Zahn, Bacon); “one can therefore no longer base the chronology of an Apostle’s life upon the dismissal of a court favourite”. But are there no chronological data available? Albinus, the successor of Festus, was already procurator in 62. How long he had been in office we cannot say, but he was certainly procurator in the summer of that year (Schürer, *Jewish People,* div. i., vol. ii., p. 188, E.T.; *Biblical World,* p. 357, 1897). From Jos., *Ant.,* xx., 9, 1, we learn that there was an interval of some few months full of disturbance and anarchy between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus in Jerusalem, so that we seem justified in inferring that Festus died probably in the winter of 61–62; and whilst the events of his procuratorship can scarcely have extended over five years (as would be demanded by the earlier chronology)—for in this case Josephus would surely have given us more information about them—it seems equally difficult to suppose that the events which Josephus does record could have been crowded into less than a year, or portions of two (Schürer). The entrance of Festus upon his office might thus be carried back to 59–60, and St. Paul’s departure for Rome would fall probably in 60. But a further contribution to the subject has been made by Mr. Turner, “Chronology of the N.T.,” Hastings’ B.D., pp. 418, 419, and he argues for the exclusion of a date as late as 60 for the accession of Festus, and for placing the earlier and later dates mentioned above; or, more definitely still, in 58, cf. p. 420. With this date Dr. Gilbert agrees, *Student’s Life of Paul,* p. 252, 1899. See further Zahn, *Einleitung,* ii., 634; Wendt (1899), p. 56; *Expositor,* March, 1897, Feb., 1898; “Festus” (A. Robertson), Hastings’ B.D. and B.B?—ἔλαβε διά δοχον, Ecclus. xlvi. 1, xlviii. 8. In 2 Macc. iv. 29, xiv. 26, the meaning of successor is doubtful, and it would seem that the title rather denoted a high office about the court of the Ptolemies, *cf.* Deissmann, *Bibelstudien,* p. 111. In classical Greek it is used as here for successor, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.,* xx., 8, 9, *so successor accept.* Plin., *Epist.,* ix., 13.—Φήστον: we know nothing of him except from the N.T. and Josephus. The latter, however, contrasts him favourably with his successor Albinus: “et Albinum cum ei dissimilimum fuisse tradit, scelestum hominem, simul illum laudat” (Blass). So far as our information goes, Festus also contrasts favourably with his predecessor; he acted with promptness to rid the country of robbers and sicarii, and amongst them of one impostor whose promises were specially seductive, *Ant.,* xx., 8, 9, 10, and B.B., ii., 14, 1. But although, as Schürer says, he was disposed to act righteously, he found himself unable to undo the mischief wrought by his predecessor, and after a short administration death prevented him from coping further with the evils which infested the province. For his attitude towards St. Paul as his prisoner see notes below. Two other events marked his procuratorship: (1) the quarrel between the priests and Agrippa, because the latter built on to his palace so as to overlook the Temple, and the priests retaliated by building so as to shut off his view. Festus sided with Agrippa, but allowed the priests to appeal to Rome. (2) The decision of the emperor in favour of the Syrian against the Jewish inhabitants of Cesarea, which caused a bitterness provoking in A.D. 66 the disturbances in which Josephus marked the beginnings of the great War, *Ant.,* xx., 8, 9.—θέλων τε χάριτας καταθέσται τοῖς Ἦουδαῖοι θείλες..." desiring to gain favour with...
XXV. 1. ΦΗΣΤΟΣ οὖν, ἐπιβάς τῇ ἑπαρχίᾳ, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀνέβη εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ Καισαρείας. 2. ἐνεφάνισαν δὲ ἂν ὁ ἁρχιερεύς καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν ἱουδαίων κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, καὶ παρεκαλῶν αὐτὸν, 3. αἰτοῦμεν χάριν κατ᾽ αὐτὸν, ὅτους μετακυμήται ταῖς εἰς ἱεροσολύμην, ἐνεδράν ποιοῦντες ἄνελείν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνέσιν.

1. ἑπαρχίᾳ, so also Lach., Hilgenfeld, Blass, W.H. text. ἑπαρχίᾳ, so B; but Tisch., Weiss, and W.H. marg. (so Wendt probably) following Ν Α have ἑπαρχίᾳ. Weiss regards ἑπαρχίᾳ (εἰς) as a thoughtless emendation in accordance with xxiii. 34. See also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 44, and note below.


the Jews," R.V., literally to lay down or deposit a favour with the Jews as a deposit for which a due return might be expected, cf. 1 Macc. x. 23 R.; Jos., Ant., xi. 6, 5, so too in classical Greek, Thuc., i., 33, 128; Herod., vi., 41, etc. The policy of Felix was to gain popularity with the Jews in view of the accusations which followed him on his return to Rome, Jos., Ant., xx., 8, 9. That the pursuit of such a policy was not alien to the character of Roman officials see Jos., Ant., xx., 9, 5, where we learn that Albinus, desiring to gain the gratitude of the Jews, took money of all those in prison for some trifling fault, by which means the prisons indeed were emptied, but the country was full of robbers. In B. J., ii., 14, 1, we learn that the same system was pursued by Albinus, the successor of Festus, until no one was left in the prisons but those who gave him nothing. According to Β text Felix leaves Paul in prison to please his wife, but, as Blass points out, both reasons may be true.—χάριτα (W.H., R.V.) only (in N.T.) in Jude, ver. 4, cf. xxv. 9 A; found in classics, though rarer than χάριν, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 88; in LXX, Zech. vi. 14. —δέδεμαι.: this does not at all imply that Paul had been quite free, and was now rebound, cf. ver. 23. ἄνεισις did not mean perfect freedom, and the custodia militaris might still continue. Nósen thinks that the word in its position at the end of the verse indicates a severer form of custody, but this is by no means necessary, although as the last word of the episode, and as the result of all the intercourse with Felix, it has a dramatic force and pathos. Zeller, Acts, ii., p. 83, E.T., although he thinks it remarkable that Felix and Festus are represented as acting from the same motive, as Pilate for a similar reason had consented to the execution of Jesus, is constrained to admit that conduct such as that of the two procurators is too natural for its repetition to be surprising; unscrupulous officials are always ready by complaisance at the expense of others to appease those to whom they have given just cause for complaint.

CHAPTER XXV. — Ver. 1. ἐπιβάς.: "having come into the province," A. and R.V., or, "having entered upon his province," R.V. margin. If we read τῇ ἑπαρχίᾳ with Weiss and W.H. margin, the word is an adjective of two terminations, sc. ἱστος, i.e., having entered on his duties as governor of the province (see Weiss, Apostelgeschichte, p. 8), and cf. xxiii. 34. For the adjective in inscriptions see Blass, in loco. —μετά τρείς ἁμ.: "sat citto," Bengel. —ἀνέβη: went up to Jerusalem officially as the capital; the close-connecting τε may indicate that the action of the priests in again bringing up their case was to be expected.

Ver. 2. ἐνεφάνισαν, cf. xxiii. 15, xxiv. 1: here the context evidently implies that legal and formal information was laid against Paul.—If we read οι ἁρχ., cf. iv. 5. οι πρῶτοι: sometimes taken as = τοῦ προβ. in ver. 15, cf. xxiii. 14, xxv. 1, but in Luke xix. 47 we have οι ἁρχ. καὶ οι πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ. The difference of designation seems to indicate that they were not identical with the προβ., although perhaps including them, or possibly as their chief representatives: see also Plummer on Luke, i. c. Blass seems to identify πρῶτοι with ἁρχιερεῖς, cf. iv. 5, ἁρχιερεῖς. —παρεκάλων: the word and the tense mark their importance.

Ver. 3. αἰτοῦμεν., cf. ver. 15. "Postulantes gratiam non justitiam," Corn.
4. ο μὲν οὖν Φήστος ἀπεκρίθη, τηρείσθαι τὸν Παύλον ἐν Καισαρείᾳ, λαύνον δὲ μὲλλειν εἰς τάξει ἑκκοπεύεισθαι. 5. Οἱ οὖν δυνατοὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς, φησί, συγκαταβάντες, εἶ τι ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἄνδρι τούτῳ, κατηγορεῖται αὐτῶν. 6. Διατρίψας δὲ εἰς αὐτοῖς ἡμέρας 4 πλείως ἡ δέκα, καταβὰς εἰς Καισάρειαν, τῇ ἑπαύριοι καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ οδοῦ. 49 Ι

1 After ὅ διν Syr. H. mg. adds illi qui votum fererant se pro virili (facturos esse) ut in manibus suis esset; but not β text.

2 For en Καίσ. ΝΑΒϹΕ 13, 4ο, 61, read εἰς, so Tisch., W.H., and authorities above. R.V., Weiss, Blass, Hilg. have Καίσαρειαν with BC 13, 4ο; whilst W.H. read Καίσαρειαν.


4 R.V., following ΝΑΒϹΕ, Vulg., Arm., reads πάντως εἰς Καισάρειαν, τῇ ημέρᾳ επί του οδον. H. mg. adds illius qui totum fererant se pro virili (facturos esse) ut in manibus suis esset; but not β text.

"For εν Καισ. δ is SAΒCΕ 13, 4ο, 61, read εις, so Τisch., W.Η., and authorities above.


"Ver. 5. φησί: change to the oratio recta, cf. i. 4. For other instances of the insertion of the single words φησίν or φησίν, rare in N.T., see Simcox, Language of the New Testament, p. 200; cf. xxiii. 35, xxvi. 21, i Cor. vi. 16, 2 Cor. x. 10, Heb. viii. 5. —οἱ ... δυνατοί: "Let them therefore, saith he, which are of power among you," R.V.; not simply "which are able," A.V., "qui in vobis potentessunt," Vulgate. The word may be used by Festus, because he was not acquainted with the Jewish official terms, or it may be used in a general way as in I Cor. i. 26. In Jos., B.J., i., 12, 5, we have the expression, έκαστοι δύναται, cf. Thuc. i. 89, Polyb., ix., 23, 4; but in addition to this general use of the word Jos. frequently conjoints the ἄρχοντες with the δύνατον as members of the Sanhedrim, Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. i., p. 178, E.T. This interpretation of the word is more natural than that adopted by Bengel: "qui valent ad iter faciendum: ἓνος urbanum Festi respondentes Judaei molestiam viae caussantibus;" for other explanations see Wendt-Meyer, in loco. —συγκαταβάντες: "go down with me," R.V., mecum; only here in N. T., in LXX, Ps. xviii. 17, Wisd. x. 13, Dan. iii. 49 (Theod. iii. 49) = Song of the Three Children, ver. 26. —ατονον, see critical note, and further on xxviii. 6.

Ver. 6. ημέρας πλ., see critical note, "not more than eight or ten days," R.V., i.e., the whole period of Festus'
βήματος ἐκείνου τοῦ Παύλου ἀξιόθητι. 7. παραγενομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ, περιεστήσανεν οἱ ἀπὸ ἱεροσολύμων καταβεβηκότες ἱουδαίοι, πολλὰ καὶ βαρέα ἀιτιάματα φέροντες κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου, ὥστε ἵσχυον ἀποδείξαι. 8. ἀπολογομένου αὐτοῦ, ὁτι οὐ δὲ εἰς τὸν νόμον τῶν ἱουδαίων, οὐτὲ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, οὐτὲ εἰς Καίσαρα τί ἡμαρτον. 9. ὁ Φήστος δὲ, τοῖς ἱουδαίοις θέλων χάριν καταβεβήκας, ἀποκριθείς τῷ Παύλῳ εἶπεν, Θελεῖς, εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα ἀνάβας, ἕκει περὶ τούτων ἠμαρτον εἰς αὐτοῖς. Blass sees in the words an indication of the vigour of action characterising Festus. The expression may, however, be used from the standpoint of Paul and his friends at Caesarea, who did not know how much of his absence Festus had spent in Jerusalem, or how much on the journey (so Weiss and Wendt). — τοῦ ἐπαύριον: ten times in Acts, but nowhere in Luke's Gospel. cf., however, τοῦ ἐπιβίου, Luke x. 35 and Acts iv. 5 only (Hawkins). This evidently implies that the accusers had come down with Festus, and it may again indicate his promptness, cf. ver. 17. There does not seem any indication that this immediate action shows that he had been prejudiced against Paul in Jerusalem (Chrys.).—τοῖς ἐπὶ τούτοις βήματι, xii. 21, xviii. 12, and ver. 10 below: seven times in Acts in this sense (Matt. xxvii. 19, John xv. 13), but nowhere in Luke's Gospel; twice by St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 10, 2 Cor. v. 10.—καθ. ἐπὶ τοῦ β.: a necessary formality, otherwise no legal effect would be given to the decision, cf. Schürer, Jew. People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 15, E.T., for this and other instances.— ἐκεῖνος, cf. προσέγγισθαι, Polyc., Mart., ix. 1 and 2.


Ver. 8. Evidently the charges classified as before under three heads, (i) The Law,
Sanhedrim would judge, whilst Festus would ratify their judgment or not as seemed good to him, as Pilate had acted in the case of Christ. On the other hand it is possible that Festus may have been quite sincere in his proposal: his words at least showed that in his judgment there was no case against Paul of a political nature, and he may have thought that religious questions could be best decided before the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem, whilst he could guarantee a safe-conduct for Paul as a Roman citizen. 

Ver. το εστώς ειμι: “I am standing,” used rhetorically, Blass, Gram., p. 198; on the position of εστ. see critical note.—Καίσαρος: because the procurator was the representative of Caesar: “quae acta gestaque sunt pro procuratore Caesaris sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Caesar ipso gesta sint,” Ulpian, Digest., i., 19, 1.—βεί: because a Roman citizen, no need to suppose that the word has reference here to any divine intimation.—Καύσαρος: because the procurator was the representative of Caesar: “quae acta gestaque sunt pro procuratore Caesaris sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Caesar ipso gesta sint,” Ulpian, Digest., i., 19, 1.—βεί: because a Roman citizen, no need to suppose that the word has reference here to any divine intimation.—Καύσαρος: because the procurator was the representative of Caesar: “quae acta gestaque sunt pro procuratore Caesaris sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Caesar ipso gesta sint,” Ulpian, Digest., i., 19, 1.—βεί: because a Roman citizen, no need to suppose that the word has reference here to any divine intimation.—Καύσαρος: because the procurator was the representative of Caesar: “quae acta gestaque sunt pro procuratore Caesaris sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Caesar ipso gesta sint,” Ulpian, Digest., i., 19, 1.—βεί: because a Roman citizen, no need to suppose that the word has reference here to any divine intimation. 

Ver. 11. εί μὲν γὰρ, see critical note, “if then (οὖν) I am a wrongdoer,” referring to his standing before Caesar’s judgment-seat, and not to the ήδικησα in ver. 10.—άδικείν: only here absolutely in N.T.; the verb occurs five times in Acts, once in Luke’s Gospel, and once in St. Matthew, but not elsewhere in the Gospels (Friedrich, p. 23).—δικαιοῦθεν, i.e., according to Roman law.—οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν: non recuso, Vulgate, so Blass; the verb is only used here in Acts, but it occurs three times in St. Luke’s Gospel, three times in Hebrews, once in Mark xv. 6, W.H. 

—In the present passage, and in 1 Tim. iv. 7, v. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 10, Heb. xii. 25 (twice), the word is rendered “refuse,” R.V. text; but in Luke xiv. 18, 19, the word is rendered “to make excuse”; “excused”: Jos., Ant., vii., 8, 2; but in each case the Greek verb literally means “to beg of or from,” and the Latin deprecor might well express the verb both here and in Luke xiv., l.c., cf. Esth. iv. 8 in the sense of supplicating, and for the sense as above 2 Macc. ii. 31, 3 Macc. vi. 27; see also Grimm sub v. for different shades of meaning. In Jos., Vita, 29, we have the phrase δικαιοῦθεν οὐ παραιτοῦμαι: upon which Krenkel insists as an instance of dependence upon Josephus, but not only is the phrase here somewhat different verbally, οὐ παραὶ τὸ ἀποθ., the article expressing more emphatically, as Bengel says, id ipsum agi; but cf. the instances quoted by Wetstein of the use of similar phrases in Greek, and of the Latin deprecor, e.g., Dion. Hal., A.V., 29. τὸν μὲν ὤν θάνατον... οὐ παραιτοῦμαι. See
further Intro., p. 31.—χαρίσασθαι: "to grant me by favour," R.V. margin, cf. iii. 14, xxv. 16, xxvii. 24 (Philem. ver. 22), only in Luke and Paul in N.T.; see on its importance as marking the "We" section, xxvii. 24, and other parts of Acts, Zeller, Acts, ii., 318, E.T. Paul must have known what this "giving up" to the Jews would involve.—Καίσαρα ἐπικ.: Αppello: provoco ad Casarem: "Si apud acta duis appellaverit, satis erit si dictat: Appello." Digest., xlix., 1, 2, except in the case of notorious robbers and agitators whose guilt was clear, ibid., 16. But we must distinguish between an appeal against a sentence already pronounced, and a claim at the commencement of a process that the whole matter should be referred to the emperor. It would appear from this passage, cf. vv. 21, 25, 32, that Roman citizens charged with capital offences could make this kind of appeal, for the whole narrative is based upon the fact that Paul had not yet been tried, and that he was to be kept for a thorough inquiry by the emperor, and to be brought to Rome for this purpose. cf. Pliny, Epist., x., 97, quoted by Schürer, Alford, and others, and similar instances in Renan, Saint Paul, p. 543, Schürer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 59, and div. ii., vol. ii., p. 278, E.T., and also "Appeal," Hastings' B.D., and below, p. 514.—This step of St. Paul's was very natural. During his imprisonment under Felix he had hoped against hope that he might have been released, but although the character of Festus might have given him a more reasonable anticipation of justice, he had seen enough of the procurator to detect the vacillation which led him also to curry favour with the Jews. From some points of view his position under Festus was more dangerous than under Felix: if he accepted the suggestion that he should go up to Jerusalem and be tried before the Sanhedrin, he could not doubt that his judges would find him guilty; if he declined, and Festus became the judge, there was still the manifest danger that the better judgment of the magistrate would be warped by the selfishness of the politician. Moreover, he may well have thought that at a distant court, where there might be difficulty in collecting evidence against him, he would fare better in spite of the danger and expense of the appeal. But whilst we may thus base St. Paul's action upon probable human motives, his own keen and long desire to see Rome, xix. 21, and his Lord's promise of the fulfilment of that desire, xxiii. 11, could not have been without influence upon his decision, although other motives need not be altogether excluded, as St. Chrysostom, Ewald, Neander and Meyer (see Nøsgen, 435). It has been maintained that there was every reason to suppose that St. Paul would have obtained his acquittal at the hands of the Roman authorities, especially after Agrippa's declaration of his innocence, xxvi. 32. But St. Paul's appeal had been already made before Agrippa had heard him, and he may well have come to the conclusion that the best he could hope for from Festus was a further period of imprisonment, whilst his release would only expose him to the bitter and relentless animosity of the Jews. Two years of enforced imprisonment had been patiently borne, and the Apostle would be eager (can we doubt it?) to bear further witness before Gentiles and kings of his belief in Jesus as the Christ, and of repentance and faith towards God.

Ver. 12. μετὰ τοῦ συμβ., i.e., his assessors, assessores consiliarii, with whom the procurators were wont to consult in the administration of the law. They were probably composed, in part at all events, of the higher officials of the court, cf. Suet., Tiber., 33, Lamprid., Vita Alex. Sev., 46, Jos. Antiq., xiv. 10, 2, Schürer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 60, E.T.; and see further on the word Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 65, and references in Grimm-Thayer, sub v. It would seem that the procurator could only reject such an appeal at his peril, unless in cases where delay might be followed by danger, or when there was manifestly no room for an appeal, Dig., xix., 5, and see Bethge, Die Paulinischen Reden, p. 252, and Blass, in loco. —Κ. ἐπικ., no question, W.H., R.V., Weiss (as in 4 V.); "asyn. rhetor. cum anaphora," Blass, cf. 1 Cor. vii. 18, 21, 27. The decision of the procurator that the appeal must be allowed, and the words in which it was
13. Ἡμέραν δὲ διαγενομένων τινῶν, Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Βερνίκη καθήτορας εἰς Καισάρειαν, ἕστωμεν τοῦ Φήστου. 14. ὡς δὲ πλείους ἡμέρας διέτριβον ἕκει, ὁ Φήστος τῷ βασιλείς ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παύλου, λέγων, Ἀνηρ οίς ἔστι 2 καταλελειμμένοι υπὸ

1 For ἐστασαμένοι (instead of ὁμένοι) ᾿ΙΑΒΕΣΤ. ΗΛΠ 13, 31, 68, 105, Βοχ., Αεθ., so Τίσχ., Βει. Βαζ. Weis. R. V. Hort (not Westcott) says the authority for ὁμένοι is absolutely overwhelming, and as a matter of transmission ὁμένοι can be only a correction. But he adds that it is difficult to remain satisfied that there is no prior corruption of some kind. Βλάσσ., Αγρ., p. 193, rejects ὁμένοι as impossible, and reads, ἐστασαμένοι, so Ηίλγ. Βέντ. (1899), p. 386, strongly supports ὁμένοι, and explains the aor. part. after the anal. of i. 24, x. 13, xiii. 27.

2 καταλελειμμένοι, W. H. have λεμμ.; cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 45.

announced were not meant to frighten Paul, as Bengel supposed, but at the same time they may have been uttered, if not with a sneer, yet with the intimation "thou little knowest what an appeal to Caesar means". Moreover, Festus must have seen that the appeal was based upon the prisoner's mistrust of his character, for only if the accused could not trust the impartiality of the governor had he any interest in claiming the transference of his trial to Rome.

Ver. 13. Ἀγρ. ὁ βασιλεὺς: this was Herod Agrippa II., son of Agrippa I., whose tragic end is recorded in chap. xii. At the time of his father's death he was only seventeen, and for a time he lived in retirement, as Claudius was persuaded not to entrust him with the kingdom of Judæa. But on the death of Herod, king of Chalcis, A.D. 48, Claudius not only gave the young Agrippa the vacant throne, A.D. 50, but transferred to him the government of the Temple, and the right of appointing the high priest. His opinion on religious questions would therefore be much desired by Festus. Subsequently he obtained the old tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, and the title of king was bestowed upon him. We have thus a proof of St. Luke's accuracy in that he calls him βασιλεὺς, cf. xxvi. 27, but not king of Judæa, although he was the last Jewish king in Palestine. Bernice and Drusilla were his sisters. He offended the Jews not only by building his palace so as to overlook the Temple, but also by his constant changes in the priesthood. In the Jewish war he took part with the Romans, by whom at its close he was confirmed in the government of his kingdom, and received considerable additions to it. When Titus, after the fall of Jerusalem, celebrated his visit to Caesarea Philippi—Herod's capital, called by him Νερόνιας in honour of Nero—by magnificent games and shows, it would seem that Agrippa must have been present; and if so, he doubtless joined as a Roman in the rejoicings over the fate of his people. Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, ii., 1, 30, "Agrippa II."; Βλάσσ., Ζωή των Πληθυντών, div. i., p. 58 ff., "Herod" (6), Hastings' B.D., Farrar, The Herods, p. 193 ff. (1896).—Βερνίκη (Βερεν. = Μακεδονιαν form of Φερενίκη, see Βλάσσ., in loco, and C. I. G., 361; C. I. A., iii., i., 556, Headlam in Hastings' B.D.): the eldest of the three daughters of Agrippa I. She was betrothed, but apparently never married, to Marcus, son of Alexander, the Alabarch of Alexandria (see Βλάσσ. for correct reading of Jos., Αντ., xix., 5, 1, Ζωή των Πληθυντών, div. i., vol. ii., p. 342, note). On his death at the age of thirteen she was married to her uncle, Herod of Chalcis, Jos., u. s., but after a few years she was left a widow, and lived in the house of her brother Agrippa II. In order to allay the worst suspicions which were current as to this intimacy, she married Polemon, king of Cilicia, Ant., xx., 7, 3 (Juvin., Sat., vi., 156 ff.), but she soon left him and resumed the intimacy with her brother. Like Agrippa she showed openly at least a certain deference for the Jewish religion, and on one occasion, says Βλάσσ., u. s., p. 107, we find even her, a bigot as well as a wanton, a Ναζιρίτης in Jerusalem, B. J., ii., 15, 1. This was in A.D. 66, and she endeavoured while in the capital to stay the terrible massacre of Florus—"the one redeeming feature of her career," Β. D. But later on, exasperated by the Jewish populace who burnt her palace, she became, like her brother, a partisan of the Romans, and in turn the mistress of Vespasian and of Titus, Τάκτ., Hist., ii., 82; Suet., Tit., 7; Jos., B. J., ii., 17, 6. O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 83,
Φήλικος δέσμιος, 15. περὶ οὗ, γενομένου μου εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα, ἐνεφάνισαν οἱ ἄρχερεις καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν ἱερατών, αἰτομένου καὶ αὐτοῦ; δικὴν. 16. πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθην, διτι οὐκ εστὶν ὅσος Ῥωμαῖοι χαρίζεσθαι τινα ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀπώλειαν, πρὶν ή ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχῃ τοὺς κατηγόρους, τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λαβὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος. 17. συνελθόντων οὖν αὐτῶν ενθάδε, ἀναβολήν μηδεμίαν ποιησάμενος, τῇ εὔξης καθίσας επὶ τοῦ βῆματος εκλέεσα ἀχθήνα τὸν κρίνα. 18. περὶ οὐκ ἀστάθεις οἱ κατηγοροὶ οὐδὲμίαν αἰτίαν. 4 ἐπέφερον ὄν ὑπενόουν ἕγο. 19. ζητήματα δὲ τίνα περὶ τῆς ἰδιᾶς δεισιδαιμονίας εἴχον πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ περὶ τοῦ

1 For δικὴν ΝΑΒC read καταδίκην, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. Meyer explains καταδ. as an interpretation of δικὴν, but more probably καταδ. was altered into δικὴν on account of ver. 3 (Wendt).


speaks of Drusilla as a worthy sister of Bernice: he might have said the same of the other sister, Mariamne, since she too left her husband for the wealth of Demetrius, the Jewish Alabarch of Alexandria, Jos., Ant., xx., 7, 3. —διαπραγμένοι, see critical note. No doubt an official visit of congratulation paid by Agrippa as a Roman vassal upon the procurator’s entry on his office. The future participle makes the sense quite easy, but if we read the aorist it looks as if Agrippa and Bernice had previously saluted Felix, and afterwards came to his official residence, Caesarea. Rendall includes in κατέντησαν ποιτ only the notion of an arrival but also of settling down for a stay short or long: “came to stay at Caesarea and saluted Felix” (aorist), but see Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 125.

Ver. 14. ἀνέθετο: only in Luke and Paul, cf. Gal. ii. 2. “Laid Paul’s case before the king,” R.V., cf. 2 Macc. iii. 9, and instances in Weistzen, Gal. ii. 2. In the middle voice the idea is that of relating with a view to consulting, so here (cf. vv. 20, 26, Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 2); it was natural for Festus thus to consult Agrippa, see above on ver. 13.

Ver. 15. ἀφι. καὶ οἱ πρεσβ., see on ver. 2. —ἐνεφάνισαν, see critical note. If we read καταδίκην = “sentence,” R.V., i.e., of condemnation; LXX, Symm., Ps. lxxxix. 3, Wisd. xii. 27; so in Polyb., xxvi. 5, 1.

Ver. 16. ἠθός, see vii. 14.—χαρίζ., p. 489.—πρίν ή ... ἐξου, cf. Luke ii. 26, the only two passages where a finite verb occurs after πρίν in N. T., see further Burton, pp. 52, 129, 133, and Plummer, Luke, i. c.—κατὰ πρόσωπον, see on iii. 13.—τόπον: “opportunity,” Rom. xv. 23, Ephes. iv. 27, Heb. xii. 17, Ecclus. iv. 5, cf. Jos., Ant., xvi. 8, 5 (Polyb., i., 88, 2).

Ver. 17. ἀναβ. μὴ ἀυτίαν επέφ. : classical, εφερον, cf. Τhuc., ν., 76; Ηerod., i., 26, so in Polyb. and Jos., but see critical note. αιτίαν: criminis delatio, accusatio, and so in ver. 27; see for various meanings Grimm, sub ν.—ὑπενόουν: possibly he supposed that there were to be some charges of political disturbance or sedition like that which had recently given rise to such bloody scenes and a conflict between Greeks and Jews in the streets of Caesarea. St. Chrys., Hom., well emphasises the way in which the charges against Paul had repeatedly broken down.

Ver. 19. ζητήματα ... τίνα: plural contemptuously (Weiss). —δεισιδαιμονίας, see on xvii. 22, “religion,” R.V.: in ad-
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

"Ἰησοῦ τεθνήκότος, δὲ ἔφασκεν ὁ Πάουλος Ἰην. 20. ἀπορούμενος δὲ ἔγνω ἡ τῆς περὶ τοῦτον ἤγγισε, ἔλεγον, εἰ διάνοια πορεύεσθαι εἰς ἑκουσαλήμ, καὶ καὶ δύνας ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς τήν τοῦ Ἱερουσαλήμ διάγνωσιν, ἀκελεύνω τηρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν, ἕως ὡς ἡ τέμψεως αὐτὸν πρὸς Καίσαρα.

1 εἰς σο. ἩΒΗΡ., Tisch., W. H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, but retained by Blass, Hilgenfeld. Although ἁπαρ, not elsewhere in N.T. with simple acc., but as this is good Greek no need to read the prep. For τοῦτον ΝΑΒΕΛ read τοῦτων, so Tisch. and authorities above, so Blass, but brackets τοῦτων at end of verse.

2ο, απορούμενος δὲ εγώ εἰς τὴν περί τοῦτον ἤγγισε, ἔλεγον, εἰβοῦλοιτο πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, κακείκρίνεσθαι περί τοῦτον, τοῦ δὲ Πάουλου ἐπικαλεσαμένου τηρηθήναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ διάγνωσιν, ἐκείνως τηρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν, ἕως ὡς τέμψεος αὐτὸν πρὸς Καίσαρα.

dressing a Jewish king Felix would not have used the term offensively, especially when we consider the official relation of Agrippa to the Jewish religion (see above, ver. 13), but he may well have chosen the word because it was a neutral word (verbūm μέσον, Bengel) and did not commit him to anything definite.—τοῦ Τοῦν δ' AυCΕL read τοῦτων, so Tisch. and authorities above, so Blass, but brackets περὶ τοῦτων at end of verse. For πεμψω ΑυCΕL 13, 31, 40, 61, 137, read ἀναπεμψω, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg., R.V. After διαγνωσιν Blass in β with Gig. adds επειδὴ τινα οὐκ εδυναμην κριναι.

εν ucern aut necivit, aut non curavit, Bengel: see further Luckock, Footsteps of the APOSTLES as traced by St. Luke, ii., p. 269.—ἐφάσκεν: with the notion of groundless affirmation, "alleging", see Page, in loco, and Meyer on Rom. i. 22 (Rev. ii. 2). Blass and Knabenbauer take it as = dictitabat.

Ver. 2ο. απορούμενος δὲ: "being perplexed how to inquire concerning," R.V., omitting εἰς, the verb αποροῦμενος talking a direct accusative. See above on ii. 12. Festus might have truly said that he was perplexed, as he still was, concerning Paul, and it is possible that the positive motive assigned for his action in ver. 9 was an honest attempt on his part to get more definite information at Jerusalem than he would obtain in Cesarea—but we know how St. Paul viewed his question. On the other hand he may have wished to conceal his real motive (Weiss).—Καίσαρα: in N.T. the name is always official, never personal. It was first assumed as an official title by Octavius, the nephew of Julius Caesar (see above), who doubtless took it on account of the fame of his uncle, and as a name not likely to be hated and despised by the Romans like that of "king". After the death of Gaius Caesar, the last of the Julian stock,
22. Αγρίππας δὲ πρὸς τὸν Φήστον ἔφη, Ἠβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκούσαι. ο δὲ, Αὔριον, φησίν, ἀκούσι αὐτοῦ.

23. Τῇ οὖν ἐπαύριον ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἀγρίππα καὶ τῆς Βερνίκης μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας, καὶ εἰσελθόντων εἰς τὸ ἀκροατήριον, σὺν τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ ἀνδράς τοὺς καὶ ἐξοχίν οὐδὲ τὴν πόλεως,

ο δὲ om. δ S ΑΒ, Vulg., Boh., so Tisch. and other authorities as above.

ο δὲ om. S&ΑΒ 13, so Τisch. and other authorities as in ver. 21, except Hilg.

For τοις . . . τοῖς χιλιάρχοις Syr. H. mg. reads qui descendissent de provincia; in β text Blas adds the words after τοῖς χιλιάρχοις (καὶ).

it was adopted by Claudius and by succeeding emperors, Tac., Hist., ii., 80, until the third century, when the title Augustus was reserved for the supreme ruler, and that of Caesar was adopted for those who shared his government as his possible heirs, as earlier still it had been conferred upon the heir presumptive: "Caesar," Hastings' B.D. and B.D. 3.

Ver. 22. Ἠβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς: "I also was wishing to hear the man myself," R.V., margin, imperfect, as of a wish entertained for some time; it was probable from Agrippa's position, and his official relationship to Judaism, that he would have been already interested in Paul. Bethge takes it as if it meant that a strong desire had been already awakened by the governor's statement to hear Paul, see also Winer-Moulton, xli. a, 2; but it is most usual to explain the imperfect here (without ἤ) rather than the direct present as used out of politeness, softening the request, "I should like," Burton, p. 16, Page, in loco; Lightfoot, On a Fresh Revision, etc., p. 16. Calvin strangely takes the imperfect to mean that Agrippa had long cherished the wish to hear Paul, but had checked it hitherto, lest he should seem to have come with any other motive than to see Festus.—ἀπὸν: emphatic (and emphasised by ἐξοχεῖα), indicating the immediate compliance with Agrippa's wish.

Ver. 23. φαντασίας, Polyb., xv., 25, 15, etc.; Diod. Sic., xii., 83, and instances in Wetstein, cf. Herod., vii., 10. φαντά-σεθα (Page); "in eadem urbe, in qua pater ipsorum a vermis corrosus superbi perierat" (Wetstein). The word here in the description may point to the presence of an eyewitness (Plumptre).—τὸ ἀκροατήριον: auditorium, but the article need not be pressed, as here the word may simply imply the chamber used on this occasion; it would scarcely have been the place of formal trial, as this was not in question.—χιλιάρχοι: there were five cohorts stationed at Caesarea, Jos., B. f., iii., 4, 2, but see the remarks of Belser, Beiträge, pp. 138-140.—ἀνδράς τοῖς κατ' εξοχήν: evidently from the context to be regarded as heathen. Both Jew and heathen in Caesarea had equal civil rights, and had to conduct the public affairs in common; the expression here used does not mean that Jews were excluded from the government, although it is quite in accordance with the fact of the preponderating Gentile element mentioned by Josephus, B. j., iii., 9, 1; Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. I., p. 86, note, E.T.—κατ' ἐξοχήν: here only in N.T., not in classical Greek in this sense; primarily of any prominence, cf. LXX., Job xxi. 28, ἑξοχέας, 3 Macc. v. 31; cf. for its meaning here Cic., Ad Att., iv., 15, 7, in classical Greek ἑξοχέας; for the phrase, Winer-Moulton, ii., 2, 9.

Ver. 24. βασιλεύ, see above on p. 495.—συναρπάσταις: only here in N.T.; cf. Wisd. ix. 10, Tobit xii. 12 AB.—τὸ πλ.: the statement is not in the least inconsistent with vv. 2, 7, 15. In Jerusalem at all events it is easily intelligible that a noisy crowd would second the actual accusers, cf. xvii. 5, 6, while in connection with Caesarea we know from the latter years of the government of Felix how bitter the Jews were against the Gentiles, and how natural it would be for them to oppose the Apostle of the Gentiles, Jos., B. f., ii., 13, 7; Ant., xx., 8, 7.—ἐνέτυχόν μοι: "made suit to me," R.V., Wisd. viii. 20, 3 Macc. vi. 37, so in Plut., Pomp., 55, cf. Polyc., Martyr., xvii., 2, with dative only; it is used also of those making complaint before some authority, 1 Macc. viii. 32, x. 6, xi. 35, 2 Macc. iv. 36, see Westcott on Heb. vii. 25. The verse with the exception of Heb. vii. 25 and text is only found in
και καλεσάντος τοῦ Φήστου, ἡχήὶ ὁ Παύλος. 24. καὶ φησὶν ὁ Φήστος, Ἀγρίππα βασιλεύ, καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαρόντες ἥμιν ἄνδρες, διεφεύγει τοῦτον, περὶ οὗ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων 1 εὐντυχον μοι ἐν τῇ ἱεροσολύμῳ καὶ ἐνθάδε, ἐπιβοῶτες μὴ δεῖν ἕναυτὸν μηκέτι.

25. ἔγνω δὲ καταλαβόμενοι μηδὲν ἔξων θανάτων αὐτοῦ πεπραχθεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦτον ἐπικαλεσάμενος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, ἕκρινα πέμπειν αὐτὸν.

26. περὶ οὗ δοσφάλες ιν γράφαι τῷ κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐχῶ· διὰ προσήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐφ’ ὅμοι, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ σοῦ, βασιλεύ Ἀγρίππα, ὅπως τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης σχῆ τι γράφαι. 27. ἀλλον γὰρ μοι δοκεῖ, πέμπτον δέσμιον, μή καὶ τὰς κατ’ αὐτοῦ αἰτίας σημάναι.

1 εὐντυχον ἩCAELHP, Tisch., W.Η. marg., Weiss, but in text W.Η. read εὐντυχεῖν (so Blass in β text), with B.Η. 40, 105. For εὐνοοῦτες ΝΑΒ 61, Tisch., W.Η., R.V., Weiss, Wendt read βοῶτες. After εὐντυχον μοι Blass in β text omits τε and ενθάδε (retained by Hilgenfeld) with Cod. Dublin, Berger, and proceeds with the same Codex, and Vers. Bohem. (Tisch.), and especially with Syr. H. mg. to reconstruct the text in β (see also Hilgenfeld's reconstruction). οὐκοὶ παράδοι αὐτῷ εἰς θανάτον. (εν) αὐτῷ κατηγορηθέντος δὲ εἰς ἑν τὸν κατασκευασμένον αὐτῷ διὰ τὴν ἐντολήν αὐτοῦ ἐν Ιεροσολύμοις καὶ ενθάδε, επιβοώντες μη δεῖν αὐτὸν μηκέτι. εγώ δὲ καταλαβόμενος μηδὲν θανάτου αὐτοῦ πεπραχθέντος, καὶ αὐτοῦ δε τοῦτον επικαλεσάμενος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, ἕκρινα πέμπειν αὐτὸν.

26. περὶ οὗ ασφαλές τι γράψαι τῷ κυρίῳ, τί γράψω, ἐν προήγαγον αὐτὸν εφ’ ὑμῶν, καὶ μᾶλιστα, βασιλεύ Ἀγρίππα, τίς τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης σχῆ τι γράφαι. 27. ἀλλον γὰρ μοι δοκεῖ, πέμπτον δέσμιον, μή καὶ τὰς κατ’ αὐτοῦ αἰτίας σημάναι.

Rom. viii. 27, 34, xi. 2, in each place of making supplication to God. For its use cf. έντυχεῖν and έντυχον, of making request to one in authority, cf. Deissmann, Bibelstudien, i., pp. 117, 118, 143, 144, e.g., the frequent formula on the papyri, έντυχεῖν εἰς τό τοῦ βασιλέως ομα. Clemen regards the whole speech of Festus to Agrippa, vv. 24-27, as an interpolation on account of the repetition of ver. 21 in ver. 25, and of the contradiction supposed to exist between vv. 27 and 19. But Jüngst differs from him with regard to the latter point, and although admitting the hand of a reviser freely in the first speech, and also in vv. 14-21, he hesitates to define the revision too exactly in the latter speech.

Ver. 25. καταλαβόμενος, cf. iv. 13 and x. 34; Ephes. iii. 18.—τοῦ Σ: "sanctius hoc nomen erat quan Caesar," Blass.—αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦτον, cf. xxiv. 15, Thuc., vi., 33 (Wetstein).

Ver. 26. δοσφάλες τι γράφαι, Dig., xlii., 6. "Post appellationem interpo-
sitam litterae danda sunt ab eo, a quo appellatum est, ad eum qui de appella-
tione cogniturus est, sive principem, sive quem alium, quas litt. dimissorias sive Apostolos appellant" (Wetstein and Blass).—τοῦ κυρίου: title refused by Augustus and Tiberius because it savoured too much of the relationship between a master and a slave, and perhaps because it seemed a title more fitting to God (as Wetstein explains it), cf. Suet., Aug., 53, Tiber., 27, and Tacitus, Ann., ii., 87. It was accepted by Caligula and succeeding emperors (cf. Pliny's Letter to Trajan with the frequent Dominus), although Alexander Severus forbade it to be applied to him; for other instances, and instances on inscriptions, see Wetstein, in loco, Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, 44, and Bibelstudien, 77, 78, and Tert., Apol., 34, Polyc., Martyr., vii., 2, ix. 2, who refused to utter it with reference to Caesar. For the due significance of the word in St. Luke, who uses it more fre-
XXVI. 1. ἈΓΡΙΠΠΑΣ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Παύλον ἔφη, Ἐπιτρέπεται σοι ὅπερ Εὐαγγελεῖται τῷ δὲ Παύλῳ ἀπελογεῖτο, ἐπειδὰς τὴν χεῖρα. 2. Περὶ πάντων δὲ ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων, βασιλεῖς Ἀγρίππα, ἥγημας Εὐαγγελεῖται μὲλῶν ἀπολογεῖσθαι ἐπὶ σοῦ σήμερον. 3. μάλιστα γνώστην οὐν σε πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων ἑδὼν τι καὶ ἡγημάτων. 4. δὴ δέομαι σοι μακρόθυμως ἀκούσαι μου.

---

1 After Paulus Blass in β adds θαρρων καὶ εν τω αγιω πνευματι παρακλησιν λαβων with Syr., Harcl., mg. -ανακρίσεως: here not in its strictly legal and judicial sense of a preliminary inquiry, but an inquiry into the case, cf. ver. 22 (iv. 9), with a view to sending a report to the emperor as judge, Renan, Saint Paul, p. 544, and Zöckler, in loco. Festus knew what the charges were, but not their significance, and he hoped to obtain some definite information from Agrippa or Paul—he wanted something ασφαλές; Paul had contradicted the charge of treason, and what was left, ver. τg, seemed full of obscurity and absurdity.

Ver. 27. ἀλογον, cf. Thuc., vi., 85, Xen., Ages., xi., 1 (elsewhere in N.T., 2 Pet. ii. 12, Jude ver. 10, cf. Wisd. xi. 15, 16, 3 Macc. v. 40 (A om.), 4 Macc. xiv. 1, 80). It would seem from the verse that the procurator was not bound to send the littera dimissoria (O. Holtzmann).—επισταμενος: for construction cf. Heb. ii. 10, or the expression may be quite general “that any one sending,” etc.—σημάναι: here per litteras significare, as in classical Greek (Wetstein). This decisive turn given to events by Paul’s appeal is regarded by Weizsäcker (Apostolic Age, ii., 124, E.T.) as the most certain event in the whole history of the case; Paul as a prisoner could only be taken to Rome if he was to be brought before the emperor’s court, and this had to be done if he invoked such intervention. On Zeller’s and Weizsäcker’s attempt to see in the appearance of Paul before Agrippa a mere repetition of the episode of our Lord before Annas cf. Spitta’s reply, Apostelgeschichte, p. 281.
4. τὴν μὲν ὀνωθέν βλέποντος, τὴν δὲ ἀρχή ἔχοντες 
ἐν τῷ ἄνοιξη 
μου ἐν ἱεροσόλυμοι, ἵστατ πάντες οἱ ἱουδαίοι,
5. προγινώσκοντες με ἁπαντῶν, (οὐκ ἄλλοις μαρτυρεῖν,) ὅτι κατὰ τὴν 
ἐκ νεοτητὸς αἴρεσιν τῆς 
φαρισαίας


2 ἱουδαίοι, so W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg., with ABHLP; Tisch. with NEC read ἱουδαίοι, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 44.
6 καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι τῆς 1 πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίας γενομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ κρανίμενος.

7. εἰς τὸ δώδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν ἐν ἀκτενείᾳ νῦκτα καὶ ἡμέραν ἄφησε 2 καταντήσαι· περὶ ἦς ἐλπίδος ἐγκαλούμενος, βασιλεύς Ἀγρίππα, ὑπὸ τῶν ἱουδαίων.


1 For καταντήσαι Β has καταντήσειν, so W.Η. marg., Weiss, 베사. at end of verse ἈBΕη, Tisch., W.Η., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After νῦκτα, τον is omitted by ἈBΕΗΛΡ, so by Tisch and other authorities above.

δωδεκάφυλον ἡμών μεταφορά; and in Josephus it is frequently used of the public worship of God, worship in its external aspect, cf. Ant., ix., 13; xii., 5, 4; v., 10, 1; xii., 6, 2. It was therefore a very natural word for Paul to use; and it is not necessary to suppose that he did so merely for the sake of Festus and the Romans (Blass), although the word was used of one mode of worship when contrasted with another; see further Hatch, Essays in B.G., p. 55; Trench, Synonyms, i., p. 200, and Mayor on James i. 26.—Μάρτυς: emphatic at the end, expressing the "straitest sect" by name, cf. Gal. i. 14, Phil. iii. 5, 6.

Ver. 6. καὶ νῦν: the expression does not indicate any contrast with ver. 4: this hope for which he stands to be judged is in full accord with his whole past life.—ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι: phrase only found elsewhere in St. Paul's Epistles, where it is frequent; Rom. viii. 20, 1 Cor. ix. 10, Tit. i. 2. A hope not merely of the resurrection of the dead, but of the Messiah's kingdom with which the resurrection was connected, as the context points to the national hope of Israel; cf. Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 175. E.T., see also pp. 137, 148, 149, and E. T. Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, B. ii., pp. 75, 79, on the strong bond of the common hope of Israel.—πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας, see critical note. With either preposition we have a Pauline expression; on the force of εἰς see Alford and Weiss, in loco. If we read ἡμῶν after πατέρας, perhaps including Agrippa himself as a Jew.

Ver. 7. ἡμῶν ἐπί: unto which promise, not semp (Grotius, Bengel), καταντήσαι εἰς, cf. the same construction with the same verb, Phil. iii. 11, Ephes. iv. 13, only in Luke and Paul, but never by the former elsewhere in metaphorical sense; in classical Greek after verbs of hoping we should have had a future, but in N.T. generally aorist infinitive, Viteau, Lo Grec du N.T., p. 154 (1893).—τὸ δωδεκάφυλον: here only in biblical Greek; perhaps used after the mention of the fathers, as the heads of the tribes; for the word cf. Prot. doc. i., 3, Clem. Rom., Cor., iv. 6 (cf. xxxix. 4), and T. Synh., ἐν ἐπὶ δωδεκάφυλον; the expression was full of hope, and pointed to a national reunion under the Messiah; for the intensity of this hope, and of the restoration of the tribes of Israel, see on iii. 21 (p. 115), and references in ver. 6, Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 67, and especially Psalms of Solomon, xviii., 28, 30, 50.—ἐν ἀκτενείᾳ, cf. xii. 5, 2 Macc. iv. 38, 3 Macc. vi. 41, Jud. iv. 9 (twice?): Cic., Ad Att., x., 17, 1. See Hatch, Αιτία, p. 12.—νῦκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, cf. Luke ii. 37, joined with λατρεύον, as here, and in both places of the earnest prayer for the Messiah's coming; same phrase elsewhere in N.T. only in Rev. vii. 15. For the force of the expression here and its relation to the Temple worship see Blass in loco, and Schürer, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 174. E.T.—καὶ ἱωβ: by Jews, O King! Agrippa knew that this hope, however misdirected, was the hope of every Israelite, and the Apostle lays stress upon the strange fact that Jews should thus persecute one who identified himself with their deepest and most enduring hopes.

Ver. 8. R.V. gives more clearly the significance of the original, "Why is it judged incredible with you, if God (as He does) raises the dead?" εἰ with indicative assumes that the hypothesis is true, Vulgate "si Deus mortuos suscitat?" cf. Luke xvi. 31. It has sometimes been thought that St. Paul
6-10. 

here makes a special appeal to the Sadducean part of his audience—παρ' ὑμῖν—including among them Agrippa, with his indifference and practical Sadduceism (Alford), with his policy favouring the Sadducees in the appointment of the high priests (Felten): others have seen in the words a reference to the general resurrection with which the Apostle’s Messianic belief was connected, or to cases of resurrection in the history of Israel, as, e.g., 1 Kings xvii., 2 Kings iv., as if the speaker would ask: Why do you judge a thing incredible in your judgment when you have instances before you in the sacred books accepted by Agrippa and the Jews? But it is far better to consider the words in connection with the great truth to which the whole speech was meant to lead up, νερ. 23, νίπ., that Jesus, although crucified, had risen again, that He was at this moment a living Person, and by His resurrection had been proved to be the Messiah, the fulfiller of the hope of Israel. Zöckler regards the question as forming a kind of transition from the general hope of the Jews in a Messiah to the specific Christian hope in Jesus. 

—ἀπιστον: only here in Ἀκτς, twice in Luke’s Gospel, but frequent in St. Paul’s Epistles of those who believed not. See further Nestle, Philologica Sacra, p. 54, 1896, and Wendt, p. 391 and note (1899). Nestle proposes to place the verse as out of connection here between νν. 22 and 23, with a full stop at the end of the former; and Wendt commends this view.

Ver. 9. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν: the words may be taken as simply resuming the narrative of the Apostle’s life which he had commenced in νν. 4 and 5, the three succeeding verses forming a parenthesis, or as an answer to the question of ver. 8, the real antithesis to μὲν οὖν, ver. 9, and the narrative, νν. 9-11, being found in νν. 12 and what follows. On μὲν οὖν see Rendall, Acts, Appendix, p. 163, and also Page on ii. 41, Acts, pp. 94, 95; see also critical note above.—ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐμαυτῷ ὁ ὄνομα ΙησοῦτοΥ Ναζωραίου δειν πολλά ἐναντίον πράξαι τὸ καὶ εἰποίησα εν Ἰεροσολύμοις, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἄγιων ἔγερσα κατέκλεισα, τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἄρχερῶν instead of the impersonal construction we have frequently the personal construction with the infinitive as here, cf. 2 Cor. x. 9—only in Luke and Paul, indication of literary style, Viteau, Le Grec du N. T., p. 152 (1893).—τὸ ὄνομα Ἡ' τοῦ Ν., see on iv. 10, 12.—ἐναντία πράξαι, cf. xxviii. 17, and also 1 Thess. ii. 15, Tit. ii. 8.

Ver. 10. οὐ καὶ ἠτύχησα, cf. Gal. ii. 10 (Bethge, p. 272), on the distinction between πράσσειν and ποιεῖν Westcott on St. John iii. 22.—γε▀: emphatic.—τῶν ἄγιων, see above ix. 13, cf. its use in ix. 32; the word aggravates St. Paul’s own guilt. Agrippa too would know of pious Jews by the same designation.—ἀναρ. τέ αὐτῶν: probably pointing to more deaths, not as expressing the death of Stephen alone, cf. viii. 1, ix. 1, xxii. 4. The state of affairs which rendered the murder of St. Stephen possible in the capital would easily account for similar acts of outrage in other places, so that there is no need to suppose with Weiss that the notice here is unhistorical.—κατήκουσαν ψῆφον: “I gave my vote,” R.V., the ψῆφος, literally the pebble used in voting, calculus defer ς ιναμ (Grimm), i.e., addo calculus, αφροβο, cf. ψῆφον φέρειν, ἐπιφ. or ἐκφ. If the phrase is taken quite literally, it is said to denote the note of a judge, so that Paul must have been a member of the Sanhedrim, and gave his vote for the death of St. Stephen and other Christians. On the other hand the phrase is sometimes taken as simply = συνευδοκείντη αναιρέσει (so amongst recent writers, Knabenbauer), xxii. 20. (C. and H. think that if not a member of the Sanhedrim at the time of Stephen’s death, he was elected soon after, whilst Weiss holds that if the expression does not imply that the writer represents Paul by mistake as a member of the Sanhedrim, it can only be understood as meaning that by his testimony Paul gave a decisive weight to the verdict in condemnation of the Christians.) Certainly it seems, as Bethge urges, difficult to suppose that Paul was a member of such an august body as the Sanhedrim, not only on account of his probable age at the time of his conversion, but also because of his comparatively obscure circumstances. The Sanhedrim was an
assembly of aristocrats, composed too of men of mature years and marked influence, and the question may be asked how Saul of Tarsus, who may not even have had a stated residence in the Holy City, could have found a place in the ranks of an assembly numbering the members of the high priestly families and the principal men of Judaea: see *Expositor*, June, 1897, and also for the bearing of the statement on the question of Paul's marriage, with Hackett's note, in loco. For the voting in the Sanhedrin see Schürer, div. ii., vol. i., p. 194. E.T. Rendall, p. 336, meets the difficulty above by referring the expression under discussion to a kind of popular vote confirming the sentence of the court against Stephen, for which he finds support in the language of the law and in the narrative of the proto-martyr's condemnation.

Ver. 11. *τιμωρών* (cf. xxii. 5), more usually in the middle voice in this sense, although the active is so used sometimes in classical Greek, Soph., O. T., 107, 140, Polyb., ii., 56, 15. For ecclesiastical censures and punishments see Eidersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 374, cf. Matt. x. 17, xiii. 34.—*πράγμα* ἃν: "I strove to make them blaspheme," R.V., all other E.V. render "I compelled them to blaspheme," but the imperfect leaves it quite doubtful as to whether the persecutor succeeded in his attempts or not. The imperfect may thus be regarded as conative, Burton, p. 12, cf. Luke i. 59, Matt. iii. 14. Blass points out that it may have the force of repeated action (cf. ἐδίωκον), but even if so, it does not say that the compulsion was effectual, *Gram.*, p. 186. See further Page, in loco, for the rendering of R.V., which he regards as correct. A striking parallel may be adduced from Pliny's Letter to Trajan, x., 97, where the Christians are urged to call upon the gods, to worship the emperor, and to blaspheme Christ, "quorum nihil cogit posse dicuntur qui sunt revera Christiani," cf. Polycarp, *Martyr.*, ix., 2, 3.—*βλασφημοῖς*: "blasphemy," cf. Jesus, "maledicere Christo," Pliny, *ad Polio*, i, 7; cf. i Tim. i. 13 with this passage, and Paul's later reflections on his conduct.—*εν οίς* ἢν ἀγκαζόμενος αὐτοῖς: "even unto foreign cities," R.V., so that other cities besides Damascus had been included in the persecution, or would have been included if Saul's attempt had been successful.—*επιτροπής*: "I set about persecuting them," The imperfect *ἐδίωκ* may however denote repeated action, and may indicate that Saul had already visited other foreign cities. Weiss regards the το as connecting the two imperfects *de conatu* together—the latter imperfect being regarded as a continuation of the former, in case the victims sought to save themselves by flight.—*εμμαιν.:* only in Josephus once, *Ant.*, xvii., 6, 5, but εμμαίνει in Wisd. viii. 23, and in classical Greek, so also ἡμαίνειν.—

Ver. 12. *ἐν οίς*, i.e., as I was thus engaged, *inter qua*, "on which errand," R.V. margin, see xxiv. 18.—*τεντροπίας* ἢν, cf. 2 Macc. xiii. 14, Polyb., iii., 15, 7, "commission," A. and R.V. "Paulus erat commissarius," Bengel, the two nouns show the fulness of the authority committed to Paul.

Ver. 13. *ήμερας μέσης*: temporal genitive, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 107 (in classical Greek ἡμ. μεσοῦσα). The expression is perhaps stronger than in xxii. 6, in the bright full light of day.—κατὰ τὴν ὕδωρ: "on the way," and so foreboding nothing (Weiss).—*βασιλεύ*: "advertitur rex ad miraculum reli," Blass, cf. ver. 7, so Weiss.—*ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρ.:* here only expressly, but implied in ix. 3, xxii. 6, indicating the supernatural nature of the light; noun only here in N.T., cf. Dan. xii. 3.—*περιλάμψαν*: only in Luke, cf. Luke ii. 9, where the word is also used for a light from heaven; nowhere else in N.T., but the verb is found in Plutarch,
II-15.

14. And 

15.


Josephus. The fact that the light shone round about Paul and his companions is at any rate not excluded by ix. 7 or xxii. 9, as Weiss notes. It is quite in accordance with the truth of the facts that the more vivid expression should occur in Paul's own recital.

Ver. 14. See notes on ix. 7 and xxii. 7, and reading above in β.-τη Εβραίδιαλεκτω: this is intimated in ix. 4 and xxii. 7 by the form Σαουλ, but here the words are inserted because Paul was speaking in Greek, or perhaps he spoke the solemn words, indelible in his memory, as they were uttered, in Hebrew, for Agrippa (Alford).—σαπρον σοι κ.τ.λ.: a proverb which finds expression both in Greek and Latin literature (see instances in Wetstein): cf. Scholiast on Pind., Pyth., ii., 173: ἡ βία τῶν βουν τῶν γὰρ οἱ ἀκτείνα κατὰ τὴν γεωργίαν κατετάχθησαν ἐκ τοῦ ἄρουτος, λακτίζουσι το κέντρο και μᾶλλον πάλιν γεμίστοναι. Cf. also Aesch., Agam., 1631 (cf. Prom., 323), Eur., Bacch., 791, and in Latin, Terence, Phorm., i., 2, 27; Plautus, Truc., iv., 2, 59; and there may have been a similar proverb current among the Hebrews. Blass, Gram., pp. 5, 6, thinks that the introduction of the proverb on this occasion before Festus and Agrippa points to the time when Paul possessed, and which he called into requisition in addressing an educated assembly. It is not wise to press too closely a proverbial saying with regard to Saul's state of mind before his conversion; the words may simply mean to intimate to him that it was a foolish and inefficacious effort to try to persecute Jesus in His followers, an effort which would only inflict deeper wounds upon himself, an effort as idle as that described by the Psalmist, Ps. ii. 3, 4. At all events Paul's statement here must be compared with his statements elsewhere, 1 Tim. i. 13; see Witness of the Epistles, p. 389 ff., and Bethge, Die Paulinischen Reden, p. 275.

Ver. 15. Evidently the following verses contain a summary of what in the other two accounts of the Conversion is spoken to Paul by Ananias, and revealed by the Lord in a vision, cf. ix. 15, xxii. 14 (so Alford, Felten, Zöckler). This is far more satisfactory than to suppose that the two narratives in ix. and xxii. are really dependent upon xxvi., the author having employed in them an oral tradition relating to Ananias, without being at all aware that by introducing such an account he was really contradicting a point upon which Paul lays special stress, viz., the fact that he had received his apostleship neither from man nor through man, Gal. i. 1 (so Wendt (1899), p. 189, and McGiffert, pp. 120 and 355). But in the first place nothing is said as to the Apostle receiving his Apostleship from Ananias; he receives recovery of sight from him, but his call to his Apostleship commences with his call before Damascus: "epocha apostolatus Paulini cum hoc ipso conversionis articulo incipit," Bengel; and see specially Beyschlag, Studien und Kritiken, p. 220, 1864, on Gal. i. 15 (Witness of the Epistles, p. 379, 1892); and, further, the introduction and omission of Ananias are in themselves strong corroborations of the naturalness of the three accounts of the Conversion. Thus in chap. xxii., ver. 12, cf. ix. 10, "non conveniebat in hunc locum ulterior de An. narratio, ix. 10 fi., sed conveniebat praecomin ejus, quod non est illic" (Blass); so too it was natural and important to emphasise before a Jewish audience the description of Ananias (in ix. 10 he is simply τις μαθητής) as εὐλαβής κατὰ τον νόμον, well reported of by all the Jews, whereas in xxvi. "tota persona Ananise sublata est, quippe quae non esset apta apud hos auditores" (Blass). The three narratives agree in the main facts (see notes in comment., and Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, 2nd edit., p. 216), and "the slight variations in the three accounts do not seem to be of any consequence." Ramsay, Saint Paul, p. 379, cf. also
Τίς εἶ, Κύριε; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ἐγώ εἰμι ἵππος δυν τις διώκεις. 16. ἀλλὰ ἀνάστησθι, καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἀφθῆν σοι, προχειρίσασθαι σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ κλητήρα ἢ τε εἰδές ὅτε τε ὀφθήσομαι σοι. 17. ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐσείμενον ἀνάστησθι καὶ στῇτι ἐπί τοὺς πόδας σου ἐκ τούτο γὰρ ὧφθη, προχειρίσασθαι σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ κλητήρα ἢ τε εἰδές ὅτε τε ὀφθήσομαι σοι. 17. ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐσείμενον ἀνάστησθι καὶ στῇτι ἐπί τοὺς πόδας σου ἐκ τούτο γὰρ ὧφθη, προχειρίσασθαι σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ κλητήρα ἢ τε εἰδές ὅτε τε ὀφθήσομαι σοι.


3. Before των εθνων ΝΑΒΕΣIL read εγώ, so other authorities above.
núν στο ἀποστέλλω, 18. ἀνοίξαι ἐφαθαλμοῦς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέφαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτῶς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν, καὶ κλήρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις,

doubtful. Rendall urges that the word cannot mean “delivering” without some phrase such as ἐκ χειρός, as common in the LXX, but cf. on the other hand LXX, Judg. x. 15, xviii. 28 A, Ps. xxx. 2, xlix. 15, Hosea v. 14, etc. But how could Paul be said to be chosen εξ θητοῦ? The phrase would certainly sound strange to him as a description of his own position. Rendall also objects that in 1 Chron. xvi. 35 the word means to gather the scattered exiles from among the heathen as the context shows, but the Hebrew verb מָשֵׁא means to deliver, and is so rendered, l. c., in A. and R. V. It is also urged that λαός is always the name of honour, and that elsewhere where the enemies of the Apostle were named Ιουδαίοι; but not only is the collocation “the people and the Gentiles” a common one, cf. Is. xxxv. 5, xlii. 7. Both Jews and Gentiles were blinded (ούς above, referring to both), the former because seeing they saw not, Matt. xiii. 13, Rom. xi. 8; the latter in that knowing God in His creation they glorified Him not as God, and their senseless heart was darkened, Rom. i. 21; and to both St. Paul proclaimed the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. iv. 6, Ephes. i. 18. The infinitive of purpose depending on ἀποστέλλω, Burton, p. 157; Viteau, Le Grec du N.T., p. 169 (xix. 3)—ἐνθετόνου: “that they may turn,” R.V. (“to turn them,” margin, so A.V.); in St. Luke, who uses the verb more frequently than any other N.T. writer, it is nearly always intransitive, except in Luke i. 16, 17, Moulton and Geden, while Grimm adds ver. 20 below; so here all E.V. before the authorised, cf. Vulgate, “ut convertantur” (Humphry). If we thus take ἐνθετόν as intransitive, it is subordinate to the previous infinitive of purpose, ἀνοίξαι, and τοῦ λαβεῖν again subordinate to ἐπιστρέφαι, expressing the final result aimed at (Page, and see also Wendt’s note, in loco (1899)).—ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς: throughout St. Paul’s Epistles the imagery was frequent with reference not only to Gentiles but also to Jews, cf. Rom. ii. 19, xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 5, Ephes. v. 18, Col. i. 12. The words gain in interest here if we think of them as corresponding with the Apostle’s own recovering from blindness, spiritual and physical (Plumptre).—τοῦ Σατανᾶ, Blass, Gram., pp. 32, 144; no less than ten times by St. Paul in his Epistles; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4, Ephes. ii. 2, vi. 12 (Col. i. 13). ἐκ θητοῦ σκότους, Luke xxii. 53). There is no reason to suppose with Bengel that St. Paul is here referring to Gentiles rather than to Jews, for whilst the Jews no doubt would regard the Gentiles as loving σκότος and in the power of Satan, cf. also Luke xii. 16, xxii. 31, Acts v. 3. For current ideas with regard to Satan and the teaching of the N.T. cf. Ebersheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., p. 775; Charles, Book of Enoch, Introd., p. 52, and Assumption of Moses, x., 1, where Satan is apparently represented as the head of the kingdom of evil; cf. in the N.T. Ephes. i. 21, vi. 22, Col. ii. 15, for the whole hierarchy of evil spirits at the disposal of Satan, and 2 Thess. ii. 9; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 14 for his supernatural powers of deceiving or preventing men; see especially Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 145.—τοῦ λαβεῖν: expressing the ultimate object of ἀνοίξαι (see above, and Weiss, in loco).—ἐκ θητοῦ ἡμάριον, iii. 16, the language here is quite Pauline, cf. Col. i. 12-14, where also delivery out of the power of darkness and forgiveness of sins in the Son of God’s love are connected as here.—τῇ θυσίᾳ εἰς ἐλαίῳ: may be connected with λαβεῖν, faith in Christ as the condition of forgiveness placed emphatically at the end; cf. x. 43. A. and R.V. connect the words with ἡγιασμένοις, so Vulgate.—κλήρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασ., cf. xx. 32, Col. i. 12.

Ver. 18. ανοίξαι ἐφαθαλμοῦς αὐτῶν, cf. Acts ix. 8, p. 140, and also Matt. ix. 30; so too Isai. xxxv. 5, xlii. 7. Both Jews and Gentiles were blinded (see above, referring to both), the former because seeing they saw not, Matt. xiii. 13, Rom. xi. 8; the latter in that knowing God in His creation they glorified Him not as God, and their senseless heart was darkened, Rom. i. 21; and to both St. Paul proclaimed the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. iv. 6, Ephes. i. 18. The infinitive of purpose depending on ἀποστέλλω, Burton, p. 157; Viteau, Le Grec du N.T., p. 169 (xvi. 3)—ἐνθετόνου: “that they may turn,” R.V. (“to turn them,” margin, so A.V.); in St. Luke, who uses the verb more frequently than any other N.T. writer, it is nearly always intransitive, except in Luke i. 16, 17, Moulton and Geden, while Grimm adds ver. 20 below; so here all E.V. before the authorised, cf. Vulgate, “ut convertantur” (Humphry). If we thus take θυσία as intransitive, it is subordinate to the previous infinitive of purpose, ανοίξαι, and τοῦ λαβεῖν again subordinate to ἐπιστρέφαι, expressing the final result aimed at (Page, and see also Wendt’s note, in loco (1899)).—ἐπὶ σκότους εἰς φῶς: throughout St. Paul’s Epistles the imagery was frequent with reference not only to Gentiles but also to Jews, cf. Rom. ii. 19, xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 5, Ephes. v. 18, Col. i. 12. The words gain in interest here if we think of them as corresponding with the Apostle’s own recovering from blindness, spiritual and physical (Plumptre).—τοῦ Σατανᾶ, Blass, Gram., pp. 32, 144; no less than ten times by St. Paul in his Epistles; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4, Ephes. ii. 2, vi. 12 (Col. i. 13). ἐκ θητοῦ σκότους, Luke xxii. 53). There is no reason to suppose with Bengel that St. Paul is here referring to Gentiles rather than to Jews, for whilst the Jews no doubt would regard the Gentiles as loving σκότος and in the power of Satan, cf. also Luke xii. 16, xxii. 31, Acts v. 3. For current ideas with regard to Satan and the teaching of the N.T. cf. Ebersheim, Jesus the Messiah, ii., p. 775; Charles, Book of Enoch, Introd., p. 52, and Assumption of Moses, x., 1, where Satan is apparently represented as the head of the kingdom of evil; cf. in the N.T. Ephes. i. 21, vi. 22, Col. ii. 15, for the whole hierarchy of evil spirits at the disposal of Satan, and 2 Thess. ii. 9; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 14 for his supernatural powers of deceiving or preventing men; see especially Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 145.—τοῦ λαβεῖν: expressing the ultimate object of ανοίξαι (see above, and Weiss, in loco).—ἐκ θητοῦ ἡμάριον, iii. 16, the language here is quite Pauline, cf. Col. i. 12-14, where also delivery out of the power of darkness and forgiveness of sins in the Son of God’s love are connected as here.—τῇ θυσίᾳ εἰς ἐλαίῳ: may be connected with λαβεῖν, faith in Christ as the condition of forgiveness placed emphatically at the end; cf. x. 43. A. and R.V. connect the words with ἡγιασμένοις, so Vulgate.—κλήρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασ., cf. xx. 32, Col. i. 12.
πίστει τῇ εἰς ἔμε. 19. Ὁ δὲ, βασιλεὺς Ἄγριππᾶ, οὐκ ἔγενομην ἀπίθης τῇ οἴρανίᾳ ὑπεσχὼ, 20. ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Δαμασκῷ πρῶτον 1 καὶ ἱροσυλόμους, εἰς τὴν χώραν τῆς ἱουδαίας, καὶ τοῖς ἰδέους, ἀπῆγγελλον μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, ἡμι

referring to the whole revelation from ver. 12, marking the natural result of what had gone before; not used in St. Paul's Epistles.—βασ. Α.: “cum ad sua facta redeat, apte regem denuo compellat,” Blass, marking the commencement of his real defence.—ἀπειθής: only in Luke and Paul in N.T., cf. Luke i. 17; Rom. i. 30, 2 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 16, iii. 1; in LXX and in classical Greek.—ὅπτασία: here and here only Paul himself apparently speaks of the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him before Damascus by this word, but ὑπεσχόμενος, as Beyschlag shows, is not confined to appearances which the narrators regard as visions, cf. Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23, and its meaning must be explained from the entire “objectivity” with which St. Paul invests the whole narrative of his Conversion, cf. Witness of the Epistles, p. 385 (1892), and p. 380 for further reference to Beyschlag in Studien und Kritiken, 1864, 1890, and his Leben Jesu, i., p. 435. In modern Greek ὅπτασία = a vision (Kennedy).

Ver. 20. ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Δ.: “both to them of Damascus first, and at Jerusalem,” reading τε (see critical note) after πρῶτον, thus closely connecting Damascus and Jerusalem as the scenes of Paul's first activity, cf. ix. 20, 28.—εἰς τἀκαίρον τῇ τὴν χώραν τῆς ἱουδαίας τῆς ἱουδαίας, see critical note. If we read accusative simply without εἰς = accusative of space marking the extension of the preaching. Blass solves the difficulty by regarding εἰς = εν, us satē. The statement seems to contradict Gal. i. 22, and there is no mention of such a widely extended preaching at this time in Acts. It has therefore been held by some that reference is made to the preaching at the time of Saul’s carrying relief with Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, xi. 30, xii. 25 (Zöckler and Rendall), while others refer the passage to Rome xv. 10 (Weiss), and others combine xi. 29, 30, xv. 3 = Rom. xv. 10. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 382, regards the statement as so directly contradictory to all other authorities that he practically follows Blass in β text, and reads εἰς πάνταν τὴν χώραν τῆς ἱουδαίας καὶ τοῖς ἰδέους, with support by Par. “Judeis,” see note below, and Wendt (1899), p. 396. Clemen, p. 144, regards τε καὶ ἱερ.: as a gloss of R. Judaicus (ver. 21 being added by R. Anti-judaicus), and both Wendt and McGiffert view the whole reference as added to the original source.
21. ἐνεκα τούτων μετ' οἱ Ιουδαῖοι συλλαβόμενοι ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ ἐπιερώντο διαχειρίσθαι. 22. ἐπικουρίας οὖν τούτῳ τῆς παρά τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀχρὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ταύτης ζωτικα, μαρτυρόμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ, οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ἐν τῇ οἴ

1 The art. before loud om. *BL 13, 61, 105, so Tisch., R.V., Hilgenfeld, W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, but Lach. and Meyer follow T.R. After τινά, Tisch., Hilgenfeld, with *M E, Vulg. Chron. reads οὖτα, but the word may easily have been added to express more clearly that the temple, xxi. 30, was the place where they found Paul, not where they sought to kill him (Wendt).


classical Greek ποιεῖν is more frequent de in honestis, cf. Xen., Mem., iii., 9, 4, see Grimm, sub τ.

Ver. 21.—ἐνεκα τούτων: because I preached to Jews and Gentiles alike, proclaiming one Gospel to both, and placing both on an equality before God (not for profaning the Temple), cf. xxi. 28. On ἐνεκα see Blass, Gram., p. 21.

This Attic form of the word is read here by all authorities, and Blass notes it as characteristic of the literary style of this address before Agrippa, see above on ver. 4.—συλλαβόμενοι, i. 16, xii. 3. So also in each of the Gospels in the active voice, of a violent arrest; in passive see above, xiii. 27, and frequent in same sense in LXX, and 1 and 2 Macc.—ἐπειρώντο: here only in N.T. in middle, but see critical note on ix. 26. Cf. 1 Macc. xii. 10, 2 Macc. x. 12, 3 Macc. i. 25, ii. 32, 4 Macc. xii. 3. Imperfect because the attempt was not actually made.—διαχειρ., see on v. 30. The whole description ranks as a summary without giving all the details of the events which led up to the Apostle's imprisonment.

Ver. 22. ἐπικουρίας... τῆς παρά (ἔν) Θεοῦ: "the help that is from God," R.V., i.e., the help which comes from God only; only here in N.T., cf. Wisdom xiii. 18 (ἐπικουρία, S9), for the use of the same phrase cf. instances in Weisstein from Polyaenus; the word is found in Josephus, but also frequently in classical Greek, of succour against foes.—τυχών: no idea of chance, cf. 2 Tim. ii. 10; the aid was divine, not human.—οὖν, see Wendt, and references, Blass, Gram., p. 267, Winer-Moulton, liii., 10, 4.—ζωτικα: stō salōus, Bengel, after these repeated dangers. The A.V. hardly gives the force of the word; it is a Pauline expression, cf. Ephes. vi. 13, 14, Col. iv. 12, 16 Knabenbauer, subsi{sto incolumis}.—μαρτυρόμενος: "testifying," A.V., yet μαρτυρόμενος, see critical note, would rather signify "testifying," so R.V., see on vi. 3. Grimm-Thayer, if the reading in T.R. is retained, evidently considers that it should be rendered as passive, "testified to both by small and great".

But μαρτυρόμενος marks most appropriately the office of bearing testimony to which Paul was appointed.—μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ: if taken to mean "both small and great," the words would have a special force in thus being spoken before Festus and Agrippa, but if = young and old, i.e., before all men, cf. viii. 10, Heb. viii. 11; cf. Gen. xiv. 4, 11, etc., but in Rev. xi. 18, xiii. 16, xiv. 5, reference is made rather to rank than to age, and the latter meaning may well be included here; cf. Deut. i. 17, Job iii. 19, Wisd. vi. 7.—οὐδὲν εκτὸς λ. ὑστεροποιεῖ ἄν τοῖς οὖν τοῖς μελλόντοις = οὐδὲν εκτὸς τοῦ μελλόντος, cf. Rev. xvii. 8, Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 135. μελλ. γίγ., cf. Luke xxi. 36; οὐκετός, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 27; the word is only used by St. Paul elsewhere in N.T. (except Matt. xxiii. 26), cf. 1 Kings x. 13, 2 Chron. ix. 12, xvii. 19.—οἱ προφ.—καὶ Μ.: more naturally Moses and the prophets, Luke xvi. 29, 31, and cf. xxviii. 23, but Moses may have been mentioned to influence the Sadducean element in the audience: the historical Christ was always the subject of St. Paul's preaching "Jesus is the Christ," and the historical Christ was also the ideal Christ; cf. iii. 13, 1 Cor. xv. 3. See on this verse critical note, and Wendt (1899), p. 397, note.

Ver. 23. εἶ = Heb. vii. 15, i.e., as is most certain from the authority of Scripture, "how that the Christ," R.V.—παθητός: "must suffer," R.V. ("although is subject to suffering," margin), cf. Vulgate, passibilis (not patibilis); no question here of the abstract possibility of, or
προφήται ἐπάλησαν μελλόντων γενέσθαι. εἰ Μωϋσῆς, 23. εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος εἰς ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μὴν καταγγέλλειν τῷ λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι. 24. Ταύτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπολογουμένου, ὁ Φήστος μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ ἐφη. Μάην, Παύλῳ τὰ τοιλλα σε γράμματα

1 For καὶ Μωϋσῆς Flor. and Gig. have "scriptum est in Moysen". Blass regards this as the remaining fragment of the original β text, which ran somewhat as follows: γεγραπται γαρ εν Μωυσει καὶ τοις προφ. πολλα περι τουτων, τοις ερευνησασιν (τ Ρετ. i. ΙΙ).

2 Blass reads in β text Εμανής Παύλε εμανής with Flor., so περιετρεψεν with Flor. (ut videtur), so ηγεμών for Φήστε on the same authority.

3 Βlass read in β text ἕμας Παύλε εμανής with Flor., so περιετρεψεν with Flor. (ut videtur), so ηγεμών for Φήστε on the same authority.

Ver. 24. ἀναλ.: the present participle, indicating that Festus broke in upon the speech, cf. iv. 1.—μεγ. τῇ φ.: raising his voice, because interrupting in surprise and astonishment, and no doubt with something of impatience if not of anger (Chrysostom).—Μαίην: a hyperbolic, but not a jesting expression; the mention
not only of a resurrection, but the expressed belief that this Christ Whom Festus could only describe as "one who was dead," xviii. 19, should bring light not only to Jews but even to Gentiles, to Romans like himself, was too much such a belief could only result from a disturbed brain, cf. xviii. 32 for the effect of the announcement of a resurrection and a judgment on the polished Athenians, cf. St. John x. 20, where our Lord's words provoked a similar pronouncement by the Jews, the learned Jews of the capital. μαίνεσθαι: "qui ita loquitur ut videatur mentis non compos esse," Grimm, cf. xii. 15, 1 Cor. xiv. 23, opposite to σωφρονίζον τρίτον ἄποφη. (see also Page's note); cf. the passage in Wisd. v. 3, 4, and Luckock, Footsteps of the Apostles, etc., ii., p. 263.—τα πολλά σε γράμματα: "thy much learning," R.V., giving the force of the article perhaps even more correctly, "that great learning of thine". It is possible that the words may refer simply to the learning which Paul had just shown in his speech, of which we may have only a summary, and γράμμ. may be used of the sacred writings from which he had been quoting, and to which in his utterances he may have applied the actual word, and so Festus refers to them by the same term, cf. 2 Tim. iii. 15. Others refer the word to the many rolls which St. Paul had with him, and which he was so intent in studying. It is possible that the word may be used here as in John vii. 15, of sacred learning in general, of learning in the Rabbinical schools, and perhaps, as it is employed by a Roman, of learning in a more general sense still, although here including sacred learning = μαθήματα, cf. Plat., Apol., 26 D. If books alone had been meant βιβλία or βιβλία were would have been the word used,—περιτρέπει εἰς μανίαν: "doth turn thee to madness," R.V., cf. our English phrase "his head is turned," literally "turn thee round" (Humphry), cf. Jos., Ant., ix., 4, 4, ii., 4, 1. It is possible that Festus used the expression with a certain delicacy, since in using it he recognises how much wisdom Paul had previously shown (Weiss, Bethge). After such an expression of opinion by Festus, and owing to the deference of Agrippa to the Romans, Knabenbauer thinks that the king could not have expressed himself seriously in the words which follow in ver. 28.

Ver. 25. Οὐ μαίνομαι κ. Φ.: whatever may have been the sense in which Festus addressed Paul, there is no doubt as to the courtesy of the Apostle's answer, μετά επιεικείας αποκρινόμενος, Chrys. κράτιστε: "most excellent," R.V., see above, i. 1.—σωφρ.: "not veracitas, objective truth; no suspicion has been raised against St. Paul's truthfulness of character (cf. John xviii. 37); as our Lord stood before Pilate as a witness for the truth, so His Apostle stands face to face with a Roman sceptic as a witness to the existence of a world of real existences and not of mere shadows and unrealities (Bethge, p. 294). σωφρ.: the opposite of madness, cf. Plato, Protag., 323 B (Xen., Mem., i., 1, 16), δ ἐκεί σωφρονίζην ἤγετο εἰς τήληθη λέγειν, ενταύθα μανίαν. The two nouns are only found here in St. Luke's writings, but cf. σωφρονεῖν, Luke viii. 35, Rom. xii. 3, 2 Cor. v. 13; cf. βιβλία ζώης, chap. v. 20.—ἀποφή, cf. ii. 4 and 14, of the Pentecostal utterances, and of the solemn utterances of St. Peter; "aptum verbum," Bengel. St. Paul was speaking with boldness like St. Peter, and under the same divine inspiration; in LXX of the utterances of the prophets, cf. 1 Chron. xxv. 1, of philosophers, and of oracular responses, like the Latin profari and pronuntiare, see above on ii. 4, and Grimm-Thayer, sub v.
πιστεύεις; βασιλεύ, ἀγρίππα, τοῖς προφήταις; οἴδα ὅτι πιστεύεις. 28. ο δὲ ἀγρίππας πρὸς τὸν Παύλον ἐξῆ, ἔν ὀλίγῳ μὲ πείθεις Χριστιάνον γενέσθαι.

Ver. 26. ἐπίσταται γὰρ: here only with περὶ: in proof that his words were words of soberness, and that he was basing his statements on facts, St. Paul appeals to the knowledge of Agrippa, a knowledge which he would have gained from his close connection with the Jewish religion, but also to some extent perhaps from the events of his father’s reign, for Herod Agrippa had beheaded James with a sword, and had cast Peter into prison: “patet hoc,” says Bengel, “nam etiam Christianum nomen sciebat”.—If καὶ is retained, “to whom also,” i.e., because of his knowledge just mentioned.—πορισματικῶς: “freely,” R.V., everywhere else R.V. renders “boldly”; verb only in Luke and Paul, see on ix. 27; the Apostle spoke freely because of the king’s full knowledge, but his boldness is also shown in his question to the king, and to the reply which he makes to it in the king’s name, ver. 27.—καθέναι γὰρ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.: if οἴδαν and τι are both retained, see critical note, τι may be taken adverbially, “in any degree,” but see Winer-Moulton, lv., 9, b., and Wendt’s note, in loco, p. 399 (1899).—ἐν γωνία πεπραγ., cf. Luke vii. 17, xxiii. 8. Blass notes this expression, Gram., p. 4, as a proof that Paul used more literary expressions than usual in addressing his audience, and no doubt the expression was used by classical writers, cf. Plato, Gorg., 485 D; Epict., Diss., ii., 12, 17, and other instances in Wetstein, cf. angulus, Ter., Adelph., v., 2, 10.

Ver. 27. πυθεῖται; the question and answer were quite natural as addressed to a Jewish king; it was a belief which St. Paul could justly presuppose in every Jew, even in one like Agrippa, educated amongst the Romans. The question may well have been asked as a proof that the words which had preceded were words of truth and soberness, and that the king could so regard them, even if Festus could not; if Agrippa believed the prophets—as Paul affirmed—he could not regard the fulfilment of their prophecies as irrational. Or we may view the question as taking up, after the interruption of Festus, the statement of vv. 22, 23, and as a forcible appeal to Agrippa, as to one who could judge whether in the death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth there was anything really contrary to the picture of the Messiah drawn by the Hebrew prophets. It is possible that the Apostle meant to add a second ground for the knowledge of the king; not only were these events not done in a corner, but they had been prophesied by the prophets, in whom Agrippa believed; but instead of thus stating a fact, he addresses the king with increasing urgency and emotion, as one specially interested in religious questions, ver. 3 (Zöckler, Meyer).

Ver. 28. ἐν ὀλίγῳ μὲ πείθεις Χ. γένεσθαι, see critical note, “with but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian,” R.V. reading ποιήσαι, and πείθεις being used de conatu (so Zöckler in his 2nd edition); cf. προσήλυτον ποιεῖν, Matt. xxviii. 15. Schmiedel, Encycl. Bibl., i., 754, inclines to explain the phrase Χ. ποιήσαι as a Latinism: Christianum agere, to play the part of a Christian. Weiss sees in the words a little irony, as if Agrippa would answer St. Paul’s appeal to his belief in the prophets by intimating that it was not so simple a matter to become a Christian, even if one, as a Jew, believed in the prophets. Or we may regard Agrippa as rejecting, not so much in banter as in cold disdain, the enthusiasm of the orator, and adopting the tone of a certain Jewish orthodoxy (Zöckler), not, i.e., the indifference of
29. ο δὲ Παύλος εἶπεν, Ἐπιμήκην ἂν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ οὐ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μοι σήμερον, γενέσθαι τοιούτους ὁποῖος κἀγὼ εἰμί, παρεκτός τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων.


The Roman, but that of the Sadducees to the prophets. The A.V. "almost" must be abandoned, even if we retain γενέσθαι, for ἐν ὀλίγῳ cannot be so rendered, either here or elsewhere in the N.T.; ἐν ολίγῳ, or ὀλίγῳ or ὀλίγον δεῖ would be required as the classical expression for "almost". The best parallel is Ephes. iii. 3, ἐν ὀλίγῳ: "in a few words"; so A. and R.V. (cf. 1 Pet. v. 12). But if in the next verse we read μεγάλω instead of πολλῷ, so R.V. (see critical note), it seems best to understand πόνῳ with ὀλίγῳ, as this noun could fitly stand with both μεγάλῳ and ὀλίγῳ = with little trouble, with little cost. The R.V. rendering of the two verses reads as if πολλῷ was retained in ver. 29, whereas μεγάλῳ is the reading adopted in R.V. text. So far as N.T. usage is concerned, ἐν ὀλίγῳ might be rendered "in a short time" (cf. James iv. 14, 1 Pet. i. 6, Rev. xvii. 10, so in classical Greek), but this rendering also is excluded by ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ in the next verse. Wendt maintains that ἐν ὀλίγῳ may still be rendered "almost"; the phrase is instrumental, as if expressing the thought contained in ὀλίγῳ δεῖ, and meaning that a little was wanted to attain the aim = almost. So St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem; Luther, Beza, Grotius = propemodum. The answer of Agrippa, therefore, need not be taken ironically, as by most moderns, but in earnest (cf. ver. 32, where his favourable opinion supports this view), although Wendt acknowledges that his confession was only half-hearted, as is seen by his desire to conclude the interview (Wendt, 1888, note, p. 530, and 1899, p. 400, to the same effect, so too Schurer, Jewish People, div. i., vol. ii., p. 108, note). If we read πετάσῃ, see critical note, we render "but little thou art persuading thyself that thou canst make me a Christian," taking up πετάσῃ of ver. 26. This reading is adopted by Blass and Belser, but the former takes ἐν ὀλίγῳ as meaning brevis tempore in this verse (so in Plato, Apol. 22 B), but in ver. 29 he takes it as = facile, whilst ἐν μεγάλῳ (which he reads) — difficult. Belser, however, takes the phrase ἐν ὀλίγῳ in the same sense in both verses, "with little trouble or pains". St. Chrysostom thought that the phrase ἐν ὀλίγῳ was used by Agrippa in one sense and by St. Paul in another (so too Lewin, cf. Grimm-Thayer and Plumptre); Blass apparently obliges us to adopt the same view, but there is nothing in the context to support it (Wendt, Belser).—Χριστ.: there is nothing strange in this use of the word by Agrippa; he may have become acquainted with it in his knowledge of the Christian movement (see above), and the term could easily have spread from Antioch over the district which he ruled. It is difficult to say in what sense he used the term; and no doubt the shade of meaning which we attach to his employment of it will depend upon the meaning which we give to the rest of his answer — a meaning earnest or contemptuous. Thus on the former supposition it is possible that he may have used the word instead of the despised "Nazarene," to indicate his half-friendly attitude towards Christianity, and his relative recognition of it by connecting it with the name which was cherished by every Jew, although the context shows that he had no intention whatever of allowing Paul's persuasive powers further scope; see Wendt (1899), who points out as against Lipsius that there is nothing unhistorical in the introduction of the name here, as if the writer presupposed that it would be familiar to every Jew. On the other hand, although a Jew, Agrippa, before such an audience, might well have used a term with which the Romans also would probably have been familiar, and if he spoke contemptuously (so Blass, Rendall) he would naturally employ a title which had been given in scorn, and which apparently at this period even the Christians themselves had not accepted; see below, and note on xi. 26. Ver. 29. εὐφαίμην ἄν: on the optative with ἄν, Burton, p. 80, Blass, Gram., p. 202, Viteau, Le Grec du N.T., p. 40.
30.1 Καὶ ταύτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ, ἀνάστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμόν ἡ τε Βερνίκη καὶ οἱ συγκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς. 31. καὶ ἀναχωρήσαντες ἐλάλουν πρὸς ἅλλους λέγοντες, ὡς οἱ οὗτοι ἀνθρώποι σφηνοῦσιν πρὸς ἄνθρωπον τούτων καὶ ἀνάρρηται. 32. Ἀγρίππας δὲ τῷ Φήστῳ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἡ Καισαρία Ἀπολέλυσθαι εὐθέως καί ἐκδικός ἀνθρώποις. 33. Ἀποκαλύφθη δὲ τῷ Καίσαρι οὗτος, καὶ ἐπιβαληθήναι καί ἐκδικήθηναι τῷ Καίσαρι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ, καὶ ἐπεκέκλητος Καίσαρα καί εἴπεν αὐτῷ ΗΛΠ (137), Syr., Η., Flor., so Βlassin β text, and Ηilg.; but otherwise unsupported, R.V. omit.

1 καὶ ταύτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ HLP (137), Syr., Flor., so Blass in β text, and Hilg.; but otherwise unsupported, R.V. omit.


3 επεκ., but AL; Blass επεκ., but in β text Blass has επεκ., so ΝΒΗΠ, etc.

Ver. 30. πράσσει, present tense: "agit de vitae instituto" (Grotius, Blass). Ver. 32. ἔδωκεν: a true affirmative imperfect of verbs denoting obligation or possibility, when used to affirm that a certain thing could or should have been done under the circumstances narrated; therefore not correct to speak of an omitted ἀν, since the past necessity was not hypothetical or contrary to fact, but actual, Burton, p. 14, but cf. Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 114; cf. xxiv. 19, xxvii. 21. -εὶ μή επεκ. Καίσαρα: the appeal had been made and accepted and Paul must be sent to Rome, but doubtless the decision of Agrippa would have great weight with Festus, and would greatly modify the letter which he would send to Rome with the prisoner (see above, p. 499), and we may thus account for the treatment of Paul on his arrival in the capital, xxviii. 16. The circumstance that the innocence of Paul is thus established at the mouth of various personages, and now by Agrippa, himself a Jew, as well as by Festus, a Roman, has been made the ground of objection to the narrative by Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, Weizsäcker, Schmiedel. But whilst we may frankly admit that St. Luke no doubt purposely introduced these varied testimonies to Paul's innocence, this is no proof of the incorrectness of his statements (Wendt, Matthias). If we grant, as St. Luke affirms, that the primary cause of the Apostle's imprisonment was the fanatical rage of the Jews against him as a despiser and enemy of the national religion, it is quite conceivable that those who were called to inquire into the matter without such enmity and prejudice should receive a strong impression of his innocence, and should give expression to their impressions. On the other hand, the description in Acts enables us to see how Paul, in spite of
such declarations in his favour, might find himself compelled to appeal to Caesar. Had he acted otherwise, and if release had followed upon the verdict of his innocence, he was sure that sooner or later the implacable Jews would make him their victim. McGiffert, ιι. s., p. 356, observes that even if both Agrippa and Festus were convinced of the Apostle's innocence, this would not prevent Festus from seeing in him a dangerous person, who would stir up trouble and cause a riot wherever he went; such a man could not have been set at liberty by Festus as a faithful Roman official; but see above on xxv. 12. On the whole narrative see Zöckler, p. 311; Bathge, p. 260 (for phraseology). Zöckler supposes as a foundation for the narrative a written account by Luke himself, perhaps an eyewitness, at an early period after the events. Wendt (1899) also takes the view that the writer of the narrative had probably been in the personal company of St. Paul at Caesarea before the start on the journey for Rome, xxvii. 1, and that the reason that he does not employ the first person in the narrative of xxv., xxvi., is because the facts narrated in these two chapters did not immediately concern him, although he was in Caesarea during their process. In referring to the account of St. Paul's conversion as given in ch. xxvi. it is noteworthy that McGiffert, p. 120, speaks of it as occurring "in a setting whose vividness and verisimilitude are unsurpassed".

CHAPTER XXVII.—Ver. 1. Blass at the outset speaks of this and the next chapter as "clarissimam descriptionem" of St. Paul's voyage, and he adds that this description has been estimated by a man skilled in nautical matters as "monumentum omnium pretiosissimum, quæ rei navalis ex tota antiquitate nobis relicta sint". He refers to Die Nautik der Alten by Breusing, formerly Director of the School of Navigation in Bremen, 1886; a book which should be read side by side with J. Smith's well-known Voyage and Shipreck of St. Paul, 4th edit., 1880 (cf. also J. Vars, L'Art Nautique, 1887, and see also Introdt., p. 8).—

*footnote* 1 With Flor., Gig., Syr. H. mg., Blass reconstructs the β text: ουτως ουν ο ηγεμων πεμπεσθαι αυτον Καισαρι εκρινεν, και τη επαυριον προσκαλεσαμενος εκατονταρχην τυν σπειρης Σεβαστης ονοματι Ιουλιον, παρεδωκεν αυτω τον Παυλον συν τοις λουντος δεσμηται, so Hilgenfeld, 1899.
314.—πέρονι: Meyer and Zöckler take the word to indicate prisoners of a character different from Paul, i.e., heathen, not Christians; but Wendt (so Hackett) points out that Luke in Acts uses πέρονι in singular and plural as simply = another, or other, additional; vii. 18, viii. 34, xv. 35, xvii. 34. As against this Zöckler quotes Luke xxiii. 32, Gal. i. 7.
—Ιουλίω: name far too common for any identification; Tacitus speaks of a Julius Priscus, Hist., ii. 92, iv. 11, a centurion of the praetorians, but see below on xxviii. 16.—σπείρης Σ.: "of the Αugustan band," R.V. It is suggested that the term is here used is a popular colloquial way by St. Luke, and that it is not a translation of a correct Roman name, but rather "the troops of the emperor," denoting a body of legionary centurions who were employed by the emperor on confidential business between the provinces and the imperial city, the title Augustan being conferred on them as a mark of favour and distinction. If this is so we gather from this notice in Acts a fact which is quite in accordance with what is known from other sources, although nowhere precisely attested. But can any connection be established between such a body and any branch of the imperial service which is actually known to us? There were certain legionary centurions who went by the name of frumentarii, who were employed not only, as their name implied, on duties connected with the commissariat, but also with the custody of prisoners and for purposes of police. In xxviii. 16, A.V. and R.V. margin, we have the remarkable reading: "and the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the [praetorian] guard" (see on l.c.). But it is urged that we cannot understand by this expression the Prefect of the Praetorian Guard, who would not be concerned with the comparatively humble duty of receiving and guarding prisoners. But in the Old L.V. called�γασ (unfortunately the only representative of the Old Latin for this passage) we have for a translation of the Greek στρατοπεδάρχης, in itself a very rare word, princeps peregrinorum. Now the legionary centurions who formed the frumentarii were regarded in Rome as being on detached duty, and were known as peregrini; on the Caelian Hill they occupied the camp known as the castra peregrinorum, and their commander bore the name of princeps peregrinorum. If therefore we may identify the Strato-pedararch in Acts xxviii. 16 with this commanding officer, we may also infer that Julius was one of the Peregrini, and that he hands over his prisoners to his superior officer, Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 315, 347, Mommsen, Sitzungsbereichte d. Berl. Akad., 1895, p. 495 ff., Rendall, Acts, p. 340. But see on the other hand Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 389 (1897), Knabenbauer, Acts Apostolorum, p. 448, Belser, Beiträge, p. 147 ff., who point out that there is no clear evidence of the title princeps peregrinorum before the reorganisation of Sept. Severus, (2) that we have evidence that prisoners were sent from the provinces and committed to the care of the prefectus praetorio, cf. Traj., Ad Plin., 57, with reference to one who had appealed: "vinctus mitti ad prefectos praetorii mei debet," and other instances in Zahn, u. s., and Knabenbauer. See further for the value of the Old Latin reading in Gigs "Julius" (Headlam), Hastings' B.D., and below on xxviii. 16. But whether we adopt the explanation suggested by Prof. Ramsay or not, it is still open to us to maintain that the title "Augustan" was a title of honour and not a local title; not connected with Sebaste the chief town of Samaria, or with Caesarea Sebaste. Schürer in answer to Mr. Headlam's criticism ("Julius," Hastings' B.D.) is still of opinion, Theol. Literaturzeitung,
2-3. 

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

δότος σύν ημῖν Ἀριστάρχου Μακεδόνος Θεσσαλονίκεως. 3. τῇ τε ἑτέρᾳ κατήχθημεν εἰς Σίδωνα· φιλανθρώπως τῷ Ιούλιῳ τῷ Παύλῳ χρησάμενος, ἐπέτρεψε πρὸς φίλους ἑν τῇ μεταγωγῇ τῷ Μακεδόνῳ Θεσσαλονίκεως.

1 Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt read πορευθέντα with Ἐλλ. AB 13, 36, 68. Blass in β text follows Flor. according to which Paul's friends come to him, "permitam amicis qui veniebant (ad eum) uti curam ejus agerent".

From some of the great harbours of the Asian coast the centurion might have passed to Italy, or probably from Adramyttium (if the ship was going home) he intended to go to Neapolis, and take the great high road to Rome, if no ship could be found in the Asian harbours so late in the season.—τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀ. τόπους: "to sail by the coasts of Asia," A.V.; but with εἰς after πλοῖον see critical note, "to sail unto the places on the coast of Asia," R.V., cf. for the phrase, xi. 1, Polyn., i., 3, 6. In xvi. 3 τόποι is similarly used. See J. Smith's note, u.s., p. 63.—ἀνήχ., see above on xiii. 13; in the preceding verse we have the corresponding nautical term κατά γεσθαι, to come to land.—Ἀριστ., cf. xix. 39, xxi. 4. Perhaps the expression σύν ημῖν may mean that he was with them, but only for a time, not being actually one of them, i.e., of Paul's company; he may have gone in the Adramyttian ship on his way to his native home, and left Paul at Myra. On the other hand, Col. iv. 10, he is named as one of Paul's companions in Rome, and as his "fellow-prisoner," see Salmon, Introd., p. 383. Whether he made the journey as an actual fellow-prisoner with Paul cannot be proved, although Col., u. s. (Philem. ver. 24), may point to it, see Lightfoot, Philippianus, 35, 36, Lewin, St. Paul, ii. 183; "one Aristarchus," A.V., as if otherwise unknown; R.V. gives simply his name. Jüngst refers Μακεδ. Θεσσ. to his Redactor.

Ver. 3. τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ: an easy journey to Sidon—distance 69 sea miles (Breusing).—κατάχ.: technical nautical term, opposite of ἀνάγειν in ver. 2, see above.

—φιλανθ. τε ἡ Ἰούλιος...χρῆσ.: "and Julius treated Paul kindly," R.V., cf. xxviii. 2. Bengel says "videtur audisse Paulum," R.V., cf. xxviii. 2. Hobart, so also Zahn, sees in φιλανθ., which is peculiar to Luke in N.T., the word a medical man might be likely to use. See also on χρηστοπία, xxviii. 2, below, but in Dem., 411, 10, we have the phrase φιλανθ. τυλίχρησθαι, so in Plutarch, and the adverb occurs in 2 Macc. ix. 27, 3 Macc. iii. 20. χρῆσ. only in Luke and Paul, cf. 2 Cor.
4. κάκειθεν ἀναχέθητες ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον, διὰ τὸ τοῦτο ἀνέμου εἶναι ἔκαντιος. 5. τὸ τε πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κύπριαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν διαπλεύσατε, κατῆλθομεν εἰς Μύρα τῆς Λυκίας. 6. κάκει εὕρον καὶ ἐκατόνταρχος πλοίου Ἀλεξανδρίνου πλοίον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, ἐνεβίβασεν ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ. 7. εἰς Ἰταλίαν, μῆμεν ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτό. 8. ἀπεδείχθομεν κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, μὴ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ προσεόντος βασιλέως.
ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου, ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην κατὰ Σαλμώνην. 8. μόλις τε παραλεγόμενοι αὐτὴν, ἠλθομεν εἰς τόπον των καλοῦν τὸν Καλοὺς Αμένας, ὥς ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ πόλις Λασία. 9. ἰκανοῦ δὲ χρόνον διαγενομένου, καὶ διὸ τοῦ ἐπισφαλοῦς τοῦ πλοὸς, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν ἤποιεῖαν ἦν παρεληλυθέναι, παρῆνε δὲ Παῦλος, λέγων αὐτοῖς,

course, and the westerly winds, prejudicial to the run of the Adramyttian ship from Sidon to Myra, were favourable for the direct run of a ship from Alexandria, cf. ver. 9, and the course taken by the Alexandrian ship was probably a customary one during a certain season of the year for the voyage from Alexandria to Italy. Blass, on the other hand, quoting from Lucian, maintains that the ship was obliged to quit the usual course owing to the winds, but Ramsay has here the entire support of J. Smith, u. s., p. 73.—ἐπιβήσατο: vox nautica, Holtzmann, cf. Thuc., i., 53.

Ver. 7. ἐν λευκὸς ἡμέρας or ἡκάσιος: in temporal sense only in Luke in N.T., see Hawkins, p. 151, and cf. Vindicia Lucana (Klostermann), p. 51.—βραδυπλοούσα: Artemid., Oceir., iv., 30; ταχυπλοείν, Polyb. (Blass), evidently on account of the strong westerly winds; the distance was about a hundred and thirty geographical miles to Cnidus.—Σάλμωνιον: see J. Smith, p. 82, and Appendix, p. 251 ft., 4th edition: not mentioned, however, elsewhere. This harbour would afford them shelter for a time, for west of Cape Matala the land trends suddenly to the north, and they would have been again exposed to the north-westerly winds, see further for a description of the place Findlay's Mediterranean Directory, p. 66, quoted by Breusing and Goerne, who also have no doubt that the place is identical with that mentioned by St. Luke (see also Wendt, 1898 and 1899).—Λασία, see critical note; like the Fair Havens not mentioned by name in any ancient writer,
but since 1856 it may be fairly said that its identification has been established with a place some four miles to the east of Fair Havens, or rather the ruins of a place to which the name Lasea was still given, see J. Smith, 4th edition, p. 82, and p. 268 (Appendix); Alford, Proleg. to Acts, p. 27. If Lasea was one of “the (ninety or) hundred towns of Crete,” and one of the smaller amongst them, it ceases to be strange that no precise mention of it should occur in ancient writers (Grimm).

Ver. 9. ικανού δε χρ. γεν.: not since the commencement of the voyage (as Meyer), but since they lay weather-bound. Wendt (1899) agrees with Meyer as against Weiss and Ramsay, on the ground that there is no έκεί, so Hackett.

—τοῦ πλοῦς: “terminus proprie nauticus,” Klostermann, Vindicia Lucana, J. Smith, p. 84, who refers to Jul. Pollux, i., 105, although the adjective was not distinctively so. It is only used by St. Luke, and although it is frequently employed by medical writers, it is found also in Plato, Polybius, Plutarch (cf. also Wind. ix. 14, and for the adverb iv. 4), τοῦ πλοῦς: “the voyage,” R.V., but perhaps “sailing,” A.V., is best, so Ramsay—the dangerous season for sailing had commenced; in the next verse = “voyage,” i.e., to Rome (Alford); only in Luke, cf. xxi. 7, on the form of the genitive see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 84, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 19, 2 Thess. ii. 2. The dangerous season was reckoned from 14th September to 11th November, and from 11th November to 5th March all navigation was discontinued; see Blass, in loco, and Ramsay, Saint Paul, p. 322; according to Hesiod, Works and Days, 619, navigation ceased after the setting of the Pleiades about 20th October. The Jewish period for navigation ended 28th September.—διὰ τοῦ καὶ τὴν ποιητέαν ἡδῆ παρεληλυθέναι: the mention of the fact that the Fast, i.e., the Great Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 29, Jos., Ant., xiv., 16, 4, was over, Tisri the 1oth, made the danger more apparent. According to Mr. Turner, “Chronology,” Hastings’ B.D., the great Fast on Tisri 10 in 58 A.D. fell circa 15th September, so that the dangerous sailing season would have just commenced. In A.D. 59, the date preferred by Ramsay, the Fast would be on 5th October. Starting from the view that a considerably later point of time than Tisri 10 is implied, cf. xxviii. 11, various attempts have been made to interpret ηστεία differently, and it has been referred to the Athenian festival of the Thesmophoria, the third day of which was so called; or to some nautical mode of expression not elsewhere employed equivalent to externum autumni, but all such attempts are based upon no authority (Zöckler, in loco), and there can be no doubt that the expression “the Fast” κατ’ ήστειν refers to the Jewish Fast as above, and that after the Jewish calendar, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, and as Wendt observes there is nothing strange in the fact that his travel-companion should also so reckon, cf. xx. 6 above, even if he was a Gentile Christian, an observation to be noted in face of Schmiedel’s recent arguments against the Lucan authorship, Encycl. Bibl. p. 44, 1899. The indication that St. Paul kept the Jewish Fast Day is significant. —παρήγαγε: “ admonished,” R. and A.V., in N.T. only here, and in ver. 22, see note. The Apostle had sufficient experience to justify him, 2 Cor xi. 25 (Weiss), his interposition is all an indication of the respect which he had secured: “the event justified St. Paul’s advice,” J. Smith.

for the passive signification of ὑβρις cf. 2 Cor. xii. το. ζημίαν: only elsewhere in Paul, cf. Phil. iii. 7, 8. ου μόνον: occurs regularly with the infinitive in the N.T. instead of μὴ μόνον, Burton, p. 183. φόρτος, see critical note, if we read φορτίου the word which is dim. in form but see also Blass and Wetstein, in loco, for distinction between φορτίον and φόρτος.

Ver. 11. ο δε εκατόν. : the centurion evidently presides at the Council as the superior officer, see Ramsay, St. Paul, pp. 324, 325, but, as Wendt notes (and so Blass), the majority decide, not the centurion alone.-τώ κυβερ, και τώ ναυκλ. : "to the master and to the owner of the ship,'' A. and R.V., better to the pilot and the captain''; ναύκληρος was not the owner, although the word might denote ownership as well as command of the ship, for the ship if it was a corn ship would belong to the imperial service, and would form a vessel of the Alexandrian fleet. In Breusing's view, p. 160, ναύκληρος is owner of the ship, but κυβερνήτης is better rendered, he thinks, "captain" than "pilot," cf. Plut., Mor., 807 B (Wetstein and Blass).—ἔπειθετό μᾶλλον τοις λεγ.: "locuto Lucana," cf. xxviii. 24, the centurion's conduct was natural enough; what would be said of him in Rome, where provision ships for the winter were so eagerly expected, if out of timidity he, though a soldier, had hindered the captain from continuing his voyage? Breusing, pp. 161, 162, and quotations from Suet., Claudius, 18, as to the compensation offered by the emperor to merchants for losses in winter and storm. Goerne points out that it may have been also to their interest to proceed on the voyage, rather than to incur the responsibility of providing for the keep of the large crew during a long stay at Fair Havens.

Ver. 12. ἀνευθέτου: here only, but in later Greek we have δύσθετο, so in Jos. St. Luke, however, uses ἐσθετος in his Gospel, ix. 62, xiv. 35 (found only once elsewhere in N.T., Heb. vi. 7). We may compare J. Smith's 1st and 4th edition, p. 85. In the latter he points out that recent surveys show that Fair Havens may have been a very fair winter harbour, and that even on nautical grounds St. Paul's action may have been justified, but Blass, in loco, adheres to the view that the harbour was only fit for use during the summer.—prus παραχειμάσαι: noun only here in N.T., not found in LXX, but in Polyb. and Diod. Sic. παραχειμάσαι: only in Luke and Paul in N.T., 1 Cor. xvi. 6, cf. Acts xxviii. 11, Tit. iii. 12, not in LXX, but used by Dem., Polyb., Plut., Diod. Sic. —οι πλείονες: πλείονες (πλείους) with the article only by Luke and Paul in N.T., cf. xix. 32; by St. Paul seven times in his Epistles. Bengel well says, "plura sutfragia non semper meliora".—έθεντο βουλην: on the noun and its use by St. Luke see above, ii. 23, and for the phrase cf. Luke xxiii. 51, in LXX, Ps. xii. 2 (Judg. xix. 30, A al.); so also in classical Greek.—ἀναχθήναι: "to put to sea," R.V., see on xiii. 13.—ει πως δύναιντο: on the optative see Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 172; and Burton, p. 111; cf. Mark xi. 13, Acts viii. 22, xviii. 27, Rom. i. 10, xi. 14. Phil. iii. 11.—καταντήσαντες: Lucan and Pauline, see above, xvi. 1.—εις Φοίνικα, Strabo, x., 4: Ptolemy, iii., 17. Generally taken as = modern Lutro, so Ramsay, Alford, Renan, Rendall, Blass, J. Smith (pp. 87, 88), Lewin, Rendall, Plumptre, and Muir in Hastings' B.D., "Fair Havens"; so amongst recent German writers on this voyage, cf. Breusing, p. 162, and Goerne, u. s., p. 360, both of whom quote Findlay, Mediterranean Directory, p. 67, "Port Lutro, the ancient Phænix, or Phoenice, is the only bay on the south coast where a vessel could be quite secure in winter"; but on the other hand Hackett, in loco, Wordsworth,
ΧΙΙ. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον. 13. ὑποπνεύσαντος δὲ κύτων, δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι, ἀράντες ἀσσόν παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην.

1 Flor. om. δι. . . . κεκρατ., so Blass in β.
2 For ἀσσόν Blass in β with Flor. reads θασσόν, so Hilg. (1899); Vulg., so Erasmus, “cum sustulissent de Asson,” taking Assos as Ασος (Asus, Pliny) as the name of one of the Cretan towns; Luther takes it as acc., “cum sustulissent Assum.” Wycl. and Rhem. follow the Vulg., and Tynd. and Cranm. follow Luther, but there is no clear trace of the existence of a town so called in Crete, and Assos lay far to the north, xx. 13 (Plumptre).

Humphry and Page (whose full note should be consulted) suppose the modern Phineka to be meant; so also C. H. Prichard in Hastings’ B.D., “Crete”; see below. Alford, Acts, Proleg., p. 28, quotes from J. Smith’s Appendix (2nd edition) the words from Mr. G. Brown’s Journal (1855, 1856) stating that Lutro is the only secure harbour in all winds on the south coast of Crete, words quoted by Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 326, and Muir, Hastings’ B.D., “Fair Havens.” — λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον τοῖς Κ. κ.τ.λ.: “a harbour of Crete which faces south-west and north-west,” so Ramsay, and so A.V. and Vulgate. But R.V. so Rendall “looking north-east and south-east,” which is a correct description of the entrance of the harbour of Lutro, so J. Smith, Alford, Lumby and Plumptre, who interpret “looking down the south-west and north-west winds,” literally translated as in the direction of these winds, i.e., the direction to which they blew, and so north-east and south-east, κατά indicating the line of motion, cf. R.V. margin, and so Rendall and Knabenbauer, in loco. C. and H., so Ramsay and Farrar, find an explanation of the wording A.V. in the subjectivity of the sailors, who describe a harbour from the direction in which they sail into it; and thus by transmission from mouth to mouth the wrong impression arose that the harbour itself looked south-west and north-west. As against Rendall’s interpretation and that of R.V., see Page and Hackett’s learned notes in loco. Both lay stress upon the phrase, λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον, as used only of that which is opposite, and which you face. Cf. Luke’s own use of κατά, iii. 13, viii. 26, xvi. 7, xxvii. 7. Page, and so C. H. Prichard, Hastings’ B.D., “Crete,” would adopt A.V. reading, but would apply it to the harbour Phineka, opposite Lutro, which does look south-west and north-west. λίβα, (prob. λιβω) Herod., ii. 25, Polyb., x., 103, etc., south-west wind Africus, north-west wind Corus or Caerus.

Ver. 13. ὑποπνεύσαντος: leniter afflante, aspirante, cf. ὑποκινέω, ὑπομείδια, a moderate breeze from the south arose which would favour their westerly course. Cf. Luke xii. 55, not in LXX or Apocrypha, but see Heliod., iii., 3 (Wetstein). — δόξαντες, xii. 9, τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι: their purpose, i.e., of starting from Fair Havens for the more desirable anchorage of Lutro some forty miles distant. προθέσεως, cf. xi. 23; in N.T. only in Luke and Paul in this sense; cf. 2 Macc. iii. 8. ἀράντες: “they weighed anchor,” R.V. So Ramsay, J. Smith, pp. 65, 97; only here in N.T. in this sense, sc. τὰς ἀγκύρας, cf. θεός, i., 52, and ii., 23, but the word may imply simply profecti, of movement, whether by sea or by land, of armies or ships; so Breusing takes it intransitively, no need of any noun, Thuc., iv., 129; vii., 26 (p. 164): see also ver. 17. For aorist participle of an action antecedent in time to that of the principal verb cf. xiv. 19: Burton, pp. 63, 64.—ἀσσόν παρελέγοντο τὴν Κ.: “sailed along Crete, close in-shore,” R.V., i.e., as they rounded Cape Matala, about six miles west of Fair Havens; the statement so emphatically introduced by St. Luke seems to imply that their ability to weather the point was for some time doubtful, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 326. ἀσσόν: “if the wind went round a point towards the west they would fail; and the anxious hour has left its record in the single word of ver. 13, ἀσσόν,” Ramsay, u. s. See critical note, and
14. μετ' ου πολύ δε έβαλε κατ' αυτής άνεμος τυφωνικός, ο καλού-
μενος Ἐυροκλύδων. 15. συναρπασθέντος δι τοῦ πλοίου, καὶ μὴ

above on ver. 8. άσσον, an adverb com-
parative of άγχι; the comparative degree
makes it more emphatic (see above), as
they had been coasting for weeks, and
now they went "closer" in shore (see R.V.);
Wendt (1890) takes it, however, not as a comparative with reference to
ver. 8 (so Meyer, Weiss), but as a super-
lative, cf. xxiv. 22, xxv. 10.


31 μετρίως, Luke xν. 15, Ατς i.5, “ob-
serve the "Litotes" of ου with an adjec-
tive or adverb, four times in "We
sections, twelve in rest ofActs, twice in
Luke vii. 6, xv. 13, rare in rest of N.T.

Hawkins, p. 153.—έβαλε κατ' αυτής:
intransitiνe, as often in classicalGreek
since Ηomer: "there beat down from
it," R.V., i.e., from Crete and its moun-
tainsover 7,000 feet in height, Ή so also
Blass, Holtzmann, Ramsay, Ζόκλιer,
Page, Rendall, Wendl, Weiss, Knaben-
bauer, and J. Smith, in later editions, see
p. 100, 4th edition; a graphic description
of a common experience in the Cretan
waters, as the ship crossed the open bay
between Cape Matala and Phαεnice, the
wind suddenly shifting to the north, a
νιολόθος hurricane (strictly from east-north
east) burst upon them from Μount Ιda,
squalldescending from the hillson the
Lake of Gennesaret, and κατά του κρημ-
νού, Luke viii.33, cf. Μatt. viii.32 (J.
164 (so Ηackett, Lewin, Farrar), takes
κατ' αυτής as = against the ship, but
the word πλοίον is used forship, and not
ναυς until ver. 41. Luther regarded αυτής
as agreeing with προθέσεως (so Tyndale
and Cranmer).—τυφωνικός: formed from
τυφώς, turbo, denoting not the direction,
but the vehemence of the wind (Breusing,
Page), a heavy, eddying squall (J. Smith,
Ramsay), vorticosus (Bentley).—Ευρο-
κλύδων, see critical note. If we read
with ΝΑΒ Ευρακύλων, render “which
is called Euroaquilo,” R.V. Perhaps the
irregularly formed Euroaquilo occasioned
the corrections. V. Euroaquilo. Blass
calls it νοξ hybrida from νοξ and
Aquilo (qui Latin = κυ, ut Ακύλας,
xviii. 2), strictly the “East-north-east”
wind (Breusing thinks “North-east”
sufficient; so Wyclife and Tyndale
in their translations). Such a wind would
drive the ship into the African Syrtis as
the pilot feared, ver. 17, and the word is
apposite to the context, to all the cir-
cumstances, and is so well attested as to
fairly claim admission as the word of St.
Luke. The Latin had no name for the
Greek Καικίας, blowing between Aquilo
and Eurus, and it is quite possible that
the Roman seamen, for want of a specific
word, might express this wind by the
compound Euro-Aquilo; cf. ο καλούμενος,
which seems to point to some popular
name given to the wind; for similar com-
pounds cf. Ευρόνοτος and Ευρο-Αuster,
and Gregalia, the name given to the
same wind by the Levantines, as Euripus
has become Egripou (Renan, Saint Paul,
p. 551); see Bentley, Remarks on a late
Discourse on Freethinking, p. 97, quoted
at length by Breusing, “Euraquilo,”
Hastings’ B.D. and B.D.*, i.

Ver. 15. συναρπασθέντος δι τοῦ
πλοίου: “and when the ship was caught
by it” (Ramsay), a graphic word as if
the ship was seized in the grasp of the
wind; only in Luke, cf. Luke viii. 29,
Acts vii. 12, xix. 27; in ΛΧΧ cf. Ρroν.
νί. 25, 2 Μacc. iii. 27, ίν. 41, 4 Μacc. ν.
4, so in classicalGreek, e.g., Soph.,
Ελεκτ., ΙΙ5ο.—Αντοφθαλμείν: “and could
not face the wind,” R.V., “look at the
wind eye to eye”; eyes were painted on
the prοws of vessels, but Αlford thinks
that the word was not originally a nautical
term derived from this practice, but that
more probably the expression was trans-
ferred to a ship from its usage in com-
mon life; it is used in Polybius of facing
an enemy, Polyb., i., 17, 3, of resisting
temptation, xxviii. 17, 18, with δύναται
as here, and also with δύναται in Wisd.
xiv. 14, cf. Acts vi. 11, Β text. For the
fit application of the word to a ship
see Breusing, p. 166.—καταπτόμεθα: “we gave way to it (to the wind),
and were driven,” or το πλοίον may be
regarded as the object, “we gave up
the ship to the winds,” “data nave fluctibus
δυνάμενον ἀντοφθαλμεὶν τῷ ἀνέμῳ, ἐπιδιόντες 1 ἑφερόμεθα. Ἱ. 7. ἦν ἄρατες, βοηθεῖας ἔχρωντο, 16. Ἰουνίου δὲ τι ὑποδραμόντες καλομένου 2 Κλαύδην, μόλις ἱσχύσαμεν περικρατεῖς γενέθαι τῆς σκάφης: 17. ἦν ἄρατες, βοηθεῖας ἔχρωντο.

1 After τοῦ. Blass in β τοῦ text, so Hilg. (1899) add τοῦ πνεοντι καὶ συστειλαντε τα ιστια with 137, Syr. H. (cf. Cassiod., Bede), and before εφερ. Blass has κατα το συμβαινον (Hilg. τυχον) with Syr. H.

2 Κλαύδην HLP d; H. Κλαύδην Syr. H., Arm., Boh., so Tisch., Weiss; A has first three letters Κλα; but Κλαν Vulg. have Καυδα, W. H., Blass, so R. V. text (Κλαυδα marg.), Hilg. (1899), and the form Κλαυδα is supported by Κλαυδος in Ptolem., iii., 15, 8, and other authorities in Hastings' B.D., “Cauda” (Ramsay). See note in comment., and Wendt, p. 408 (1899). The variation cannot be accounted for by the mere dropping out of Λ before Α as Weiss maintains, for the difference of spelling occurs in other than M.S. authorities. Verner-Schmiedel, p. 65, note.

Ver. 16. ὑποδραμόντες: “and running under the lee of a small island,” R.V.; J. Smith calls attention to the nautical accuracy of St. Luke's terms; they ran before the wind to leeward of Cauda; ὑποδραμ., they sailed with a side wind to leeward of Cyprus and Crete, ὑπεπλεύσαμεν, ver. 4, see also Ramsay, Saint Paul, p. 328, to the same effect; here was calmer water, and the island (see below) would afford them a refuge for a time from the gale. Breusing, pp. 167, 168, 161, thinks that the great sail had been struck at once, and that the artemon or small foresail was kept up as a storm sail; otherwise the ship would have simply been the plaything of the waves. But Ramsay and others (see Farrar) think, on the contrary, that the one huge sail, in comparison with which all others were of little importance, was kept up, but that the strain of this great sail on the single mast was more than the hull could sustain; the timbers would have started, and the ship foundered, had she not gained the smooth water to the lee of Cauda.—μόλις ἱσχύσαμεν: “we were able with difficulty to secure the boat,” R.V.; the boat had not been hauled in, as the storm was so sudden; and now as it was nearly filled with water, and battered by the waves and storm, it was hard work to haul it in at all (J. Smith), as Luke himself experienced (pressed into this service of hauling in the boat; note first person, Hackett, Ramsay, p. 337); clearly they could not afford to lose such a means of safety; even as it was, the boat was dragging along as a heavy weight regarding the ship (Breusing, p. 169).—περικ., cf. Susannah, ver. 39, A, for ἕκρατεις in B.—σκαφῆς: a small boat towed behind, only in this passage in N.T., cf. vv. 30, 32, Latin, scapha; Cic., De Invent., ii., 51 (Humphry).—Κλαύδην, see critical note, an island twenty-three miles from Crete, nearly due south of Phænice. Ramsay (but see on the other hand Wendt, p. 408, 1899) maintains that preference be given to the forms of the name in which the letter Λ is omitted, cf. the modern Gardho in Greek, and Gozzo in Italian; not to be confounded with Gozo near Malta (Renan, Saint Paul, p. 551), and see further on its present name, J. Smith, pp. 95, 259, 4th edition.

Ver. 17. ἦν ἄρατες: “and when they had hoisted it up” into the ship, see on ver. 13.—βοηθ. ἔχρωντο: they used helps υποζ. τὸ πλοίον undergirding the ship, A. and R.V., on ἔχρωντο see ver. 3, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15; often compared to the custom called in modern language frapping, or undergirding the ship with cables to prevent the timbers from being strained, or to hold them together during a storm, Plato, Rep., 616, C, Polyb., xxvii., 3, 3, Horace, Od., i., 14, 6. The difficult point to decide is whether the girders were put longitudinally round the ship, i.e., passed from stem to stern, or under the ship transversely. Breusing, p. 670 (so Goerne and Vars), defends the former at great length, following Böckh. The passage from Plato, u. s., he admits may possibly make for the latter view, but it is evident that the description is not
very definite or precise, and the passage in Isidore of Seville, Orig., xix., 4, 4, "tormentum (ὑπόζωμα) funis in navibus longus, qui a prora ad pappim extenditur, quo magis constringantur," which Bockh quotes (so also Vars, L'Art Nautique, p. 210) is much clearer. Moreover, the girding was often performed when the ships were on land, on the stocks, and it is not likely that the operation in the circumstances under discussion could have meant passing a cable under the keel. Further, by girding the ship transversely, i.e., underneath the ship (p. 175), only the timbers in the middle of the ship would be held together, whilst a girding longitudinally was needed to secure the whole planking of the ship. But see on the other hand Ramsay, p. 329, who agreeing with Smith holds that the cables were passed underneath round the ship transversely. Either operation, one would suppose, would have been difficult during a storm. For instances of this practice in modern times, see Smith, and C. and H., small edit., p. 645. Wendt (1899) refers to Naber’s conjecture of βοείαις for βοηθ. as very plausible.—μή εἰς τὴν Σ.: "on the great quicksands," Ramsay; "the Syrtis," R.V., not merely "the quicksands," as A.V., but the Syrtis Major, "the Goodwin Sands of the Mediterranean" (Farrar), lying at a distance to the south-west of Cluda; upon them the sailors knew that they would be cast, unless they could manage by some means to alter their course.—ἐκπέσωσιν: a regular nautical term, to fall off, εκ, i.e., from a straight course, Ευρ., Ηερ., 409, Herod., viii., 13, others supply "from deep water" and render ἔκπ. to be cast away, Grimm-Thayer, sub v., cf. vv. 26, 29.—χαλάσω το σκεύος: "lowered the gear," R.V., "they reduced sail," Ramsay; here and in ver. 30 used as a nautical term; the tempting reference to Isa. xxxiii. 21, LXX, cannot be sustained, for the meaning of the words is very doubtful. The article with the singular (in ver. 19, the plural) seems to indicate "the gear," the mainyard carrying the mainsail (so Page, Wordsworth, Humphry). Of the A.V., J. Smith says that no more erroneous translation could be imagined, as "they struck sail" would imply that the ship had no means of escaping danger, but was left to flounder hopelessly in the storm, although Meyer-Wendt take the words to mean that they preferred to let the ship drift without any mast or sail than to be driven on upon the Syrtis, as was inevitable with the ship kept in full sail. Chrysostom explains το σκ. as = τâ istia, but some sail was necessary, and they had still the artemon or storm sail, so J. Smith, who thinks that they lowered the great sail and mainyard some way, but not apparently entirely. The aim of the sailors was not merely to delay their course (which would only bring them upon the Syrtis), but to alter it, and it is therefore quite possible that χαλάσω το σκεύος may denote a series of operations, slackeningsail, lowering as much of the gear as they could, but leaving enough sail spread to keep the ship's head to the wind, i.e., to the north instead of drifting to south-west upon the quicksand (Ramsay). Breusing, p. 177 f., who thinks that the mainsail had been lowered at the commencement of the storm, adopts quite a different meaning for the words, and interprets them as implying that weights and great stones were let down by ropes into the sea for the purpose of retarding the progress of the vessel, and with this view Blass and Knabenbauer are in agreement (Wendt, 1899, evidently inclines to it, and Goerne adopts it); this curious view, which Ramsay finds it difficult to regard seriously, Breusing supports by a passage in Plut., Moral., p. 507, A (so Hesychius' explanation, ἄγκυρα τὸ ναυτικὸν σκεύος), which intimates that ἄγκυραι were frequently employed to check the course of a ship in a storm; but even if the Greek words admit of this explanation, the object of the sailors was nothing less than to alter the course of the vessel, and Breusing's supposition would not conduce to this.—οῦτως ἔφροντο: "so were driven," R.V., i.e., in this state, "and drove on so," Rendall; meaning that we let the ship drift in that position, i.e., undergirded, with storm sail set and on the starboard tack; J. Smith, so Ramsay, not simply "were driven hopelessly".

Ver. 18. σφοδρῶς δέ χειμαλ. ἥμαν:
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ
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μένων ημών, τη εξής εκβολήν εποιούντο τg. και τη τρίτη αυτόχειρες
την σκευήν του πλοίου" ερρίψαμεν 2ο." μήτε δε ηλίου μήτε άστρων
επιφαινόντων επί πλείονας ημέρας, χειμώνός τε ουκ ολίγου επικει
Ιnstead of rst pers. pl. δSΑΒ*C, Vulg., Αrm., so Τisch., W.Η., R.V., Βlass in β,

Weiss, Wendt have 3rd pers. (W.Η., so Τisch., with one ρ with ΝΒ", while ΑΒ"C
have double ρ); ΗLP, Syr. Η. and Ρ., Βoh. have Ist pers. pl., and so Ηilg.
(1899) with one ρ. 137 Syr. Η., Wern. add εις την θαλασσαν, so Βlass in β text,
and Ηilg.; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56.

"Αt beginning of verse Βlass in β and Ηilg. (1899) add επιμενοντος δε του
χειμωνος και with Gig., Syr. Ρ. (the latter with επι πλ. ημ. after χειμωνος), whilst
χειμ. . . . to λοιπον is omitted.
" and as we laboured exceedingly with the ship, p. 186. J. Smith takes σκεύη
the storm," R.V., Ramsay, Rendall, a to mean the mainyard, but the word is
regular nautical and classical term , cf. here apparently used in a more general
Τhuc., ii., 25; iii., 69; viii., 99; Plato, Ιon, sense, as above, R.V., margin, " furni
54ο Β. Ιn Αttic Greek usually σφόδρα, ture of the ship ".
Ver. Ι9. ερρίψαμεν, see critical note.
but cf. LΧΧ, Josh. iii. τ6, Εcclus. xiii.
13, 4 Μacc. vi. τI ; only here in Ν.Τ. Ramsay prefers the first person, although
Weiss thinks that it is used to express not well supported, because it increases
how severely they were distressed by the the effect , but in any case the scene is
storm.-τή εξής . . . και τη τρίτη, cf. graphically described, έρριψαν may be
Ι.uke xiii. 32, connected with the words due to εποιούντο, but, as Wendt notes,
which follow in R.V. and by Ramsay. ερρίψαμεν may have been equally due to
For τη εξ. cf. Luke vii. Ι Ι (but see αυτόχειρες. Βreusing rejects the first
W.Η.), ix. 37, and above on xxi. τ, χxν. person, p. 187, from a seaman's point of
τ7; nowhere else in Ν.Τ. - εκβολήν view ; the sailors would have kept the
εποιούντο : " they began to throw the passengers in their places, and not have
freight overboard," R.V., Ramsay, allowed them to engage in a work in
Felten, a technical term, so in classi which they might perchance have done
cal Greek, for throwing out cargo to more harm than good.
lighten a ship ; Latin jactura, LΧΧ,
Ver. 2ο, μήτε δε ηλίου μήτε άστρων :
Jonah i. 5, with των σκευών, and Julius the omission of the article here intensi
Pollux, i., 99, who also has the phrase fies the meaning, Βlass, Gram., p. π43,
κουφίσαι την ναύν, cf. ver. 38 below. "weder etwas von Sonne ".-επιφαιν
Τhe imperfect marks that they began by όντων, cf. Luke i. 79; only in Luke and
throwing away the cargo, probably what Paul, Τit. ii. Ιτ, iii. 4; " shone upon us,"
was on deck, so that the vessel would R.V., thus their only guidance, humanly
ship less water , and in ver. τg they cast speaking (for, of course, they had no
out (έρριψαν, aorist) the furniture of the compass), was taken from them, cf.
ship, its fittings and equipment, anything ΑΕncid, i., 88; iii., τg5 ; Ηorace, Εpod.,
movable lying on the deck upon which x., 9, and for the phrase, Polyb., v., 6,
the passengers could lay their hands 6.-επί πλείονας : often in Luke επί
(αυτόχειρες only here in Ν.Τ. represent with acc. of time, cf. xxviii. 6, and
ing the
Weiss). Οthers include for instances in Luke and other parts
under the word the actual baggage of of Αcts of the same usage as predomi
the passengers, but we should have ex nant (though not exclusive) in Luke see
pected ημών instead of του πλοίου, whilst Ηawkins, Ηora Synoptica, p. 152 ;
others explain of beds and crockery, Κlostermann, Vindicia Lucana, p. 53 ;
tables, etc., furniture in this sense (Ζόςk Luke x. 35, xviii. 4, Αcts iii. Ι, ίν. 5, xiii.
ler and Felten, exclusive of beds which 3 Ι, xvi. Ι8, xvii. 2, xviii. 2o, xix. 8, το,
were not in use). Βreusing rejects this 34.-ουκ ολίγου : only in Luke, eight
interpretation as "too silly," and he times in Αcts, see above on ver. Ι4.
thinks that the expression really means επικειμ., cf. I Cor. ix. Ι6, Ηeb. ix. Ιο,
that by thus throwing overboard the Luke ν. Ι, χxiii. 23 (John xi. 38, xxi. 9,
poles and tackling, room was found for literal sense), and for its use here, Ρlut.,
the crowd of passengers on the deck, as Τimol., 28, τέλος δε του χειμώνος επικει
the hatchways could not be kept open, μένου. Ιn LΧΧ, Job xix. 3, Wisd. xvii.
since the heavy sea would have swamped 21 S, Ι Μacc. νi. 57, 3 Μacc. i. 22, etc.

Ε


PRAXEIS APOTOSTOLON

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

μένου, λοιπόν περιηρείτο πάσα ἐλπὶς τοῦ σώζεσθαι ἡμᾶς. 21. πολλῆς δὲ απερχομένης, τότε σταθεὶς ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἶθεν, Ἑβαί μὲν, ὁ ἄρεσ, παυδαρχισαντάς μοι μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Κρήτης, κερδήσαί τε τὴν ὀβριν ταύτην καὶ τὴν ζημίαν.

1 For ἹABC have τε, so Tisch., W. H., Blass, R. V., Hilg., Weiss, Wendt.
22. καὶ ταῦτα παρακλήματι ὑμᾶς ἐφημερίν: ἀποβολή γὰρ ψυχῆς οὐδεμία ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου. 23. παρέστη γὰρ μοι τῇ νυκτὶ ταῦτῃ ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗ εἰμὶ, ὑμῖν καὶ λατρεύω, 24. λέγων, ἂν φοβότε Παύλε Καίσαρί σε δειπνήσῃ καὶ ἰδοὺ κεχάρισται σοι ὁ Θεὸς πάντα τοὺς πλέοντας μετὰ σοῦ. 25. διὸ εὐθυμεῖτε, ἀνδρεῖς παίτι πάντως ἔσται καθ' ὑμᾶς τὸτε ὁ Θεὸς πάντα τοὺς πλέοντας μετά σοῦ. 26. εἰς νῆσον δὲ τινὰ διερχόμενον μετὰ σοῦ. 27. Ως δὲ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατῇ νῦς ἔγενετο, διαφερομένων ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ Ἀδριατ. 


...
before us.—ἐπιστεφόμενοι, cf. ver. 17, and further instances in Wetstein, see also vv. 29, 32, below.

Ver. 27. τισταρεσκελεκταν ὑπενόουν: only in Luke; “surmised,” R.V., less decided than “deemed,” A.V., see on xiii. 25 (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 4).—προσάγειν τινά αὐτοῖς χώραν: “that some land was approaching them,” R.V., so Breusing and Ramsay, intransitive in LXX, Josh. iii. 9, 1 Sam. ix. 18, Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 3, etc., “Lucas optuce loquitur, nautarum more,” Kypke: the opposite verb would be ἀναχωρεῖν, recedere, see Wetstein and Blass for illustrations. J. Smith thinks that probably they heard the breakers on the shore, but Breusing and Goerne (so Blass) think that the anchor or whatever weight was dragged behind the ship appeared to strike the ground, see above on ver. 17, cf. critical note for προσαχείν, Doric for προσφείν.—χώραν: the point of Koura, east of St. Paul’s Bay, J. Smith; the ship would pass within a quarter of a mile of it, and while the land is too low to be seen when the night is stormy, the breakers can be heard for a considerable distance; cf. the description of the wreck of the Lively in 1810, Smith, p. 123, 4th edition.

Ver. 28. βολίσαντες: having let down
bolίσαντες, εδρόν ὁργών διπατέτε σ. 29. φοβούμενοι τε μήπως εἰς τραχεῖς τόπους ἐκπέσωμεν, ἐκ πρύμνης διατήρησαν γάρρας τέσσαρας, ήψιτο τε βαρέαν γενέσθαι. 30. τῶν δὲ ναυτῶν ἠτούντων φυγεῖν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ χαλασάντων τὴν σκάφην εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, 2 προφέσει


2 After θαλ. Blass in β text adds ευκαιριαν ζητοῦντων, so Hilgenfeld (1899) with Gig., and after εκτ. both add on the same authority τον ασφαλεστέροντο πλοιον εστώναι.

the sounding-lead (βολίς), elsewhere only in Eustath., in active voice, but see also Grimm-Thayer, sub v. —ὁργών: five or six feet, a fathom, Grimm; Breusing compares Herod., iv., 41, and gives six feet; on the accent see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 72. "The ancient fathom so nearly agrees with the English that the difference may be neglected," J. Smith, p. 131.—βραχύ δὲ διαστήσαντες: "and after a little space," so Ramsay, Rendall; the phrase may refer to space or time; if we understand τὸ πλοῖον or ἐν τούτοις we should take it of the former (Grimm); but if we explain = βραχύ διάστημα τούς τούσ (Blass), it may be taken of either. Διάςτημα is only found in Luke for signifying any space of time, Luke xxii. 59, cf. Acts v. 7; but Luke xxiv. 51, διάστημα τοῦ αὐτοῦ. J. Smith shows how exactly the geographical details in the traditional St. Paul's Bay correspond with the description here. Before a ship drifting from Čauda could enter the bay it would not only pass within a quarter of a mile of Point Kaura, north-east of Malta, but the measurements of 20 and 15 fathoms exactly correspond to ascertained soundings according to the vessel's average of speed.

Ver. 29. φοβούμενοι: the diminution of the depth of water increased the danger of running aground, perhaps on some hidden reef of rocks.—τραχεῖς τόπους, cf. Luke iii. 5, in quotation Isa. xl. 4; nowhere else in N.T., cf. Bar. iv. 26 (3 Macc. i. 23), so in Diod. Sic., xii., 72, of rocks, Polyb., i., 54. It was evidently a hydrographic term, and classed with δυσόρμος, ἄλμενος, etc., Jul. Pollux, i., 101; J. Smith, p. 132.—ἐκτεστομεν, see ver. 17. "to cast ashore," R.V., or simply "cast on rocky ground," which is more indefinite than the former rendering, and perhaps correctly so, as there were possible dangers from sunken reefs as well as from a rocky coast. On the subjunctive after verbs of fear and danger cf. Burton, p. 15.—ἐκ πρύμνης: this was unusual, but to anchor was their only chance of safety, and four anchors would make the vessel more secure: ancient vessels carried as a rule several anchors. Athenæus speaks of a ship which had eight iron anchors, cf. for the number here, and the security which they gave, Caesar, Bell. Civ., i., 25, "naves quatermini anchoris destinabat, ne fluctibus moverentur"; anchorage from the prow would have caused the ship to swing round from the wind, whereas anchorage from the stern would enable the sailors to manage the ship far more easily, and to bring her under control of the helm when they wished to run her aground (see the description in Ramsay, Rendall, Farrar, and J. Smith). On the interesting parallels of anchoring ships from the stern in our own naval engagements see C. and H., small edition, p. 653, and J. Smith, p. 133, 4th edition.—νύχτο: "prayed," R.V. margin, the Greek sailors might pray at such a crisis (Rendall).—βαρέαν γενέσθαι, cf. vv. 33, 39, characteristic of Luke, cf. Luke iv. 42, vi. 13, xxii. 26, Acts xii. 18, xvi. 35, xxii. 12.

Ver. 30. ἠτούντων: "and as the sailors were seeking," R.V.; "about to flee," A.V. is incorrect, for they were planning possible means of escape, and could scarcely be said to be about to escape, cf. β text—if they succeeded the passengers and the soldiers would thus be left to their fate.—προφ. ὡς: under colour, under pretence, specie, cf. Mark xii. 40, Luke xx. 47, John xv. 22, Phil. i. 18, 1 Thess. ii. 5. Cf. for its use here Thuc., v., 53, vi., 76. For ὡς cf. xvii. 14, xxviii.
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

29-33.

... Βραχύτελεις 31. εἶπεν ο Παύλος τῷ ἐκατονάρχῃ καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις, Ἐὰν μή οὗτοι μείνωσιν ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ, ὡμεῖς σωθῆναι οὐ δύνασθε. 32. τότε οἱ στρατιώται ἀπέκοψαν τὰ σχοινία τῆς σκάφης, καὶ εἶασαν αὐτὴν ἐκπεσεῖν. 33. ἄχρι δὲ οὗ ἔμελλεν ἡμέρα γίνεσθαι, παρεκάλει ὁ Παύλος ἄπαντας μεταλαβεῖν τροφῆς, λέγων, Τεσσαρεσκεδεκάτην τήν ἡμέραν προσδοκώντες,
ΧΧVΙΙ. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

άσιτοι διατελείτε, μηδέν προσλαβόμενοι. 34. διό παρακαλά ύμες προσλαβείν τροφής· τούτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ομηρίας συνεργία ὑπάρχει· οidebar ύμων  ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας εἰς τὴς κεφάλης σαλιγκήν. 35. εἰτῶν δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον, εὐχαρίστησε τῷ Θεῷ ἐνώπιον πάντων, καὶ κλάσας ἐσθίειν." 36. εὐθυμοὶ δὲ γενόμενοι πάντες, καὶ αὐτοὶ

1 Instead of προσλαβ. Lach. with A 40 reads προσλαμβανομενοι, prob. change to προσδοκωντες. 3 Instead of προσλ. ΝΑΒC, Chrys., so Τisch., W. H., R. V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt read μεταλ. For υμετ. ΑLΡ have υμετ., so Hilg. 3 For ek ABC minusc., Tisch., W. H. and other authorities above read ατο, but Hilg. has ek with ΝΗΛΠ. For πετονται ΝΑΒC Vulg., Syr. P., Boh., Arm., Λατιν. have απολιται, so Tisch., W. H. and other authorities above; but πετον is supported by ΗΛΡ, Sah., Syr. H., so Hilg. and Meyer who suppose that ατολ is from Luke xxi. 18; but see on the other hand Alford’s note. After νινεχει Blass in β text and Belser, so Hilg., add ελπιζω γαρ εν τω Θεω μου οτι with Gig.

food they might have by them; in ancient ships there were no tables spread, or waiters to bring food to the passengers, and each one who wanted refreshment must fetch it for himself. Plumptre takes πρός as meaning no extra food, only what would keep body and soul together, but it is doubtful whether the Greek will bear this or Breezing’s interpretation.

Ver. 34. διό: so that they might be ready for the work which would be necessary.—προσλαβείν, see critical note. —πρός: here only with genitive in N. T., cf. Blass, Gram., p. 136; i.e., stands, so to speak, on the side of our deliverance, Latin a parte, cf. Thuc., ii. 86; iii. 59; Plat., p. 459 C; Winer-Moulton, xviii. f. —σωτήρας, emphatic. —σωτήρας: “safety,” R. V., only used here and in Heb. xi. 7 of the preservation of physical life, safety, so in classical Greek and in Greek medical writers, see on xvi. 17; “health,” A.V., not limited formerly as now to the condition of body and mind, cf. Luke i. 77, “science of health” Wycliffe = “knowledge of salvation,” and cf. also Ps. lxvii. 2, “thine saving health,” literally “thy salvation” (Humphry). Effort on their part was necessary, and yet no hair of their heads should perish; what a significant union of faith in God and self-help! (Bethge.) —οidebar γὰρ ὑμετέρας σωτήρας (cf. Luke xxi. 18, nowhere else in N. T., but the proverbial phrase, as it apparently was, is found in 1 Sam. xiv. 45, 2 Sam. xiv. 11, 1 Kings i. 52 (cf. Matt. x. 29), see critical note, and cf. Shakespeare, Tempest, Act i., Scene 2.

Ver. 35. λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαρίστησε τῷ Θ., cf. Luke xxii. 19, xxiv. 30, with intentional solemnity (Weiss, Weizsäcker). The words are sometimes taken to mean that Paul simply encourages them by his own example to eat. But Blass, see critical note, who comments “et oratione confirmat et exemplo,” adds in β text επιδιδοὺς καὶ ημίν, i.e., to Luke and Aristarchus, in which he sees a distinct reference to the cana sacra (so Belser). But quite apart from this reading in β the peculiar language of St. Luke seems to intimate such a reference. Olshausen and Ewald (so Plumptre) take the words to refer to the Agape, whilst Meyer (so Hackett) sees a reference to the act of the Jewish house-father amidst his household; but Wendt simply refers it to the act of a pious Jew or Christian giving thanks before eating a meal and sharing it, so Zöckler. Bethge, more specifically, sees in the act a thanksgiving of a Christian to God the Father, an instance of what St. Paul himself recommends, Ephes. v. 20, Col. iii. 17, and both Felten and Knabenbauer apparently prefer to interpret the words as marking Paul’s reverence towards God before the Gentiles around him. Breusing shows, p. 196, that ἄρτος might = panis nauticus, but in the passage which he quotes from Lucian we have ἄρτος nauticus.

Ver. 36. τροφῆς: with a partitive meaning; cf. γεύσασθαι, xxiii. 14, μεταλαβείν, ver. 33, κορέννυσθαι, ver. 38. Cf. Herod., viii., 90. Luckock points out that St. Luke distinguishes between the bread of which the Apostle partook and
the food, τροφής, taken by the rest, and certainly the expression πλώος is remarkable, cf. Luke xxii. 19, i Cor. xi. 23, 24; but it is perhaps noteworthy that the Romanist Felten (see above) sees no reference to the Eucharist, although he fully admits that this act of Paul in thus giving thanks must have made a great impression at such a moment. —εὐθυμοῦν, ver. 22, cf. 2 Macc. xi. 26.—καὶ αὐτοῖς: "also themselves," following his example.

For the second time Paul had restored their courage by his faith and prudence; the event had already shown that he deserved confidence, and it is evident that he inspired it, see the testimony of Bréusing, pp. 198, 199.

Wendt, so too Jungst, and Clemen see no reason to regard vv. 33-36 as an interpolation in the "We" source, as vv. 21-26 above. Overbeck regards both sections as standing or falling together, and treats them both as interpolations, but Ramsay, whilst regarding the two sections as inseparably connected, treats them both as belonging to the original "We" source, and he rightly expresses surprise at those who accept ver. 33 ff., and refuse to accept vv. 21-26 (Saint Paul, p. 337); much more intelligible is the judgment of Weissacker than that of the other German critics in question when he describes the narrative as an indivisible whole, and considers it impossible to disentangle the mere history of travel from it, or to strip away the miraculous additions.

Ver. 37. The number was large, but nothing is told us of the size and manning of the Alexandrian ship, and Josephus, Vita, 3, mentions that there were about 600 in the ship which took him to Italy. On the large size of the ships engaged in a traffic similar to that of the corn ship in this chapter see Breusing, p. 157; Vars, p. 191; Hackett and Bliss, in loco, and ver. 6; Lucian, Πλοίον ή Ευχαί., 5. The number may be mentioned at this point that they might know afterwards that all had been saved. But Breusing thinks that it would have come perhaps more naturally at the end of the narrative, and that it is given here because the rations were distributed to each on board at this juncture. For the phrase cf. xix. 7.

Ver. 38. κορεσθ., 1 Cor. iv. 8, nowhere else in N.T., with genitive of the thing with which one is filled, as in classical Greek. Alford refers to LXX, Deut. xxxi. 20, but see Hatch and Redpath, sub ν.—κορεσθέντες: de nasc., Polyb., i. 60, 8f; LXX, Jonah i. 5.—τὸν σίτον: "the wheat," A. and R.V., Vulgate, Αὐτοί; so Ramsay, Breusing, Vars, J. Smith, Page, and so too Erasmus, Bengel, etc., i.e., the cargo, cf. ver. 6. Blass thinks that the word used is decisive in favour of this interpretation; otherwise we should have had σῖτια or ἀρτοι if merely food had been meant; not only was the cargo of sufficient weight really to lighten the ship, but there was need for the ship being as clear as possible for the operations in ver. 40. Wendt 1899 appears also to favour this view, cf. his comments with those in 1888 edition, where he adopts the view of Meyer and Weiss, that the word means provisions of food, as at first sight the context seems to indicate. But the latter would not have made such appreciable difference in weight, nor would those on board have been likely to throw them away, since they could not tell on what shore they might be cast, whether hospitable or not, or how long they would be dependent on the food which they had in the ship. In ver. 38 the reference may be to the cargo on deck, or at all events only to a part of the cargo (Holtzmann). Naber conjectured ιστόν, but no such emendation is required (Wendt).

Ver. 39. τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἔπεγ.: "they did not recognise the land," Ramsay; the sailors probably knew Malta, since, xxviii. 11, there was evidently nothing unusual in eastern ships touching at the island on their way to Rome. But they did not know St. Paul's Bay, which is remote from the great harbour, and was not distinguished by any marked features to secure recognition, Ramsay, J. Smith; see also note on xxviii. 1. C. and H. lay stress on the imperfect, "they tried to recognise . . ., but could not"; but in xxviii. 1 we have the aorist indicating that the land was recognised immediately on landing.—κατενόουν: "perceived," R.V., cf. Matt. vii. 3, Luke vi. 41, xx. 23.—κάλπον τινα: a sort of bay or creek, "a bay," R.V., the word means a bay either small or large, and St. Paul's Bay may be described as a small bay or creek (Ren dall); ἐγκατασταλὼν "with a sandy beach," Ramsay, with a beach, R.V., i.e., smooth and fit for a vessel's landing place, cf. xxvi. 5, Matt. xiii. 2, 48, John xxi. 4; cf. Xen., Anab., vi. 4, 4 (see Page's note); in LXX, Judg. v. 17 A, Ecclus. xxiv. 14 S4, al. J. Smith adds that St. Luke here again employs the correct hydrographical term, frequently used by Arrian in this sense. The traditional St. Paul's Bay may certainly well have been the place meant (so Wendt, 1899, and Blass). On the smooth, sandy beach see Hackett, note, p. 334, who has also visited the spot, and confirmed Smith's view, although both admit that the former sandy beach has been worn away by the action of the sea; Smith, p. 247, 4th edition, and see also Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 341.—ἐξώσαν τὸ πλοίον: "to drive the ship upon it," R.V., i.e., the beach, so Ramsay, Rendall, Breusing, Vars, Goerne, J. Smith (4th edit., p. 142); the object was not to save the ship from being destroyed, but the crew from perishing; under like circumstances the same would be done to-day (so Breusing, Vars), cf. Arrian, Perip. Pont. Eux., 6. ἐξώσαν: so in Thuc., ii., 90; viii., 104 (and see Wetstein); see also critical note on οἰκουσαν el δυνατον, and Burton, p. 106, and Grimm-Thayer, sub el, i., 7, c., with optative, where the condition represents the mind and judgment of others . . ., as if the sailors had said amongst themselves ἐξέσαμεν el δυνάμθα, cf. xxi. 19.

Ver. 4ο. καὶ τὰς ἁγκ. περιελόντες: "and casting off the anchors," R.V., cf. ver. 20 for the same verb, so that the meaning cannot be as A.V., following Vulgate, "having taken up"; in fact it is the very reverse. The sailors loosed the cables of the anchors which were fastened within the ship, that they might fall off into the sea (Blass); Breusing and Vars compare Xen., Hell., xvi., 21, τὰς ἁγκύρας ἀποκόπτοντες = τὰ σχοινία τῶν ἁγκυρῶν. —ἐιων εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν: "they left them (the anchors) in the sea," R.V., relinquebant, Blass; so Breusing, Vars, Goerne, as against A.V., and Vulgate, committebant se, or Luther's rendering (Beza and Grotius), έυων τὸ πλοίον εἰναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Grimm-Thayer renders "they let down into the sea," i.e., abandoned, which gives better the force of εἰς than regarding it simply as = εν. ἀμα: "at the same time," R.V., "simul laxantes," Vulgate, "loosing withal," Rheum, but in no other E.V. (Speaker's Commentary).—τὰς ἕξευκτ. τῶν πηδαλίων: the bands of the rudders, the fastenings of the rudders, i.e., the two paddle-rudgers with which Greek and Roman ships were supplied, one on each quarter, C. and H. and J. Smith, p. 183, 4th edition,
these rudders had been lifted from the water and lashed up while the ship was anchored by the stern (see Breusing's description, p. 98, cf. Eur., Hel., 1536: πηδάλια ζεύγλαισι παρακαθίετο, but the rudders were wanted when the ship again got under weigh.—τήν πνεούσην, sc. αυρά.—ἐπήριστε: technical word for spreading out the sail, opposite to υφίεσθαι.—κατείχον εις τὸν ἀγιαλόν: "they made for the beach," R.V., in order to land, cf. Xen., Hell., ii., 1, 29; others take it as meaning to check the ship's headway, but better, to hold or head the ship, Herod., vii., 59, 188, so Grimm-Thayer, sub v., sc. τὴν ναῦν, whilst others take the verb intras transitively as above in R.V.—τὸν ἄρτημον: "the foresail," R.V., Ramsay, J. Smith. The word has been interpreted by various writers as meaning nearly every sail which a vessel carries. If the interpretation of ver. 17 is correct, it could not mean the mainsail as A.V. Others apply it to the stern-sail, which bears the name to-day (Italian, artimone; French, voile d'artimon), but to set this sail would have been the most foolish thing they could have done, so Vars, Breusing. The word is found only here for the foresail, and its meaning is fixed by the fact that no other sail could be so well used by sailors under the circumstances, see Breusing, p. 103 and 103 ff., 4th edit. In his edition, 1899, Wendt thinks it probable that the sail here meant is otherwise called δόλων, but see J. Smith, p. 200, 4th edit. In his former edition he preferred to interpret it of the topsail (Meyer, Weiss, Zöckler, Baumgarten), but Breusing, p. xii., points out that only in the sixteenth century were topsails introduced; see also Vars, p. 93.

Ver. 41. περιπ. δὲ εἰς τ. διθ.: Luke x. 30, James i. 2, with the dative, as generally, but Arrian, περιπεσοντες εἰς τὸν πρώτον διθάλασσον (Wetstein), 2 Macc. vi. 13, x. 4, Polyb., i., 37, εἰς τὸν πλοῖον διθ.: a bank or a ridge between two seas, which has sea on both sides; cf. Dio Chrys., 5, p. 83, where reference is made to the dangers of the sea: βραχία καὶ δίθάλασσα καὶ ταξία μακραί ... ἐπιτόρον ... παρέχομεν τὸ πλοῖον (Wetstein and Blass). Breusing, Vars and Goerne (so Blass) take the words εἰς τ. δ. to refer to a hidden ridge beneath the water, and the aorist περιπ. in contrast to the imperfect κατείχον seems to favour this, as expressing that they came upon a τόπον διθ.: unexpectedly, cf. Page's note and Ramsay's translation, "chancing on a bank between two seas." But the latter writer adds that the περιπ. does not imply want of purpose, as ἐπόκελλαν shows, and the meaning is that while at anchor they could not see the exact character of the spot (see also C. and H.), but as they approached they found that they had lighted on the channel not more than a hundred yards in breadth between the island of Salmonetta and the mainland; this might very properly be called "a place where two seas meet." A. and R.V., as it formed a communication between the sea within the bay and the sea outside. The adjective διθ. in as applicable to water uniting two seas, e.g., the Bosphorus, cf. Strabo, ii., 5, 12 (quoted by Smith), as to land like the Isthmus of Corinth; see J. Smith, pp. 142, 178, 4th edit., Hackett, C. and H., Lumby, Rendall, and note in Speaker's Commentary. Breusing, p. 204, Goerne, Wendt (1899) take it of St. Paul's Bank which lies just in front of St. Paul's Bay, so too Vars, p. 258, for the same view and its support.—ἐπόκελλαν τὴν ναύν: "they ran the vessel aground" (cf. J. Smith, p. 143, 4th edit.), see critical note. ἐπόκελλα and ἐπικέλλω are both used in classical Greek, but the latter is "altogether poetical" (Blass), and more usually intras transitive. In Homer, Odys., ix., 148, however, we have νησὶς ... ἐπικέλσαι, and 546, νησίς ἐκλαίσαι (cf. adpellere naevam). Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 186, sees in this sudden introduction of the phrase ἐπόκελλαν τὴν ναύν an indication that St. Luke had read his Homer, since in no other passage in the N.T. do we find the obsolete word ἡ ναῦς, the commoner expression τὸ πλοῖον occurring in this chapter no less than thirteen times. R.V. renders τὴν ναυν "the vessel," all other E.V. "the ship," and
42. τῶν δὲ στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο ἵνα τοὺς δεσμοὺς ἀποκτείνω, μήτις ἐκκολυμβήσας διαφύγω. 43. ο δὲ ἐκάτονταρχος, βουλόμενος διασώσαι τὸν Παύλον, ἐκώλυσεν αὐτούς τοῦ βουλήματος, εκέλευσε τοὺς δυνάμενους κολυμβᾶν, ἀποβράβισάς πρῶτους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐξιέναι. 44. καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς, οὓς μὲν ἐπὶ σανίν, οὓς δὲ ἐπὶ τινῶν ἄπε τοῦ πλοίου. καὶ οὕτως ἐγένετο πάντας διασωθήναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

it has been thought that the word is so changed here because that which had hitherto been a πλοῖον capable of sailing was now reduced to a mere hulk (Wordsworth, Humphry).—καὶ ἡ μὲν πρώπα ἐξελέγχσα: "and the prow struck," R.V.; Ramsay, this is accounted for by the peculiar nature of the bottom in St. Paul's Bay, see J. Smith, Ramsay, Hackett, Alford, "a bottom of mud graduating into tenacious clay, into which the fore part would fix itself, and be held fast while the stern was exposed to the force of the waves". For the verb in intransitive sense as here cf. Prov. iv. 4, cf. ἐνειδίκευσεν, v., 206 (Wetstein).—ἀσάλευτος: only in N.T., LXX, Josh. viii. 22, Judg. vii. 19, Prov. xix. 5, 1 Macc. xv. 21, 2 Macc. xii. 35, etc., so absolutely in Herod., i., 10.

Ver. 43. βουλόμενος: "desiring," R.V.; the centurion had from the first, ver. 3, treated Paul with respect, and the respect had no doubt been deepened by the prisoner's bearing in the hour of danger, and he would naturally wish to save the man to whom he owed his own safety, and that of the whole crew. διασώσαι, even if he cared little for the rest he was determined "to save Paul to the end," literally, so C. and H. There is no reason whatever to regard the words βουλ., . . . τὸν Π. as an interpolation.—ἐκώλυσεν αὐτούς τοῦ β.: only here with this construction, accusative of person and genitive of thing, but similar usage in Xenophon, Polybius. For the resultative aorist, i.e., the aorist of a verb whose present implies effort or intention, commonly denoting the success of the effort, cf. also Matt. xxvii. 20, Acts vii. 36, Burton, p. 21.—τοὺς δυν. κολυμβᾶν: probably Paul was amongst the number; he had thrice been shipwrecked, and had passed a day and a night in the open sea, 2 Cor. xi. 25 (Felten, Plumptre).—ἐξιέναι: four times in Acts, nowhere else in N.T., but frequent in LXX, Vulgate, "a vi maris," which Breusing, p. 203, strongly endorses.

Ver. 42. τῶν δὲ στρατ.: only the soldiers, since they and not the sailors were responsible for the safety of the prisoners, cf. xii. 7, xvi. 27; C. and H., small edit., p. 236.—ἐκκολ.: "swim away" (Ramsay), literally "out," Eur., Hel., 1609, Dion H., v., 24.—διαφ.: only here in N.T., LXX, Josh. viii. 22, Judg. vii. 19, Prov. xix. 5, 1 Macc. xv. 21, 2 Macc. xii. 35, etc., so absolutely in Herod., i., 10.
ΧΧΒΙ. Ι. ΚΑΙ διασωθέντες, τότε ἐπέγνωσαν ὅτι Μελίτη ή νῆσος καλείται. 2. Οἱ δὲ βαρβάροι παρείχον αὐτά τὴν πυρδρομίαν ἡμῶν· ἀγάφατος γὰρ πυρᾶν, ἐπροσελάβοντο πάντας ἡμᾶς, διὰ τὸν


2 Ν* has προσελαμβανον, so Blass and Hilg.; 137 has προσελαμβανον; Vulg., Par. resiciebant; Gig. reserunt, and Blass takes the word in his text as = resicetabant. Wendt thinks that this may have been the original reading. For αναψ. (Meyer) ΝΑΒC 61, 68, Tisch., W. H., Blass, Hilg., Weiss read αψαντες.

Ver. 44. τοὺς λ., sc. ἰδεῖνα τὴν γῆν.—οὖν μὲν . . . οὖς δὲ, Luke xxiii. 33, and in classical Greek.—ἐπὶ σανίσιν: "some on planks and some on pieces from the ship," Ramsay; the planks which were in use in the ship as distinguished from actual parts or fragments of the ship in the next clause: in LXX, Ezek. xxvii. 5, the word is used of planks for the deck of a ship (Cant. viii. 9, 2 Kings xii. 9 (2)). Breusing, pp. 45, 203 (so Blass), takes it of the boards or planks which were used for keeping the cargo firmly in its place. The furniture of the vessel had already been thrown overboard, so that we can only think of the pieces broken away as the ship stranded, or perhaps broken off by the escaping crew. ἐπί: here used promiscuously with dative and genitive in the same sense.—ἐγένετο: with infinitive following, characteristic of St. Luke, Friedrich, p. 13.—διασωθήναι: on its use by St. Luke here and in xxviii. 1, 4 (Luke viii. 3), see Höflert, pp. 9, 10, 284. For the remarkable correspondence between the details of the scene of the shipwreck and the topography of St. Paul's Bay see not only J. Smith and Ramsay, but Goerne, p. 374, Breusing, p. 204, and Vars, p. 257. Breusing and Vars both admit that it is not safe to trust too much to tradition, but in this case, as they both point out, it was only likely that St. Paul would have won loyal adherents in the island who would have handed down every detail of his visit to their children, and the local tradition is in striking accordance with the description of the sacred narrative; see further Introd., p. 8.

CHAPTER XXVIII. — Ver. 1. διασωθήναι, see on xxvii. 43. Used by Josephus of his own shipwreck and escape, Vita, 3, and in Xen. and Thuc. of coming safely to a place.—τὸν διασ.. not imperfect as in xxvii. 39; here denoting the immediate recognition of the place after they had once gained safety (Weiss, Rendall, C. H.). St. Paul's Bay is several miles distant from Valetta, the harbour which the sailors doubtless knew previously, see also Breusing, p. 190, Vars, p. 243, and J. Smith, pp. 140 and 148, 4th edition.—Μελίτη, see critical note; Malta, cf. Diod. Sic., v., 12, Strabo, vi., 2, Ovid, Fasti, iii., 567, Sicula Melita as distinct from Melita Illyrica (Meleida). There is no need here to refute the view that the latter, in the Adriatic Sea on the coast of Dalmatia, is meant. This view depends chiefly upon the narrow view of the meaning of the Adria xxvii. 27, see also below on vv. 2, 3. It was first put forward in the tenth century by Constantine the Porphyrogenite, and was advocated in the last century by a Dalmatian monk, Padre Georgi, himself a native of Meleda, no doubt jealous for the honour of his birthplace and his monastery. Its chief champion may be said to be W. Falconer, in his Dissertation on St. Paul's Voyage, 1817, republished in 1870 by his nephew, Judge Falconer. This last was an unsuccessful attempt to controvert the arguments of J. Smith in favour of Malta, who may be said to have established his case to demonstration (see for a candid description of Falconer's view "Adria" (Dickson), Hastings' B.D.). More recent nautical authorities have most decisively confirmed the view of J. Smith, cf. Breusing, p. 190, and Vars, p. 242. Quite apart from the strong local tradition in favour of Malta, and the testimony of the Apocryphal Acta Petri et Pauli in favour of Γαυδομελέτη (Goso-Malta) (for references to Lipsius' edition, Wendt and Zöckler, in loco), it is not too much to say that Meleda could not have been reached without a miracle under the
證候的第二個原因，因為它的症狀是：

3. **εφεστώτα, και διά τον ψυχός.**

在這個案例中，海風，以及風的症狀，

1 After φρυγ. NABC 61, Vulg., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass add τι, but Hilg. omits (so Gig.).

2 The authorities for απο instead of εκ are overwhelming, NABCCHLI, and other authorities above with Hilg. For εξελ., which is strongly supported by NABC 61, and so other authorities above, except Hilg., HLP (Meyer, Alford) read εξελ.
3-6. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

τῆς θέρμης εξελθούσα καθήψε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ. 4. ὡς δὲ εἶδον οἱ βαρβαροὶ κρεμάμενοι τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Ἡ πόνης φονεῖς ἐστίν οὗ ἀνθρώπος αὐτος, ἐν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ δίκη οὐχ ἔστασεν. 5. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀποτινάξας τὸ θηρίον εἰς τὸ πῦρ, ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν κακὸν. 6. οἱ δὲ προσδόκοις αὐτῶν μέλλειν 1 πίμπρασθαι ἡ καταπίπτειν ἀφ' χειρὸς εἰς πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσδοκώντων, καὶ θεωρούντων μὴ δ' ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτῶν

---

1 πίμπρασθαι ΝτΣΒΗLP, Chrys., so Lach., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.; Tisch. has μετρασθ. with Ντ; πιπράσθ. Α.

Hackett's note for similar proof. Mr. Lewin, as late as 1853, believed that he saw a viper near St. Paul's Bay, St. Paul, ii., 208.—εξελθούσα: "out of," but if από "by reason of," R.V. margin, "from the heat," the viper numbed by the cold felt the sudden heat, and was restored to activity, cf. on its habits (Hackett), ἡθος "in cause significatus saepe apud Graecos," Grotius, Bengel. Cf. xx. 9, and Luke xxi. 26.—καθήψε, see critical note. Αἰθ. supported by Meyer and Alford, as if the serpent glided out through the sticks.—θηρίον: only in Luke in N.T., but in classics and in LXX, Job vi. 17, Ps. lxxviii. (xxix.) 6, Eccl. iv. 11, Ecclus. xxviii. 28; often used in medical writers instead of ἀθρόματος (Hobot), but the latter is also used in Hipp.—καθήψε: only here in N.T., but frequent in classical Greek, and usually in middle, although not found in LXX, cf. however Symm., καθάπτεσθαι, Cant. i. 6, cf. Epict., Diss., iii, 20, 10, ὡς τοῦ τραχήλου: (Grimm): Blass, Page, Felten render "bit," memordit. So Nüsgen and Zöckler, who think that this is evidently meant from the context, although not necessarily contained in the verb itself: Diez, ἡθος used it of poisonous matter introduced into the body (Hobot, p. 288). Blass thus expresses the force of the aorist, "momento temporis hoc factum est, priusquam P. manum retraxisset"

Ver. 4. τὸ θηρίον: "the beast," R.V. Although this is the meaning of the Greek word, it is to be noted that St. Luke uses it here exactly as the medical writers, who applied it to venomous serpents—in particular, to the viper, ἡθος (so Aristotle), and an antidote made chiefly from the flesh of vipers went by the name ἡθοριάκη (Hobot, Zahn, Knabenuer), and those bitten by a viper were called θηριάκητοι.—ἐξελθούσα: "hanging from," R.V., it clung by its mouth to the hand of Paul, construction as in classical Greek, cf. 2 Macc. vi. 10.—πάντως: only in Luke and Paul, expressing strong affirmation, cf. cxxi. 22, and Luke iv. 23; cf. Tob. xiv. 8, 2 Macc. iii. 13.—φονεὺς, a murderer, and therefore justice demands his life, death for death, they saw that he was a prisoner perhaps from his chains (Bengel); at all events the soldiers would have guarded him, as we may infer from xxvii. 43.—ἡ Δίκη: "justice," R.V., cf. Hesiod, Theog., 902; so in Soph., Ant., 544; Ed. Col., 1384; for the personification cf. Wisdom i. 8, xi. 20, and several instances in 4 Macc., see Grimm-Thayer, sub ν. The Maltese may have heard the name from the Greeks or Romans, or they may have honoured a goddess of their own, whose name Luke here represents by ἡ Δ., "deible lumen naturæ... nec quis sit ὁ Δίκαιος... must Ultor norunt," Bengel.—διασωθέντα, see on xxvii. 43.—οὐκ εἶασεν: "hath not suffered," they thought of him as already dead, as if the deadly bite had already done its work; not sinit, as Vulgate, but sivit.


Ver. 6. οἱ δὲ...: Paul shook off the viper—the natives looked for a fatal result. They knew the deadly nature of the bite, and their subsequent conduct shows that they regarded it as nothing short of miraculous that Paul escaped. So St. Luke evidently wishes to describe the action, see on μὲν οὖν, ver. 5. and δὲ, Rendall, Acts, p. 161, Appendix—προσδόκοις, see below.—πίμπρασθαι, from the form πίμπρημι, present infinitive passive, see critical note, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 122; cf. in LXX, Numb. v. 21, 22, 27, πρῆθειν, H. and R., of parts of the body becoming swollen. In classical Greek πίμπρασθαι means "to take
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gινόμενον, 1 μεταβαλλόμενοι ἐλεγον θεὸν αὐτόν εἶναι. 7. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τὸν τόπον ἑκείνον ὑπήρχε χωρία τῷ πρῶτῷ τῆς νῆσου, ὀνόματι Ποπλίω, δὲ ἀναδεξάμενος ἡμᾶς τρεῖς ἡμέρας 2 φιλοφρόνως εξένισεν.

1 Instead of μεταβάλλ. (KJV, so Tisch., Hilg.) ABP have the aorist μετάβαλ., so W.H., Weiss, Blass, Wendt.

2 After ημέρας τρεῖς Hilg. adds εν τῇ αἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, but not Blass.

fire, and πρῆθεν "to cause to swell," and those two ideas are combined, as in the word πρηστήρ, "a venomous snake, the bite of which caused both inflammation and swelling" (Page, in loco), cf. Lucan, ix., 790. In the N.T. the verb is peculiar to St. Luke, and it is the usual medical word for inflammation (Hobart, Zahn) in Hipp., Aret., Galen.—καταπίπτειν: only in Luke in N.T., cf. Luke viii. 6, Acts xxvi. 14, it was used by medical writers of persons falling down suddenly from wounds, or in epileptic fits; Hipp., Galen (Hobart, Zahn), cf. the asp-bitten Charmian in Ant. and Cilo. (Shakespeare), Act v., Scene 1.-ἐφώ: only in Acts ii. 26.-προσθ. . . . ἀποστόν: the two words are described by Hobart as exactly those which a medical man would use (so too Zahn), and he gives two instances of the latter word from Galen, in speaking of the bite of a rabid dog, or of poison, p. 289. The word is used elsewhere in N.T. of something morally amiss; cf. Luke xxiii. 41, Acts xxv. 5, 2 Thess. iii. 2, but here evidently of something amiss physically. In R.V. it is rendered in each passage "amiss." The word in N.T. is confined to Luke and Paul, but it is found several times in LXX in an ethical sense (as in N.T., except in loco), cf. Job iv. 8, xi. 21, xxvii. 6, xxxiv. 12, xxxv. 13, Prov. xxiv. 55 (xxx. 20), cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 23; so too in Thucydides, Sophocles, Plutarch, etc.; but it is used of any harm happening to a person as here, cf. Jos., Ant., viii., 14, 4; xi. 5, 2; Herodian, iv., 11. προσθοκεῖα, peculiar to St. Luke in N.T.; cf. Luke xxii. 6, Acts xi. 11, and προσθοκεῖα, in Luke six times, in Acts five, was, no doubt, frequently used in medical language (Hobart, Zahn) for the expectation of the result of a disease or paroxysm "when they were long in expectation," R.V.), but in Jos., Ant., viii., 14, 4, we have καὶ μὴν τῶν ἀπότων προσθοκεῖα, and in Herodian, iv., 11, μὴν ἀποστὸν προσθοκεύσας αὐτὸν γινεῖν, cf. Luke iv. 23 (Klostermann, Weiss).—μεταβαλλόμενοι, so frequently in classics without τῆν γνώμην, cf. Jos., B. Π., v., 9, 3.

—θεὸν αὐτόν εἶναι: it is perhaps fanciful to suppose with Grotius and Wetstein that they compared him to the infant Hercules, or to ΑΕsculapius represented with the serpent, but the latter is undoubtedly right in adding, "eleganter autem hic describitur vulgi inconstantia"; we naturally compare with Chrysostom the startling change in the people of Lystra, xiv., 11, 19, "Aut latro inquietu aut deus... datur tertium: homo Dei" (Bengel).

Ver. 7. χωρία: "lands," R.V. Vulgate, praedica. In this passage τόπος and χωρία occur together, but whilst the former is used of place indefinitely, the latter is used of a definite portion of space enclosed or complete in itself; cf. John iv. 5; Grimm-Thayer's Syn., sub συν, τόπος. —τῷ πρώτῳ: an official title technically correct in Malta, Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 343, honoraria appellatio, so too Schmiedel, Encycl. Bibl., i., 47, 1899; as his father was alive, he would not have been called from his estates (see, however, O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 106), but the inscriptions authorities confirm the first view, a Greek inscription giving πρῶτος Μάλταμαν καὶ Προπλίον, applied to a Roman Knight, Prudens by name, τοποθετούσα, so that Publius may well have been of the same rank, and in a Latin inscription we have municipii Melitensium primum omnium, see Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 422; Blass, in loco; Zöckler, Holtzmann, Knabenbauer, also Alford, Lewin, Hackett, Renan; possibly the conjecture may be correct that the Greek and Latin inscriptions give a translation of a title which the Romans already found in vogue in the island. Publius would be naturally the chief authority in the island under the Roman praetor of Sicily, Cic., Verr., iv., 18.—Ποπλίος: Greek form for the praenomen Publius, "nomen a populus derivatum," Blass; Ramsay, p. 343, thinks that Poplius may = the Greek rendering of the nomen Poplius, but that the peasantry may have spoken of him familiarly by his praenomen Publius. Tradition makes him bishop of Malta (Felten, Knaben-
8. ευγενετο δι των πατέρων του Ποπλίου πυρετοίς καὶ δυσεντερία υποδέχεσθαι: ἐγένετο δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Ποπλίου πυρετοίς καὶ δυσεντερίαν επίθεται τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, ἵδατο αὐτῶν. 9. τοῦτον οὖν γενόμενον, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ ἑξόντες ασθενείας ἐν τῇ νήσῳ προσήχοντο καὶ εξένισεν: ἑξόντες, ἑξέχωσαν, ἑξέκρυσαν, ἑξῄστηκαν. Η δυσεντερία, υποδέχεσθαι, φιλοφ. αναδεξ.: only here of hospitable reception = ὑποδέχεσθαι, χν. 7, φιλοφ., 2 Macc. iii. 9, 4 Macc. viii. 5; in the former passage φιλοφ. ὑποδέχθηκε, so in Jos., Ant., xiv., 5, 6, ὑποδέχθηκε, and instances in Wetstein, see above on ver. 2.—ἡμάς: some take the word as referring to Paul and his companions, Luke and Aristarchus (as it seems to lead on to what follows), perhaps including Julius, whilst others point out that he may have entertained the whole crew for the short space of time mentioned, as the ημέρας τρεῖς indicates that the entertainment was only provisional; probably he had a large number of slaves (Νόσγεν, Weiss). Publius may well have been officially responsible for the needs of the Roman soldiers and their prisoners, but φιλοφ. indicates that the duty was performed with generous courtesy.—ἐξένισεν: entertained (as his guests), cf. ch. 6, 23, etc., Heb. xiii. 2. The traditional site was at Civita Vecchia, the old capital of the island, where St. Paul spent the three months, and another tradition places it on the way from St. Paul's Bay to the capital.

Ver. 8. πυρετοίς: the use of the plural for a fever is peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., and quite medical, Hobart, J. Smith, Zahn (cf. Luke iv. 38, 39); although the plural is found in Dem., Lucian in the sense of "intermittent attacks of fever," but Hobart shows that the term was very common in Hipp., and he also quotes from Arетеus and Galen. Each of the other Evangelists uses πυρετός, but in the singular, never in the plural. The disease was common in Malta (J. Smith and C. and H.),—δυσεντερία, see critical note, "dysentery," R.V.; "Lucas medicus morbos accuratius describere solet," Wetstein; another medical term, peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., often joined with πυρετός by Hippocrates (Hobart, Zahn).—συνέχ., cf. Luke iv. 38, συνεχομένη πυρέτος μεγάλα, where St. Luke not only speaks of πυρ. μέγας, where Matthew and Mark (viii. 14 and i. 30) have simply πυρέτος, but also introduces the term συνέχ., where they have πυρέτοσωυς; ἑξόντες, and συνέχ., are both used by the medical writers as in these passages, although no doubt συνεχεσθαι is sometimes found with a word like νοσήματι in classical Greek (cf. Grotius, in loco, Hobart, Zahn, Weiss), so in Hippocrates, ὑπὸ δυσεντερίης ἑξομένως; and τοῖσιν ὑπὸ τῆς ἱμαλείης νόσου συνεχομένοισιν; nine times in St. Luke, elsewhere only three times in N.T., and once in St. Matt. iv. 24, in a way similar to St. Luke, but joined there not only with νόσους, but with a word (βασάνου) which the medical writers (so St. Luke) never employ of bodily disease.—Ιάσατο αὐτῶν, cf. Mark xvi. 18, the word is more frequently used by the medical writers for "healing" than any other (Hobart), and it occurs in St. Luke's writings fourteen times and once figuratively, in St. Matthew four times and once figuratively, once in St. Mark, three times in St. John, once figuratively, and in the rest of the N.T. three times, but in each case figuratively. In answer to the attempts to regard the miraculous element as an addition to the narrative here, as in the previous chapter, it may be sufficient to quote the remarks of Weizsäcker: "The stormy voyage and shipwreck form the central point of the narrative: to this is appended the residence at Malta. In the former, Paul reveals himself as a prophet; in the latter, as the possessor of miraculous power. We should make a vast mistake, however, if we were to infer from this that the simple travel-record had here been revised by a writer intent upon artificially glorifying the Apostle as a worker of miracles. The narrative is an indivisible whole: it is impossible to disentangle the mere history of travel from it, or to strip away the miraculous additions," Apostolic Age, ii., p. 126, Ε.Τ.

Ver. 9. θεραπεύοντο: "were cured," R.V. Lekebusch, pp. 382, 393, and Holtzmann, in loco, think that the medical skill of St. Luke may also have been instrumental in effecting these cures, and this is urged on the ground that θεραπεύοντο, ver. 10, intimates that not only St. Paul received honour in return for the cures
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εθεραπεύοντο. 10. οἱ καὶ πολλαίς τιμαῖς ἑτίμησαν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἰαγω-

μένοις ἐπέθετο τὰ πρόσ 1 τὴν χρείαν.

11. Μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς μῆνας ἀνέχθημεν ἐν πλοίῳ παρακατειμακότο έν

τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Ἀλεξανδρίνῳ, 2 παρασήμων Διοσκοῦρων; 12. καὶ καταγένες

1 For the sing. τὴν χρ. NAB 13, 40, 137 have the plural, so Tisch., W.H., R.V.,
Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

8 Blass reads ψ τὴν παράσημον Διοσκοῦρων (Vulg., Syr. Ρ., Gig.).

effected. But such a conjecture must remain quite uncertain, although it is
no doubt quite possible that as we have here a verb which properly denotes medici-
tal treatment (cf. θεραπεία, Luke ix. 11) for the restoration of health, the care
(cura) of medical skill was freely added by St. Luke, and enhanced the debt
which the sick owed.

Ver. 10. πολλαίς τιμαίς: "with many honours," A. and R.V., used quite
generally, so in Vulgate, "multis honori-
bus"; even in the expression "honos habendus medico," Cic., Ad Div., xvi., 9,
we need not limit the word to the
honorarium; so in 1 Tim. v. 17 τιμής is
used quite generally, and in Ecclus.
xxxviii. it is very doubtful whether in the
expression "honour a physician,"
tίμα λατρόν, the verb refers to payment.
There is therefore no need to take the
word as referring to a physician's fee
in money, as Wordsworth, Humphry,
Plumptre, although the word may have
been so used by a physician; but it was
scarcely likely that St. Paul would have
received such a reward for his services,
to say nothing of the fact that it was con-
trary to Christ's commands, Matt. x. 8.—
cal ἄναγ. ἐπέθετο: "and when we
sailed they put on board," R.V., so Ram-
say, ἄναγ., technical term, xxvii. 3, 2.—
tὰ πρὸς τὴν χ., see critical note, fre-
quently in Luke and Paul, both in
singular and plural, and often in LXX,
cf. Acts xx. 34, Rom. xii. 13, used here
quite generally; it may have included
money, but no doubt things needful,
post naufragium, Bengel.

Ver. 11. τρεῖς μῆνας: no account is
given of St. Paul's doings in Malta, or
of his preaching or founding a Church,
but the writer's interest is centred on the
Apostle's journey to Rome, and what
immediately concerns it.—ἀνήχ., see
above on xiii. 13; in the earlier part of
February, as the shipwreck took place
probably before the middle of November
(Ramsay), but Blass thinks March, as he
places the shipwreck about the com-
 mencement of December, but with a
favourable wind the ship would risk the
voyage, even before the regular sailing
season commenced (so Wendt and Ram-
say).—Ἀλέξ.: very likely a corn ship,
driven for refuge by the same gale; on
the accent here and in xxvii. 6 see
Winer-Schmiedel, p. 73. —παρασή-
μακότοι: only in Luke and Paul in N.T.,
cf. xxvii. 12, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, Tit. iii. 12,
and in classical Greek. —παρασήμω
Διοσκ.: "whose sign was the Twin
Brothers," R.V., i.e., Castor and Pollux;
or perhaps in a ship "marked with the
image or figure of the Dioscuri," or the
latter word in the dative may be a dedica-
tory inscription—marked "To the Dios-
curi," i.e., in honour of them, so Wendt,
Holtzmann, Grimm-Thayer. Others take
παρασ. as a noun, so Alford, Page, quot-
ing from an inscription found near Lutro
and given by J. Smith, in which reference
is made to a Dionysius of Alexandria as
gubernator navis parasemo Ιsopharia.
Phryn. prefers the form Διόσκοροι.
Blass has ψ τὴν παράσημον Διοσκοῦρων,
see critical note and Blass, in loco; cf.
for the word 3 Μacc. ii. 29. Castor and
Pollux were best known as the tutelary
gods of sailors, and probably at this date
they were both the insigna and the tutela-
of the ship. St. Cyril of Alexandria tells
us that it was always the Alexandrian
method to ornament each side of the
prow with the figures of deities, probably
in this case Castor and Pollux, one on
each side of the vessel; and we may
further note that the twin brothers were
specially honoured in the district of
Cyrenaica, not far from Alexandria (Schol.,
Pind., Pyth., v. 6). For other classical
notices cf. Hor., Od., i. 3, 2; iii., 20, 64;
Catull., iv., 27; lxviii., 65; Eur., Helen.,
1663, and "Castor and Pollux," B.D.8,
and "Dioscuri," Hastings' B.D. The
mention of the ship's sign shows the
minuteness of the information of an eye-
witness, and the fact that an Alexandrian
ship thus wintered in the island is a
strong piece of incidental evidence in
favour of the identification of the island
with Malta; the latter would be a natural
harbour for a ship of Alexandria on the way to Italy, but Meleda would be altogether out of the course (see J. Smith, p. 278, fourth edit.).

Ver. 12. καταχ.: “touching at,” R.V., Ramsay, cf. xxvii. 3. We are not told that St. Paul landed, but the local tradition makes him the founder of the Sicilian Church, C. and H., p. 663, small edit.—Συρ.: (Stragosa) about 100 miles distant from Malta, the capital of Sicily, and a Roman colony; in a mercantile city St. Paul would find countrymen and Jewish proselytes; it was moreover a city of great historical interest, and a usual stopping-place for Alexandrian ships on their voyage to Italy; see C. and H., p. 662, u. s., and notices in Strabo, vi., p. 270 (but see also Grimm-Thayer, sub v., Συρ.); Cicero, Verr., iv., 53; Pliny, N.H., iii., 8, and B.D., sub v. For accentuation cf. also Grimm-Thayer.

—τρεῖς ἡμέρας: probably to wait for a favouring breeze from the south.—περιελόντες: so A. and R.V., but latter in margin περιελοντες, see critical note. Ramsay also following T.R. points out that the latter reading could hardly signify more than “cast off” (“cast loose,” margin, R.V.), unnecessary here although important information in xxvii. 40, where τὰς ἀκτὰς is added, and the meaning is evidently different. Ramsay renders “by tacking” (the verb referring to the frequent alteration of the ship’s course); they worked up to Rhoegium by good seamanship as they could not go straight across, J. Smith, C. and H., p. 663, small edit. Mr. Lewin, St. Paul, ii., p. 726, takes a different view, and thinks that they were obliged to stand out to sea to fill their sails, and so to come to Rhoegium by a circuitous sweep. R.V. renders simply “made a circuit,” so Grimm-Thayer. W.H., ii., p. 226, explain their rendering “weighed anchor” by the use of the verb in xxvii. 40 (but see Blass above), the elliptic employment of transitive verbs being common in Greek nautical language as in English, and by the opinion that the run from Syracuse to Rhoegium could not be described as circuitous, unless the ship was thrown out by contrary winds (but see above); Mr. Rendall supports W.H., Mr. Page the opposite, following T.R., so Smith, p. 156, fourth edit., and see critical note above, and Wendt (1899), p. 418. A.V. “fetched a compass,” so Tyndale, which formerly meant that they made a circuit, but the phrase is now obsolete, cf. 2 Sam. v. 23, 2 Kings iii. 9, same Greek verb in LXX.—Ρήγιον: Reggio, Titus put in here on his way from Judea to Puteoli bound for Rome, Suet., Tit., 5; and we learn from Jos., Ant., ix., 2, 5, that Caligula began to construct a harbour for the corn-ships of Egypt, although he never finished it. The place was situated at the southern entrance to the Straits of Messina, here little more than a few miles in breadth between it and the city Messina (on its name from ρήγνυμι, because Sicily was at this point rent away from Italy, see Grimm-Thayer, sub v., and Wetstein).

St. Paul was said to have visited Messina, and to have given the Christians a bishop, Acta Petri, Acta Pauli, Lipsius, p. ix. (Zöckler). The coins show us that here too the Dioscuri were the patron deities.—κατατ. only in Luke and Paul, see xvi. 1, cf. 2 Macc. iv. 44.—ἐπιγ.: “a south wind sprang up,” R.V., here only in N.T., cf. Thuc., iii., 74, iv., 30; Xen., Hell., iii., 2, 17, oberto Austro, Blass, or it may mean coming after or in succession to, ἐτί, the previous adverse wind.—δευτεραίοι, cf. πεμπταίοι, xx. 6, Blass in β, John xi. 39, Phil. iii. 5, so in classical Greek. The distance is about 180 miles, and J. Smith, p. 217, 4th edit., points out that if we suppose the ship to sail at seven knots an hour the voyage would take about twenty-six hours, and St. Luke’s account is shown to be very accurate; see also Ramsay and Hackett for examples of the ancient rate of sailing quite in accordance with the facts before us.—Ποσσούλος (Pozzuoli), in earlier days Dicaearchia; its new name was Latin, probably from the mineral springs in the neighbourhood a puteis, or perhaps a putendo (C. and H.). It was
not only a great landing-place for travellers from the East, but the great harbour for Alexandrian corn-ships, as also for the trade from Syria and Spain (Renan, Saint Paul, p. 558). Seneca, Epist., 77, gives us a vivid description of the interest taken in the arrival of the corn-ships, since the people of Rome depended so much upon this cargo for food. The importance gained by the place is shown by the fact that it gave its name to the bay, once the Bay of Cumae, now the Bay of Naples, but in St. Paul's day Sinus Puteolanus. Here St. Ignatius desired to land that he might follow the footsteps of St. Paul to Rome (Martyr., v.), see further Jos., Ant., xvii., 12, 1, xviii., 7, 2; Strabo, xvii., 1, 7, and Wetstein's references. For modern writers cf. also Lewin, St. Paul, ii., 218, and Farrar, ii., 386; their description shows how the Apostle's eyes now rested upon "one of the loveliest of earthly scenes".

Ver. 14. αδελφούς, see on i. 15, they may have been from Alexandria, as the commerce between it and Puteoli was so considerable; the absence of the article indicates that the writer knew nothing of their presence previously, but at all events Blass is right when he says, "non magis mirum est Puteolim Christianos ante Paulum fuisset quam Rome". Probably after Rome itself Puteoli was the most ancient Jewish community in Italy. Jews were there as early as B.C. 4, after the death of Herod the Great, Jos., Ant., xvii., 12, 1; B. J., ii., 7, 1, and Schürer accepts the notice of the existence of a Christian Church as in the text, Jewish People, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 241, E.T., so too O. Holtzmann, Neuest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 108; see also Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 26. Rhegium and Puteoli are the only two Italian towns mentioned in the N.T. (except, of course, Rome itself), and when we consider that Puteoli was the most important port, not only for ships from Alexandria, but also from Syria, there is nothing surprising in the fact that Christianity found an early and an easy entrance; at Pompeii, not far from Puteoli, Christianity had made its way, and before 79 A.D. it was discussed by the gossiping loungers in the street (Ramsay).—παρεκλ.: "we were entreated to tarry," R.V. Ramsay (so Blass), rendering "we were consoled among them, remaining seven days" (see critical note), thinks that R.V., although strongly supported, is irreconcilable with St. Paul's situation as a prisoner. Julius was a Roman officer, and discipline was natural to him, however friendly he was towards Paul. Blass compares xx. 12, and Zöckler also prefers the inferior reading on account of this more usual meaning of παρακαλεῖν. Probably the seven days' delay was needful for Julius to report his arrival at Rome, and to receive further orders from the capital, perhaps with regard to the disposal of the prisoners, but St. Paul must have been rejoiced at the opportunity of celebrating a Sunday with the little Christian Church at Puteoli, cf. χχ. 6, xxvi. 4.—και ουτός: "and so we came to Rome," about 140 miles, cf. xxvii. 25, "destinatum itineris terminum," Blass, cf. the article before Ρ., Blass, Grant., p. 140, so Bengel (but see Page's note). Others take ουτός as simply = after the stay of seven days, a notice which leads on to ver. 15, and makes us to understand how the brethren came to meet us, since news would easily have reached Rome, and a deputation of the brethren have arrived at Appii Forum. On the former view the writer marks the conclusion and the aim of the long journey (cf. εις την Ρ. before the verb; in χχ. 12, 13, names of places follow the verb without any article, Weiss), and there is a kind of triumph in the words: like an emperor who has fought a naval battle and overcome, Paul entered into that most imperial city; he was nearer now to his crown; Rome received him bound, and saw him crowned and proclaimed conqueror: cf. Chrys. Others take ηλθ. = επορευόμεθα, the actual end of the journey following in ver. 16 (see on the other hand Wendt, in loco, 1888). But ver. 15 may possibly be taken as adding an episode which com-
... seems to have been connected in some way with the Appian family. It was situated at the northern end of a canal which ran thither from a few miles apparently above Terracina through the district of the Pompitine Marshes. The boatmen of whom Horace speaks in his lively description, s. s., were employed in conveying passengers in boats towed by mules along this canal. The Appian Way itself was parallel with the canal, so that the centurion and the Apostle might have travelled by either, and this uncertainty as to the route no doubt made the Roman Christians wait at Appii Forum. Night travellers apparently preferred the boat. The R.V. renders "The Market of Appius" (really the Greek is a transliteration of the Latin Appii forum, as the words stood in 1611, "forum") (not Forum), Hastings' B.D.). The word apparently implied what we should call a borough or assize town, cf. Forum Julium, etc. The picture drawn by Horace suggests a sharp contrast between the holy joy of the Christian meeting and the coarse vice and rude revelry which so often filled the wretched little town (Plumptre, C. and H.). — Τριών Ταβ. : Tres Tabernae, frequent halting-place, deversoria, about 33 miles from Rome on the Via Appia, probably at the point where the road from Antium crosses it, near the modern Cisterna. At this time it was a place of some importance, cf. Cic., Ad Att., ii., 12. The Latin taberna = a shop of any kind, and would require an adjective like deversoria (sc. taberna) to be equivalent to a tavern in the modern sense, Lewin, Saint Paul, ii., 224.—ευχαριστήσας τῷ Θεῷ, ἔλαβε θάρσος, cf. Job xvii. 9, whether Ramsay is correct in connecting this encouragement with the chronic disorder of the Apostle, which would often occasion fits of depression, it is evident that St. Paul, who was so full of sympathy, "the heart of the world," and craved for sympathy from others, may well have felt that he was still a prisoner, and the recent perilous voyage may also have left its mark upon him. Anyhow, the meeting with Christian friends, and the thought that these Christians were not ashamed...
ΧΧVΙΙΙ. ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

16. ὍΤΕ δὲ Ἕλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος παρεδόθη τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ. τῷ δὲ Παύλῳ ἐπέτραπεν μένειν καθ' ἐαυτόν, σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ. 17. Εγένετο δὲ μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς συγκαλέσασθαι τὸν Παύλον τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρώτους συνελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, συνέλεγεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἀδριάνδεδελφοὶ, ἐγὼ οὐδὲν ἐναντίον ποίσασ χαίρειν εἰς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, δέσμιος εἰς ἱεροσολύμην παρέδοθαι εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν Ῥωμαίων.  


2. After τοῦ T.R. adds στρατοπεδάρχῃ. R.V. om. in text, not marg. The words are supported by HLP 137, Syr. Η', Gig., Par. Prov., Blaß in ß, Hilg., Zöckler. They are om. by ΝΑΒΙ 13, 4ο, 61, Vulg., Syr. P., Syr. H. text, Boh., Arm., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt (read simply ἐπέτραπεν τῷ Π., if words are omitted); see further below.  


either of the Gospel of Christ, or of Paul the prisoner, even in Rome, may well have endowed his soul with much strength. Bishop Lightfoot, Phil., pp. 16, 17 (so too Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 113), thinks that the words may intimate that it was a relief to St. Paul to find that some members at least of the Roman Church were favourably disposed towards him; but, as Zöckler points out, there is certainly no proof here, at least, that the Church was composed preponderantly of Jewish Christians, or that Paul was glad that he received a welcome in a Church so composed, and we have no direct evidence of the existence of an anti-Pauline Jewish party among the Roman Christians; but in the presence of the brethren St. Paul would see a proof that this love was not merely in word or in letter, but in deed and in truth: "videbat Christum etiam Romae esse," Bengel.  

Ver. 16.—Ἠλθομεν, see critical note. They would enter by the Porta Capena. On the words which follow see critical note. They are retained by Blaß and Ramsay, although these writers differ as to their interpretation, while Lightfoot, Phil., pp. 7, 8, admitting that the balance of existing authorities is against them, inclines to see in the words a genuine tradition, even if no part of the original text. For Ramsay's view see above on xxvii. 1. Blaß takes the expression τῷ στρατ., to refer to Afranius Burrus (and to this identification Lightfoot attaches much probability). It is striking that both before and after Burrus there were two "prefects," Tac., *Ann.*, xii., 42, xiv., 51, whereas Luke writes τῷ στρατ., "the captain of the guard"; but on the other hand we can scarcely draw any decisive argument from this, because the writer may refer merely to the "prefect" in charge of this particular case, whether he had a colleague or not. —καθ' εαυτόν, see critical note for addition in β text. Not only the goodwill of the centurion, and the services which St. Paul had rendered, but also the terms in which Festus had reported the case in the *elogium*, would combine to secure this favour. The words do not imply that Paul was kept in prison in the camp apart from the other prisoners, but, as in vv. 23, 30, that he was allowed to have a house or lodging in the city (Ramsay); he could scarcely have summoned the Jews to the camp, ver. 17 (Bethge), see also Lightfoot, Phil., p. 103.—τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατ.: custodia militaris, he was still bound to a soldier by a light chain, so that he could not go in and out as he pleased, but the form which his custody took has been well compared to that which Herod Agrippa underwent, who was confined at one time in Rome, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 6, 5, at first in the camp, and afterwards on the accession of Gaius in a house of his own, although still under military custody, *cf.* xxvii. 27.  

Ver. 17. The whole section vv. 17-28 is referred by Hilgenfeld to the "author to Theophilus." In ver. 20 the Paul bound for the hope of Israel belongs only to the "author to Theophilus," *cf.* xxiii. 6, xxvi. 6; it is only the same author who still supposes him to bear
18. ανακρίναντές με εβούλοντο απολύσαι, διά το μηδεμίαν αιτίαν θανάτου ὑπάρχειν ἐν ἡμοί. 19. αντιλεγόντων δὲ τῶν Ιουδαίων, ἡναγκάσθηνεπικαλέσασθαι Καίσαρα, οὔς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους μου ἤχων τι

1 After Ioudainon 137, Syr. H. C., add (cf. xxi. 36, xxii. 22, xxv. 24), so Blass in β, Hilg., Zöckler; and after κατηγορεῖν (ΔΔΒ) the same authorities with Gig., Par., Prov. add αλλ' ἐνα λυτρωσμα τ. ψυχήν μου κε θανατον.

the chain, xxvi. 29, which according to xxii. 29, 30, had been long removed. A reference to the passages in question is sufficient to show the unreasonableness of this criticism. In this same section Clemen can only see his two redactors, Judaicus and Anti-Judaicus, at work again, the latter in vv. 25-28, and the former in vv. 16-24. But it will be noticed that Wendt (1899) still allows that an historical kernel lies at the foundation of the narrative, and although he does not speak so unhesitatingly as in 1888, he still allows that it is not inconceivable that Paul soon after his arrival in Rome should seek to enter into relations with the Jews there, to convince them if possible of his innocence, and to prevent any unfavourable influences on their part upon his trial.—μετά ἡμεράς τρείς: an intimation of Paul's continuous energy; the previous days may well have been employed in receiving his own friends, and in making his summons known.—των Ιουδ.: the edict of Claudius, cf. xviii. 2, had evidently been very transient in its effects, and the Jews soon returned; possibly they may only have emigrated to the neighbourhood, e.g., to Aricia (Schürer). —πρώτους, ef. xiii. 50, xxv. 2, Luke xix. 47, here including the ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, the γερουσιάρχαι, the ἀρχόντες and others, Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. xxiii., or the word may perhaps be used of social distinction, including the officers named. The Jews in Rome were divided into no less than seven synagogues. It does not of course follow that all came in answer to the Apostle's characteristic summons, as he always turned to his countrymen first. Rendall renders "those that were of the Jews first," as if Paul invited first the members of the synagogues who were Jews, intending to reserve the devout Gentiles for the second place; see R.V. renderings in loco. —συνελ.: it was natural that Paul should thus assemble them, and that he should then endeavour to show that although a prisoner he was guiltless of any offence against the Jewish nation; otherwise he could not expect the representatives of his people to listen to his message; so far it would be difficult to find an intimation of anything unhistorical (see Blass, in loco).—ἐγώ: the word probably occurring first, W.H., R.V. Weiss, seems to indicate from its emphatic position that the Apostle's chief concern on this occasion was to vindicate himself.—ἐλεγε: imperfect, "quia expectatur responsum," Blass, see note on iii. 3.—αδελφοι . . . λαῷ . . . πατρώοι: all indicate the same conciliatory spirit: "mira certe Pauli πηαυστευτου" (Calvin).—ποιήσας: "though I had done," R.V., i.e., at the time he was taken prisoner there had been nothing done by him to merit such treatment.—το λαῷ, cf. xxi. 28. The man who could write Rom. ix. 1 ff. and 1 Cor. vii. 18 (cf. ix. 21) might justly use such words.—παρεδόθη, cf. xxi. 11. The words ascribe primarily to the Jews a share in the imprisonment of which they appear as only the indirect cause, cf. xxi. 33, but Paul summarises the chief points and does not enter into minute details; moreover his words were strictly true, for he would have been freed by the Romans in Jerusalem had not the outcry of the Jews stamped him as a malefactor. For similar instances of a main summary cf. ii. 23, xiii. 29, xxi. 11, xxii. 27.

Ver. 18. ανακ., cf. xxiv. 8, xxv. 6, 26, referring here to the judicial inquiries of Felix and Festus.

Ver. 19. ἀντίλ.: the word is a mild one to describe the bitter enmity of the Jews ("clementer dicit," Bengel); they are not actually represented as speaking against Paul's acquittal, although they are evidently presupposed as doing so by the proposal of Festus, xxv. 9, and by the belief that sooner or later he would fall a victim to their plots the Apostle was no doubt compelled (ὑγακάσσῃ) to appeal. Holtzmann seems to forget the part played by the Jews, and their bitter enmity, when he says that in reality Paul was compelled to appeal not by the Jews, but by Festus; see also critical note.—του έθνους μου: they were still his nation,
κατηγορήσει. 20. διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν παρεκάλεσα ὅμως ἰδεῖν καὶ προσλαλήσει· ἐνεκεν γὰρ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ τὴν ἀλώσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι. 21. οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπον, Ἦμεις οὕτε γράμματα περὶ σοῦ ἔδεξαμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἱουδαίας, οὕτε παραγεγραμμένοις τῷ ἄδελφῳ ἀπηγγείλεις ἢ ἐλαλήσει τι περὶ σοῦ πονηρόν. 22. ἐξευθενὶ δὲ παρὰ σοῦ ἀκούσας αἱ φρονεῖς, περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἰρέσεως

1 ἐνεκεν the Ionic form is supported by Χ. A. W. H., Weiss, Blass.
2 After τῆς Blass in β, so Hilg. add αὕτης κερασυλομένων with Gig., Syr. Pesh.

and he was not ashamed to call them so, as a true patriot, when he stood before a foreign tribunal; cf. xxiv. 17, xxvi. 4, "see what friendliness of expression, he does not hold them in odium," Chrysostom.

Ver. 20. διὰ ταύτην . . . προσλαλήσει: "for this cause therefore did I intreat you to see and to speak with me," R.V. text; in margin a comma is placed after ὑμᾶς, "call for you, to see and to speak with you:" but the former seems the more likely, for as a prisoner St. Paul would hardly go out into the synagogue.

-ἐνεκεν, see critical note; if ἐνεκεν, the word is only used by St. Luke amongst the Evangelists; cf. Luke iv. 18 (quotation), xviii. 29, and elsewhere only by St. Paul, 2 Cor. iii. 10; Ionic form (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 50).—τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ι., cf. xxvi. 6.—περίκειμαι: for construction, Winer-Moulton, xxxii., 5; cf. 4 Macc. xii. 3; Clem. Rom., 2 Cor., i., 6 (bis). Nothing could be more pathetic than this reference to the chain, cf. Ephes. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20; the words might well serve as an introduction to what was to follow, the Christian prisoner and the Jewish leaders all had "one hope of their calling," and in that hope they and he were one.

Ver. 21. πρὸς αὐτὸν: the emphatic position of the words may indicate, as Weiss suggests, that as Paul had spoken to them up to this point of a personal matter, so they in reply spoke with a like reference.—οὕτε γράμματα, i.e., no official letters from the Sanhedrim—this was practically impossible, for it is not likely that any ship had left Caesarea before Paul's departure with such intelligence (so Weiss, Blass, Hackett).—τῶν ἄδελφ., i.e., of the Jewish nation, cf. ver. 17. The Jews do not assert that they know nothing of Paul, but only that with reference to the statement which he had just made they had received no report (ἡτύμως, cf. R.V., so iv. 23), or had any of his countrymen spoken evil of him. The aorists point to this limitation of the assertion (Page's note, and Nösgen, greco loco), and this view prevents us from seeing any contradiction between vv. 21 and 22, for if the statement in the former verse be taken quite generally of Paul's work, the Jews contradicted themselves in ver. 22, where they evidently include Paul in this sect (ταύτης), of which they knew that it was everywhere spoken against.

-πονηρόν: the stress need not be laid on this word, as if the sentence meant that they had heard something about Paul, but nothing evil; it may well have been chosen with reference to the Apostle's own expression, οὐδὲν ἐναντίον.

Ver. 22. διὰ ταύτην: "but we think good," cf. xv. 38. They acknowledge that no report had reached them to invalidate the statements which Paul had just made as to the causes of his imprisonment, but (δέ) they would hear not from others, but from himself (παρὰ σοῦ).—αὐτὸς: evidently no reference to any special view of Christianity as characterising St. Paul's own teaching, but a reference to his claim to be imprisoned for the hope of Israel.—ἐν αὐτῷ: Christianity was for them only a sect, and therefore they could not understand the Apostle's identification of it with the Jewish national hope. See note on ver. 17.

γνωστόν . . . ημίν: if the view is correct that the edict of Claudius, see chap. xvii. 2, was occasioned by the early preaching of Christianity in Rome, it is possible that the dislocation of the Jewish community then caused may help at all events to explain why the Christian Church in Rome did not grow out of the Jewish synagogue in the capital to the same context as elsewhere, see Sanday and Headlam, Romans, pp. xxi, xxii. It may no doubt be urged that the Christian Church in Rome was not entirely a heathen-Christian Church, and that, as the names in Rom. xvi. indicate, it contained a Jewish element. But it is quite con-
tautos gnwsoin estin hymai panataxou atplegetai. 23. Taβαμενοi de autou hméras, homocos prods auton eis tin xevian pleioseis ois xeriti-
theo diapartrúmenos tin basileian tou Theou, peidhan te autous ta
peri tou 'Ihsoi, apot te tou vnomou Mosewos kai ton propheta
apor peid eos epiteras. 24. kal oi mén epieidhetai tois legoméneous,

1 At the end Blass in B with Gig., Par. adds en oly thn oikoumenv.
2 For hom NAB (A gládon so W.H.) have gládon.

ceivable that in the capital, with its two
million inhabitants, the Jews, who had
only recently returned to the city, should
know nothing beyond what is here indi-
cated in such general terms of a poor and
obscure sect who dwelt no longer in the
Jewish quarter. It is also worthy of con-
sideration that the Jews of Rome, whilst
not guilty of any untruth in what they
had just said as to their knowledge of
the Christian sect, may have expressed
themselves in this guarded manner from
political reasons. If St. Paul's statement
in ver. 18 as to the favourable bearing of
the Roman authorities towards him was
ture, it was but natural that the Jews
should wish to refrain from hasty or hostile
action towards a prisoner who was evi-
dently treated with consideration in his
bonds; they would rather act thus than re-
vive an old quarrel which might again lead
to their own political insecurity, see espe-
cially Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 9, who lays
stress on N.T. passages quoted above, and
Grimm-Thayer, sub v.—pleioseis: more
than at the first time; Blass takes it as
plurimi, cf. ii. 40, xiii. 31.—εξετίθετο,
cf. xi. 4, xviii. 26, and in vii. 21 in
different sense, nowhere else in
N.T. J. Weiss and Vogel both lay
stress upon the recurrence of the
word in the medical writer Dios-
corides; for other references, Grimm
Thayer, sub v. It is possible that the
middle here, as in xi. 4, gives it a re-
flexive force, the Apostle vindicates his
own conduct (Rendall).—Mosewos: from
the law of Moses, whose enemy he was
represented to be, no less than from the
Prophets.—πειθων suavissime, Bengel;
on the conative present participle see
Burton, p. 59, but here the word is used
not simply de conatus; it refers here to
the persuasive power of St. Paul's words,
although it does not say that his words
resulted in conviction.—καταλυμα, καταγώγιον,
as if it meant a
place of sojourn for hire; see especially
for the whole question Lewin, St. Paul,
i. 238; but see on the other hand
Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 9, who lays
stress on N.T. passages quoted above, and
Grimm-Thayer, sub υ.-πλείονες: more
than at the first time; Blass takes it as
plurimi, cf. ii. 40, xiii. 31.—εξετίθετο,
further, Rendall, p. 352. Nothing said by the Jews con-
dicts the existence of a Christian com-
munity in Rome, nor is it said that they
wished to learn the Christian tenets from
Paul, as if they knew nothing of them
from their own knowledge, or as if they
knew nothing of the causes of the opposi-
tion to the Christian faith; motives of
curiosity and of policy might well have
promised a desire to hear Paul speak for
himself, and with such motives there was
apparently mingled a tone of contempt
for a sect of which they might fairly say,
from the experience of their countrymen,
and from their own experience in Rome,
περι των ουκ απτιλεγεται: autel. Lucan-
Pauline; only once elsewhere; cf. John
xiv. 12. See B text above.

Ver. 23. Taβαμενοι: cf. Matt. xxviii. 16, and Polyb., xviii., 36, 1, for a similar
phrase; a mutual arrangement between the
two parties; only here in the middle
voice in Acts.—την xevian: may = τη
koloseumeia, ver. 30 (Weiss, Holtzmann),
or it may refer to entertainment in the
house of a friend, cf. xxi. 16, and Phillem., ver. 22. Lewin urges that
although we can well understand that
Paul's friends would wish to entertain
him, we have no evidence that the strict-
ness of the military guard was thus far
relaxed, and he also presses the fact that
Suidas and Hesychius explain xevian =
kataluma, katatygion, as if it meant a
place of sojourn for hire; see especially
for the whole question Lewin, St. Paul,
i. 238; but see on the other hand
Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 9, who lays
stress on N.T. passages quoted above, and
Grimm-Thayer, sub υ.—πλείονες: more
than at the first time; Blass takes it as
plurimi, cf. ii. 40, xiii. 31.—εξετίθετο,
cf. xi. 4, xviii. 26, and in vii. 21 in
different sense, nowhere else in
N.T. J. Weiss and Vogel both lay
stress upon the recurrence of the
word in the medical writer Dios-
corides; for other references, Grimm
Thayer, sub υ. It is possible that the
middle here, as in xi. 4, gives it a re-
flexive force, the Apostle vindicates his
own conduct (Rendall).—Mosewos: from
the law of Moses, whose enemy he was
represented to be, no less than from the
Prophets.—πειθων suavissime, Bengel;
on the conative present participle see
Burton, p. 59, but here the word is used
not simply de conatus; it refers here to
the persuasive power of St. Paul's words,
although it does not say that his words
resulted in conviction.—καταλυμα, καταγώγιον,
as if it meant a
place of sojourn for hire; see especially
for the whole question Lewin, St. Paul,
i. 238; but see on the other hand
Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 9, who lays
stress on N.T. passages quoted above, and
Grimm-Thayer, sub υ.—πλείονες: more
than at the first time; Blass takes it as
plurimi, cf. ii. 40, xiii. 31.—εξετίθετο,
cf. xi. 4, xviii. 26, and in vii. 21 in
different sense, nowhere else in
N.T. J. Weiss and Vogel both lay
stress upon the recurrence of the
word in the medical writer Dios-
corides; for other references, Grimm
Thayer, sub υ. It is possible that the
middle here, as in xi. 4, gives it a re-
flexive force, the Apostle vindicates his
own conduct (Rendall).—Mosewos: from
the law of Moses, whose enemy he was
represented to be, no less than from the
Prophets.—πειθων suavissime, Bengel;
on the conative present participle see
Burton, p. 59, but here the word is used
not simply de conatus; it refers here to
the persuasive power of St. Paul's words,
although it does not say that his words
resulted in conviction.—καταλυμα, καταγώγιον,
as if it meant a
place of sojourn for hire; see especially
for the whole question Lewin, St. Paul,
i. 238; but see on the other hand
Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 9, who lays
stress on N.T. passages quoted above, and
Grimm-Thayer, sub υ.—πλείονες: more
than at the first time; Blass takes it as
plurimi, cf. ii. 40, xiii. 31.—εξετίθετο,
cf. xi. 4, xviii. 26, and in vii. 21 in
different sense, nowhere else in
N.T. J. Weiss and Vogel both lay
stress upon the recurrence of the
word in the medical writer Dios-
corides; for other references, Grimm
Thayer, sub υ. It is possible that the
middle here, as in xi. 4, gives it a re-
flexive force, the Apostle vindicates his
own conduct (Rendall).—Mosewos: from
the law of Moses, whose enemy he was
represented to be, no less than from the
Prophets.—πειθων suavissime, Bengel;
on the conative present participle see
Burton, p. 59, but here the word is used
not simply de conatus; it refers here to
the persuasive power of St. Paul's words,
although it does not say that his words
resulted in conviction.—καταλυμα, καταγώγιον,
as if it meant a
place of sojourn for hire; see especially
for the whole question Lewin, St. Paul,
i. 238; but see on the other hand
Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 9, who lays
stress on N.T. passages quoted above, and
Grimm-Thayer, sub υ.—πλείονες: more
than at the first time; Blass takes it as
plurimi, cf. ii. 40, xiii. 31.—εξετίθετο,

which they attained was not sufficient to convince even the well-disposed Jews to throw in their lot with Paul. Perhaps it is best to remember that the tenses are in the imperfect: "some were being persuaded of the things, etc." and this also keeps up the reference to the previous πείθων, persuaderestudens (Blass, Plumptre).—οιδε ἠπίστουν: "and some disbelieved," R.V., or "continued in their disbelief." The verb only here in Acts, but cf. Luke κνιν. 11, 4, Mark xvi. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 7, Wisd. x. 7, xii. 17, xvii. 15 (see H. and R.), etc.

Ver. 25. δέ: the best attested reading marks sharply and emphatically the turn of affairs; there may have been Pharisees among the well-disposed Jews, and to these Paul may have made an appeal when the hope of Israel, now as formerly, was in question, cf.xxiii. 6, but if so, they would not decide to rank themselves amongst "the Pharisees that believed," however imperfectly, and of them as well of the unbelievers the writer can only say απελύοντο, cf. middle Exod. xxx. 11, and so Polyb., iii., 34, 12. ἐπέντεντος τοῦ Π.: the words do not mean that they departed because Paul so spoke, but almost = ἀπελυμένων εἰσεν (so Blass, Nösgen). It may be that Paul's words of censure were partly directed against the spirit which prompted the Jews to depart all together; in other words to suppress the differences which had evidently arisen amongst them, for the sake of an outward show of fellowship, lest they should again be charged as tumultuantes (Nösgen); but beyond all this, in their absence of brotherly love for one who still claimed them as his ἀδελφος, in the unbelief of some, in the want of the courage of their convictions in others, St. Paul saw a fulfilment of that hardness and dulness of heart of which the prophet had spoken. —ῥήμα ἐν: "one word," emphatically drawing attention to the prophetical utterance which followed; it was evening, the night was drawing on, and (ver. 23) too for the disbelieving nation: the day was far spent, the night was at hand (Bethge).—καλῶς: cf. Matt. xν. 7, Mark vii. 6, 9 (as in these two passages placed first with strong indignation, Page), xii. 28, Luke xx. 39, the word often occurs in Paul's Epistles. It is remarkable that the same prophetic quotation with which the Christ had opened His teaching by parables, which is cited in all four of the Evangelists, should thus form the solemn close of the historical books of the N.T. See above on Matt. xiii. 14, Mark iv. 12, Luke viii. 10, and John xii. 40, where the same words are quoted by St. John to explain the rejection of Christ's own teaching, just as here by St. Paul to explain the rejection of the teaching about Christ. "Est hoc extremum dictum Pauli in Actis, neque fortuitum esse videtur; totius enim ferilibrum summam continet ad gentis evangelium a Judaeis jam translatum esse; quippe spectatum ab eis" (Blass), cf. the course of events in Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, xiii. 42, xviii. 6, xii. 9. —το Π. το "Α.: the solemnity of the words is intensified by thus introducing the Holy Ghost, rather than merely the human agent, as Himself speaking (see also critical note); and not only so, but by thus intimating that they were resisting not man but God, cf. vii. 51. ἡμῶν: if we read υμῶν the word indicates that St. Paul would not identify himself with the unbelieving Jews, cf. vii. 52, the indicative words of St. Stephen, which the speaker had himself heard.

Ver. 26. πορεύθητι . . . εἰτε: the quotation is accurately taken from the LXX, Isai. vi. 9, 10, and the first line is additional to the words otherwise given in full by St. Matthew; as the speaker is the messenger to the Jews who condemns.
οὐ μὴ συνήτε· καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε. 27. ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὑπὶ βαρέως ἦκουσαν, καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν· μὴ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ὑπὸν ἀκούσαν, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνὼς, καὶ ἐπιστρέψαμεν, καὶ ἰδοὺ· αὕτως." 28. γνωστὸν οὖν ἦν ὁμιλία, ὅτι τοῖς ἔφθειοι ἀποστάλη τὸ σωτηρίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, αὕτως καὶ ἀκούσατε. 29. καὶ ταῦτα ἠτέλειτο, ἀπῆλθον οἱ ἱουδαῖοι, πολλὰς συζήτησιν.


The whole of the verse is wanting in NA B E D 13, 40, 61, 68, so in W.H., Weiss, but retained by Blass in β, Hilg., with HLP, Syr. H. c*, Vulg. Clem., Gig., Par. Wendt describes it as an interpolation, cf. ver. 25, see also Lightfoot On a Fresh Revision, etc., p. 29; Blass, Phil. of the Gospels, p. 92.

this hardness of heart, he applies to himself the word τοῦτο.

Ver. 27. ἰασόμαι, see critical note; the indicative future as in R.V. adds to the force and vigour of the passage: after μὴ it represents the action of the verb as more vividly realised as possible and probable than is the case when the subjunctive is used (Page), see also Winer-Moulton, Ivi., 2a; Bethge, p. 331; cf. Luke xii. 58, Acts xxi. 24 (Blass). It is significant that Luke the physician should thus cite as almost the last words of his record a prophecy ending with ἰασόμαι (Plummer, St. Luke, Introd., p. ixvi.).

Ver. 28. γνωστὸν οὖν: for the word similarly used cf. ii. 14, iv. 10; iii. 38—τοῦτο τὸ σωτ., see critical note; cf. LXX, Ps. lxvii., 2, xcvi., 2, 3. σωτ., adjective, neuter of σωτήρ, used substantively (as in classical Greek), so often in LXX of the Messianic salvation; cf. Luke ii. 30, iii. 6, Ephes. vii. 17, and Clem. Rom., Cor., xxx., 12, xxxvi., 1. The word is used only by St. Luke and St. Paul, see Plummer, note on Luke iii. 6. For the whole expression here cf. xiii. 26, where words very similar are used by Paul, and with very similar results, ver. 46. τοῦτο, emphatic this, the very message of God’s salvation, this is what I am declaring to you.—αὐτὸι καὶ ἀποστάλητε: “they will also hear,” R.V. The words thus rendered may not convey so truly a reproach to the Jews as in A.V., but at the same time they express something more than the mere fact that Gentiles as well as Jews will now hear the message; that message will not only be sent (ἀποστάληται), but also heard; the καὶ may well indicate that whilst the Jews will hear with the ear only as distinct from the understanding, the Gentiles will not only hear, but really (καὶ) listen (see Rendall and Weiss, in loco). At the same time we must remember that as a background to what the Apostle here says we have his words in Rom. ix.-xi., and the thought which he had expressed to the Roman Church that God had not really cast away his people, but whilst through their unbelief the Gentiles had been called, yet that inclusion of the heathen in the Messianic kingdom would rouse the Jews to jealousy, and that thus all Israel would be saved, Rom. xi. 21; cf. x. 19; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 341 ff. We can scarcely doubt that the words are uttered not merely to condemn, but to lead to repentance; at all events it would not be possible to find stronger words against his own countrymen than those written by St. Paul in his earliest Epistle, 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16; and yet we know how St. Paul, for those same countrymen, could wish himself accused; so Bethge, as against Overbeck, who can only see that in Acts the belief of the Gentiles results not in a noble jealousy, but in the bitter envy of the Jews. But there blends with the tone of sadness a note of triumph in the words αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀποστάληται, the future of his message is assured, and we may borrow two words as an inscription for these closing pages of St. Luke’s second treatise—the last word of the Apostle, and the last of the historian.
30. "Εμείνε δὲ ο Παύλος διετίανόλην εν ιδίω μισθώματι, και ἀπεδέχετο πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευόμενους. 2 πρὸς αὐτὸν, 31. κηρύσσων


2 After πρὸς αὐτὸν 137 Syr. H. c*, Gig., Par. add ιουδαιους τε και Ἑλλήνας explanatory of παντας, so Blas in β text, Hip.; Blass also adds και διελέγετο πρὸς before the inserted words just mentioned, with Gig., Par. Χριστου ομ. by Tisch., Hip., with Ν* Syr. H.

—ἀκούσοντας . . . ἀκωλύτως—the word of God was heard and welcomed, and that word was not bound, see the suggestive remarks of Bethge, p. 335, and Zöckler on ver. 31.

Ver. 29. See critical note.—συζήτησιν, rixa, Βlass, possibly this may have helped to delay the Apostle's trial, as apparently some of the Jews would not have moved in the matter.

Ver. 30. έμείνε δὲ: Βlass (so also Hackett, Lekebusch) makes the important remark that the aorist shows that Paul's condition was changed after the two years, cf. ἐκάθισε, xviii. 1 (see also Burton, pp. 19, 20). When, therefore, Luke wrote his history, the inference is that the Apostle had been liberated either from prison or by death. Blass indicates another change, vix., that he may have been removed into the praetorium, and that his trial was just coming on.—ἰδιὸς, see above on ver. 23.

That the Apostle should have been able to hire a house at his own expense receives confirmation from the coincidence with Phil. iv. 10, 14, 18; others have suggested (Wendt, 1899, Knabenbauer) that he may have won the means of hiring it by his own work. See in this connection Rendel Harris, Four Lectures, etc., pp. 50, 51, and the extract from the Armenian Version of Ephrem's Commentary on the Acts. It would seem that Ephrem imagined that the rent of the lodging was paid by the proceeds of the cloak and books (2 Tim. iv. 13). Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 9, holds that ξενία here from the εἰσπορ., see above, most frequent in Luke, Friedrich, p. 7, see critical note.

Ver. 31. τα περί: on the phrase see p. 48τ.—τοῦ Κ. Ι. Χ., see critical note, and cf. xi. 7, καν. 26, the full phrase corresponds with the solemn conclusion of the book.—μετὰ τ. παρρ.: the phrase with or without τὰ παρρ. four times in Acts, and nowhere else in N.T., see on p. 128. In Jerusalem by the Twelve, iv. 29, and in Rome no less than in Jerusalem by St. Paul, the witness was given “with all boldness,” cf. Phil. i. 14; and so the promise in the vision vouchsafed to the Apostle of the Gentiles was verified, xxii. 11, and the aim of the Gentile historian fulfilled when the Gospel was thus preached boldly and openly, εἰς ἀκρότητι τῆς γῆς, see note on i. 8.—ἀκωλύτως: “eadem plane dicuntur in ep. ad Phil. Roma data, i. 12 sqq.,” Blass, and the word of God had free course and was glorified. The adverb is found in Plato, Epict., Herodian, and also in Josephus. In LXX the adjective is found in Wisd. vii. 22, and the adverb is used by Symm., Job xxxiv. 31. There is a note of triumph in the word, Bengel, Zöckler,
ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

την βασιλείαν του Θεού, και διδάσκων τα περί του Κυρίου Ιησού Χριστού, μετά πάσης παρρησίας ακωλύτως.

1 Blass with Syr. H., demid. tol., Par., Wern., Prov. reconstructs β text after του Θεου: δισχυριζομενος και λεγων ακωλυτως, οτι ουτος εστιν ο Χ. ο υιος του Θεου και αν μελετεται τα το κοσμος κρινεσθαι, and cf. Hilg. with variations in former part, but identical after ακωλ.

and we may note with Wordsworth and Page the cadence of these concluding words, μετα π. π. ακωλ. But all this does not forbid the view that the writer intended to give a third book to complete his work. This latter view is strongly insisted upon by Prof. Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 23 ff., while Bishop Lightfoot, B.D.4, i., 27, can see no conceivable plea for any third treatise, if the purpose of the narrative is completed by Paul coming to Rome and there delivering his message, so, although less strongly, Harnack, Chron., i., p. 248, see note on i. 8. But Prof. Ramsay has received the strong support not only of Zöckler, and curiously enough of Spitta, Apostelgeschichte, p. 318, but still more recently amongst English writers of Rendall, and in Germany of Dr. Zahn. Just as in St. Luke's Gospel xxiv. 44 forms not merely a starting-point for, but an anticipation of, the succeeding history, or just as xxiv. 44-53 contain in a summary what is afterwards related in greater detail, Acts i. and ii., so in v. 30, 31 of Acts xxviii. we have, as it were, a brief sketch of what succeeded the events hitherto recorded, and an anticipation of what followed upon them. This probability remains quite apart from the additional force which is given to it if Ramsay is right in regarding πρώτος, Acts i. 1, as signifying not simply πριστός, but the first of a series, a view strongly supported by Zahn, Einleitung, ii., p. 371. Certainly the aorist, ver. 30 (see above), and the expression δειται δουλευειν to show that some fact was known to the writer which followed the close of the two years, and we can therefore hardly say that he wrote no more because he knew no more, unless we also suppose that he wrote his history at the conclusion and not during the course of the two years. This he may have done while the result of St. Paul's first trial was still unknown, although Phil. i. 25-27, ii. 24, Phil. mer. ver. 22, show us plainly with what confidence the Apostle awaited the issue. At all events almost any conjecture seems more probable than that the writer should have concluded so abruptly if he had nothing more to chronicle than the immediate and tragic death of his hero! Zöckler, Apostelgeschichte, p. 162, Spitta, Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums, I., 15, 16. To say with Jülicher, Einleitung, p. 27, that he refrained from doing this because in such an event he would chronicle not the triumph but the defeat of the Gospel is certainly a strange argument, and no one has given a better answer to it than Harnack by asking, Since when did the early Christians regard martyrdom as a defeat? Is the death of Christ, or of Stephen, in the mind of the author of Acts a defeat? is it not rather a triumph? Chron., i., 247. The elaborate discussion of the abrupt conclusion in Acts by Wendt, 1899, pp. 31, 32, is entirely based upon the assumption that Luke was not the author of Acts, and that therefore this author, whoever he was, wrote no more because his information failed him, and he knew no more. This could not have been so in the case of Luke, who was with the Apostle at Rome, as we have from undoubted testimony quite apart from Acts. See further Introd. For the release of St. Paul, his subsequent journeys to Spain and to the East, and his second imprisonment, see in support, Zahn, Einleitung, i., p. 435 ff., Harnack, Chron., i., 239, Spitta, w. z., Salmon, Introd., p. 403 ff., Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus, Steinmeyer (1897), and Critical Review (July), 1898. There were many possible reasons why the hearing of St. Paul's appeal was so long delayed. The record of the previous proceedings forwarded by Festus may have been lost in the wreck, and it was therefore necessary to wait for fresh official information, as the prisoner's accusers had not arrived. And when they arrived, it is very possible that they may have been glad to interpose fresh obstacles, and that they would be content to keep Paul bound as before; as evidence was probably wanted, not only from Jerusalem, but from various parts of the empire, the interposition of these fresh delays was easy. St. Paul had
himself suggested that the Jews in Asia ought to be summoned, or to be present, xxiv. 19. That such delays would not be unusual we may learn from Tacitus, e.g., Ann., xiii., 43; cf. Suet., Nero, 15. When we remember how long a delay occurred in the case of the Jewish priests, the friends of Josephus, Vita, 3, who were sent to Rome by Felix to plead their cause, it ceases to be surprising that St. Paul was detained so long without a trial; see on the whole question Lewin, St. Paul, ii., 277 ff.; Lightfoot, Phil., p. 4; Knabenbauer, Actus Apostolorum, pp. 453, 454, 1899.
ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE

TO THE

ROMANS
INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

Of the beginnings of Christianity in Rome nothing whatever is known on direct evidence. The tradition which assigns the founding of the Church there to Peter cannot possibly be maintained. In one form it assumes that Peter, on the occasion referred to in Acts xii. 17, travelled to Rome, and there propagated the Church from the synagogue as a centre. As this departure of Peter from Jerusalem took place, on the usual reckoning, about 42 A.D., there would be time for his twenty-five years' episcopate of Rome, which was once the accepted Romish idea, though now given up even by Romish scholars. But it is clear from the book of Acts (chap. xv.) that Peter was in Jerusalem ten years after this, and it is equally clear from the Epistle to the Romans that he had not been in Rome when this letter was written, seven years later still. In face of a passage like chap. xvi. 20 it is impossible to suppose that the Church of Rome had already been the scene of another Apostle's labours. Three years later, when Paul at length arrived in Rome, it had still been unvisited by Peter, to judge from what we read in Acts xxviii.; and even when he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, towards the close of his first imprisonment, there is no indication that his brother Apostle had yet seen the capital. The earliest tradition represents Peter and Paul as in Rome together, and, indeed, as suffering together, in the Neronian persecution. All the evidence for this will be found in Euseb., Hist. Eccl., II., xxv. What the worth of it is, it is not easy to say. It is not incredible that Peter may have been in Rome about the date in question, especially if Babylon in 1 Peter v. 13 means Rome, as it does in the Apocalypse. But in any case Peter can have had no direct part in founding the Church. In Iren., iii., 1, 2, Peter and Paul are spoken of as "preaching the Gospel in Rome, and founding the Church," at the time that Matthew published his gospel.
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That Christianity was there long before this time is indubitable, but the Roman Christians, it has been suggested (see Harvey's note on Iren. ad loc.), "appear neither to have had an ecclesiastical polity nor to have been under the regular regimen of the Church. . . . Several expressions in the epistle seem to indicate a crude, unsettled state of things there. . . . They are spoken of as depending rather upon mutual exhortation and instruction than upon any more authoritative communication of evangelical truth (xv. 14) . . . and the Apostle expresses his intention to visit them, according to a purpose entertained ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν [ικανῶν is the true reading] with the hope that he might come ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) τοῦ Χριστοῦ, i.e., in the collation of spiritual gifts which as yet they had not, and in the establishment of that Apostolical order and government among them which should complete their incorporation with the Body Catholic of Christ's Church." It is quite true that the epistle reveals nothing of the organisation of the Church at Rome, but it reveals just as little of any intention on Paul's part to bestow on the Church the supposed benefits of "Apostolical order and government". The assumption underlying this expression is quite unhistorical. There was no uniform legal organisation of the Church in the apostolic age; and the Christians in Rome not only depended upon mutual exhortation and instruction, but, as Paul acknowledges, were well able to do so. They had χαρίσματα differing according to the grace given to them, and if they had no legal organisation, they had a vital and spiritual differentiation of organs and functions, for which the other is but a makeshift (chap. xii. 3-8). Sanday and Headlam think that though the Church did not, in the strict sense, owe its origin to Peter and Paul, it may well have owed to them its first existence as an organised whole (Commentary, p. xxxv.). This may be, for it was Paul's habit to appoint elders in all the churches he planted (Acts xiv. 23, Tit. i. 5); but, as the gospel was known at Rome, and believers were baptised there, and no doubt observed the Lord's Supper, it is clear that no particular organisation was wanted either to ensure or to perfect their standing as Christians.

Where tradition fails, we can only fall back on conjecture—conjecture to be verified by its coherence with what the epistle itself reveals. In this connection it has long been customary to refer to Acts ii. 10 (οι επιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαίου). There were Roman Jews in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and even if they were domiciled there and did not return to Rome, there must have been many visitors who did. The Jews in Rome were numbered by thousands; they occupied a large ward of the city, beyond the
Tiber, by themselves, and they had ceaseless communications with Jerusalem. Hence many have supposed that Christianity came to Rome by some such channel as this. If it did, we should expect it to have originated in the synagogues, the existence of nine of which is definitely attested (Sanday and Headlam, p. xxiv.). The epistle itself gives no direct evidence of any such connection: if the Church originated in the synagogue at Rome, the connection had been completely severed by the time Paul wrote. It has been supposed that the well-known sentence in Suetonius, Claud., 25 ("Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit": see also Acts xviii. 2) refers to conflicts which arose in the synagogues over the alleged Messiahship of Jesus, and that the separation of the Church and the synagogue, and even a change in the prevailing complexion of the Church, which from Jewish-Christian became mainly Gentile-Christian, date from this event; but no stress can be laid on this. It is clear from Acts xxviii. 17-22 that when Paul came to Rome the leaders of the synagogue either knew nothing or affected to know nothing about the new sect which was growing up beside them. This makes it at least improbable, whatever its actual origin, that the Christian Church at Rome can have had strongly Jewish sympathies. Besides, even if the Church had originated in the synagogue, it is practically certain, from the analogy of other places whose history is known, that the mass of the members would not be Jews by birth, but of the class of proselytes (εὐσεβείς, φοβούμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ), whose attachment to Judaism was less rigid, and whose spiritual receptivity was as a rule greater.

Many scholars, impressed by these considerations, have sought rather a Gentile-Christian origin for the Church. Communication, they point out, was constant, not only between Rome and Jerusalem, but between Rome and all the East, and especially all the great towns. There was constant coming and going between Rome and such cities as Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus, not to mention others which had been the scene of Paul's labours. Early Christianity, too, was largely self-propagating. "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts viii. 4). Hort (Romans and Ephesians, p. 9) speaks of "a process of quiet and as it were fortuitous filtration"; and it was probably by such a process, initiated, suspended, and renewed on different occasions, that the new religion was introduced to Rome. To conceive the matter in this way is no doubt to conceive it very indefinitely, but it is hardly possible to go further. Attempts have been made to do so. Assuming, for instance, that chap. xvi. is in its right place, and really formed part of
the Epistle to the Romans, it has been argued that the large number of friends and acquaintances Paul had in the Church, and especially the conspicuous place given to his old associates Prisca and Aquila, prove that the Christianity of the Romans was essentially of the Pauline type, and that the Church therefore owed its origin and its character, indirectly no doubt, to him. The epistle certainly does not bear this on its face; Paul never says a word which implies that the Romans owed anything, even remotely, to him; there is rather an impression of regret that they did not. Besides, it is a mistake to assume that all Paul's friends were necessarily "Paulinists"—an expression which neither he nor they could have understood. Among those at Rome, and among the most important, as we should judge by the honourable terms in which they are mentioned (xvi. 7), were some who had been Christians longer than he; and "the quiet and as it were fortuitous filtration" was that of Christianity, undoubtedly of some universal type, but not distinctively of Paulinism.
CHAPTER II.

CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

Hardly any question in New Testament criticism has been more elaborately discussed than this. The traditional opinion was that the Church consisted of Gentile Christians. The idea that it consisted of Jewish Christians, first broached apparently by Koppe in 1824, gained currency through Baur, and for a generation after his essay (1836) commanded wide assent among critics. A strong protest in favour of the old opinion was kept up all the time, but it was not till 1876 that Weizsäcker produced a decisive reaction in its favour. The great mass of the Church, he argued, must have been Gentile-Christian, though there was no doubt a Jewish-Christian minority. An attempt to construct a theory answering more closely to the facts presented by the epistle is that of Beyschlag. He supposes that the Church consisted mainly of proselytes—that is, of persons who were Gentiles by birth, but had passed through the Jews' religion. This would explain the great difficulty of the epistle, that Paul addresses his readers as if they were Gentiles, but argues with them as if they were Jews. Schürer, again, conceives of the Church as non-Jewish, and at the same time non-Pauline; the Hellenistic Jews of the diaspora would make Christians comparatively free in their relations to the ceremonial law, but with no adequate comprehension of the Pauline freedom, in principle, from law in every sense; it is an audience like this Paul is trying to elevate to his own standpoint. That such an audience could be found is not to be denied; whether it is to be found here we can only ascertain by comparing this theory with the facts of the epistle. Finally, Holtzmann gives up the attempt to realise the character of the Church. St. Paul had never been in Rome, did not really know the situation there, and has no distinct idea of his audience. When he finds it necessary to explain why he writes to them at all he thinks of them as Gentiles; when their previous culture and spiritual history, their sympathies, antipathies, and mode of reacting toward the Gospel generally, are in question, they are Jews. All this
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shows that the problem is a complex one; and there is no means of doing anything to solve it but to examine the facts once more. They are all contained in the epistle itself, and it will be convenient to adduce the evidence (1) for the Gentile-Christian character of the readers; (2) for the Jewish-Christian character; and then to ask what conception covers and combines all the facts.


(a) Chap. i. 5 f. Paul writes: "We received grace and Apostleship, with a view to obedience of faith εν πάσιν τοις έθνεσιν . . . εν οις έστε και υμείς". Paul’s conception of himself as Apostle of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 8), and his appeal to this vocation in the salutation of his letter, put it beyond doubt that έθνη here means Gentiles, as opposed to Israel, and not nations generally. He is exercising his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles in writing to the Romans; for they, too, are in that class. Those who take the Jewish-Christian view argue that Paul would have had no need to tell a Church consisting of Romans by birth that they were included within the scope of his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles. But surely the Apostle’s expression is perfectly natural; whereas if εν πάσιν τοις έθνεσιν means “among all the nations,” it becomes perfectly meaningless.

(b) Chap. i. 13. "I purposed often to come to you, . . . ίνα τινα καρπόν σχώ και εν υμίν καθώς και εν τοις λοιποίς έθνεσιν." This case is quite unambiguous. The Roman Christians are put on a level with the rest of the έθνη, and it agrees with this that the distinction of classes in ver. 14 (Greek and barbarian, wise and unintelligent) belongs to the pagan world.

Of course it is not meant here that Paul was Apostle of the Gentiles in such a sense that he would not have preached the Gospel to the Jews; but as far as he has a special vocation—and it is on a special vocation, and not on the duty of preaching the Gospel to every creature, that he bases his right to address the Romans—it is to the Gentile world. The Roman Church, therefore, belonged to that world.

(c) Chap. xi. 13. υμίν δέ λέγω τοις έθνεσιν. Here the whole Church is addressed in its character as Gentile. To this it has been replied that the whole Church is not addressed here; with υμίν δέ Paul expressly turns aside to address only a part of the Church. If the words stood alone, this might be maintained, but the context is decisive in favour of the former meaning. In the continuation of the passage (see especially xi. 25-28) the Church as a whole is warned against contempt for the Jews; it is addressed in the second person (xi. 25, 28, 30 f.), without any suggestion of distinctions in it, whereas the
Jews are spoken of throughout in the third. Further, when Paul speaks of the Jews in chaps. ix.-xi., it is as “my brethren,” “my kinsmen according to the flesh,” not ours nor yours, as would have been the case had the bulk of the Church been of Jewish origin.

(d) Chap. xv. 15 f. τολμηρότερως δὲ γράψαμεν ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ. Here Paul justifies himself, in closing, for writing as he has done—especially, perhaps, for writing so decidedly in chap. xiv.-xv. 13—to the Romans. The reason he gives is unmistakable. He is a minister of Jesus Christ, a priest in the service of the Gospel; the offering he has to lay on the altar is the Gentiles, and he writes to the Romans because they are Gentiles, to further them in their faith, that when they are presented to God it may be an acceptable offering, sanctified in the Holy Spirit. There is no evading this argument; to say that in vers. 17-20 Paul's justification of this presentation of himself as minister of Jesus Christ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη is directed against Jewish-Christian suspicions and insinuations (cf. 2 Cor. x. 12-18, xii. 11, 12) may or may not be true, but is quite irrelevant; even if there were such suspicions, and even if they had begun to find acceptance in Rome, the Gentile character of the Church at Rome as a whole is here put beyond question.

(e) Less stress can be laid on passages like vi. 17 f. (ἥτε δούλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας), though they have undoubtedly something which recalls the εξ εὐνῶν ἀμαρτωλοί of Gal. ii. 15. By the time he has reached chap. vi. Paul is quite entitled to assume that his readers were once slaves of sin, without suggesting anything about their nationality. Neither do the suggestions of particular sins (e.g., in vi. 12-14) throw any real light on the question. All kinds of bad things are done both by Gentiles and Jews. But discounting weak and uncertain arguments, there is a plain and solid case for maintaining that the great bulk of the Church at Rome was of Gentile origin.

2. Evidence for the Jewish-Christian character of the Church.

(a) There are passages in which Paul includes himself and his readers in the first person plural; now no one, it is to be observed, is included with him in the superscription, so that “we” must mean “you and I”. Thus iii. 9 προεξῆμενα; are we (Jews) surpassed? But it is very natural to suppose that Paul here, as is his rule, allows his opponents (real or imaginary) to state their own objections in their own person, the “we” neither including himself nor his readers; or if he speaks in his own person, it is the national consciousness of the Jew, which Paul of course shared, and not the joint consciousness of Paul and his readers, which is conveyed by the plural. Another passage of the same kind is iv. 1: Ἄβραμ ἦν
ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟ ήμων κατά σάρκα. Here also the explanation is the same. Paul says "our" forefather because he has no choice. He could speak of his fellow-countrymen as "my kinsmen according to the flesh"; but it would have been obviously absurd for him to speak of Abraham as "my" forefather. It is only through his relation to the nation that he can claim a connection with Abraham, and hence the "our" in iv. 1 is national, not individual, and has nothing to do with the Romans. Cf. the precisely similar case in ix. 10 (Isaac our father). The same use of the first person plural is found in 1 Cor. xi (All our fathers were under the cloud), which no one doubts was written to a thoroughly Gentile Church. As far therefore as passages like these are concerned, they do not invalidate in the least the evidence adduced for the Gentile character of the Church at Rome.

(b) Not so simple are those passages which speak either in the first or second person plural of the relation of the readers, or of Paul and his readers alike, to the law. The most important of these is chap. vii. 1-6. Paul here speaks to his readers as persons γνώσκοντες τὸν νόμον, knowing what law is. Even if we admit—which is not necessary, nor I believe right—that the reference is to the Mosaic law, it does not follow that the readers were Jews. Indeed the explicit recalling of the law to mind, while he assumes it to be known, might plausibly be alleged as an argument against a Jewish origin. But to pass that by, does not vii. 4, it is argued—So then, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law by the body of Christ—imply that the persons addressed had lived under the law as well as the writer?—in other words, that they were Jews? And is this not confirmed, when we read in ver. 5 f., “When we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were through the law, wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we have been discharged from the law”? Have we not here, in relation to the law, an experience common to Paul and those whom he addressed, and does not this imply that antecedent to their conversion they and he had lived under the law—that is, were Jews by birth? It is natural, at first sight, to think so, but it is certainly wrong. There is an experience common to Paul and to all Christians, whatever their birth; if it were not so, they would not be Christians. It is possible also for him to describe that experience in relation to the law; once all Christians were under it, now they are so no more. All Christians were under it, for all were under sin, and to the Apostle sin and law are correlative terms. The law, indeed, did not take precisely the same form for Jew and Gentile; the one had an objective revelation, the other had a substitute, if not an equiva-
lent for this, written on his heart; but in both it wrought to the same issues. There is nothing in the world less Jewish, there is nothing more human, than Rom. vii. 7-24; but that is Paul's description of life under the law, and of the working of the law in that life. We understand it only too well, though we are not Jews; and so, no doubt, did those to whom it was first addressed. Hence Paul could quite well say to a Gentile Church: Ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; and could associate himself with them to say, We were discharged from the law by dying to that in which we were held. A perfectly clear case of this is to be found in Gal. iii. 13-iv. 9. No one imagines that the Galatians were Jews, yet Paul vindicates for them the very thing which he says of the Romans here. God sent forth His Son, he writes, made of a woman, made under law, to redeem those that are under law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the spirit of His Son into our hearts, etc. The alternation of the first and second persons here shows how Paul could conceive of Jew and Gentile alike as under law in their pre-Christian days, and how in their emancipation from this in Jesus Christ one experience was common to them all. In truth, "sin," "the law," "the curse of the law," "death," are names for something which belongs not to the Jewish but to the human conscience; and it is only because this is so that the Gospel of Paul is also a Gospel for us. Before Christ came and redeemed the world, all men were at bottom on the same footing: Pharisaism, legalism, moralism, or whatever it is called, it is in the last resort the attempt to be good without God, to achieve a righteousness of our own without an initial all-inclusive immeasurable debt to Him; in other words, without submitting, as sinful men must submit, to be justified by faith apart from works of our own, and to find in that justification, and in that only, the spring and impulse of all good. It was because Paul's Jewish experience was digested into a purely and perfectly human experience that he was able to transcend his Judaism, and to preach a universal gospel; and the use of such expressions as we have in vii. 1-6 is no proof that those to whom they applied were Jews too. They apply to us.

(c) The character of the argumentation in the epistle has been adduced in support of the Jewish origin of the readers. It is quite true that in the dialectical development of his gospel in Romans Paul often states and answers such objections as would naturally occur to one representing the historical and legal standpoint of the Jews' religion. Cf. iii. 1 (What advantage then hath the Jew?), vi. 1 (Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound?), vi. 15
(Are we to sin, because we are not under law, but under grace?), vii. 7 (What shall we say then? Is the law sin?), xi. 1 (I say then, Hath God cast off His people?). There are two obvious reasons why Paul should have developed his gospel by this dialectical process apart from the assumption that he is meeting the anticipated objections of his readers. One is, that he was a Jew himself, and justified his gospel instinctively, as he went along, against the \textit{prima facie} objections to it which arose in his own mind. Here, again, however, we must remember that though Paul was a Jew he was a man; and it does not strike one as rigorously historical, but as somewhat absurd, to characterise as Jewish or as Jewish-Christian the criticism of grace which comes natural to every human being. The other reason is, that Paul had heard already in other places most of the objections to his gospel which he answers in this epistle. There is only one express reference to this, in iii. 8 (As we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil that good may come: for \textit{tines} here, cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1, Gal. ii. 12); but that Paul's gospel was assiduously and energetically counterworked we know quite well, and he may have heard (through some of his friends in the city) that his adversaries were forestalling him at Rome. These reasons fully explain the nature of his arguments; and in view of the direct evidence for the Gentile character of the Church they prove nothing on the other side.

\textit{(d)} Great stress was laid by Baur on chaps. ix.-xi. in this connection. These, it was argued, were the real kernel of the epistle—the part for the sake of which it was really written, and by relation to which the rest has to be explained; and these, moreover, have no interest, or none worth speaking of, for a Gentile Church. It was only to a Jewish-Christian consciousness that this vindication of God's wonderful ways in the history of redemption required to be or could be addressed. Plausible as this may sound, the facts are against it. For whatever reason, it is precisely and unambiguously to the Gentiles that all this section is addressed. In ix. 1 f., x. 1 f. Paul speaks of the Jews in the third person (my prayer to God for \textit{them}, etc.). He calls them \textit{my} kinsmen, not \textit{your} or \textit{ours}. He quotes himself, but not his readers (xi. 1), as proof that God has not cast off His people, which he would hardly have done had they also been Christian Jews (but see note on this verse). He uses the fate of the Jews, the natural branches, to warn his readers, grafted into the tree of life contrary to nature, against contempt, pride, and unbelief. Whatever the motive of these chapters may have been, it cannot have been that the bulk of the Romish Church was Jewish in
origin, or strongly Jewish in sympathy. The apostle's own application of their teaching in xi. 17-24 proves exactly the reverse.

(e) Still less can anything be made of an appeal to xiii. 1-7. The Jews were certainly a rebellious and turbulent race, and inherited theocratic ideas which might make them doubt the lawfulness of paying tribute to Caesar (Deut. xvii. 15, Mark xii. 13-17); but Christianity too in all its forms is an idealism which necessarily raises the question of the relation of God's Kingdom to the kingdoms of this world, and so gives occasion to such explanations as those of Paul in chap. xiii. 1-7. It has been pointed out, too, that echoes of this passage occur in the public prayer of the Roman Church in Clem., ad. Cor., I., lxi., at a period when the Gentile character of the Church is not questioned.

(f) As for the use of the Old Testament in this epistle, it has no bearing whatever on the nationality of the readers. To all the New Testament writers the Old Testament was revelation, and in a sense Christian revelation; and they used it in the same way no matter to whom they wrote.

None of these passages is sufficient to prove that the Church as a whole was Jewish-Christian, or even that it was strongly influenced by Jewish ideas. On the other hand, the passages quoted under 1 prove conclusively that the bulk of the Church was Gentile, so that one writing to it as a body thought of it as a Gentile Church. This, of course, would not preclude the existence in it of a minority of Jewish origin. We can hardly conceive, in the lifetime of the Apostles, a Church without such an element. The Apostles themselves were all Jews, and it was their rule—it was even Paul's rule—to preach to the Jew first. But apart from this general presumption, we have a distinct indication in the epistle itself that there was in the Roman Church a Jewish-Christian element. In chap. xiv. Paul speaks of dissensions between "the strong" and "the weak," and though it would be wrong simply to identify these with Gentile and Jewish Christians, it is a safe inference from xv. 7-13, taken in connection with what precedes, that the difference between "strong" and "weak" was not unrelated to that between Gentile and Jew (see notes ad loc.). Hence the prevailing tendency of scholars is to recognise that the Church was Gentile as a whole, but had a minority of Jewish origin. To what extent the Gentile mass was influenced by Jewish ideas—how far the Gentile members of the Church had been originally proselytes, and were therefore appreciative of the Jewish-Christian consciousness or in sympathy with it—is another question. As we have seen above, under 2, b, c, no special assumption of this kind is needed to explain the manner in which Paul vindicates his gospel to them.
CHAPTER III.

CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE—ITS OCCASION AND PURPOSE.

The character of the epistle has been a subject of as much discussion as the character of the readers, and the discussion is less likely ever to be closed. A writing of such vitality, which is always being in part lost, and always rediscovered in new power—a writing of such comprehensive scope and such infinite variety of application—a writing at once so personal and historical, and so universal and eternal, is not easily reduced to a formula which leaves nothing to be desired. The definitions of its purpose which have been given by scholars strike one rather as all right than as all wrong. But before entering on an examination of these it will be proper to investigate the occasion of the letter, as it may have some bearing on its purpose.

Paul’s intention to visit Rome is first mentioned in Acts xix. 21, and, as Hort remarks, it is expressed with curious emphasis. “After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit (ἐθέτο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι), when he had passed through Macedonia, and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome.” He passed through Macedonia and Achaia, as he proposed, and it was during his stay in Corinth (which, according to the usual chronology, was in the winter of 58-59), and towards the close of it, that he wrote this letter. This is a point on which all scholars are agreed. When he wrote, he was on the point of starting, or perhaps had started, on his journey to Jerusalem, with the collection for the poor saints there which had been made in the Churches of Galatia, Macedonia and Achaia (chap. xv. 25 ff., 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4, 2 Cor. viii. ix.). He had with him Timothy and Sosipater, or Sopater (chap. xvi. 21), whom we know otherwise to have been in his company (Acts xx. 4), when he started on that journey. Gaius, his host at the moment (xvi. 23), is probably the same as the Gaius whom he had himself baptised at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 14). The time and place, therefore, at which the Epistle to the Romans was written are beyond question. But we ought to notice these not only formally, as points of geography and chronology, but in their significance in Paul’s life. The time was one at which he felt that his work in the
East was done. From Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum he had fully preached the gospel of Christ. He had no more place in these parts (xv. 19, 23). His eye was turned westward, and rested inevitably on Rome. He had wished to visit it for a good many years (xv. 23), perhaps ever since he had first met Prisca and Aquila in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2), and he had often formed the purpose, though it had been as often disappointed (i. 13). But now it had a definiteness which it had never had before. He did not indeed look on Rome as the goal of his journey; he meant only to stay there till he had been somewhat satisfied with the Church's fellowship, and then to be conveyed by them toward Spain (xv. 24). But he was a Roman citizen, and must have been conscious, as an expression in i. 8 shows ("Your faith is proclaimed in all the world"), of the supreme importance of the Church which had its seat in the capital of the empire. He would not only wish a point of support there for his further operations in the West; he must have been more than commonly anxious that Christianity there should appear as what it truly was, and that the Romans should be firmly established in it. If Paul was going to write to the Romans at all, no matter from what immediate impulse—though it should only have been to announce his approaching visit—it would be natural that his communication, in proportion as he realized the place and coming importance of the Church at Rome, should assume a catholic and comprehensive character. We can hardly imagine the man who was conscious of his own vocation as Apostle of the Gentiles, and conscious at the same time of the central significance of this Church, writing anything of a merely formal character to such a community. When he introduced himself to them, it was a great occasion, and the epistle is the best evidence that he was sensible of its greatness.

There are other considerations which would tell on Paul's mind in the same direction. When he wrote, he was setting out on a journey the issue of which was doubtful and perilous. At the very outset he had to change his course, because of a plot formed against him by the Jews (Acts xx. 3). He dreaded what these same relentless enemies might do in Judaea; he was not sure that even the Christians in Jerusalem would receive graciously the offering which his love and zeal had raised among the Gentiles on their behalf (chap. xv. 31). He was setting out in readiness not only to be bounded, but to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts xxi. 13). In a sense, therefore, this epistle might be called his testament (Weiss). He puts into it, not merely what is suggested to him by special circumstances of which he is aware in the Church at Rome—e.g., the discussion of the relations between "the strong" and "the weak"—but all that his
own situation and that of the Church, looking at both in the largest aspect, determine to be of interest. He has achieved a great work in the East. By carrying the charity of the Gentile Christians to Jerusalem, and fraternising once more with the primitive Church, he hopes to secure and perfect that work, and to effect a more cordial union between the two great branches of Christendom, which so imperfectly understood each other. He has passed through great conflicts, but his mind has only been made clearer by them, and established in firmer possession of the fundamental principles of the Christian life; he can define it without misgiving in relation to all previous modes of human experience and all earlier stages of religion, whether in Greek or Jew. His heart is set on further labours, but he is profoundly conscious of the uncertainties of the future. Such are the outward and the spiritual conditions under which Paul writes. Is it not manifest that when we give them all the historical definiteness of which they are capable, there is something in them which rises above the casualness of time and place, something which might easily give the epistle not an accidental or occasional character, but the character of an exposition of principles? Be the immediate motive what it may, it is not incredible that the epistle should have something in it which is rather eternal than historical, and that it should require for its interpretation, not a minute acquaintance with opinion in the apostolic age, but some sense of God and man.

The various opinions as to the purpose of the letter have been classified by almost all writers on Introduction under similar heads: it is only necessary to premise that such opinions do not in fact (whatever their authors may think) necessarily exclude one another.

1. The purpose of the letter, according to some, is dogmatic. It is a systematic and formal exposition of the Gospel according to Paul. It is a doctrinal treatise, to which only accident gave the form of a letter; in other circumstances it might have been a book. This was the opinion which ruled at the time of the Reformation. Luther calls the epistle absolutissima epitome evangelii. Melanchthon calls it doctrinae Christianae compendium. No one can say that these descriptions are inept. Luther did find the Gospel in Romans, and found it in a power which made him the greatest conductor of spiritual force since Paul, which directly regenerated one half of Christendom, and indirectly did much to reform the other half. Melanchthon made the epistle the basis of his Loci. He was delighted to find a theology which did not philosophise about the mysteries of the Trinity, or the modes of incarnation, or active and passive creation; but through sin and law and grace gave the know-
ledge of Christ and His benefits. The dogmatic conception of the epistle has held its ground even in modern times, and among writers who pride themselves in giving the historical its due. Thus Hausrath describes it as "the essential content of what he otherwise preached by word of mouth". Hilgenfeld calls it "a complete presentation of the Gospel which Paul preaches among the Gentiles". Pfliegerer, more dogmatically still, speaks of it as "an objective development of the truth of the Gospel, drawn from the nature of the Gospel itself". And certainly, whatever the writer's motive may have been, the letter has a systematic character. There is no analogy in any other of his epistles to the connected train of thought which runs from i. 16 to viii. 39 or even to xi. 36. There is indeed a break between chaps. viii. and ix., but there is no unbridgeable gulf. Holtzmann gives, as specimens of the way in which they can be connected, the opinions of Mangold (in i.-viii. Paul justifies his doctrine of salvation, in ix.-xi. his action as a missionary), of Holsten (in i.-viii. he justifies the content, in ix.-xi. the result, of his preaching), and of Pfliegerer (in i.-viii. there is the dogmatic, in ix.-xi. the historical aspect of his gospel). This last agrees pretty much with Godet, who makes the subject of the whole eleven chapters salvation by faith, chaps. i.-viii. treating this in relation to the individual, and chaps. ix.-xi. in relation to its development in history. The systematic character of this part, therefore, is beyond doubt. Those who insist upon it are not of course blind to the parts of the epistle (chaps. xiv. and xv.) in which incidental matters affecting the Church at Rome are touched upon; but it is not in these, they would say, but in the formal presentation of the truth in chaps. i.-xi. that the purpose of the letter is revealed. Granting this, however, the question arises whether the systematic character of the epistle is equivalent to a dogmatic character. In other words, is Paul simply expounding, in a neutral, unprejudiced, objective fashion, the whole scope and contents of his gospel, or is he expounding it in relation to something present to his mind, and to the mind of his readers, which gives the exposition a peculiar character?

2. The latter alternative is affirmed by those who hold that the purpose of the epistle is controversial. It is an exposition of Paul's gospel indeed, but not a purely dogmatic one, which in an epistle would be gratuitous and out of place. The exposition is throughout conducted with reference to an attack such as would be made on Pauline Christianity from the point of view of Judaism, or even of Jewish Christianity. It is not so much an exposition as a defence and a vindication. Practically this idea governs many interpretations, e.g., that of Lipsius. That there is
an element of truth in it is not to be denied. Paul does not write in vacuo, in no concrete relations at all. In iii. 8 there is a hint of actual adversaries and their criticisms on the Pauline gospel; in xvi. 17-20 there is another hint of at least possible ones. It may be, as has been noticed above (p. 566), that Jews or Jewish Christians were attempting to create prejudice against the Apostle in Rome; but we cannot, on the ground that this is a letter, and must therefore have its character explained by the circumstances of the readers, conclude for certain (with Weizsäcker), that this was the case. In expounding his gospel systematically to the Romans, Paul defines it, not necessarily against enemies who were forestalling him in Rome, but against the criticism which had followed him all through his missionary work. And we must remember, as has also been referred to already, that part of that criticism was not so much Jewish as human. It is not the Jewish or Jewish-Christian consciousness in particular—it is the consciousness of the natural man at a certain stage of moral development—which thinks that forgiveness is an immoral doctrine, and is shocked at the idea of a God “who justifies the ungodly,” or on the other hand, indulges the idea that pardon procures licence to sin. Though the opposition Paul encountered everywhere was headed by Jews or by Christians of Jewish birth, what it represented was by no means exclusively Jewish; and in an epistle of this unique character, standing where it stands in the Apostle’s life, and making so little express reference to actual Jewish adversaries (contrast it in this respect with Galatians or 2 Cor. x.-xiii.), we must not limit too narrowly the kind of opposition he has in view. He is stating the case of gospel against law—against all that is pre-Christian, infra-Christian, and anti-Christian; and his polemic has not a temporary but a permanent significance. It is addressed not to Jews of the first century, but to men, and to Christians, of all time. Nothing so conclusively proves its necessity as the fact that it so soon ceased to be understood. It is not easy to live at the spiritual height at which Paul lived. It is not easy to realise that religion begins absolutely on God’s side; that it begins with a demonstration of God’s love to the sinful, which man has done nothing and can do nothing to merit; and that the assurance of God’s love is not the goal to be reached by our own efforts, but the only point from which any human effort can start. It is not easy to realise that justification, in the sense of an initial assurance of God’s love, extending over all our life, is the indispensable pre-supposition of everything which can be called Christianity. It is not easy to realise that in the atoning death of Christ and the gift of the Holy Ghost there are the only and the adequate securities
for Christian morality; that the only good man is the forgiven man, and that he is good, not because he is under law, but because he is not under law but under grace. There must have been many men who were practically Christian, and that, too, in the broad sense, which gave no advantage to the Jew over the Gentile, but who were far from realising their Christianity in principle like Paul. In his heroic sense, indeed, Christianity hardly survived him; it was recovered in something like its native power, attested even by a recrudescence of its original perils, at the time of the Reformation; and it always requires to be rediscovered again. But this is only another way of saying that the polemic of the Epistle to the Romans is not narrowly anti-Jewish; it is anti-legal; and whenever legalism establishes itself in the Church anew, whether as mere custom, or as a dogmatic tradition, or as a clerical order claiming to be essential to the constitution of the Church, the Christian conscience will find in this polemic the sword of the spirit to strike it down. We admit, therefore, that the epistle has a controversial aspect; but probably the controversy is not so much with definite adversaries at work in Rome as with those principles and instincts in human nature which long experience as a preacher had made familiar to St. Paul.

3. A third view of the epistle defines its purpose as conciliatory. This, again, by no means excludes either of the views already commented on. Even controversy may be conducted in a conciliatory tone, and with a conciliatory purpose. When Paul wrote, he was extremely anxious about the unity of Jew and Gentile in the Church. His journey to Jerusalem had mainly that in view. In the epistle, while there is much that is trenchant in argument, there is nothing that is personal in feeling. There is no contemptuous irony, such as we have in 2 Cor. x.-xiii.; no uncontrolled passion such as flashes out here and there in Galatians. Although the law works wrath and stimulates sin, he describes it as holy, spiritual, and ordained unto life. He speaks with passionate affection of the Jews (ix. 1 ff.), always recognises their historical prerogatives (iii. 1 ff., ix. 1 ff.), warns the Gentiles against self-exaltation over them, and anticipates the salvation of Israel as a whole. In chaps. xiv.-xv. also his generosity to "the weak," though his judgment is unequivocally with the strong, may be regarded in the same light; the weak are certainly connected with the Jews, and his aim in the whole passage is the peace and unity of the Church. All this confirms us in thinking that the controversial aspect of the epistle should not be urged with special severity against Jewish Christians, or their modes of thought: Paul has no desire to exasperate any one, but in the position in which he stands, "the greatest moving power in the enlargement
and building up of the universal Church” (Hort), about to visit Jerusalem at once, and Rome, if he can, immediately afterwards, his desire is to win and to unite all.

From this point of view it is possible to form a conception of the purpose of the epistle which will do something like justice to it as a whole. It is an epistle, not a book. Paul wrote to Rome, not simply to clear up his own mind, not as a modern writer might do, addressing the world at large; he wrote to this particular community, and under a particular impulse. He knew something about the Church, as chaps. xiv. and xv. show; and while he might have acquired such information from members of it whom he met in Corinth, Ephesus, or elsewhere, it is quite probable, from chap. xvi., that he had friends and correspondents at Rome itself. He wrote to the Roman Christians because it was in his mind to visit them; but the nature of his letter is determined, not simply by consideration of their necessities, but by consideration of his own position. The letter is “occasional,” in the sense that it had a historical motive—to intimate and prepare for the coming visit; but it is not occasional in the sense in which the first Epistle to the Corinthians is so. It is not a series of answers to questions which the Romans had propounded; it is not a discussion, relevant to them only, of points either in doctrine or practice which had incidentally come to be of critical importance in Rome. Its character, in relation to St. Paul’s mind, is far more central and absolute than this would imply. It is in a real sense a systematic exposition of what he distinctively calls “my gospel” (ii. 16), such an exposition as makes him thoroughly known to a community which he foresaw would have a decisive importance in the history of Christianity. It is not an impromptu note, nor a series of unconnected remarks, each with a motive of its own; it is the manifesto of his gospel, by means of which the Apostle of the Gentiles, at a great crisis and turning point in his life, establishes relations with the Christian community in the capital of the Gentile world. It can be dated, of course, but no writing in the New Testament is less casual; none more catholic and eternal. It is quite true that in expounding his gospel Paul proceeds by a certain dialectical process; he advances step by step, and at every step defines the Christian truth as against some false or defective, some anti-Christian or infra-Christian view; in this sense it is controversial. But we have seen already the limitations under which alone a controversial character can be ascribed to it; Paul is not so much controverting anybody in particular as vindicating the truth he expounds against the assaults and misconstructions to which he had found it give rise. There is no animosity against the
Jews in it; no sentence such as 1 Thess. ii. 15 f. or Gal. v. 12. It is an establishment of principles he aims at; except in iii. 8, xvi. 17-20 there is no reference to persons. Even in chaps. ix.-xi. (see the introduction at chap. ix.) the whole tone is conciliatory; the one thing which tries our faith in them is Paul's assurance of the future of his own people. But as an interpretation of the actual working out in human history of that method of salvation which he has expounded in the first eight chapters—as an exhibition of the process through which the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles alike contribute eventually to the universality of the Gospel—these chapters are an essential part of the epistle. They are mainly but not exclusively apologetic: they belong to that whole conception of the Gospel, and of the mode in which it becomes the inheritance of the world, which was of one substance with the mind of St. Paul. No one who read the first eleven chapters of the epistle could meet the Apostle as a stranger on anything essential in Christianity as he understood it. No doubt, as Grafe has remarked, it does not contain an eschatology like 1 Cor. xv. or 2 Cor. v., nor a Christology like Col. i. But it establishes that which is fundamental beyond the possibility of misconception. It vindicates once for all the central facts, truths and experiences, without which Christianity cannot exist. It vindicates them at once in their relation to the whole past of mankind, and in their absolute newness, originality and self-sufficiency. It is an utter misapprehension to say that "just the most fundamental doctrines—the Divine Lordship of Christ, the value of His death, the nature of the Sacraments—are assumed rather than stated or proved" (Sanday and Headlam, p. xli.). There can be only one fundamental doctrine, and that doctrine for Paul is the doctrine of justification by faith. That is not part of his gospel, it is the whole of it: there Luther is his true interpreter. If legalists or moralists object, Paul's answer is that justification regenerates, and that nothing else does. By its consistency with this fundamental doctrine, we test everything else that is put forward as Christian. It is only as we hold this, on principle, with the clearness with which Paul held it, that we can know what Christian liberty is in the sense of the New Testament—that liberty in which the will of God is done from the heart, and in which no commandments or ordinances of men, no definitions or traditions, no customs or "orders," have any legal authority for the conscience. And in the only legitimate sense of the word this liberty does not make void, but establishes the law. That is the paradox in the true religion which perpetually baffles those who would reduce it to an institution or a code.
CHAPTER IV.

INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

The integrity of the Epistle to the Romans has been called in question mainly in connection with chaps. xv. and xvi. Partly on the ground of textual phenomena, partly on internal grounds, the authenticity of these chapters has been denied, in whole or in part; and even among those who recognise chap. xvi. as Pauline, many are unable to recognise Rome as the place to which it was addressed. It will be convenient to consider (1) the questions raised by the position of the doxology, and the various endings; (2) questions raised by the internal character of chap. xv.; and (3) questions connected with the character and destination of chap. xvi.

1. The position of the doxology, and the various endings. The facts in regard to the doxology are as follows:—

(a) It is given at xvi. 25-27, and there only, by ΒΟCDΕ, Vulgate, Syriac, Memphitic, Aethiopic and Latin Fathers. This is by far the best attested position for it, and that which, owing to the respect of Erasmus for the Vulgate, it occupies in the received text,

(b) At xiv. 23, and there only, it is found in L, most cursive, Greek lectionaries, and Greek commentators except Origen. Possibly the lectionaries explain its appearance at this point. The matter in chaps. xv. and xvi. being of a more personal or temporary interest was not likely to be chosen for reading in church. But in order that the great doxology, which was too short for a lesson by itself, might not be lost in public worship, it was appended to the last lesson before chap. xv.

(c) It is found both after xiv. 23 and at xvi. 25-27 in AP 17 arm.

(d) It is omitted in both places in FG, but F has space left after xvi. 24, in which f (the Latin of this bi-lingual MS.) has the doxology, while G has space left between chaps. xiv. and xv.

Besides this variety of MS. attestation, there are certain other facts to take into consideration. (a) There is the evidence of Origen (in his translator Rufinus) to the text in his time. It runs as follows (ed. Lommatzsch, vii., p. 453): Caput hoc Marcion, a quo
Scripturae evangelicae et apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est: omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est: usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse posuit invenimus; in nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus hoc est: omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est: statim cohaerens habetur: ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare. Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est postitum, continent. This remark is made at xvi. 25, and caput hoc means, of course, this passage, i.e., the doxology. Marcion wholly omitted it there. But what do the following words mean? What strikes one at first is that he not only omitted it there, but omitted everything standing after "whatsoever is not of faith is sin"—in other words, not only the doxology, but the whole of chaps. xv. and xvi. But Dr. Hort (vide Appendix, p. 112), who reads (with what he says seems to be the best MS.) in eo loco instead of ab eo loco, and changes hoc into hic, only finds the statement that Marcion cut off the whole of the doxology at xiv. 23, as well as at xvi. 25. But usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit is a very misleading way to express this to readers whose copies of the epistle would all contain chaps. xv. and xvi., and it is hardly open to doubt that the first impression of the meaning is the correct one, and that Marcion ended his Epistle to the Romans at xiv. 23. Thus, as Gifford puts it, "we have evidence of a diversity of position before Origen's time, and regarded by him as independent of Marcion's mutilated copies. But we have no evidence of omission before Marcion, who was at Rome propagating his views about A.D. 138-140."

(b) There is the evidence of the "capitulations," or division of the epistle into sections, in some MSS. of the Latin Bible, especially the two best codices of the Vulgate, Codex Amiatinus and Codex Fuldensis, both sixth century MSS. In Codex Amiatinus there are fifty-one sections. The fiftieth, entitled De periculo contristante fratrem suum esca sua, et quod non sit regnum Dei esca et potus sed justitia et pax et gaudium in Spiritu Sancto, evidently answers to chap. xiv. 15-23; the fifty-first, which is entitled De mysterio Domini ante passionem in silentio habito, post passionem vero ipsius revelato, as plainly corresponds to the doxology. The capitulations therefore were drawn up for a Latin MS. which omitted chaps. xv. and xvi. In another way the capitulations in Codex Fuldensis point to the same conclusion.

(c) There is the appearance, at least, of different endings. 1. When the doxology stands at xiv. 23, it indicates an ending at that
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point, though otherwise it is a very unnatural one, as the subject and sense of chap. xiv. run on unbroken to xv. 13. 2. There is at xv. 33 what has sometimes been taken as another ending: “The God of peace be with you all. Amen.” 3. There is the benediction at xvi. 20: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.” This is genuine, and is an ordinary Pauline formula at the close of a letter. 4. There is the benediction at xvi. 24: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.” Most editors regard this as spurious; it has been transferred in Western texts from verse 20 to this place, and finally established itself in both. Gifford, however, regards it as genuine in both places. 5. There is the doxology at xvi. 25-27.

(d) In G all mention of Rome is wanting: see critical note on i. 7, 15.

This complicated combination of facts has not yet been clearly explained, and perhaps never will be. Renan’s theory was that Romans is really a circular letter, and that it was sent in various directions, with different endings, which were afterwards combined. Lightfoot thought the facts adduced amounted to irresistible evidence that in early times shorter copies of the epistle existed, containing only chaps. i.-xiv., with or without the doxology; and the theory by which he explained these facts was this, that “St. Paul, at a later period of his life, reissued the epistle in a shorter form with a view to general circulation, omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Romans in the first chapter, and adding the doxology, which was no part of the original epistle.” This tempting theory was expounded in the Journal of Philology, 1871, in a review of M. Renan; and this review, along with a minute criticism of Dr. Hort, and a reply by Lightfoot, can be studied in Lightfoot’s Biblical Essays, pp. 285-374. An acute statement of the objections to it is also given by Gifford in the introduction to his commentary (p. 23 f.); yet when all is said, it remains the most satisfying hypothesis that has yet been suggested for the colligation of the facts. Sanday and Headlam think that Paul could not possibly have made the break at xiv. 23—he must have been too conscious that the sense ran on unbroken to xv. 13; it was probably to Marcion, therefore, to whom the references to the Jews and the Old Testament in xv. 1-13 were objectionable, that the imperfect copies of the epistle owed their existence. This is hardly convincing. If there is not a break at xiv. 23, there is at least a pause in the thought, and Paul may as easily have made a division there as the author of our present division into chapters. Besides, as Gifford points out (see above,
p. 577), there is evidence that the doxology stood in different positions (at xiv. 23 for one) before Origen’s time, and independently of Marcion’s mutilated copies. Hence some one must have felt that xiv. 23 was not an impossible place to stop at, and that for other than Marcion’s reasons; and if some one, why not Paul himself? But in the absence of any direct evidence as to how the textual phenomena originated, it is very improbable that any certainty on the subject will ever be attained.

2. Questions raised by the internal character of chap. xv.

The Tübingen school, or at least some of its more vigorous adherents, followed Baur in finding chap. xv. too moderate in tone for Paul. Baur regarded the last two chapters as the work of some one “writing in the spirit of the Acts of the Apostles, seeking to soothe the Judaists and to promote the cause of unity, and therefore tempering the keen anti-Judaism of Paul with a milder and more conciliatory conclusion to the epistle.” An argument like this rests on a general impression of what it was possible for Paul to write, and can only be met by another general impression of a different sort. It is sufficient to say that later scholars are practically at one in finding that there is nothing in the chapter inconsistent with Pauline authorship. The Paul by whom Baur measured all things in the epistles is really not the Paul of history, but of a more or less arbitrary theory; and his picture has to be corrected by taking into account precisely such revelations of his true attitude to the questions of his time as are found in this chapter. Lipsius, who thinks the fifteenth chapter as a whole genuine, nevertheless holds that it has been interpolated. He omits the latter part of verse 19—δοτε με ἀπὸ ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρώκαιν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ—as inconsistent with Gal. i. 18-24, and unsupported by any accredited historical evidence. But he admits that it is supported by Acts ix. 28 f.; and if we compare i. 8, Col. i. 23, and remember that what we have before us is not sworn evidence but a broad rhetorical description of the Apostle’s missionary labours, we shall probably think the expression characteristically Pauline rather than the reverse. In verse 20 Lipsius omits ὅχ ὅπου ἁνομάσθη Χριστός, οὐ μὴ ἐν ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ, ἀλλά. The words, he argues, are suggested by 2 Cor. x. i 5; but the purpose expressed in them, of not preaching the Gospel in Rome, because Rome is a mission-field belonging to others (who have introduced Christianity there already), is incompatible with i. 5, 13-15, xii. 3, xv. 15. It is enough to answer that the purpose of not preaching the Gospel at Rome is not expressed here at all. Paul tells the principle on which he has always acted—the principle
of breaking new ground. It is the principle on which he will act still, for he takes Rome only en route for Spain; but that is not inconsistent with anything he purposes to do at Rome in the way of Christian work, nor with anything he does in this epistle. On the same principle Lipsius omits also verses 23 and 24; but with equal groundlessness. The very facts to which he refers, that the plan of travel announced in these verses is nowhere else referred to either in Acts or in the Epistles, and that it was (as he thinks) never carried out, are conclusive evidence of the genuineness of the passage. What motive could a late interpolator have for putting into Paul's mind a projected voyage, of which there was no purpose on record, and which was never actually made? The unanimous testimony of all sources guarantees the integrity of the text; and there is no reason whatever to doubt that it is Paul's.

3. Questions connected with the character and destination of chap. xvi.

When we come to this chapter the situation is changed. It is not its genuineness, but its destination, that is called in question. Since 1829, when David Schulz suggested that it was a fragment of an epistle to the Ephesians, this opinion has been widely received. The exact extent of the fragment, indeed, is disputed. Schulz made it consist of verses 1-20; Weizsäcker says verses 1-23; others, verses 3-20, or 1-15, or 1-16 and 21-23, or 3-16 only. Whatever its limits, the arguments on behalf of it can only be estimated by going over the chapter, and considering them as they emerge.

(a) The suggestion is made that Phoebe, sailing from Cenchreae, would naturally have Ephesus rather than Rome as her goal. But there is no reason to believe that she was sailing from Cenchreae, though she lived there. Paul may have met her in Corinth on her way to Rome.

(b) At first sight there may seem more reason to believe that Aquila and Priscilla point to Ephesus. They had gone thither with Paul at an earlier date (Acts xviii. 19), and they had a church in their house there, which joined them in a greeting to Corinth, when Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19); and they were there also some years later (2 Tim. iv. 19). The question is whether these facts, in the circumstances, outweigh the fact that the greeting is found here in a letter addressed to Rome. If we look at the whole situation, this is at least doubtful. As fellow-workers of Paul, it is plain that they shared to a large extent his wandering life, and we know that they had originally a connection with Rome (Acts xviii. 2). There is nothing in the least improbable
in the idea that though they were in Ephesus, say in 54 and 57 A.D., and again say in 66, they should have been in Rome in 58. Paul must have had his information about the Church in Rome from some one; and nothing is so likely as that he had it from his old and intimate associates, Aquila and Priscilla, who had themselves a connection of old standing with the capital.

(c) There remains the case of Epænetus, who is described as the first fruits of Asia unto Christ. The received text has Achaia, but that is an error. One fails to see, however, why this Epænetus, though the first Christian convert in the province of Asia, should be bound to remain there always. There is no difficulty in supposing that he was at Rome, and that Paul, who knew him, was aware of the fact, and introduced his name to multiply for himself points of contact with the Roman Church.

These are the only definite matters of fact on which the theory of an Ephesian destination of the chapter has been based. They do not amount to anything against the weight of all the external evidence which makes them part of a letter to Rome. Nor is their weight increased by pointing out in the verses which follow the large number of persons with whom Paul had been in personal relations — persons whom he calls "my beloved," "my fellow-labourers," "my fellow-captives"; "who bestowed much labour on us"; "his mother and mine". Paul's life as a missionary brought him into contact with persons in all the great towns of the East, and though he had not yet visited Rome, it cannot be doubted that many of those with whom in the course of his twenty years' ministry he had established such relations as are referred to here, had for one cause or other found their way to the great city. Paul would naturally, in preparing for his own visit, make all that he could of such points of attachment with the Roman Church as he had. It is, as Gifford points out, a very strong, indeed a conclusive argument for the Roman destination of the letter, that of the twenty-two persons named in verses 6-15, not one can be shown to have been at Ephesus; while (1) Urbanus, Rufus, Ampliatus, Julia and Junia are specifically Roman names, and (2) besides the first four of these names, "ten others, Stachys, Apelles, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobas (or Patrobius), Philologus, Julia, Nereus are found in the sepulchral inscriptions on the Appian Way as the names of persons connected with 'Caesar's household' (Phil. iv. 22), and contemporary with St. Paul". Hence, in spite of the difficulty of Paul's knowing so many people in a Church he had never visited, and the equally great
difficulty that none of all these people are mentioned in the letters
the Apostle afterwards wrote from Rome (see Col. iv. 10 f.),
scholars like Lightfoot, Gifford and Sanday find no reason to give
up the historical tradition which makes this chapter an integral part
of the epistle addressed to Rome. There is really more reason to
question verses 17-20 than any other part of the chapter. Words like
those in verse 19—εφ' υμίν υνχαίρω, θέλω δε υμάς κ.τ.λ.—certainly
strike one as in better keeping if addressed to a Church with which
Paul had had such previous relations as entitled him to take a per-
sonal tone than if addressed to strangers. But we cannot tell a
priori how the consciousness of an Apostle towards a Christian
community he had never yet seen was determined; it may, with all
the disclaiming of titles to interfere, have involved precisely that
authoritativeness and sense of responsibility to and for the Church
which is expressed in this passage.

As for the doxology, it stands by itself. Lightfoot thought it no
part of the original epistle. Neither did Alford. "Probably," says
the latter, "on reperusing his work either at the time, or, as the
altered style seems to import, in after years at Rome, he subjoins
the fervid and characteristic doxology with which it closes." Opinions
on the genuineness of the doxology vary in part (but not exclusively)
as opinions vary on the genuineness of the pastoral epistles. In
spite of the vindication of the style word by word, the impression it
leaves on the mind is hardly Pauline. It seems artificial rather than
inspired. It is defended by Gifford, Hort, and Sanday and Headlam;
by Weiss (who thinks Paul may have added it with his own hand),
Godet, and many others: rejected by Delitzsch, Pfeiderer, Schultz
and Lipsius. In substance it recapitulates the main ideas of the
epistle.

Text.

The text printed in this commentary is the Textus Receptus, but
that which is commented upon is practically that of Westcott and
Hort. Various readings, of any importance, have been carefully
noted in the apparatus criticus, with such an indication of the
authorities for them as will be sufficient for those who do not aspire
to be experts in this department: care has been taken to give the
evidence for those readings in which critical editors depart from the
received text. It is impossible here to do more than note the MSS.
and other authorities which have been cited; information as to
their characteristics and value must be sought from such sources as
the Prolegomena to Tischendorf's Novum Testamentum Graecum,
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or Scrivener's *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, or Westcott and Hort's *Introduction*, vol. ii. An easier book to begin with is Hammond's *Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament*. In Sanday and Headlam's *Commentary* (pp. lxiii.-lxxiv.), there is a lucid account of the chief sources of evidence for the text of Romans, and of their relations to one another; while B. Weiss, in his great work, *Das Neue Testament: Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung*, gives weight to considerations of a kind that more purely “diplomatic” constructors of texts are apt to overlook.

The principal MSS. of Romans are those which also contain the gospels, *viz.*, ΝΑΒC. Ν and B belong to the fourth century, A and C to the fifth. The MSS. next in importance, DEFG, are different from those which are called by the same names in the gospels: they are all Graeco-Latin MSS. D is the Codex Claromontanus which Tischendorf assigns to the sixth century. It wants Romans i. 1-7, 27-30. Tregelles describes it as “one of the most valuable MSS. extant”. E is the Codex Sangermanensis, now at St. Petersburg. It is probably not older than the ninth or tenth century, and is described by Sanday and Headlam as “nothing more than a faulty copy of D”. F is the Codex Augiensis, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is of the ninth century, and wants Romans i. 1-iii. 19 ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. G is the Codex Boergerianus, now in Dresden, and is a little later than F. It wants Romans i. 1 ἀφωρισμένος . . . i. 5 πίστεως, and ii. 16 τὰ κρυπτά . . . ii. 25 νόμον Ἰς. These four all belong to the type of text which Westcott and Hort call Western. Other uncials of less importance are K, Codex Mosquensis; L, Codex Angelicus; and P, Codex Porphyrianus, all of about the same age, *i.e.*, the ninth century. Of cursive MSS. those quoted in this work are 17 (the same as 33 in the Gospels, and 13 in Acts), “the queen of cursive”; 47, of the eleventh or twelfth century, now in the Bodleian Library; and 67, of the eleventh century, now at Vienna. The marginal corrector of this MS., quoted as 67 **, gives many peculiar and ancient readings. The versions referred to are the Latin Vulgate, especially as given in Codex Amiatinus *circa* 514 A.D. and Codex Fuldensis, also of sixth century; the old Latin contained in DEFG (see above); the Syriac versions, one of which (the Peshitto) was “certainly current much in its present form early in the fourth century” (Sanday and Headlam), while the other dates from the sixth: an occasional reference is also made to the Egyptian versions, and to the Armenian: the last was made in the fifth century.
To estimate the value of any reading it is necessary to consider the relations to each other of the authorities which support it. In the Epistle to the Romans, as elsewhere in the New Testament, these authorities tend to fall into groups. Thus ΝB form one; DEFG a second; and ΝACLP a third. ΝB form what Westcott and Hort describe as "neutral" authorities; DEFG are "Western"; ΝACLP include what they call "Alexandrian," but are not identical with it. Sanday and Headlam, after giving an account of the authorities for the text, define the "specific characteristics of the textual apparatus of Romans" as these: (i.) the general inferiority in boldness and originality of the Western text; (ii.) the fact that there is a distinct Western element in B, which therefore when it is combined with authorities of the Western type is diminished in value; (iii.) the consequent rise in importance of the group ΝAC; (iv.) the existence of a few scattered readings either of B alone or of B in combination with one or two other authorities which have considerable intrinsic probability, and may be right. By a little practice on the readings for which the authority is given in the apparatus criticus, the student can familiarise himself with the facts, and exercise his own judgment on them.

In the notes, Winer means Moulton's edition of Winer's Grammar; W. and H. stands for Westcott and Hort; S. and H. for Sanday and Headlam's Commentary on Romans.
ΠΑΥΛΟΤ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΤ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

I. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ δούλος Ἰησού Χριστοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, ἡ προσεπηγείλατο διά τῶν προφητῶν αὐτῶν.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-7. The usual salutation of the Apostle is expanded, as is natural in writing to persons whom he has not seen, into a description both of himself and of his Gospel. Both, so to speak, need a fuller introduction than if he had been writing to a Church he had himself founded. The central idea of the passage is that of the whole epistle, that the Gospel, as preached by Paul to the Gentiles, was not inconsistent with, but the fulfilment of, God's promises to Israel.

Ver. 1. Paul's description of himself. δούλος Ἰ. Χ. The use of the same expression in James, Jude, 2 Pet., shows how universal in the Church was the sense of being under an obligation to Christ which could never be discharged. It is this sense of obligation which makes the δουλεία, here referred to, perfect freedom. κλητός ἀπόστολος is an Apostle by vocation. No one can take this honour to himself, any more than that of a saint (ver. 7), unless he is called by God. In the N.T. it is always God who calls. It is as an Apostle—i.e., with the sense of his vocation as giving him a title to do so—that Paul writes to the Romans. ἀπόστολος is here used in the narrower sense, which includes only Paul and the twelve, see on xvi. 7. ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ: for καλείν and αφωρίζειν similarly combined, see Gal. i. 15. The separation is here regarded (as in Gal.) as God's act, though, as far as it had reference to the Gentile mission, it was carried out by an act of the Church at Antioch (Act. xiii. 2, ἄφορίζατε δIKEῃκ.τ.λ.). What it means is "this one thing I do". εὐαγγελίῳ Θεοῦ is the Gospel which comes from God, the glad tidings of which He is the source and author. As a name for the Christian religion, or the proclamation of it, it had a great fascination for an evangelist like Paul, who uses it out of all proportion oftener than any other N.T. writer.

Ver. 2. δ προεπηγείλατο. The Gospel is not in principle a new thing, a subversion of the true religion as it has hitherto been known to the people of God. On the contrary, God promised it before, through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures. It is the fulfilment of hopes which God Himself inspired. διά τῶν προφητῶν does not restrict the reference to the prophets in the strict sense of the word. The O.T., as a whole, is prophetic of the New, and it is in the law (Abraham) and the Psalms (David), as much as in the prophets (Isaiah, Hosea), that Paul finds anticipations and promises of the Gospel: see chap. iv.

The omission of the article with ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις (cf. xvi. 26) is probably significant, for as against these two passages there are over forty in which ή γραφή occurs: itemphases the Divine character of these as opposed to other writings. That is ἅγιον which belongs to God, or is connected with Him: ή γραφή is the O.T. as God's book.

Ver. 3 f. τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ: the subject of the Gospel of God is His Son. For the same conception, see 2 Cor. i. 19: ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς Χ. Ἡ. ἡ ὁμοιότητα τῆς ἡμῶν κηρύξεως. Taken
by itself, "the Son of God" is, in the first instance, a title rather than a name. It goes back to Ps. ii. 7; the person to whom it is applied is conceived as the chosen object of the Divine love, God's instrument for accomplishing the salvation of His people. (Weiss.) The description which follows does not enable us to answer all the questions it raises, yet it is sufficiently clear. "The Son of God" was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. For γενομένου, cf. Gal. iv. 4; for David, 2 Tim. ii. 8, where, as here, the Davidic descent is an essential part of the Pauline Gospel. That it was generally preached and recognised in the primitive Church is proved by these passages, as well as by Heb. vii. 14 and the genealogies in Matthew and Luke; yet it seems a fair inference from the Lord's question in Mk. xii. 35 ff. that for Him it had no real importance. Those who did not directly see in Jesus one transcendentally greater than David would not recognise in Him the Saviour by being convinced of His Davidic descent. This person, of royal lineage, was "declared Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of holiness, in virtue of resurrection from the dead". The word ορισθέντος is ambiguous; in Acts x. 42, xvii. 35, it is used to describe the appointment of Christ to judge the living and the dead, and is rendered in A.V. "ordained". If to be Son of God were merely an office or a dignity, like that of judge of the world, this meaning might be defended here. There is an approximation to such an idea in Acts xiii. 33, where also Paul is the speaker. "God," he says, "has fulfilled His promise by raising up Jesus; as it is written also in the second Psalm, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." Here the resurrection day, strictly speaking, is the birthday of the Son of God; sonship is a dignity to which He is exalted after death. But in view of passages like Gal. iv. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 5 f., it is impossible to suppose that Paul limited his use of Son of God in this way; even while Jesus lived on earth there was that in Him which no connection with David could explain, but which rested on a relation to God; the resurrection only declared Him to be what He truly was—just as in the Psalm, for that matter, the bold words, This day have I begotten Thee, may be said to refer, not to the right and title, but to the coronation of the King. In virtue of His resurrection, which is here conceived, not as from the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν), but of the dead (αναστάσεως νεκρῶν— a resurrection exemplifying, and so guaranteeing, that of others), Christ is established in that dignity which is His, and which answers to His nature. The expression κατὰ πνεύμα αγιωσύνης characterises Christ ethically, as κατὰ σάρκα does physically. Not that it makes the sonship in question "ethical" as opposed to "metaphysical": no such distinctions were in the Apostle's thought. But the sonship, which was declared by the resurrection, answered to (κατὰ) the spirit of holiness which was the inmost and deepest reality in the Person and life of Jesus. The sense that there is that in Christ which is explained by his connection with mankind, and that also which can only be explained by some peculiar relation to God, is no doubt conveyed in this description, and is the basis of the orthodox doctrine of the two natures in the one Person of the Lord; but it is a mistake to say that that doctrine is formulated here. The connection of the words ενδυνάμει is doubtful. They have been joined to ορισθέντος (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 4: δι' ευνάμεις θεοῦ): declared to be Son of God "by a miracle," a mighty work wrought by God; and also with υιοῦ θεοῦ = Son of God, not in humiliation, but "in power," a power demonstrated by the gift of the Spirit and its operations in the Church. Jesus, Messiah, Our Lord," summarises all this. "Our Lord" is the most compendious expression of the Christian consciousness. (A. B. Bruce, Apologetics, 398 ff.) "The whole Gospel of Paul is comprehended in this historical Jesus, who has appeared in flesh, but who, on the ground of the πνεύμα αγιωσύνης, which constitutes His essence, has been exalted as Christ and Lord." (Lipsius.) Ver. 5. Through Christ Paul received χάριν κ. αποστολήν. The plural, ελάβομεν, may mean no more than the
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3-8.

4 πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἑθεσιν, ὑπέρ τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ, 6. ἐν οἷς ἐν Ch. xvi. ζητεί καὶ ὡμείς, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 7. πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἀγαπητοὶ Θεοῦ, κλητοὶ ἄγιοι, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

8. Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ ἀγάπης Θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἄγιοις, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη απὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

1 For πασὶ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ G reads πασὶ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ. The same MS. also omits τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ in ver. 17. This is part of the evidence on which Lightfoot relied to show that Paul had issued chaps. i.-xvii. of this Epistle as a circular letter with all local allusions (such as these, and the many in chaps. xv. and xvi.) omitted. See Introduction, p. 578.

2 For περὶ read περι with ΝΒΑCD, etc.

3 singular, or may proceed from the latent consciousness that the writer is not the only person entitled to say this; it is not expressly meant to include others. χάρις, grace, is common to all Christians; ἀποστολὴ rests upon a specialised χάρις and implies competence as well as vocation. But in the N. T. these are hardly distinguished; it is a man's χάρισμα which constitutes his "call" to any particular service in the Church. εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως: the object of the apostleship received through Christ is obedience of faith, i.e., the obedience which consists in faith (but cf. Acts vii. 7) among all the Gentiles. Cf. chap. xvi. 16, 2 Thess. i. 8. The meaning of άθένες (Gentiles, not nations) is fixed by ver. 13 and by Paul's conception of his own vocation, Gal. i. 16, ii. 8, Eph. iii. 1 ff. ὑπέρ τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ: the final purpose of his vocation is that Christ's name may be above every name.

Ver. 6. The Romans, as well as others, are included among the Gentiles, and described as Jesus Christ's called. They belong to Him, because they have heard and obeyed the Gospel. "Calling," in Paul always includes obedience as well as hearing. It is effectual calling, the κλητοί being those who have accepted the Divine invitation.

Ver. 7. The salutation proper. It is addressed to all who are in Rome, etc., to include Christians of Jewish as well as Gentile origin. They are ἀγάπητοι Θεοῦ, God's beloved, because they have had experience of His redeeming love in Jesus Christ; and they are κλητοὶ ἄγιοι, saints, in virtue of His calling. See on κλητοὶ ἀπόστολοι above. The word ἄγιος did not originally describe character, but only a certain relation to God; the ἄγιοι are God's people. What this means depends of course on what God is; it is assumed in scripture that the character of God's people will answer to their relation to Him. It is worth mentioning that, as a synonym for Christian, it is never applied in the N. T. to an individual: no person is called ἄγιος. Phil. iv. 21 (δοκασάερα τάντα ἄγιον ἐν Χ. Ι.) is not an exception. The ideal of God's people cannot be adequately realised in, and ought not to be presumptuously claimed by, any single person. (Hort's Christian Ecclesia, 56.) Paul wishes the Romans grace and peace (the source and the sum of all Christian blessings) from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. The greeting is followed by a thanksgiving, which passes over insensibly into an introduction of a more personal character, in which Paul explains his desire to visit the Romans and to work among them (vers. 8-15).

Ver. 8. Πρῶτον μὲν. Nothing can take precedence of thanksgiving, when Paul thinks of the Romans, or indeed of any Christian Church in normal health. Πρῶτον μὲν suggests that something is to follow, but what it is we are not told; Paul's mind unconsciously leaves the track on which it started, at least so far as the linguistic following out of it is concerned. Perhaps the next thing was to be the prayer referred to in ver. 10. (Weiss.) διὰ 'Ι. Χ. Jesus Christ must be conceived here as the mediator through whom all our approaches to God are made (Eph. ii. 18), not as He through whom the blessings come for which Paul gives thanks. περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν: the "all" may have a certain emphasis when we remember the divisions to which reference is made in chap. xiv. Η πίστεως ὑμῶν is "the fact that you are Christians." The very existence of a Church at Rome was
something to be thankful for. εν δλω τω κόσμω is, of course, hyperbole, but a Church in Rome was like "a city set on a hill".

Ver. 9 f. μάρτυς γάρ μού ἐστιν ο θεός (Phil. i. 8): at a distance the Apostle cannot directly prove his love, but he appeals to God, who hears his ceaseless prayers for the Romans, as a witness of it. λατρεύω in the LXX is always used of religious service—worship, whether of the true God or of idols. en τω πνεύματι μου: Paul's ministry is spiritual and rendered with his spirit—not like that of the ministers in the ἁγιον κοσμικόν at Jerusalem. en τω εὐαγγελίω: in preaching the glad tidings of His Son. ώς αδιαλείπτως: the ώς may either be "how" or "that": looking to ί τo Thess. ii. 1, "how" seems more probable. μνείαν υμών ποιοῦμαι: I remember you. Cf. Job xiv. 13 (Ο that Thou wouldst appoint me χρόνον εν ὑμών μοι ποιηθῇ). επί των προσευχῶν μου: at my prayers. (Winer, p. 476.) For εί πως, see Acts xxvii. τ2 and Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 276. έχων is "now at length," "now, after all this waiting". (S. and H.) The ποτί, which can hardly be conveyed in English, marks the indefiniteness which even yet attaches in the writer's mind to the fulfilment of this hope. εὐδοκήσαμαι: the R.V. gives "I may be prospered"; the A.V. "I might have a prosperous journey". The latter brings in the idea of the ἄξιον, which was no doubt present to consciousness when the word εὐδοκήσαμαι was first used; but it is questionable whether any feeling for the etymology remained in the current employment of the word. The other N.T. examples (1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3 John ver. 2), as well as the LXX, suggest the contrary. Hence the R.V. is probably right. en τω θελήματι του θεοῦ: his long cherished and often disappointed hope had taught Paul to say, "if the Lord will" (Jas. iv. 15).
καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσι. 14. Ἐλληνὶ τε καὶ βαβυλώνις, σοφοὶ τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὁφελεῖται εἰς: 15. ὡστό τῷ κατ’ ἐμὸν πρόθυμον καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐσθενισασθαι. 16. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ ἐσθενισθῆναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 17. Ἐν καθῶς θαυμάζω ἵνα ἔσθω καὶ ἐν σωτηρία πάντων ἐν Ῥώμῃ om. Ἡ; see on ver. 7.

Ver. 14 f. These verses are naturally taken as an expansion of the thought contained in the preceding. Paul’s desire to win fruit at Rome, as among the rest of the Gentiles, arises out of the obligation (for so he feels it) to preach the Gospel to all men without distinction of languages or cultures. If it depended only on him, he would be exercising his ministry at Rome. The Romans are evidently conceived as Gentiles, but Paul does not indicate where they would stand in the broad classification of ver. 14. It is gratuitous, and probably mistaken, to argue with Weiss that he meant to describe them as βαρβάροι, when we know that the early Roman Church was Greek speaking. In τὸ κατ’ ἐμὸν πρόθυμον, the simplest construction is to make τὸ κατ’ ἐμὸν subject and πρόθυμον predicate, supplying ἑστι: all that depends on me is eager, i.e., for my part, I am all readiness. But it is possible to take τὸ κατ’ ἐμὸν πρόθυμον together, and to translate: the readiness, so far as I am concerned, (is) to preach the Gospel to you also who are in Rome. The contrast implied is that between willin (which Paul for his part is equal to) and carrying out the will (which depends on God (ver. 10)). With this Paul introduces the great subject of the epistle, and, in a sense, of the Gospel—that which he here designates δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. The conception is peculiar. He has professed his readiness to preach the Gospel, even at Rome. Anywhere, no doubt, one might have misgivings about identifying himself with a message which had for its subject a person who had been put to death as a criminal: anywhere, the Cross was to Jews a stumbling block and to Greeks foolishness. But at Rome, of all places, where the whole effective force of humanity seemed to be gathered up, one might be ashamed to stand forth as the representative of an apparently impotent and ineffective thing. But this the Gospel is not; it is the very reverse of this, and therefore the Apostle is proud to identify himself with it. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. It is such because there is revealed in it δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ—the very thing men need to ensure salvation; and that in such a manner—from faith to faith—as to make it accessible to all. And this, again, only answers to what stands in the O.T.—It is written, the righteous shall live by faith."

Ver. 16 f. δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστίν: for it is a power of God. It does no injustice to render "a Divine power". The conception of the Gospel as a force pervades the epistles to the Corinthians; its proof, so to speak, is dynamical, not logical. It is demonstrated, not by argument, but by what it does; and, looking to what it can do, Paul is proud to preach it anywhere. εἰς σωτηρίαν: σωτηρία is one of a class of words (to which ζωή, δόξα, κληρονομία belong) used by Paul to denote the last result of the acceptance of the Gospel. It is the most negative of them all, and conceives of the Gospel as a means for rescuing men from the ἀπώλεια which awaits sinners at the last judgment. In παντὶ τῶ πιστεύοντι Ἰουδαίω τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι another of the main interests of the writer in this epistle is brought forward; the Gospel is for all, the same Gospel and on the same terms, but without prejudice to the historical prerogative of the Jew. Ver. 17 shows how the Gospel is a Divine saving power. It is such because there is revealed in it δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. Plainly, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is something without which a sinful man cannot be saved; but what is it? The expression itself is of the utmost generality, and the various definite
meanings which have been assigned to it attempt to justify themselves as relevant, or inevitable, by connecting themselves with the context as a whole. There can be no doubt that the fundamental religious problem for the Apostle—that which made a Gospel necessary, that the solution of which could alone be Gospel—was, How shall a sinful man be righteous before God? To Luther, who had instinctive experimental sympathy with the Pauline standpoint, this suggested that δικαιοσύνη θεού meant a righteousness valid before God, of which a man can become possessed through faith; for such a righteousness (as the condition of salvation) is the first and last need of the sinful soul. In support of this view reference has been made to ver. 18, where ἁσέβεια and ἀδικία ἀνθρώπων are represented as the actual existing conditions which the δικ. θεού has to replace. No one can deny that a righteousness valid before God is essential to salvation, or that such a righteousness is revealed in the Gospel; but it is another question whether δικ. θεού is a natural expression for it. The general sense of scholars seems to have decided against it, but it seems quite credible to me that Ραυλ used δικ. θεού broadly to mean "a Divine righteousness," and that the particular shade of meaning which Luther made prominent can be legitimately associated even with these words. Until lately, scholars of the most opposite schools had agreed in finding the key to the expression δικ. θεού in two other Pauline passages, where it is contrasted with something else. Thus in chap. x. 3 δικ. θεού is opposed to man's ἄρξας δικαιοσύνη; and in Phil. iii. 9 the opposition is more precisely defined: μη δὲ γὰρ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐν θεού δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. If this contrast were allowed to tell here, the righteousness of which Paul speaks would be one of which God is the source or author; we do not bring it to Him, He reveals it for our acceptance. And this also, of course, answers to the facts: Gospel righteousness is a gift, not an achievement. But then, it is said, there is nothing in the passage to suggest such a contrast; there is not any emphasis whatever on θεοῦ to bring before the mind the idea of a righteousness not due to God, but a work of man's own. To this it may fairly be answered that the contrast did not need to be specially suggested; if it had not presented itself instinctively to those to whom Paul wrote, they would not only have missed the point of this expression, they would not have understood three lines anywhere. We must assume, upon the whole, in the recipients of Paul's epistles, a way of conceiving the Gospel answering broadly to his own; the invisible context, which we have to reproduce as best we can, may be more important sometimes than what we have in black and white. The broad sense of "a Divine righteousness" covers this second, which may be called the historical Protestant interpretation, as well as Luther's; and the fact seems to me an argument for that broader rendering. In view, however, of the undoubted difficulty of the phrase, new light would be welcome, and this has been sought in the O. T. use of δικαιοσύνη (τῆς), especially in the Psalms and in Is. xl. lxvi. See, e.g., Ps. xxxv. 24, 28, li. 14; Is. lvi. 1, lxii. 1; Ps. xcvi. 2. In the last of these passages we have a striking analogy to the one before us: ἔγνωρίσει κύριος τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, ἐναντίον τῶν ἔθνων ἀπέκτασε τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ; and in others we cannot but be struck with the parallelism of "righteousness" and "salvation," sometimes as things which belong to God (Ps. κcviii. 2), sometimes as things which belong to His people. On the strength of facts like these, Theod. Häring, in a stupendous programme entitled Δικ. θεοῦ bei Paulus (Tübingen, 1896), argues that δικαιοσύνη θεού means the judicial action of God in which He justifies His people and accomplishes their salvation. This fits into the context well enough. Put as Paul puts it—how shall man be just with God?—the religious problem is a judicial one, and its solution must be judicial. If the Gospel shows how God justifies (for of course it must be God, the only Judge of all, who does it), it shows everything: salvation is included in God's sentence of justification. Häring himself admits that this interpretation is
rather of philological than of religious import; this "rechtstelliges Waltent Gottes" cannot but have as its consequence "the justification of man, a righteousness which proceeds from God and is valid before God" (Δικ. Θεοῦ bei Paulus, S. 68); that is, this meaning leads by immediate inference to the other two. But it can by no means be carried through (any more than either of the other two) in all places where the phrase occurs; in iii. 5, e.g., Haring himself admits this; in iii. 25, 26, where he insists on the same sense as in i. 17, he does not so much as refer to the clause διά τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προεξουσίων ἀμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ αὐτοῦ, which, it is not too much to say, necessitates a different shade of meaning (for δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ there: see note). The advantage of his rendering is not so much that it simplifies the grammar, as that it revives the sense of a connection (which existed for the Apostle) between the Gospel he preached, and even the language he preached it in, and the anticipations of that Gospel in the Ο.Τ., and that it gives prominence to the saving character of God's justifying action. In substance all these three views are Biblical, Pauline and true to experience, whichever is to be vindicated on philological grounds. But the same cannot be said of another, according to which righteousness is here an attribute, or even the character, of God. That the Gospel is the supreme revelation of the character of God, and that the character of God is the source of the Gospel, no one can question. Certainly Paul would not have questioned it. But whether Paul conceived the righteousness which is an eternal attribute of God (cf. iii. 5) as essentially self-communicative—whether he would have said that God justifies (Δικαιοσύνη) the ungodly because he is himself Δικαιοσύνη—is another matter. The righteousness of God, conceived as a Divine attribute, may have appeared to Paul the great difficulty in the way of the justification of sinful man. God's righteousness in this sense is the sinner's condemnation, and no one will succeed in making him find in it the ground of his hope. What is wanted (always in consistency with God's righteousness as one of His inviolable attributes—the great point elaborated in chap. iii. 24-26) is a righteousness which, as man cannot produce it, must be from God, and which, once received, shall be valid before God; and this is what the Apostle (on the ground of Christ's death for sin) announces. But it introduces confusion to identify this the conception of an eternal and necessarily self-imparting righteousness of God. The Apostle, in chap. iii. and chap. v., takes our minds along another route. See Barmby in Expositor for August, 1896, and S. and H. ad loc. ἀποκαλύπτεται intimates in a new way that the Divine righteousness spoken of is from God: man would never have known or conceived it but for the act of God in revealing it. Till this ἀποκαλύπτεται it was a μυστήριον: cf. xvi. 25 f. ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. Precise definitions of this (e.g., Weiss's: the revelation of the δικ. Θεοῦ presupposes faith in the sense of believing acceptance of the Gospel, i.e., it is εκ πίστεως; and it leads to faith in the sense of saving reliance on Christ, i.e., it is εἰς πίστιν) strike one as arbitrary. The broad sense seems to be that in the revelation of God's righteousness for man's salvation everything is of faith from first to last. Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 18. This N.T. doctrine the Apostle finds announced before in Hab. ii. 14. ἐκ πίστεως in the quotation is probably to be construed with ἔζησεν. To take it with δίκαιος (he who is righteous by faith) would imply a contrast to another mode of being righteous (viz., by works) which there is nothing in the text to suggest. The righteous who trusted in Jehovah were brought by that trust safe through the impending judgment in Habakkuk's time; and as the subjective side of religion, the attitude of the soul to God, never varies, it is the same trust which is the condition of salvation still. The Gospel of God's righteousness is necessary, because the human race has no righteousness of its own. This is proved of the whole race (i. 18-iii. 20), but in these verses (18-32) first of the heathen. The emphasis lies throughout on the fact that they have sinned against light.

Ver. 18 f. The revelation of the righteousness of God (ver. 17) is needed in view of the revelation of His wrath, from which only δικ. Θεοῦ (whether it be His justifying sentence or the righteousness which He bestows on man) can deliver. ὄργη in the N.T. is usually
eschatological, but in 1 Thess. ii. 16 it refers to some historical judgment, and in John iii. 36 it is the condemnation of the sinner by God, with all that it involves, present and to come. The revelation of wrath here probably refers mainly to the final judgment: the primary character of Jesus in Paul's Gospel being ο ρυόμενος ημάς εκ της οργής της ερχομένης, 1 Thess. i. 10, Rom. v. 9; but it is not forcing it here to make it include God's condemnation uttered in conscience, and attested (ver. 24) in the judicial abandonment of the world. The revelation of the righteousness of God has to match this situation, and reverse it. ασέβεια is "positive and active irreligion": see Trench, Syn., § lxvi. Τhe religious influence of the material world. (See the magnificent illustration of this in Illo- 
worth's Divine Immanence, chap. ii., on the religious influence of the material world.) This knowledge involves duties, and men are without excuse because, when in possession of it, they did not perform these duties; that is, did not glorify as God the God whom they thus knew.

Ver. 21 ff. εις το ειναι αυτούς αναπολογήτους would naturally express purpose: to make men inexcusable is one, though not the only or the ultimate, intention of God in giving this revelation. Βut the διότι almost forces us to take the εις το as expressing result: so that they are inexcusable, because, etc. (see Burton's Moods and Tenses, § 411.) In vers. 21-23 the wrong course taken by humanity is described. Νature shows us that God is to be glorified and thanked, i.e., nature reveals Ήim to be great and good. Βut men were not content to accept the impression made on them by nature; they fell to reasoning upon it, and in their reasonings (διαλογισμοί, "perverse self-willed reasonings or speculations," S. and Η.) were made vain (εματαιώθησαν); the result stultified the process; their instinctive perception of God became confused and uncertain; their unintelligent heart, the seat of the moral consciousness, was darkened. In asserting their wisdom they became fools, and showed it conspicuously in their idolatries. Τhey resigned the glory of the incorruptible God (i.e., the incorruptible God, all glorious as He was, and as He was seen in nature to be), and took instead...
πετεινών καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἐρπετών. 24. διὸ καὶ παρέδωκεν Ἐρη. 19. αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεός ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοὺς ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν λαυτοῖς. 25. αὐτοῖς μετῆλλαξαν τὴν ἁλληλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ ἐσεβάζθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς τῆς πάθης ἀτμίας. Αἵμην. 26. διὰ τούτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεός εἰς πάθη ἀτμίας, αἱ τρισάτηνα ἁλληλείαν, εἰς τῶν ἁμαρτήσαν εἰς τὸν Θεόν ἐλεφάσθησαν καὶ ἐφεσάσθησαν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν. 27. δοκίμοις τε καὶ οἱ ἀρσενες ἁλληλείας εἰς τὴν φυσικὴν παρὰ φύσιν, ἀρσενες ἐν ἀρσενες εἰς θηλείας εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν. 28. Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ εδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεόν ἐξειν ἐπιγινώσκει παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεός εἰς αδόκιμον νόον, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα.
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ
I. 29-32.

29. πεπληρωμένους πάση αδικία, πορνεία, πονηρία, πλεονεξία, κακιά, 
μεστούς φθόνον, φόνον, ἐρίδος, δόλον, κακοπήθειας. 30. ψυχριστάς, 
καταδίκας, θεοστυγείς, ὄβριστας, ὑπερφανίας, ἀλάζων, ἐφευρέτας 
κακῶν, γονευόμενοι, απειθείς, 31. ασυνέτους, ασυνθέτους, αστάργους, ἀσ-
c Ch. ii. 26; πόνδους,2 ἀνελεήμονας. 30. οίτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνώτε 
δι οἱ τὰ τοιαύτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτῳ εἰσίν, οἱ μόνον αὕτα 
pοιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ 4 συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσιν.3

1 ἀσυνέτος om. with ΜΑΒΚ.
2 ασπονδοῦς CD'KL, vulg., Syr., is omitted by Ν'ABDG fuld.1 Probably a gloss on ασυνθέτος.
3 Westcott and Hort suppose some primitive error probable here; see their N. T., vol. 2, Appendix, p. 108. For ποιοῦν ... συνευδοκοῦσιν B reads ποιοῦντες ... συνευδοκοῦσιν; and the construction is then completed by various additions, such as οὐκ ἐνοησαν D, οὐκ ἐγνώσαν G, non intellererunt Orig. int.

Ver. 28 ff. In vers. 28-30 we have the third and last παρέδωκεν expanded. As they did not think fit, after trial made (ἀπεκύρωσαν), to keep God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a mind which cannot stand trial (ἀδόκιμον). The one thing answers to the other. Virtually, they pronounced the true God ἀδόκιμος, and would have none of Him; and He in turn gave them up to a νους ἀδόκιμος, a mind which is no mind and cannot discharge the functions of one, a mind in which the Divine distinctions of right and wrong are confused and lost, so that God’s condemnation cannot but fall on it at last. νοῦς is not only reason, but conscience; when this is perverted, as in the people of whom Paul speaks, or in the Canaanites, who did their abominations unto their Gods, the last deep of evil has been reached. Most of the words which follow describe sins of malignity or inhumanity rather than sensuality, but they cannot be classified.

tὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ is that which God has pronounced to be the right, and has thereby established as the proper moral order of the world. θάνατος is death, not as a natural period to life, but as a Divine sentence executed on sin: it is not to be defined as physical, or spiritual, or eternal; by all such abstract analysis it is robbed of part of its meaning, which is as wide as that of life or the soul. ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι: to be guilty of such things oneself, under the impulse of passion, is bad; but it is a more malignant badness to give a cordial and disinterested approval to them in others.

It is a mistake to read these verses as if they were a scientific contribution to comparative religion, but equally a mistake to ignore their weight. Paul is face to face with a world in which the vices he enumerates are rampant, and it is his deliberate judgment that these vices have a real connection with the pagan religions. Who will deny that he was both a competent observer and a competent judge? Religion and morality in the great scale hang together, and morality in the long run is determined by religion. Minds which accepted the religious ideas of Phoenicia, of Egypt or of Greece (as represented in the popular mythologies) could not be pure. Their morality, or rather their immorality, is conceived as a Divine judgment upon their religion; and as for their religion, nature itself, the Apostle argues, should have saved them from such ignorance of God, and such misconceptions of Him, as deformed every type of heathenism. A converted pagan (as much as Paul) would be filled with horror as he re-
II. 1. Διό "αναπολόγητος εἰ, ὃ ἀνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ὃ γὰρ ἔ.
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ  

Here only. ἀποκαλύψεως ἸΙΙ.

1.δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ, 6. δς ἀποδώσει εἰκάτων κατά τά ἐργα αὐτοῦ. 7. τοις μὲν καθ’ ὑπομονήν ἐργον ἄγαδον δόσαι καὶ 

τιμήν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ἵπτουσι, ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 8. τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἑριθείας, καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν τῇ διήθεια, πειθομένους δὲ τῇ ὀδηγίᾳ, θυμὸς καὶ 

δόξαν καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐνί πάσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τοῦ κακῶν, ἰουδαίου τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος. 10. 

δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμή καὶ εἰρήνη παρὰ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἄγαδον, 

1 ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν ADKLN3; om. μὲν ΝΒDG1. 

day of judgment" (Mt. xi. 22), "the last day" (John vi. 39), "the day of God" (2 Pet. iii. 12), "that day" (2 Tim. i. 12), even simply "the day" (1 Cor. iii. 13, Heb. x. 25). This great day 

is so defined in the Apostle's imagination that the article can be dispensed with. But see Ps. cx. 5. (cix. LXX.) It is a day when God is revealed as a 

righteous judge, in the sense of Psalm 1xxi. 13 (LXX). 

Ver. 6. The law enunciated in the 

Psalm, that God will render to every 

one according to his works, is valid 

within the sphere of redemption as well 

as independent of it. Paul the Christian 

recognises its validity as unreservedly as 

Saul the Pharisee would have done. The 

application of it may lead to very different 

results in the two cases, but the universal 

moral conscience, be it in bondage to 

evil, or emancipated by Christ, accepts it 

without demur. Paul had no feeling 

that it contradicted his doctrine of justi 

fication by faith, and therefore we are 

safe to assert that it did not contradict 

it. It seems a mistake to argue with 

Weiss that Paul is here speaking of the 

Yurnorm of the Divine righteousness, i.e., 

of the way in which the destiny of men 

would be determined if there were no 

Gospel. The Gospel does not mean that 

God denies Himself; He acts in it 

according to His eternal nature; and 

though Paul is speaking to men as under 

the law, the truth which he is insisting 

upon is one which is equally true whether 

men are under the law or under grace. It 

is not a little piece of the leaven of a 

Jewish or Pharisaic conception of God, 

not yet purged out, that is found here; 

but an eternal law of God's relation to 

man. 

Ver. 7. καθ’ ὑπομονήν ἐργον ἄγαδον: 

cf. the collective ἐργον = life-work" : 

S. and H.—in ver. 15 = "by way of sted-

fastness in well-doing". δόξαν = the 

glory of the future life, as revealed in the 

Risen Saviour. τιμήν = honour with 

God. ἀφθαρσίαν "proves that the goal 

of effort is nothing earthly" (Lipsius). 

ζωὴν αἰώνιον comprehends all these three: 

as its counterpart, θανάτος in ver. 31, 

involves the loss of all. ζωὴν is governed 

by ἀποδώσει. 

Ver. 8. τοῖς δὲ ἑριθείας: for the use 

of ἐκ, cf. iii. 26, τὸν ἐκ πίστεως ἤπειρον; 

Gal. iii. 7, οἱ ἐκ πίστεως; Ch. iv. 14, οἱ 

ἐκ νόμου. Lightfoot suggests that it is 

better to supply πράσσουσιν, and to 

construe ἑριθείας with the participle, 

as in Phil. i. 17 it is construed with 

καταγγέλλουσιν: but it is simpler not 

to supply anything. By "those who are 

of faction" or "factiousness" (Gal. ν. 

2ο, 2 Cor. xii. 2ο, Phil.i.16 f.,ii.3, Jas. 

iii.14, 16) the Apostle probably means 

men of a self-willed temper, using all 

arts to assert themselves against God. 

The result of this temper—the temper of 

the party man carried into the spiritual 

world—is seen in disobedience to the 

truth and obedience to unrighteousness. 

See note on ἀλήθεια, i. 18. The moral 

import of the word is shown by its use 

as the counterpart of ἀδικία. Cf the 

same contrast in 1 Cor. xiii. 6. To those 

who pursue this course there accrues 

indignation and wrath, etc. 

Ver. 9. ὀργή is wrath within; θυμὸς 

wrath as it overflows. ὀργὴ and στενο-

χωρία, according to Trench, Synonymis, 

§ 55, express very nearly the same thing, 

under different images: the former 

taking the image of pressure, the latter 

that of confinement in a narrow space. 

But to draw a distinction between them, 

based on etymology, would be very mis-

leading. In both pairs of words the 

same idea is expressed, only intensified 

by the reduplication. Supply ἄρτας for 

the changed construction. κατεργα-

ζομένου τοῦ κακῶν: who works at evil 

and works it out or accomplishes it. 

The Jew is put first, because as possessor 

of an express law this is conspicuously 

true of him. 

Ver. 10 f. εἰρήνη is probably =
6-15. ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

11. ού γάρ ἐστιν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. 12. δοὺς γὰρ ἄνωμος ἡμαρτον, ἄνωμος καὶ ἀπολογοῦται - καὶ δοὺς ἐν νόμῳ ἡμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κρίθησονται, 13. (οὐ γάρ οἱ ἐκροσαῖ τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ οἵ τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. 14. ὅταν γὰρ ἐθνεῖ τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχονται καὶ ὁινόμοις εἰσὶν νόμος; 15. οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν εἰς καρδίας αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροῦσιν αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως, καὶ μεταξύ ἀλλῶν ἀνωτέρων πρώτον παρὰ τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

1 ἐκροσαῖ τοῦ νόμου KL 17, other cursive, Marcion; om. τοῦ ΝΑBDG. παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ΝΑBDGK; om. τῷ BD. W. and H. bracket τῷ. τοιοῦτοι τοῦ νόμου D3KL 17, other cursive, Marcion; om. τοῦ ΝΑBDG.

W. and Η. bracket τῷ.

For τοιη D (a grammatical correction) ποιωσιν is found in ΝAB.

Προσωποληψία: a comprehensive term, rather = salvation, than peace in any narrower sense. The Jew still comes first, but it is only order that is involved: the same principle underlies the judgment for Jew and Gentile. It would amount to προσωποληψία in God, if He made a difference in the Jew’s favour because of his birth, or because he possessed the law. This is expanded in vers. 12-16: mere possession of the law does not count. Men are judged according to their works, whether they have or have not had such a special revelation of the Divine will as was given to Israel.

Ver. 12. ἄνωμος means “without law,” not necessarily “without the law.” In point of fact, no doubt, there was only one law given by God, the Mosaic, and Paul is arguing against those who imagined that the mere possession of it put them in a position of privilege as compared with those to whom it was not given; but he expresses himself with a generality which would meet the case of more such revelations of God’s will having been made to man. As many as sin “without law” shall also perish “without law.” Sin and perdition are correlative in Paul. ἀνάλογος (ix. 22, Phil. i. 28, iii. 19) answers to ἔλεγχος: it is final exclusion from the blessedness implied in this expression; having no part in the kingdom of God. Similarly, as many as sin “in law” shall be judged “by law.” The expression would cover any law, whatever it might be; really, the Mosaic law is the only one that has to be dealt with. The use of the aorist ἡμαρτον is difficult. Weiss says it is used as though the writer were looking back from the judgment day, when sin is simply past. Burton compares iii. 23 and calls it a “collective historical aorist”; in either case the English idiom requires the perfect: “all who have sinned.”

Ver. 13. This is the principle of judgment, for not the hearers of law (the Mosaic or any other) are just with God, but the law doers shall be justified. ἐκροσαῖ tends to mean “pupils,” constant hearers, who are educated in the law: see ver. 18. But no degree of familiarity with the law avails if it is not done. The forensic sense of δικαιοῦσθαι is apparent in this verse, where it is synonymous with δίκαιοι εἰναὶ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ: the latter obviously being the opposite of “to be condemned.” Whether there are persons who perfectly keep the law, is a question not raised here. The futures ἀπολούνται, κριθήσονται, δικαιοῦσθαι all refer to the day of final judgment.

Ver. 14. There is, indeed, when we look closely, no such thing as a man absolutely without the knowledge of God’s will, and therefore such a judgment as the Apostle has described is legitimate. Gentiles, “such as have not law” in any special shape, when they do by nature “the things of the law”—i.e., the things required by the law given to Israel, the only one known to the Apostle—are in spite of not having law (as is the supposition here) a law to themselves. ἔθνη is not “the Gentiles,” but “Gentiles as such”—persons who can be characterised as “without law.” The supposition made in τα μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα is that of the Jews; and the Apostle’s argument is designed to show that though formally, it is not substantially true.

Ver. 15. οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται: the relative is qualitative: “inasmuch as
they shew... τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου is the work which the law prescribes, collectively. “Written on their hearts,” when contrasted with the law written on the tables of stone, is equal to “unwritten”; the Apostle refers to what the Greeks called ἀγράφος νόμος. To the Greeks, however, this was something greater and more sacred than any statute, or civil constitution; to the Apostle it was less than the great revelation of God’s will, which had been made and interpreted to Israel, but nevertheless a true moral authority. There is a triple proof that Gentiles, who are regarded as not having law, are a law to themselves.

(1) The appeal to their conduct: as interpreted by the Apostle, their conduct evinces, at least in some, the possession of a law written on the heart; (2) the action of conscience: it joins its testimony, though it be only an inward one, to the outward testimony borne by their conduct; and (3) their thoughts. Their thoughts bear witness to the existence of a law in them, inasmuch as in their mutual intercourse (μεταξύ αλλήλων) these thoughts are busy bringing accusations, or in rarer cases (ἡ καὶ) putting forward defences, i.e., in any case, exercising moral functions which imply the recognition of a law. This seems to me the only simple and natural explanation of a rather perplexed phrase. We need not ask for what Paul does not give, the object to κατηγοροῦντων or ἀπολογοῦμένων: it may be any person, act or situation, which calls into exercise that power of moral judgment which shows that the Gentiles, though without the law of Moses, are not in a condition which makes it impossible to judge them according to their works. The construction in ix. 1 suggests that the συν views the witness of conscience, reflecting on conduct, as something added to the first instinctive consciousness of the nature of an action. συνείδησις does not occur in the Gospels except in John viii. 9; twice only in Acts, xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, both times in speeches of St. Paul; twenty times in the Pauline epistles. It occurs in the O.T. only in Ecc. x. 20 (curse not the King, εν συνείδησιν σου = ne in cogitationequidem tua): the ordinary sense is found, for the first time in Biblical Greek, in Sap. xvii. 11. It is a quasi-philosophical word, much used by the Stoics, and belonging rather to the Greek than the Hebrew inheritance of Paul.

Ver. 16. The day meant here is the same as that in ver. 5. Westcott and Hort only put a comma after ἀπολογοῦμένων, but a longer pause is necessary, unless we are to suppose that only the day of judgment wakes the conscience and the thoughts of man into the moral activity described in ver. 15. This supposition may have some truth in it, but it is not what the Apostle’s argument requires. The proof he gives that Gentiles are “a law to themselves” must be capable of verification now, not only at the last day. Hence ver. 16 is really to be taken with the main verbs of the whole paragraph, ἀπολογοῦσιν, κρίνεται, δικαίωσονται: the great principle of ver. 6—ἀποδώσει εκάστω κατὰ τα ἔργα αὐτοῦ—will be exhibited in action on the day on which God judges the secret things of men through Christ Jesus. A final judgment belonged to Jewish theology, and perhaps, though this is open to question, one in which the Messiah acted as God’s representative; but what Paul teaches here does not rest merely on the transference of a Jewish Messianic function to Jesus. If there is anything certain in the N.T. it is that this representation of Jesus as judge of the world rests on the words of our Lord Himself (Mt. vii. 22 f., xxv. 31 ff.). To assert it was an essential part of the Gospel as preached by Paul: cf. Acts xvii. 31. (Baldensperger, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, S. 85 f., thinks that in the circles of Jewish Pietism, in the century before Christ, the Messiah was already spoken of as the Divine judge, and as sharing the titles and attributes of Jehovah.)

In vers. 17-24 the Apostle brings to a point the argument for which he has been clearing the way in vers. 1-16.
17. "I be 1 ou 'Ioudaioi 'eponomazi, kai epapanape to vym, kai I Here only
kaukazai en Thew. 18. kai ginoukeis to thelma, kai dokimazeis ta
"diahferonta, " kathedoumevnoi ek tou nomou. 19. pteivbas te seautoj
Phil. l. 10. n 1 Cor. xiv. 6. 19. einae tufiwv, any tov en skotei, 20. "paeidetnhn adronon
Heb. xii. 9. didaskalon nuptwv, exwta thn morfwn ths ginwsew kai th

1 ei de NAABDK: de DL Syr. ei de has probably been changed into de (Alford)
to avoid the anacoluthon. epapanape th vym DKL 17; om. to NAABDK.

The Jew makes much of the possession of the law, but when we pass from
possession to practice, he is not a whit better than the "lawless" Gentile. The
construction is not quite regular, but the meaning is clear. The natural order
would be: If thou bearest the name of Jew, and restest upon the law, and yet
in thy conduct settest the law at nought, art thou not equally under
condemnation with sinners of the Gentiles? But the construction is
interrupted at the end of ver. 20, and what ought in logic to be part of the
protasis—if in thy conduct thou settest the law at nought—is made
a sort of apodosis, at least grammatically and rhetorically: dost thou, in spite
of all these privileges, nevertheless set the law at nought? The real conclusion,
which Paul needs for his argument, is not thou then in the same
condemnation with the Gentiles? But a certain ambiguity remains in
dokimazein ta diahferonta: it may mean either (1) to distinguish, by testing,
between things which differ—i.e., to discriminate experimentally between good
and evil; or (2) to approve, after testing, the things which are more excellent.
There are no grounds on which we can decide positively for either.

Ver. 19 f. pteivbas te k.t.l. The
ta indicates that this confidence is the
immediate and natural result of what
precedes: it is not right, in view of all
the N.T. examples, to say that pteivbas
suggests an unjustifiable confidence,
though in some cases, as in the present,
it is so. Cf. 2 Cor. x. 7, Lk. xviii. 9.
The blind, those in darkness, the foolish,
the babes, are all names for the heathen:
the Jew is confident that the Gentiles
must come to school to him. paeidetn
has reference to moral as well as intel-
lectual discipline: and afrones are, as
in the O.T. (Ps. xiii. 1, LXX), persons
without moral intelligence. For the
other figures in this verse, cf. Mt. xiv.
14, Is. xlii. 6, 9, xlii. 6. The confidence
of the Jew is based on the fact that he
possesses in the law "the outline of
knowledge and truth". Lipsius puts a
strong sense upon morfwn—die leib-
hafte Verkörpierung: as if the Jew
conceived that in the Mosaic law the
knowledge and the truth of God were
incorporated bodily. Possibly he did,
and in a sense it was so, for the Mosaic
law was a true revelation of God and
His will: but the only other instance of
morfwn in the N.T. (2 Tim. iii. 5:
Διδάσκεις ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. 21. ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἔτερον, σεαυτὸν οὖν διδάσκεις; ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν, κλέπτεις; 22. ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν, μοιχεύεις; ὁ ββελουσόμενος τὰ εἰδώλα, ἱεροσυλείς; 23. δε ἐν νόμῳ καυχάσατε, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάτεις; 24. "τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δὲ υμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεῖς," καθὼς γέγραπται. 25. Περιτομή μὲν γὰρ ὑφελεῖ, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης; ἐὰν δὲ παραβάσθης νόμου ἦς, ἡ περιτομὴ σου ἐχοντες μάρφωνι εὐσεβείας rather suggests the same disparaging note which here belongs to πέποιθας. The μάρφωνι τῆς γνώσεως is in point of fact only a form: valuable as the outline or definition of truth was, which the Jew possessed in the law, it was in reality ineffective, so far as the practical authority of the law in the Jew's conduct was concerned.

Ver. 21. Here the grammatical apodosis begins, the οὖν resuming all that has been said in vers. 17-20. κηρύσσων and λέγων are virtually verbs of command: hence the infinitives. The rhetorical question implies that the Jew does not teach himself, and that he does break the law he would enforce on others.

Ver. 22. Ββελουσόμενος properly expresses physical repulsion: thou that shinkest in horror from idols. Cf. Dan. ix. 27, Mk. xiii. 14. ἱεροσυλείς: dost thou rob temples, and so, for the sake of gain, come in contact with abominations without misgiving? This is the meaning, and not, Dost thou rob the temple, by keeping back the temple dues? as has been suggested. The crime of ἱεροσυλία is referred to in Acts xix. 37, and according to Josephus, Αντ., i ν., 8, 10, it was expressly forbidden to the Jews: μὴ συλάν ιερὰ ξενικὰ, μὴ δ' ἐν ἐκνομοσύνῃ οὐκ ἔχων κειμήλιον λαμβάνειν. Ver. 23. Here again the construction is changed, and probably the use of the relative instead of the participle suggests that the sentence is to be read, not as interrogative, but as declaratory. "Thou who makest it thy boast that thou possessest a law, by the transgressing of that law dishonourest God: that is the sum of the whole matter, and thy sole distinction in contrast with the heathen." Ver. 24. And this is only what Scripture bids us expect. The Scripture quoted is Is. lii. 5, LXX. The LXX interpret the Hebrew by inserting δι' ὄμοις and ἐν τοῖς ἑθνεῖς. Both insertions are in the line of the original meaning. It was owing to the misery and helplessness of the people of God, in exile among the nations, that the heathen scoffed at the Divine name. "The God of Israel is not able to deliver His people: He is no God." Paul here gives the words quite another turn. God, he says, is now blasphemed among the nations because of the inconsistency between the pretensions of the Jews and their behaviour. As if the heathen were saying: "Like God, like people: what a Divinity the patron of this odious race must be". It is surely not right to argue (with Sanday and Headlam) that the throwing of the formula of quotation to the end shows that Paul is conscious of quoting freely: "it is almost as if it were an after-thought that the language he has just used is a quotation at all". The quotation is as relevant as most that the Apostle uses. He never cares for the context or the original application. When he can express himself in Scripture language he feels that he has the Word of God on his side, and all through this epistle he nailshis arguments so, and insistson the confirmation they thus obtain. What the closing of the sentence with καθώς γέγραπται suggests is not that it occurred to Paul after he had finished that he had almost unconsciously been using Scripture: it is rather that there is a challenge in the words, as if he had said, Let him impugn this who dare contest the Word of God.

In vers. 25-29 another Jewish plea for preferential treatment in the judgment is considered. The μὲν in ver. 25 (περιτομῇ μὲν γὰρ ὑφελεῖ) implies that this plea has no doubt something in it, but it suggests that there are considerations on the other side which in point of fact make it inapplicable or invalid here. It is these considerations which the Apostle proceeds to explain, with a view to clenching the argument that the wrath of God revealed from heaven impends over Jew and Gentile alike.

Ver. 25. περιτομῇ: the absence of the article suggests that the argument may
be extended to everything of the same character as circumcision. *ὑφελεί* : Circumcision was the seal of the covenant, and as such an assurance given to the circumcised man that he belonged to the race which was the heir of God’s promises. That was undeniably a great advantage, just as it is an advantage now to be born a Christian; but if the actual inheriting of the promises has any moral conditions attached to it (as Paul proceeds to show that it has), then the advantage of circumcision lapses unless these are fulfilled. Now the persons contemplated here have not fulfilled them. *ἵνα νόμον πράσση* : the habitual practice of the law is involved in this expression: as Vaughan says, it is almost like a compound word, “if thou be a law doer”. Similarly *παραβάτης νόμου* a law transgressor. The law, of course, is the Mosaic one, but it is regarded simply in its character as law, not as being definitely this law: hence the absence of the article. *γέγονε* : by the very fact becomes and remains.

Ver. 26 f. Here the inference is drawn from the principle laid down in ver. 25. This being so, Paul argues, if the uncircumcision maintain the just requirements of the law, shall not his circumcision be accounted circumcision, *κρινεί* is emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. *Cf*. Mt. xii. 41 f. *κρινεῖ* emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. Cf. Gal. v. 3. *ἡ ἀκροβυστία* at the beginning of the verse is equivalent to the Gentiles *ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, the *ἀνθρώπου* individualises a person who is conceived as keeping the law, though not circumcised. As he has done what circumcision bound the Jew to do, he will be treated as if in the Jew’s position: his uncircumcision will be reckoned as circumcision. *λογισθήσεται* may be merely a logical future, but like the other futures in vers. 12-16 it is probably more correct to render it to what will take place at the last judgment. The order of the words in ver. 27 indicates that the question is not continued: “and thus the uncircumcision shall judge thee,” *εάν* νόμον πράσσῃ : the habitual practice of the law is involved in this expression: as Vaughan says, it is almost like a compound word, “if thou be a law doer”. Similarly *παραβάτης νόμου* a law transgressor. The law, of course, is the Mosaic one, but it is regarded simply in its character as law, not as being definitely this law: hence the absence of the article. *γέγονε* : by the very fact becomes and remains.

Ver. 26 f. Here the inference is drawn from the principle laid down in ver. 25. This being so, Paul argues, if the uncircumcision maintain the just requirements of the law, shall not his circumcision be accounted circumcision, *κρινεί* is emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. *Cf*. Mt. xii. 41 f. *κρινεῖ* emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. Cf. Gal. v. 3. *ἡ ἀκροβυστία* at the beginning of the verse is equivalent to the Gentiles *ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, the *ἀνθρώπου* individualises a person who is conceived as keeping the law, though not circumcised. As he has done what circumcision bound the Jew to do, he will be treated as if in the Jew’s position: his uncircumcision will be reckoned as circumcision. *λογισθήσεται* may be merely a logical future, but like the other futures in vers. 12-16 it is probably more correct to render it to what will take place at the last judgment. The order of the words in ver. 27 indicates that the question is not continued: “and thus the uncircumcision shall judge thee,” *εάν* νόμον πράσσῃ : the habitual practice of the law is involved in this expression: as Vaughan says, it is almost like a compound word, “if thou be a law doer”. Similarly *παραβάτης νόμου* a law transgressor. The law, of course, is the Mosaic one, but it is regarded simply in its character as law, not as being definitely this law: hence the absence of the article. *γέγονε* : by the very fact becomes and remains.

Ver. 26 f. Here the inference is drawn from the principle laid down in ver. 25. This being so, Paul argues, if the uncircumcision maintain the just requirements of the law, shall not his circumcision be accounted circumcision, *κρινεί* is emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. *Cf*. Mt. xii. 41 f. *κρινεῖ* emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. Cf. Gal. v. 3. *ἡ ἀκροβυστία* at the beginning of the verse is equivalent to the Gentiles *ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, the *ἀνθρώπου* individualises a person who is conceived as keeping the law, though not circumcised. As he has done what circumcision bound the Jew to do, he will be treated as if in the Jew’s position: his uncircumcision will be reckoned as circumcision. *λογισθήσεται* may be merely a logical future, but like the other futures in vers. 12-16 it is probably more correct to render it to what will take place at the last judgment. The order of the words in ver. 27 indicates that the question is not continued: “and thus the uncircumcision shall judge thee,” *εάν* νόμον πράσσῃ : the habitual practice of the law is involved in this expression: as Vaughan says, it is almost like a compound word, “if thou be a law doer”. Similarly *παραβάτης νόμου* a law transgressor. The law, of course, is the Mosaic one, but it is regarded simply in its character as law, not as being definitely this law: hence the absence of the article. *γέγονε* : by the very fact becomes and remains.

Ver. 26 f. Here the inference is drawn from the principle laid down in ver. 25. This being so, Paul argues, if the uncircumcision maintain the just requirements of the law, shall not his circumcision be accounted circumcision, *κρινεί* is emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. *Cf*. Mt. xii. 41 f. *κρινεῖ* emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. Cf. Gal. v. 3. *ἡ ἀκροβυστία* at the beginning of the verse is equivalent to the Gentiles *ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, the *ἀνθρώπου* individualises a person who is conceived as keeping the law, though not circumcised. As he has done what circumcision bound the Jew to do, he will be treated as if in the Jew’s position: his uncircumcision will be reckoned as circumcision. *λογισθήσεται* may be merely a logical future, but like the other futures in vers. 12-16 it is probably more correct to render it to what will take place at the last judgment. The order of the words in ver. 27 indicates that the question is not continued: “and thus the uncircumcision shall judge thee,”
the same remark applies to circumcision itself. The most natural way to read the Greek seems to me to be this. "Not he who is so outwardly (δὲ ἐν τῷ φανέρῳ) is a Jew (in the true sense), nor is that which is outward, in flesh, the true circumcision; but he who is inwardly a Jew (is the true Jew), and heart circumcision, in spirit, not in letter (is the true circumcision)." Thus in the first pair of clauses there is not anything, strictly speaking, to be supplied; the subject is in each case involved in the article. But in the second pair the predicate has in both cases to be supplied from the first—in the one case, Ἰουδαῖος; in the other, περιτομή. Heart circumcision is an idea already familiar to the O.T. From the Book of Deuteronomy (x.16, for the meaning comp. xxx.6) it passed to the prophetic writings: Jer. iv. 4. The contrary expression—uncircumcised in heart and in flesh—is also found: Jer. ix. 26, Ez. xiv. 7. A difficulty is created by the expression ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι. After ver. 28 we rather expect ἐν πνεύματι οὐ σάρκι: the circumcision being conceived as in one and not another part of man's nature. Practically it is in this sense most commentators take the words: thus Gifford explains them by "a circumcision which does not stop short at outward conformity to the law, but extends to the sphere of the inner life". But there is no real correspondence here, such as there is in ἐν πνεύματι σάρκι; and a comparison of 2 Cor. iii., a chapter pervaded by the contrast of πνεύμα and γράμμα, suggests a different rendering. πνεύμα and γράμμα are not the elements in which, but the powers by which, the circumcision is conceived to be effected. "Heart circumcision," without any qualifying words, expresses completely that contrast to circumcision in the flesh, which is in Paul's mind; and what he adds in the new words, ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι is the new idea that heart circumcision, which alone deserves the name of circumcision, is achieved by the Spirit of God, not by the written law. Whether there is such a thing as this heart circumcision, wrought by the Spirit, among the Jews, is not explicitly considered; but it is not a refutation of this interpretation to point out that πνεύμα in 2 Cor. is characteristically the gift of the New Covenant. For the very conclusion to which Paul wishes to lead is that the New Covenant is as necessary for the Jew as for the Gentile. οὐ δὲ ἐπαινοῦσ εἰς τ.λ. The οὐ is masculine, and refers to the ideal Jew. The name Ἰουδαῖος (from Judah = praise, Gen. xxix. 35) probably suggested this remark. οὐκ ἐζ ἐπαινούσεν: the love of praise from each other, and religious vanity, are Jewish characteristics strongly commented on by our Lord (John v. 44. xii. 42 f.).

Chapter III.—Vers. 1-8. It might easily seem, at this point, as if the Apostle's argument had proved too much. He has shown that the mere possession of the law does not exempt the Jew from judgment, but that God requires its fulfilment; he has shown that circumcision in the flesh, though it be of the covenant and pledge of its promises, is only of value if it represent inward heart circumcision; he has, it may be argued, reduced the Jew to a position of entire equality with the Gentile. But the consciousness of the Jewish race must protest against such a conclusion. "Salvation is of the Jews" is a word of Christ Himself, and the Apostle is obliged to meet this instinctive protest of the ancient people of God. The whole of the difficulties it raises are more elaborately considered in chaps. ix.-xi.; here it is only discussed so far as to make plain that it does not validate the arguments of chap. ii., nor bar the development of the Apostle's theology. The advantage of the Jew is admitted; it is admitted that his unbelief may even act as a foil to God's faithfulness, setting it in more glorious relief; but it is insisted, that if God's character as righteous judge of the world is to be maintained—as it must be—these admissions do not exempt the Jew from that liability to judgment which has just been demonstrated. The details of the interpretation, especially in ver. 7 f., are somewhat perplexed.

Ver. 1 f. τὸ περισσότερον τοῦ Ἰουδαίου is that which the Jew has "over and above" the Gentile.
ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΘΕΝΤΑΤΑ 'ΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ. 3. ΤΙ ΓΑΡ, ΕΙ ΗΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑΝ ΤΙΝΕΣ; Α. ΑΚΤΣΟΥ. ΖΟΤΟ ΠΟΙΟ ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΣΕΙΣ; 4. ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΓΙΝΕΘΟΥ ΔΕ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΑΛΗΘΗΣ ΠΑΣ ΠΟΙΟΣ ΠΕΙΤΗΣ ΚΑΘΩΙ ΓΕΓΡΑΠ- ΤΑΙ, "ΟΠΟΣ ΔΝ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΤΗΣ ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΛΟΓΙΟΙΣ ΣΟΥ, ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΗΤΗΣ ΕΝ ΤΟ".

1 For καθως ΝΒ read καθατηρ. νικητης BGKL, etc., νικητης ΝΑΔΕ. For the distribution of authorities here, see note on πρωτον, page 589, note 2. The combination of Β with such later Western authorities as G here also lessens its weight; its reading is probably part of that Western element which it contains, i.e., Β and G here represent practically one authority. But the other group of MSS. represents at least two groups of witnesses, the " neutral" in ΝΑ, and the Western in D, and its reading is therefore to be preferred. Weiss, however (Textkritik der paulinischen Briefe, S. 40), would reject the indicative both here and in 2 Cor. xii. 21. The change of ει and η he regards as accidental; in KLP it occurs some sixty times.

ΤΕΡΙΤΟΡΙΘΣ Ι= "What good does his circumcision do him?" ΕΝΟΥΓΟΙ ΕΝΤΑΡΤΗΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΤΡΟΤΤΟΝ; however you choose to view the position. τροττον μιν suggests that such an enumeration of Jewish prerogatives might have been made here as is given at length in ix. 4 f. In point of fact, Paul mentions one only, in which the whole force of the Jewish objection to the arguments of chap. ii. is contained, and after disposing of it feels that he has settled the question, and passes on. The first, most weighty, and most far-reaching advantage of the Jews, is that they were entrusted with the oracles of God. They were made in His grace the depositaries and guardians of revelation. τα λόγια του θεού must be regarded as the contents of revelation, having God as their author, and at the time when Paul wrote, identical with the Ο.Τ. Scriptures. In the LXX the word λόγιον occurs mainly as the equivalent of πηγαν, which in various passages (e.g., Ps. cxix. 38) has the sense of " promise"; in ordinary Greek it means " oracle," the Divine word given at a shrine, and usually referring to the future; hence it would be natural in using it to think of the prophetic rather than the statutory element in the O.T., and this is what is required here. The O.T. as a whole, and as a revelation of God, has a forward look; it anticipates completion and excites hope; and it is not too much to say that this is suggested by describing it as τα λόγια του θεού. The sum of it was that God had promised to His people " a future and a hope." (Jer. xxix. 11; see margin, R.V.), and this promise seemed threatened by the argument of the last chapter.

Ver. 3 f. ΤΙ ΓΑΡ; For how? i.e., Well then, how stands the case? Cf. Phil. i. 18. ει ήπίστησαν τινες= if some did disbelieve. It is not necessary to render this, with reference to επιστεύθησαν in ver. 2, " if some proved faithless to their trust." What is in Paul's mind is that " the oracles of God" have had their fulfilment in Christ, and that those to whom they were entrusted have in some cases (whether few or many he does not here consider) refused their faith to that fulfilment. Surely it is no proper inference that their unbelief must make God's faithfulness of no effect. Ηε has kept Ηις promise, and as far as it lay with Him has maintained the original advantage of the Jews, as depositaries and first inheritors of that promise, whatever reception they may have given to its fulfilment. Away with the thought of any reflection upon Him! When the case is stated between God and man there can only be one conclusion: let God come out (γινέσθω) true, and every man a liar; let Him be just, and every man condemned. This agrees with the words of Scripture itself in Ps. li. (l.) 6, which Paul quotes exactly after the LXX: the Hebrew is distinctly different, but neither it nor the original context are regarded. ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΛΟΓΙΟΙΣ ΣΟΥ is a translation of Hebrew words which mean " when Thou speakest," i.e., apparently, when Thou pronouncest sentence upon man; here the sense must be, " that Thou mayest be pronounced just in respect of what Thou hast spoken," i.e., the λόγια, the oracles or promises entrusted to Israel. ΝΙΚΗΤΗΣ: win thy case (see note on text). Burton, Moods and Tenses, §§ 198, 199. ΕΝ ΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΝΕΒΔΑΙ: Probably the infinitive is passive: " when thou art judged "; not middle, " when thou submittest thy case to the
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

III.

κρίνεσθαι σε ἑκρίνεσθαισε". 5. εἰ δὲ ἢ ἀδικία ἦμῶν Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην "συνίστησι, ἐκ τί έρούμεν; μὴ ἀδικος ὁ Θεός ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὁργήν; καὶ τὰ ἀνθρωπον λέγω. 6. μὴ γένοιτο ἐπεὶ πῶς κρίνει ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; 7. εἰ γὰρ ἢ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἔμι ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἐπὶ κάθω ὡς ἀμαρτωλός κρίνειμα; 8. καὶ μὴ καθὼς εἰ ἐκ τις πίνει ἡμᾶς λέγειν, "Οτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά ἵνα ἐλθῇ τὰ ἀγαθά; ἵνα τὸ κρίμα ἐπικάλου ἕστι.

1 εἰ γὰρ BDEGKL, etc.; εἰ δὲ ΝΑ vulg. (some MSS., though others si enim).

This case is to be decided by the same considerations as the last. Tischd. and W. and H. put εἰ δὲ in their text; W. and H. put εἰ γὰρ in marg. On the strange but frequent exchange of δε and γαρ see Weiss, Textkritik, 66 f.

καὶ καθὼς; om. καὶ BK. W. and H. bracket.

judge ". The quotation from Ps. cxvi. 12, πᾶς ἀνθρώπως ψεύστης, is not important: the main thing, as the formal quotation which follows shows, is the vindication of God from the charge of breach of faith with the Jews in making Christianity the fulfilment of His promises to them.

Ver. 5 f. Here another attempt is made to invalidate the conclusion of chap. ii., that the Jew is to be judged "according to his works," exactly like the Gentile. If the argument of ver. 3 f. is correct, the unbelief of the Jews actually serves to set off the faithfulness of God: it makes it all the more conspicuous; how then can it leave them exposed to judgment! This argument is generalised in ver. 5 and answered in ver. 6. "If our unrighteousness" (in the widest sense, ἀδικία being generalised from ἀνισία, ver. 3) demonstrates (cf. v. 8) God's righteousness (also in the widest sense, δικαιοσύνη being generalised from πίστις, ver. 3), what shall we say? i.e., what inference shall we draw? Surely not that God, He who inflicts the wrath due to unrighteousness at the last day (i.τ.8), is Himself unrighteous, to speak as men speak. Away with the thought! If this were so, how should God judge the world? That God does judge the world at last is a fixed point both for Paul and those with whom he argues; hence every inference which conflicts with it must be summarily set aside. God could not judge at all if He were unjust; therefore, since He does judge, He is not unjust, not even in judging men whose unrighteousness may have served as a foil to His righteousness. It is not thus that the conclusions of chap. ii. can be evaded by the Jew. ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὁργήν: the "attributive participle equivalent to a relative clause, may, like a relative clause, convey a subsidiary idea of cause, purpose, condition or concession" (Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 428, who renders here: is God unrighteous, who (because He) visiteth with wrath). κατά ἀνθρώπον λέγω: cf. Gal. iii. 15, Rom. vi. 19, 1 Cor. ix. 8. There is always something apologetic in the use of such expressions. Men forget the difference between God and themselves when they contemplate such a situation as that God should be unrighteous; obviously it is not to be taken seriously. Still, in human language such suppositions are made, and Paul begs that in his lips they may not be taken for more than they really mean.

Ver. 7 f. These verses are extremely difficult, and are interpreted variously according to the force assigned to the τί έτικα γώ of ver. 7. Who or what supplies the contrast to this emphatic "I also." Some commentators, Gifford, for instance, find it in God, and God's interest in the judgment. If my lies sets in relief the truth of God, and so magnifies His glory, is not that enough? Why, after God has had this satisfaction from my sin, "why further am I also on my side brought to judgment as a sinner!" It is a serious, if not a final objection to this, that it merely repeats the argument of ver. 5, which the Apostle has already refuted. Its very generality, too—for any man, as Gifford himself says, may thus protest against being judged—is lessens its relevance: for Paul is discussing not human evasions of God's judgment, but Jewish objections to his previous arguments. Lipsius finds the contrast to κάθω in the Gentile world. A Jew is the speaker, or at all events the Apostle speaks in the character of one: "if my unbelief does magnify His faithfulness,
is not that all that is required? Why am I, too, like the rest of the world, whose relation to God is so different, and whose judgment is so necessary, still brought into judgment?" This would be legitimate enough, probably, if it were not for what follows. But the slander of ver. 8, which forms part of the same question as τί έτι κάγω κ.τ.λ., and to which reference is made again in chap. vi. 1, 15, had not the Jews, but the Apostle in his Christian character, for its object; hence it seems preferable to take the καγώ as referring strictly to himself. That Paul would come into judgment, in spite of the fact that his faithlessness in becoming a Christian had only set off the faithfulness of God to Israel, no unbelieving Jew questioned: and Paul turns this conviction of theirs (with which, of course, he agrees, as far as it asserts that he will be judged) against themselves. If he, for his part, cannot evade judgment, on the ground that his sin (as they think it) has been a foil to God's righteousness, no more can they on their part: they and he are in one position, and must be judged together: to condemn him is to expose themselves to condemnation; that is his point. The argument of ver. 7 is both an argumentum ad hominem and an argumentum ad rem: Paul borrows from his opponents the premises that he himself is to be judged as a sinner, and that his lie has set off God's truth: there is enough in these premises to serve his purpose, which is to show that the two propositions which do not exclude each other in his case do not do so in their case either. But, of course, he would interpret the second in a very different way from them. The question is continued in ver. 8, though the construction is changed by the introduction of the parentheses with καθώς and the attachment to λέγειν δτι of the clause which would naturally have gone with τί μη; If judgment could be evaded by sinning to the glory of God, so Paul argues, he and other Christians like him might naturally act on the principle which slander imputed to them—that of doing evil that good might come. No doubt the slander was of Jewish origin. The doctrine that righteousness is a gift of God, not to be won by works of law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, can always be misrepresented as immoral: "sin the more, it will only the more magnify grace." Paul does not stoop to discuss it. The judgment that comes on those who by such perversions of reason and conscience seek to evade all judgment is just. This is all he has to say.

Vers. 9-20. In these verses the Apostle completes his proof of the universality of sin, and of the liability of all men, without exception, to judgment. The τί ένον of ver. 9 brings back the argument from the digression of vers. 1-8. In those verses he has shown that the historical prerogative of the Jews, as the race entrusted with the oracles of God, real and great as it is, does not exempt them from the universal rule that God will reward every man according to his works (ii. 6); here, according to the most probable interpretation of προεχόμεθα, he puts himself in the place of his fellow-countrymen, and imagines them asking, "Are we surpassed? Is it the Gentiles who have the advantage of us, instead of our having the advantage of them?"

Ver. 9. Τί ένον; What then? i.e., how, then, are we to understand the situation? It is necessary to take these words by themselves, and make προεχόμεθα a separate question: the answer to τί could not be ου, but must be ουδέν. The meaning of προεχόμεθα has been much discussed. The active προέχειν means to excel or surpass. Many have taken προεχόμεθα a separate question: the answer to τί could not be ου, but must be οδινά. The ordinary meaning of the middle would be "to put forward on one's own account, as an excuse, or defence." If τί ένον προεχόμεθα could be taken together, it might certainly be rendered, What then is our plea? but it is impossible to take προεχόμεθα in this sense without an object, and impossible, as already explained, to make this combination. The only alternative is to regard προεχόμεθα as passive: What then? are we excelled? This is the meaning adopted in the R.V. "Do we excuse ourselves?" If προεχόμεθα could be taken together, it might certainly be rendered, What then is our plea? but it is impossible to take προεχόμεθα in this sense without an object, and impossible, as already explained, to make this combination. The only alternative is to regard προεχόμεθα as passive: What then? are we excelled? This is the meaning adopted in the R.V. "Are we in worse case than they?" It is supported by Lightfoot. Wetstein quotes one example from Plut. de Stoic. contrad., 1038 D.: τον ἀγαθόν πᾶσι προσέχει,
"Oti oúk éstw dikaios oúdè elè. 11. Oúk éstw o sunív,1 oúk éstw ó ekzhýwv tòn Theòv. 12. Pántes éfélwvan, òma ëxerwòsthv twv. 1. o sunív; omn. o ABG vulg.; ins. NDKL. The o before ekzhýwv is also omitted BG, and in both places, in text though not in marg., by W. and H. (marg., o ëxerwòsthv). This ëxerwòsthv is the reading in B.

1 ëxerwòsthv NABD1DG. oúk éstw tòllwn, so ABG; but N D have o tòllwn. W. and H. put the former in text, the latter in marg. The second oúk éstw is om. in B 679 and in the marg. of W. and H.

kat' oúdèn prooxomávous ùpò tòu Díou:
"who are in nothing surpassed by Zeus". The word would thus express the surprise of the Jew at seeing his prerogatives disappear; "if this line of argument be carried further," he may be supposed to say, "the relative positions of Jew and Gentile will turn out to be the very reverse of what we have believed". This is the idea which is negative in oú pántos. Strictly speaking, the o should modify pántos, and the meaning be "not in every respect": in some respects (for instance, the one referred to in ver. 2), a certain superiority would still belong to the Jew. But to allude to this seems irrelevant, and there is no difficulty in taking the words to mean, "No: not in any way". See Winer, p. 633 f. "We are not surpassed at all, we who are Jews, for we have already brought against Jews and Greeks alike the charge of being all under sin." ùpò aúmartan, cf. vii. 14, Gal. iii. 22. The idea is that of being under the power of sin, as well as simply sinful: men are both guilty and unable to escape from that condition.

Ver. 10. The long series of quotations, beginning with this verse, has many points of interest. The káthos gégrápha, with which it is introduced, shows that the assertion of indiscriminate sinfulness which the Apostle has just made, corresponds with Scripture testimony. It is as if he had said, I can express my opinion in inspired words, and therefore it has God upon its side. The quotations themselves are taken from various parts of the O.T. without distinction; no indication is given when the writer passes from one book to another. Thus vv. 10-12 are from Ps. xiv. 1-3; ver. 13 gives the LXX of Ps. v. 9; ver. 14 corresponds best to Ps. x. 7; in vv. 15-17 there is a condensation of Is. lix. 7 f.; and in ver. 18 we have part of the first verse of Ps. xxxvi. No attention whatever is paid to the context. The value of the quotations for the Apostle's purpose has been disputed. It has been pointed out that in Ps. xiv., for instance, there is mention of a people of God, "a generation of the righteous," as well as of the godless world; and that in other passages only the contemporaries of the writer, or some of them, and not all men in all times, are described. Perhaps if we admit that there is no possibility of an empirical proof of the universality of sin, it covers the truth there is in such comments. Paul does not rest his case on these words of Scripture, interpreted as modern exegetical science would interpret them. He has brought the charge of sin against all men in chap. i. 17, in announcing righteousness as the gift of the Gospel; in chap. i. 18-32 he has referred to the facts which bring the charge home to Gentile consciences; in chap. ii. he has come to close quarters with evasions which would naturally suggest themselves to Jews: and in both cases he has counted upon finding in conscience a sure ally. Hence we do not need to lay too heavy a burden of proof on these quotations: it is enough if they show that Scripture points with unmistakable emphasis in the direction in which the Apostle is leading his readers. And there can be no doubt that it does so. As Gifford well says on ver. 18: "In the deep inner sense which St. Paul gives to the passage, 'the generation of the righteous' would be the first to acknowledge that they form no exception to the universal sinfulness asserted in the opening verses of the Psalm".

Ver. 10. Oúk éstlwv dikaios oúdè elè. There is something to be said for the idea that this is Paul's thesis, rather than a quotation of Ps. xiv. 3. Ps. xiv. 3 is correctly quoted in ver. 12, and the Apostle would hardly quote it twice: dikaios, too, seems chosen to express exactly the conclusion to which he means to come in ver. 20. Still, the words come after káthos gégrápta: hence they must be Scripture, and there is nothing they resemble so much as a free rendering of Ps. xiv. 3.
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1 στομα; after στομα B 17 read αυτων. This Hebr. idiom may be right, and W. and H. put αυτων in marg.
tò Θεό. 20. διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὗ δικαιωθήσεται πάσα σάρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. Did γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἀμαρτίας.

At first sight there seems a disparity between the two parts of the verse. How does the fact that those who are under the law are impeached and condemned by such utterances of the law as those just quoted subserve the Divine intention to stop every mouth and make all the world answerable to God? We must suppose that all other men— that is, the Gentiles, who are not under the law—are convicted already; and that what is needed to prepare the way for the universal Gospel of grace is that those who have been under law should admit concerning themselves, what they are prompt enough to assert of all others ("sinners of the Gentiles": Gal. ii. 15), that they have not a word to say, and are liable to God's judgment. ἐνώπιον is a classical word, found here only in the N.T. Sanday and Headlam remark its " forensic " character.

Ver. 20. διότι means "because," not "therefore," as in A.V. The rendering "therefore" is perhaps due to the difficulty which the translators had in putting an intelligible meaning into "because." The sense seems to be: Every mouth must be stopped, and all the world shown to be liable to God's judgment, because by works of law no flesh shall be justified before Him. This last proposition—that no flesh shall be justified in this way—is virtually an axiom with the Apostle: it is a first principle in all his spiritual thinking, and hence everything must be true which can be deduced from it, and everything must take place which is required to support it. Because this is the fundamental certainty of the case, every mouth must be stopped, and the strong words quoted from the law stand where they do to secure this end. The explanation of this axiom is to be found in its principal terms—flesh and law. Flesh primarily denotes human nature in its frailty: to attain to the righteousness of God is a task which no flesh has strength to accomplish. But flesh in Paul has a moral rather than a natural meaning: it is not its weakness in this case, but its strength, which puts justification out of the question; to justify is the very thing which the law cannot do, and it cannot do it because it is weak owing to the flesh (cf. viii. 3). But the explanation of the axiom lies not only in "flesh," but in "law". "By the law comes the full knowledge of sin." (ἐπίγνωσις, a favourite Pauline word: fifteen times used in his Epistles.) This is its proper, and indeed its exclusive function. There is no law given with power to give life, and therefore there are no works of law by which men can be justified. The law has served its purpose when it has made men feel to the full how sinful they are; it brings them down to this point, but it is not for it to lift them up. The best exposition of the passage is given by the Apostle himself in Gal. ii. 15 f., where the same quotation is made from Ps. cxliii. 2, and proof given again that it applies to Jew and Gentile alike. In ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, νόμος, of course, is primarily the Mosaic law. As Lipsius remarks, no distinction is drawn by the Apostle between the ritual and the moral elements of it, though the former are in the foreground in the epistle to the Galatians, and the latter in that to the Romans. But the truth would hold of every legal dispensation, and it is perhaps to express this generality, rather than because νόμος is a technical term, that the article is omitted. Under no system of statutes, the Mosaic or any other, will flesh ever succeed in finding acceptance with God. Let mortal man, clothed in works of law, present himself before the Most High, and His verdict must always be: Unrighteous.

Vers. 21-26. The universal need of a Gospel has now been demonstrated, and the Apostle proceeds with his exposition of this Gospel itself. It brings what all men need, a righteousness of God (see on i. 17); and it brings it in such a way as to make it accessible to all. Law contributes nothing to it, though it is attested by the law and the prophets; it is a righteousness which is all of grace. Grace, however, does not signify that moral distinctions are ignored in God's procedure: the righteousness which is held out in the Gospel is held out on the basis of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. It is put within the sinner's reach at a great cost. It could never be offered to him—it could never be manifested, or indeed have any real existence—but for the propitiatory virtue of the blood of Christ. Christ a propitiation is the inmost soul of the Gospel for sinful men. If God had not set Him forth in this character, not only must we
21. Now δὲ χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ κοσμηματιζόντα, μαρτυρούμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. 22. δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τῶν πιστεύων. 23. πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον, καὶ ὑστεροῦνται.

1 καὶ εἰς πάντας: so Ν superstition, but om. ΝABC. The words are omitted by Lachm., Tischff., Tregelles, W. and H., but retained by Weiss, who explains the omission by homoeoteleuton. As εἰς πάντας alone is found in very good MSS. of the vulg. and in John of Damascus, the received text may be a combination of this and the true reading.

despair for ever of attaining to a Divine righteousness; all our attempts to read the story of the world in any consistency with the character of God must be baffled. Past sins God seemed simply to ignore: He treated them apparently as if they were not. But the Cross is "the Divine theodicy for the past history of the world" (Tholuck); we see in it how seriously God deals with the sins which for the time He seemed to pass by. It is a demonstration of His righteousness—that is, in the widest sense, of His consistency with His own character,—which would have been violated by indiscipline to sin. And that demonstration is, by God's grace, given in such a way that it is possible for Him to be (as He intends to be) at once just Himself, and the justifier of those who believe in Jesus. The propitiatory death of Jesus, in other words, is at once the vindication of God and the salvation of man. That is why it is central and fundamental in the Apostolic Gospel. It meets the requirements, at the same time, of the righteousness of God and of the sin of man.

21. νυνὶ δὲ: but now. All time is divided for Paul into "now" and "then". Cf. Eph. ii. 12 f., τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ . . . νῦν δὲ; 2 Cor. viii. 16, ἀντὶ τοῦ νῦν: the reception of the Gospel means the coming of a new world. χριστὸς νόμον: legal obedience contributes nothing to evangelical righteousness. It is plain that in this expression νόμος does not signify the O.T. revelation or religion as such, but that religion, or any other, conceived as embodied in statutes. It is statutory obedience which (as Paul has learned by experience) cannot justify. Hence νόμος has not exactly the same sense here as in the next clause, ἐκ τοῦ νόμου κ. τῶν προφητῶν, where the whole expression is equal to the O.T., and the meaning is that the Gospel is not alien to the religion of Israel, but really finds attestation there. This is worth remarking, because there is a similar variation in the meaning of δικαιοσύνη between vv. 21 and 25, and in that of ή δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ between iii. 23 and v. 2. To deny that words which mean so much, and are applied so variously, can convey different shades of meaning, even within the narrow limits of a few verses, is to deny that language shares in the life and subtlety of the mind. πεφανέρωται: once for all the righteousness of God has been revealed in the Gospel. Cf. xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, 2 Tim. i. 10, 1 Peter i. 20, Heb. ix. 8, 26.

Ver. 22. δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ. The δὲ is explicative: "a righteousness of God (see on chap. i. 17) [ver. 21], and that a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ". In the Epistle to the Hebrews Jesus Christ is undoubtedly set forth as a pattern of faith: ἀφορώντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως αρχήν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ιησοῦν, Heb. xii. 2. Cf. ii. 13 , but such a thought is irrelevant here. It is the constant teaching of Paul that we are justified (not by sharing Jesus' faith in God, as some interpreters would take it here, but) by believing in that manifestation and offer of God's righteousness which are made in the propitiatory death of Jesus. εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας: the last three words are omitted by ΝABC and most edd. If genuine, they add no new idea to εἰς πάντας; see Winer, p. 521. For διαστολή, cf. x. 12. The righteousness of God comes to all on the terms of faith, for all alike need it, and can receive it only so.

Ver. 23. ήμαρτον must be rendered in English "have sinned"; see Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 54. ήμαρτον expresses the consequence = and so come short of the glory of God. To emphasise the middle, and render "they come short, and feel that they do so," though suggested by the comparison of Mt. xix. 20 with Lk. xv. 14 (Gifford), is not borne out by the use of the N.T. as a whole. The most one could say is that sīdi is latent in
the middle: to their loss (not necessarily to their sensible or conscious loss) they come short. The present tense implies that but for sin men might be in enjoyment of "ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ". Clearly this cannot be the same as the future heavenly glory of God spoken of in ν. 2: as in John ν. 44, xii. 43, it must be the approbation or praise of God. This sense of δόξα is easily derived from that of "reputation," resting on the praise or approval of others. Of course the approbation which God would give to the sinless, and of which sinners fall short, would be identical with justification.

Ver. 24. δικαιούμενοι: grammatically, the word is intractable. If we force a connection with what immediately precedes, we may say with Lipsius that just as Paul has proved the universality of grace through the universality of sin, so here, conversely, he proves the universal absence of merit in men by showing that they are justified freely by God's grace. Westcott and Hort's punctuation (comma after τοῦ θεοῦ) favours this connection, but it is forced and fanciful. In sense δικαιούμενοι refer to πάντας τους πιστεύοντας, and the use of the nominative to resume the main idea after an interruption like that of ver. 23 is rather characteristic than otherwise of the Apostle. δωρεάν is used in a similar connection in Gal. ii. 11. It signifies "for nothing". Justification, we are told here, costs the sinner nothing: in Galatians we are told that if it comes through law, then Christ died "for nothing". Christ is all in it (1 Cor. i. 30): hence its absolute freeness. τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι repeats the same thing: αὐτῷ signifies that we contribute nothing, τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι signifies that the whole charge is freely supplied by God. αὐτῷ in this position has a certain emphasis. διὰ τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. Τhe justification of the sinful, or the coming to them of that righteousness of God which is manifested in the Gospel, takes effect through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Perhaps "liberation" would be a fairer word than "redemption" to translate ἀπολύτρωσις. In Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, it is equal to forgiveness. Ἀπολύτρωσις itself is rare: in the LXX there is but one instance, Dan. iv. 29, in which δ χρόνος μον τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως signifies the time of Nebuchadnezzar's recovery from his madness. There is here no suggestion of price or cost. Neither is there in the common use of the verb λυτροῦσαι, which in LXX represents ἄφεσις and ἱεραρχία, the words employed to describe God's liberation of Israel from Egypt (Is. xiii. 3 does not count). On the other hand, the classical examples favour the idea that a reference to the cost of liberation is involved in the word. Thus Jos., Ant., xii. 2, 3: πλείων δὲ θεοῦ τετρακοσίων τελάντων ἐν τῆς ἐπομένους γενήσεσθαι φαμένων κ.τ.λ.; and Philo, Quod omnis probus liber, § 17 (of a Spartan boy taken prisoner in war) ἀπογνός ἀπολύτρωσιν ἅσμενος εαυτόν διεχρήσατο, where it is at least most natural to translate "having given up hope of being held to ransom". In the N.T., too, the cost of man's liberation is often emphasised: 1 Cor. vii. 17, 1 Pet. i. 18 f., and that especially where the cognate words λύτρον and αντίλυτρον are employed: Mk. χ. 45, Τim. ii. 6. The idea of liberation as the end in view may often have prevailed over that of the particular means employed, but that some means—and especially some cost, toil or sacrifice—were involved, was always understood. It is implied in the use of the word here that justification is a liberation; the man who receiveth the righteousness of God is set free from some condition of bondage or peril. From what! The answer is to be sought in the connection of i. 17 and i. 18: he is set free from a condition in which he was exposed to the wrath of God revealed from heaven against sin. In Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, ἀπολύτρωσις is plainly defined as remission of sins: in Eph. i. 14, Rom. viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, it is eschatological. Ver. 25 f. But the question whether the word ἀπολύτρωσις involves of itself a reference to the cost at which the thing is accomplished is after all of minor consequence: that cost is brought out unambiguously in ver. 25. The ἀπολύτρωσις is in Christ Jesus, and it is in Him as One whom God set forth in propitiatory power, through faith (or, reading διὰ τῆς πίστεως, through the faith referred to), in His blood. προέθετο in Eph. i. 9 (cf. Rom. i. 13) is "purposed"; but here the other meaning, "set forth" (Vulg. propositus) suits the context much.
better. Ιατρήμαν has been taken in various ways. (1) In the LXX it is the rendering of μαύρον, (A.V.) “mercy-seat.” In one passage at least, Ex. xxv. 16, μαύρον is rendered Ιατρήμαν, which is possibly a combination of two translations—a literal one, a “lid” or “covering”; and a figurative or spiritual one, “a propitiatory.” Many scholars argue that Paul’s use must follow that of the LXX, familiarity with which on the part of his readers is everywhere assumed. But the necessity is not quite apparent; and not to mention the incongruities which are introduced if Jesus is conceived as the mercy-seat upon which the sacrificial blood—His own blood—is sprinkled, there are grammatical reasons against this rendering. Paul must have written, to be clear, το Ιατρήμαν ἢ μέν, or some equivalent phrase. Cf. 1 Cor. v. 8 (Christ our passover). A “mercy-seat” is not such a self-evident, self-interpretating idea, that the Apostle could lay it at the heart of his gospel without a word of explanation. Consequently (2) many take Ιατρήμαν as an adjective. Of those who so take it, some supply θύμα or ιερείον, making the idea of sacrifice explicit. But it is simpler, and there is no valid objection, to make Ιατρήμαν neuter, and supply θύμα; it is enough to say that for the Apostle the ideas of blood with propitiatory virtue, and sacrificial blood, must have been the same. The precise connection and purpose of διά (της) πίστεως is not at once clear. Grammatically, it might be construed with εντώ αυτού αίματι, cf. Eph. i.15, Gal. iii.26 (2), Mk. i.15; but this lessens the emphasis due to the last words. It seems to be inserted, almost parenthetically, to resume and continue the idea of ver. 22, that the righteousness of God which comes in this way, namely, in Christ, whom God has set forth in propitiatory power—comes only to those who believe. Men are saved freely, and it is all God’s work, not in the very least their own; yet that work does not avail for any one who does not by faith accept it. What God has given to the world in Christ, infinitely great and absolutely free as it is, is literally nothing unless it is

* Seeberg, Der Tod Christi, S. 185, adduces it with the reading του θανάτου, to support the view that in Ιατρήμαν (as a substantive) Paul is thinking not of the concrete Καφφορεθ, but only of that on account of which this sacred article received its name; in other words, of a covering by which that is hidden from God’s eyes on account of which He would be obliged to be angry with men. It is possible to take Ιατρήμαν as a substantive = a means of propitiation (as this passage from 4 Macc. shows, if we read του θανάτου), without special allusion to the μαύρον. But see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, S. 121 ff.
Faith must have its place, therefore, in the profoundest statement of the Gospel, as the correlative of grace. Thus διὰ τῆς πίστεως, though parenthetic, is of the last importance. With εἰς ἐντὸς θεοῦ we are shown God's purpose in setting forth Christ as a propitiation in His blood. It is done with a view to demonstrate His righteousness, owing to the passing by of the sins previously committed in the forbearance of God. God's righteousness in this place is obviously an attribute of God, on which the sin of the world, as hitherto treated by Him, has cast a shadow. Up till now, God has "passed by" sin. He has "winked at" (Acts xvii.30) the transgressions of men perpetrated before Christ came (προ-γεγονότων), εἰς τὴν ἀνοχήν τούτο. The last words may be either temporal or causal: while God exercised forbearance, or because He exercised it, men sinned, so to speak, with impunity, and God's character was compromised. The underlying thought is the same as in Ps. l. 21: "These things hast Thou done, and I kept silence: Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as Thyself". Such had been the course of Providence that God, owing to His forbearance in suspending serious dealing with sin, lay under the imputation of being indifferent to it. But the time had now come to remove this imputation, and vindicate the Divine character. If it was possible once, it was no longer possible now, with Christ set forth in His blood as a propitiation, to maintain that sin was a thing which God regarded with indifference. Paul does not say in so many words what it is in Christ crucified which constitutes Him a propitiation, and so clears God's character of indifference. He lays stress, however, on the fact that an essential element in a propitiation is that it should vindicate the Divine righteousness. It should proclaim with unmistakable clearness that with sin God can hold no terms. (The distinction between πάρεσις, the suspension, and ἀφεσις, the revocation, of punishment, is borne out, according to Lightfoot, Notes on Eph. of St. Paul, p. 273, by classical usage, and is essential here.) In ver. 26 this idea is restated, and the significance of a propitiation more fully brought out. "Yes, God set Him forth in this character with a view to demonstrate His righteousness, that He might be righteous Himself, and accept as righteous him who believes in Jesus." The words εἰς τὴν ἀνοχήν καὶ δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοσύνηα τῶν ἐκ πίστεως taken. Faith must have its place, therefore, in the profoundest statement of the Gospel, as the correlative of grace. Τhus διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως, though parenthetic, is of the last importance. With εἰς ἐντὸς θεοῦ we are shown God's purpose in setting forth Christ as a propitiation in Ηis blood. It is done with a view to demonstrate Ηis righteousness, owing to the passing by of the sins previously committed in the forbearance of God. God's righteousness in this place is obviously an attribute of God, on which the sin of the world, as hitherto treated by Him, has cast a shadow. Up till now, God has "passed by" sin. He has "winked at" (Acts xvii.30) the transgressions of men perpetrated before Christ came (προ-γεγονότων), εἰς τὴν ἀνοχήν τούτο. The last words may be either temporal or causal: while God exercised forbearance, or because He exercised it, men sinned, so to speak, with impunity, and God's character was compromised. The underlying thought is the same as in Ps. l. 21: "These things hast Thou done, and I kept silence: Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as Thyself". Such had been the course of Providence that God, owing to Ηis forbearance in suspending serious dealing with sin, lay under the imputation of being indifferent to it. But the time had now come to remove this imputation, and vindicate the Divine character. If it was possible once, it was no longer possible now, with Christ set forth in His blood as a propitiation, to maintain that sin was a thing which God regarded with indifference. Paul does not say in so many words what it is in Christ crucified which constitutes Him a propitiation, and so clears God's character of indifference. He lays stress, however, on the fact that an essential element in a propitiation is that it should vindicate the Divine righteousness. It should proclaim with unmistakable clearness that with sin God can hold no terms. (The distinction between πάρεσις, the suspension, and ἀφεσις, the revocation, of punishment, is borne out, according to Lightfoot, Notes on Eph. of St. Paul, p. 273, by classical usage, and is essential here.) In ver. 26 this idea is restated, and the significance of a propitiation more fully brought out. "Yes, God set Him forth in this character with a view to demonstrate His righteousness, that He might be righteous Himself, and accept as righteous him who believes in Jesus." The words εἰς τὴν ἀνοχήν καὶ δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοσύνηα τῶν ἐκ πίστεως
God's character and makes it possible for Him to justify those who believe. The passage itself contains nothing explicit—except in the words ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἷματι. It is pedantic and inept to argue that since God could have demonstrated His righteousness either by punishment or by propitiation, therefore punishment and propitiation have no relation to each other. Christ was a propitiation in virtue of His death: and however a modern mind may construe it, death to Paul was the doom of sin.

To say that God set forth Christ as a propitiation in His blood is the same thing as to say that God made Him to be sin for us. God's righteousness, therefore, is demonstrated at the Cross, because there, in Christ's death, it is made once for all apparent that He does not palter with sin: the doom of sin falls by His appointment on the Redeemer. And it is possible, at the same time, to accept as righteousthose who by faith unite themselves to Christ upon the Cross, and identify themselves with Him in His death: for in doing so they submit in Him to the Divine sentence upon sin, and at bottom become right with God. It is misleading to render εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον κ. δικαίοντα, "that He might be just and yet the justifier," etc.: the Apostle only means that the two ends have equally to be secured, not that there is necessarily an antagonism between them. But it is more than misleading to render "that He might be just and therefore the justifier": there is no conception of righteousness, capable of being clearly carried out, and connected with the Cross, which makes such language intelligible. (See Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, iv., 14, English Translation.) It is the love of God, according to the consistent teaching of the New Testament, which provides the propitiation, by which God's righteousness is vindicated and the justification of the ungodly made possible. τὸν ἐκ πίστεως ἤσυχον is every one who is properly and sufficiently characterised as a believer in Jesus. There is no difficulty whatever in regarding ἤσυχον as objective genitive, as the use of πιστεύειν throughout the N.T. (Gal. ii. 16, c.g.) requires us to do: such expressions as τὸ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ (iv. 16) are not in the least a reason to the contrary: they only illustrate the flexibility of the Greek language. See on ver. 22 above.

Vers. 27-31. In these verses the positive exposition of the righteousness of God as offered to faith through the redemption in Christ Jesus, is concluded.

The Apostle points out two inferences which can be drawn from it, and which go to commend it to religious minds.

The first is, that it excludes boasting. A religious constitution under which men could make claims, or assume anything, in the presence of God, must necessarily be false, it is at least one mark of truth in the Christian doctrine of justification that by its such presumption is made impossible. The second is, that in its universality and its sameness for all men, it is consistent with (as indeed it flows from) the unity of God. There can be no step-children in the family of God: a system which teachesthat there are, like that current among the Jews, must be wrong; a system like the Christian, which excludes such an idea, is at least so far right. In ver. 31 an objection is raised. The whole system just expounded may be said to make Law void—to stultify and disannul all that has ever been regarded as in possession of Divine moral authority in the world. In reality, the Apostle answers in a word, itseffect is precisely the reverse: it establishes law.

Ver. 27. ποῦ οὖν; where, since this is the case, is boasting? ἐξεκλείσθη: for the use of the tense, cf. ἐβλήθη and εξηράνθη in John xν.6; it is equivalent to, "is peremptorily, or once for all, shut out": διά τοῦ ποιου νόμου: By what kind of law? In other words, How is the "law," the divinely appointed spiritual order, or constitution, which excludes boasting, to be characterised? Is it by "the works" which it prescribes, and which those who live under it per-
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

Πίστει δικαιούσθαι ἄνθρωπον, χωρὶς ἠργῶν νῦν. 29. ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐ γὰρ καὶ ἑθῶν; οὐ καὶ ἑθῶν. 30. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς εἶπεν εἰς ἔπειραν ἣν Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον, οὐχί δὲ εἰς ἕπειραν ἦν ἢ ἐπειπερ ἢ ἐπειπερ "εἰς τὴν πίστευν, καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. 31. νόμον οὗν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο ἀλλὰ νόμον ἠστῶμεν. 3

1. μὸν ΝΑΚΦΚΛ 17; μὸν Β (W. and H. marg.). οὐ om. ΝΑΒCDΦΚ.

For εἰς πρὸς εἰς, ΝΑΒCD, read εἰς έπειραν; and so most editors: but Weiss regards εἰς πρὸς εἰς, which is not found elsewhere in the N.T., as the true reading.

For ιστωμεν, ΝΑΒCD,F, etc., read ιστανομεν.

* For εἰς πρὸς εἰς, ΝΑΒCD, read εἰς πρὸς εἰς, and so most editors: but Weiss regards εἰς πρὸς εἰς, which is not found elsewhere in the N.T., as the true reading.

* For ιστωμεν, ΝΑΒCD,F, etc., read ιστανομεν.

form? No: its character is given when we call it a constitution or law of "faith". Νόμος in these brief questions is evidently used in a wide sense to denote the religious order or system under which men live, regarded as established by God, and having His authority; the O.T. religion and the N.T. religion, unlike, and in some ways opposed, as they are, are alike νόμος—divine institutes.

Ver. 28. λογιζόμεθα γάρ: see critical note. In λογιζόμεθα there is no idea of an uncertain conclusion: it rather suggests the confident self-consciousness of the reasoner. ἄνθρωπος is not "any human being," as if beings of another sort could be justified otherwise: it is like the German "man" or "one". Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 1, vii. 1, xi. 28, Gal. ii. 16. The sharp distinction drawn between faith and works of law, as characterising two different religious systems, shows that faith must not itself be interpreted as a work of law. In principle it is a renunciation of all such confidence as legal obedience inspires.

Ver. 29. ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; The only way to evade the conclusion of ver. 28 would be to suppose—as is here presented by way of alternative—that God is a God of Jews only. But the supposition is impossible: there is only one God, and therefore He must be God of all, of Gentiles and Jews alike. This is assumed as an axiom by the Apostle. εἴπερ είπερ is the best attested reading, but the argument seems to require that it should "approximate to the sense of ἐπειπερ" (Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 171), which is a variant: "if, as is the fact". It is simplest to read ver. 30 as explaining and confirming what precedes: He is God of the Gentiles also, if as is the fact God is one; and (consequently) He will justify the circumcision on the ground of faith and the uncircumcision by means of faith. δικαιώσει is probably logical, rather than temporal, whether the reference be made to the last judgment, or to each case, as it arises, in which God justifies. Lightfoot insists on drawing a distinction between εἰς τὴν πίστευν and διὰ τῆς πίστεως in this passage. "The difference," he says, "will perhaps best be seen by substituting their opposites, οὐ δικαιώσει εἰς τῆς πίστεως, οὐδὲ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τοῦ νόμου: when, in the case of the Jews, the falsity of their starting-point, in the case of the Gentiles, the needlessness of a new instrumentality, would be insisted on." (Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, p. 274.) But a comparison of ii. 26, v. 1, ix. 30, Gal. iii. 8 (Weiss), shows that Paul does not construe the prepositions so rigorously: and in point of fact, what he does insist upon here is that justification is to be conceived in precisely the same way for Jew and Gentile. The εἰς τὴν πίστευν and διὰ τῆς πίστεως serve no purpose but to vary the expression.

Ver. 31. νόμον οὗν καταργούμεν διὰ τής πίστευς; Do we then annul "law" through the faith we have been discussing? Perhaps if Law were written with a capital letter, it would suggest the true meaning. The Apostle speaks as from the consciousness of a Jewish objector: is all that we have ever called Law—the whole Jewish religion—that divinely established order, and everything of the same nature—made void by faith? God forbid, he answers: on the contrary, Law is set upon a secure footing; for the first time it gets its rights. To prove this was one of the main tasks lying upon the Apostle of the New Covenant. One species of proof is given in chap iv.,

* But εἴπερ είπερ = if God is indeed one (which no Jew, the supposed interlocutor, would deny).
IV. 1. Τι οὖν δρούμεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ημῶν εὑρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα; 2. εἰ γάρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἐξει καύχημα, ἀλλὰ οὐ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 3. τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει; "Επίστευσε ὁ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 4. τῷ δὲ ἐργαζόμενῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ δόει. 5. Ver. 1. The force of οὖν seems to be that the case of Ἀβραὰμ, as commonly understood, has at least the appearance of inconsistency with the Pauline doctrine. "What, then, i.e., on the supposition that vers. 21-31 in chap. iii. are a true exposition of God's method, shall we say of Ἁβραὰμ, our forefather according to the flesh? Does not his case present a difficulty? For if he was justified by works (as one may assume), he has ground for boasting (whereas boasting, according to the previous argument, iii. 27, is excluded)." This seems to me by far the simplest interpretation of the passage. The speaker is a Jewish Christian, or the Apostle putting himself in the place of one. κατὰ σάρκα goes with τὸν προτάτο ἡμῶν, because the contrast with another kind of fatherhood belonging to Abraham is already in the Apostle's thoughts: see ver. 11. If the reading εὑρηκέναι be adopted (see critical note), no change is necessary in the interpretation. To take κατὰ σάρκα with εὑρηκέναι, as though the question were: What shall we say that our forefather Ἁβραὰμ found in the way of natural human effort, as opposed to the way of grace and faith & is to put a sense on κατὰ σάρκα which is both forced and irrelevant. The whole question is: What do you make of Abraham, with such a theory as that just described?

Ver. 2 f. With άλλ' οὖ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν the Apostle summarily repels the objection. "You say he has ground of boasting! On the contrary, he has no ground of boasting in relation to God, For what does the Scripture say? Ἀβραὰμ believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." The quotation is from Gen. xvi. 6, and is exactly as in the LXX, except that Paul writes επίστευσεν δε τῷ Θεῷ instead of και επίστευσεν τῷ Θεῷ, which serves partly to bring out the contrast between the real mode of Abraham's justification, and the mode suggested in ver. 2, partly to give prominence to faith, as that on which his argument turned. The reading επίστευσεν δε is also found in Jas. i. 23, Philo 1., 605 (Mangey), as well as Clem. Rom., 1., x, 6, and Just. Martyr, Dial., 92: so that it was probably current, and not introduced by Paul. It is assumed that something not in itself righteousness was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness; only on this assumption is boasting in his case excluded.

Ver. 4 f. The faith of Abraham, in whatever way it may be more precisely determined by relation to its object, agrees with Christian faith in the essential characteristic, that it is not a work. To him who works—der mit Werken umgehet: Luther—the reward...
is reckoned, not by way of grace (as in Abraham's case), but by way of debt. But to him who does not work, i.e., who does not make works his ground of hope toward God—but believes on Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness. Ver. 5 describes of the ungodly category under which Abraham falls, but is not a generalisation from his case. The ἁσεβὴς (Gen. κνiii.23, Ρρον.xi.31, chap. ν.6) is a person who has no claim to justification: if he is justified, it must be not on the ground of works, but freely, by God's grace, on which he relies through faith. Of course to believe in this grace of God is to do something; in that sense it is a work; but it is to do something which involves a complete renunciation of hope in anything we can do without God. It excludes merit, boasting, justification εξ έργων. Cf. Philo, i., 486 (quoted in Mayor on Jas. i.21): Βίκαίων γὰρ οὖν υἱῶν ὄσιον ὃς ἀκράτω καὶ ἀμίγει τῇ πρόσθεν μόνον πίστει καταρθηθαί . . . τό ἐπι μέν τῷ δυν̄ μελαν̄ καὶ ἀκλίνων δρμῶν . . . δικαιοσύνης μόνον ἐργον. The whole Pauline gospel could be summed up in this one word—God who justifies the ungodly. Under that device, what room is there for any pretensions or claims of man? It is sometimes argued (on the ground that all God's actions must be "ethical") that God can only pronounce just, or treat as just, those who actually are just; but if this were so, what Gospel would there be for sinful men? This "ethical" gospel is identical with the Pharisaism in which Paul lived before he knew what Christ and faith were, and it led him to despair. It leads all men either to despair or to a temper which is that of the Pharisee rather than the publican of Luke xviii. What it can never beget is the temper of the Gospel. The paradoxical phrase, Him that justifieth the ungodly, does not suggest that justification is a fiction, whether legal or of any other sort, but that it is a miracle. It is a thing that only God can achieve, and that calls into act and manifestation all the resources of the Divine nature. It is achieved through an unparalleled revelation of the judgment and the mercy of God. The whole secret of New Testament Christianity, and of every revival of religion and reformation of the Church is in that laetum et ingens paradoxon, θεός ο δικαιώντον ἁσεβῆ. Ver. 6 ff. καθάπερ καὶ Δαβίδ: David is not a new illustration of this doctrine, but a new witness to it. The argument just based on Gen. xν.6 is in agreement with what he says in the 32nd Psalm. The quotation exactly reproduces the LXX. λέγει τόν μακαιριοῦν τοῦ ἄνθρωπου: "pronounceth blessing upon the man," etc. (R.V.) or, speaks the felicitation of the man. He does so in the exclamation with which the Psalm opens. Obviously to impute righteousness with out works, and freely to forgive sins, are to Paul one and the same thing. Yet the former is not a merely negative idea: there is in it an actual bestowment of grace, an actual acceptance with God, as unlike as possible to the establishment of an unprejudiced neutrality between God and man, to which the forgiveness of sins is sometimes reduced.

Vers. 9-12. In these verses the justification of Abraham appears in a new light. In virtue of its ground in his faith, he is not only a forefather κατά
5-11.
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λογίσθηται Κύριος αμαρτίαν." 9. Ο μακαρισμός οὖν οὗτος, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν; λέγομεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 10. πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ δύναττ, ἢ ἐν ἄκροβυστίᾳ; ἢκ ὁ ἐν περιτομῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἄκροβυστίᾳ. Πρὸς Ρώμαιοὺς, καὶ σημείων ἁλαβὼν περιτομῆς, ὁφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰς Κορ. Ι.22; τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἄκροβυστίᾳ; εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δὲ ἄκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν (Ch. ΙΙ.27.

1 περιτομῆς ΧΒΕΔΦΚΛ, etc.; περιτομῆς ΑC, etc.

σάρκα (i.e., the natural ancestor of the Jews), but he is the spiritual ancestor of all believers. The faith which was imputed to him for righteousness constitutes him such; it is the same in essence as Christian faith; and so it is a vital bond between him and all who believe, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. God's method has been the same through all history.

Ver. 9. ο μακαρισμός οὖν οὗτος: This felicitation, then, what is its extent? Does it apply to the circumcision only, or to the uncircumcision also? Just as vers. 1-8 correspond to iii. 27 f., so do vers. 9-12 correspond to iii. 29-31. God is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also, and the Apostle's purpose here is to show that the felicitation of the justified in Ps. xxxii. is not limited by circumcision. λέγομεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: for our proposition is, that his faith was reckoned, etc.

Ver. 10. τῶν οὖν ἐλογίσθη; To say that his faith was reckoned as righteousness, without mentioning circumcision, suggests that the latter was at least not indispensable; still it is not decisive, and so the further question must be asked, How—i.e., under what conditions was his faith reckoned to him? Was it when he was circumcised or when he was uncircumcised? History enables Paul to answer. Not when he was circumcised, but when he was uncircumcised. Abraham's justification is narrated in Gen. xv., his circumcision not till Gen. xvii., some fourteen years later: hence it was not his circumcision on which he depended for acceptance with God.

Ver. 11 f. On the contrary, he received a sign in circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while uncircumcised. Both sign (ὑάκιν) and seal (ὁμοιογνώμα) are frequently used by Rabbinical writers to describe circumcision as a symbol or pledge that one is in covenant with God. So even of heathens: "Ο γὰρ was circumcised, and Moses feared ΓγΥΝ ΣΕΥ) γυναγγυνιαστικά propter signum foederis ejus." But usually of Jews: "Jonah shewed Leviathan sigillum (ὕπατος) Abrahami patris nostri." See Schoettgen, Wetstein, or Delitzsch, ad loc. περιτομῆς (for which W. and H. have in margin περιτομὴν) must be a genitive of apposition. With εἰς τὸ εἶναι the Divine purpose in this relation of circumcision to justification in the case of Abraham is explained. Things were ordered as it has been described that he might be father of all that believe while uncircumcised (as he himself did)—that the righteousness in question might be imputed to them; and father of circumcision (i.e., of persons circumcised) in the case of those who are not only circumcised, but also walk in the steps of the faith which he had while not circumcised. It was God's intention that Abraham should be the representative and typical believer, in whom all believers without distinction should recognise their spiritual father; the Divine method of justification was to be inaugurated and illustrated in him, as it should hold good for all who were to be justified: accordingly the whole process took place antecedent to his circumcision, and in no circumstances has circumcision any essential relation to this great blessing. For its true meaning and advantage see on ii. 25. Ο σφραγίς περιτομῆς μόνον, see Simcox, Language of the N.T., 184. The grammar in ver. 12 is faulty, and Westcott and Hort suspect a primitive error. Either τοῖς before στοιχεῖον must be omitted, or it must be changed, as Hort suggests, into αὐτοῖς, if we are to express the meaning correctly. The sense required by the context is not open to doubt. For
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δικαιοσύνην. 12. καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχεῦσιν. 1 tois ἤχεσιν τῆς ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ πίστεως

g Ch. ix. 4; τοῦ πατρὸς ἠμῶν Ἀβραὰμ. τοῦ ἡμῶν Ἀβραὰμ. 13. Οδ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ

'Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῇ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τῷ κληρονόμῳ αὐτῶν εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. 14. εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις, καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία. 15. οδ γὰρ νόμος

1 tois στοιχευσιν is found in all MSS. but cannot be right; see note in commentary below. Om. τῇ before δικαιοσύνῃς 

2 Om. τοῦ before κόσμου ΝABCD, etc.

διὰ δικαιοσύνης cf. ii. 27. For the dative τοῖς ἤχεσιν see Philipp. iii. 16, Gal. v. 16, 25. But cf. also Winer, p. 274.

Vers. 13-15. The argument of vers. 9-12 is reiterated and confirmed here in other terms. Abraham is the father of all believers: for it is not through law that the promise is given to him or his seed, that he should be heir of the world—a condition which would limit the inheritance to the Jews, but through the righteousness of faith—a condition which extends it to all who believe. We might have expected a quasi-historical proof of this proposition, similar to the proof given in τοῦ f. that Abraham's justification did not depend on circumcision. But the Apostle takes another and more speculative line. Instead of arguing from the O.T. narrative, as he does in Gal. iii. 14-17, that the promise was given to a justified man before the (Mosaic) law was heard of, and therefore must be fulfilled to all independently of law, he argues that law and promise are mutually exclusive ideas. For (ver. 14) if those who are of law, i.e., Jews only, as partisans of law, are heirs, then faith (the correlative of promise) has been made vain, and the promise of no effect. And this incompatibility of law and promise in idea is supported by the actual effect of the law in human experience. For the law works wrath—the very opposite of promise. But where there is not law, there is not even transgression, still less the wrath which transgression provokes. Here, then, the other series of conceptions finds its sphere: the world is ruled by grace, promise and faith. This is the world in which Abraham lived, and in which all believers live; and as its typical citizen, he is father of them all.

Ver. 13. ἡ ἐπαγγελία is the Divine promise, which is identical with salvation in the widest sense. The word implies that the promise is held out by God of his own motion. The peculiar content here assigned to the promise, that Abraham should be heir of the world, is not found in so many words in the O.T. Schoettgen, on ver. 3, quotes Mechilta, fol. 25, 2. "Sic quoque de Abrahamo legitimus, quod mundum hunc et mundum futurum non nisi ea de causa consecutus sit, quia in Deum creditis, q.d., Gen. xvi. 6. And Wetstein, Tanhuma, 165, 1: Abrahamo patri meo Deus possidendum dedit caelum et terram. These passages prove that the idea was not unfamiliar, and it may be regarded as an extension of the promises contained in Gen. xii. 7, xvii. 8, xxii. 17. But what precisely did it mean? Possibly participation in the sovereignty of the Messiah. Abraham and his seed would then be heirs of the world in the sense of 1 Cor. vi. 2, 2 Tim. ii. 12. So Meyer and many others. In the connection in which the words stand, however, this seems strained; and the "rationalising" interpretation, which makes the world Abraham's inheritance through the spread of Abraham's faith, and the multiplication of his spiritual children, is probably to be preferred. The religion which is conquering the world is descended from him, its power lies in that faith which he also had, and in proportion as it spreads he inherits the world. τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ: not Christ, as in Gal. iii. 16, but Abraham's descendants in the widest sense. διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως: it was not as one under law, but as one justified by faith, that Abraham had the promise given to him. In the narrative, indeed, the promise (Gen. xii. 7) antedates the justification (Gen. xv. 6), but it is repeated at later periods (see above); and as ver. 14 argues, promise, faith and justification are parts of one spiritual whole.

Ver. 14. κεκένωται cf. 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15, 2 Cor. ix. 3. κατήργηται: a
favourite word of Paul, who uses it twenty-five times.

Ver. 15. ὀργήν: wrath, i.e., the wrath of God. See on i. τ. 8. Under a legal dispensation sin is stimulated, and brought into clear consciousness: men come under the wrath of God, and know that they do. This is the note and title result of “the law,” and hence law cannot be the means through which God administers His grace, and makes man the heir of all things. On the contrary, to attain this inheritance man must live under a regime of faith. οὐ δὲ: δὲ is the true reading (see critical note), not γάρ: but where law is not, neither is παράβασις. It would not have been true to say οὐδε αμαρτία, for Paul in chap. ii. recognizes the existence and guilt of sin even where men live ἀνόμως; but in comparison with the deliberate and conscious transgression of those who live ἐν νόμῳ, such sin is comparatively insignificant and venial, and is here left out of account. The alternative systems are reduced to two, Law and Grace (or Promise).

Vers. 16-22. The Apostle can now develop, without further interruption or digression, his idea of the representative (and therefore universal) character of Abraham’s justification. The New Testament cannot be said to subvert the Old if the method of justification is the same under both. Nay, it establishes the Old (iii. 31). This is the point which is enforced in the closing verses of chap. iv.

Ver. 16 f. Διὰ τούτο: because of the nature of law, and its inability to work anything but wrath. ἐκ πίστεως: the subject is the promise, considered in reference to the mode of its fulfilment. ἵνα κατὰ χάριν: χάριν on God’s part is the correlative of πίστεως on man’s. εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιοῦν κ.τ.λ. This is the Divine purpose in instituting the spiritual order of grace and faith: it is the only one consistent with universalism in religion. οὐ τῷ έκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ έκ πίστεως Ἀβραὰμ: there seems to be some inexactness in expression here. The seed which is “of the Law” ought to mean the Jews, as partisans of law in distinction from faith: then the seed which is “of the faith of Abraham” would mean the Gentiles. But the promise did not belong at all to the seed which was “of the law,” i.e., to the Jews, as Abraham’s natural descendants; even in them, faith was required. And the seed which is “of the faith” of Abraham is not quite appropriate to describe Gentile believers exclusively; the very point of the argument in the passage is that the faith of Abraham is reproduced in all the justified, whether Gentile or Jew. Still there seems no doubt that the persons meant to be contrasted in the two clauses are Jewish and Gentile believers (Meyer), not Jews and Christians (Fritzsche, who supplies σπέρματι before Ἀβραὰμ): the difficulty is that the words do not exactly suit either meaning.

δι’ εἰσὶν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν. The πάντων is emphatic, and ἡμῶν expresses the consciousness of one who has seen in Abraham the spiritual ancestor of the new Christian community, living (as it does), and inheriting the promise, by faith. Opponuntur haec verba Πατερ εἰς, qui Abrahamum non nominant nisi cum adjeceto ἡμῶν pater noster (Schoettgen).

When Paul speaks out of his Jewish consciousness, he shares this pride (“whose are the fathers,” ix. 5); when he speaks as a Christian, to whom the Church is “the Israel of God” (Gal. vi. 16), and who can even say “we are the circumcision,” he claims all the Jews boasted of as in reality the property of believers: it is Christians, and not Jews by birth, who can truly say “We have Abraham to our father.” The earliest indication (an indirect one) of the Jewish pride in Abraham is perhaps seen in Is. ixiii. 16. That Abraham is the father of us all agrees with Scripture: Gen. xvii. 5 LXX. The δι’ belongs to the quotation. If there is any parenthesis, it should only
μη δοτα ως δοτα. 18. Ος παρ’ έλπίδα ετ’ έλπίδι έκπεσεν, εις το γενέσθαι αυτων πατέρα πολλών θεων, κατα το ελπιμενων, “Ουτως
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1 ου κατενόησεν; so DFKLP, Syr. and lat. Om. ou ΝΑΒC, best MSS. of vulg., etc. All the critical edd. omit ου, though both readings are widely and early attested; though the sense is quite good either way, the authorities for the omission are undoubtedly stronger. ηδη ΝΑCDKLP; om. BF 47, etc. W. and H. bracket. Weiss omits.

be from καθως to σε. As Abraham has this character in Scripture, so he has it before God: the two things are one and the same; it is his true, historical, Divine standing, that he is father of all believers. The attraction in κατενόησεν ου επίστευσεν θεου is most simply resolved into θεου ου επίστευσε: but see Winer, p. 204, 206. In characterising the God whom Abraham believed, the Apostle brings out further the correspondence between the patriarch’s faith and that of Christians. He is “God who makes the dead alive and calls things that are not as though they were”. Such a reference to Isaac as we find in Heb. xi. 19(λογισμενος δη κα εν νεκρων γειρειν δυνατος δ θεος) is not suggested here (yet see ver. 24), and hence it is better to take ζωοποιησεν τους νεκρους of restoring vitality to Abraham, whose body was as good as dead. In the application, the things that are not are the unborn multitudes of Abraham’s spiritual children. God speaks of them (hardly, issues his summons to them) as if they had a being. Faith in a God who is thus conceived comes nearer than anything else in Paul to the definition given in Heb xi. 1. On το μη δοτα, see Winer, p. 608.

Ver. 18 ff. Abraham’s faith described. It was both contrary to hope (as far as nature could give hope), and rested on hope (that God could do what nature could not). εις το γενέσθαι αυτων πατέρα πολλων θεων (cf. ver. 11) is most properly taken to express the Divine purpose—that he might become father, etc. (see Moulton’s note in Winer, p. 414); not result—so that he became. κατα το ελπιμενων, Ουτως κτλ., Gen. xv. 5; the passage is familiar, and the ουτως is supposed to suggest its own interpretation—the stars of the heaven.
righteousness. That which needs to be reckoned as righteousness is not in itself righteousness—on this the Apostle’s argument rests in vers. 1-8; yet it is not arbitrarily that faith is so reckoned. The spiritual attitude of a man, who is conscious that in himself he has no strength, and no hope of a future, and who nevertheless casts himself upon, and lives by, the word of God which assures him of a future, is the necessarily and eternally right attitude of all souls to God. He whose attitude it is, is at bottom right with God. Now this was the attitude of Abraham to God, and it is the attitude of all sinners who believe in God through Christ; and to him and them alike it is reckoned by God for righteousness. The Gospel does not subvert the religious order under which Abraham lived; it illustrates, extends, and confirms it.

Vers. 23-25. Conclusion of the argument. Οὐκ εγράφη δε δι’ αὐτὸν μόνον: cf. xiv. 4, 1 Cor. ix. 10, x. 6, 11, Gal. iii. 8. The formula for quoting Scripture is not εγράφη but γέγραπται: i.e., Scripture conveys not a historical truth, relating to one person (as here, to Abraham), but a present eternal truth, with some universal application. δι’ ἡμᾶς: to show the mode of our justification. οἱ μέλλει λογίζεσθαι: to whom it (the act of believing) is to be imputed as righteousness. μέλλει conveys the idea of a Divine order under which things proceed so. τοῖς πιστεύουσιν is in apposition to οἷς: “believing as we do”. (Weiss.) The object of the Christian’s faith is the same as that of Abraham’s, God that giveth life to the dead. Only in this case it is specifically God as Ηε who raised Jesus our Lord. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 21, where Christians are described as those who through Christ believe in God who raised Him from the dead. In Abraham’s case, “God that quickeneth the dead” is merely a synonym for God Omnipotent, who can do what man cannot. In Paul, on the other hand, while omnipotence is included in the description of God—for in Eph. i. 19, in order to give an idea of the greatest conceivable power, the Apostle can do no more than say that it is according to that working of the strength of God’s might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead—omnipotence is not the sole object of the Christian’s faith. His spiritual attitude toward God is the same as Abraham’s, but God is revealed to him, and offered to his faith, in a character in which Abraham did not yet know Him. This is conveyed in the description of the Person in relation to whom the Omnipotence of God has been displayed to Christians. That Person is “Jesus our Lord, who was delivered up for our offences, and raised for our justification”. The Resurrection of Jesus our Lord entitles us to conceive of God’s Omnipotence not as mere unqualified power, but as power no less than infinite engaged in the work of man’s salvation from sin. In the Resurrection of Jesus, omnipotence is exhibited as redeeming power: and in this omnipotence we, like Abraham, believe.
the time determined by Providence, they receive the Gospel. Hence διά την δικαίωσιν ήμῶν at least must be prospective.* (2) The διά has been taken in both clauses prospectively. "He was delivered up on account of our offences—to make atonement for them; and he was raised on account of our justification—that it might become an accomplished fact." That this interpretation is legitimate, so far as the language goes, cannot be questioned; and if we avoid unreal separations between things that really form one whole, it is thoroughly Pauline. Paul does ascribe expiatory value to the death or the blood of Christ; in that sense it is true the work of Christ was finished on the Cross. But Paul never thought of that by itself; he knew Christ only as the Risen One who had died, and who had the virtue of His atoning death ever in Him: this Christ was One, in all that He did and suffered—the Christ who had evoked in him the faith by which he was justified, the only Christ through faith in whom sinful men ever could be justified; and it is natural, therefore, that he should conceive Him as raised with a view to our justification. But it would have been equally legitimate to say that He died for our justification. It is only another way of expressing what every Christian understands—that we believe in a living Saviour, and that it is faith in Him which justifies. But then it is faith in Him as One who not only lives, but was delivered up to death to atone for our offences. He both died and was raised for our justification; the work is one and its end is one. And it is a mistake to argue, as Beyuschlag does (Neutest. Theologie, ii., 164), that this reference of faith to the Risen Christ who died is inconsistent with the vicarious nature of His expiatory sufferings. That His sufferings had this character is established on independent grounds; and to believe in the Risen Christ is to believe in One in whom the power of that propitiatory vicarious suffering abides for ever. It is indeed solely because the virtue of that suffering is in Him that faith in the Risen Lord does justify. For an exposition of the passage, in which the retrospective force is given to διά, see Candlish in Expositor, Dec., 1893. See also Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, p. 160 ff. The identity in principle of Abrahamic and Christian faith is seen in this, that both are faith in God. But Abraham's is faith in a Divine promise, which only omnipotence could make good; the Christian's is faith in the character of God as revealed in the work of redemption wrought by Christ. That, too, however, involves omnipotence. It was the greatest display of power ever made to man when God raised Christ from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places; and the Christ so raised was one who had been delivered to death for our offences. That is only another way of saying that the ultimate power in the world—the omnipotence of God—is in the service of a love which provides at infinite cost for the expiation of sin. The only right attitude for any human being in presence of this power is utter self-renunciation, utter abandonment of self to God. This is faith, and it is this which is imputed to men in all ages and under all dispensations for righteousness.

CHAP. V.—Vers. 1-11. The blessings of Justification. The first section of the epistle (chap. i. 18-iii. 20) has proved man's need of the righteousness of God; the second (chap. iii. 21-30) has shown how that righteousness comes, and how it is appropriated; the third (chap. iii. 31-iv. 25) has shown, by the example of Abraham, and the testimony of David, that it does not upset, but establishes the spiritual order revealed in the O.T. The Apostle now, like David, enlarges on the felicity of the justified, and especially on their assurance of God's love and of future blessedness. We may describe the contents of vers. 1-11 in the words which he himself applies (iv. 6) to the 32nd psalm: λέγει τῶν ἐκαθαρισμένων του ἀνθρώπου ό δὲ Θεος λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρίς ἐργῶν.

Ver. 1. δικαίωσεν takes up emphatically the δικαίωσιν of iv. 25: Christ's death and resurrection have not been in vain: there are those who have actually been justified in con-sequence.

* This, however, does not prevent us from conceiving of the resurrection of Christ as His public vindication, and the sign of God's acceptance of the work which He achieved in His death: in a certain sense, therefore, as His justification.
Having, therefore, been justified (the Apostle says), εἰρήνην έχομεν πρός τὸν Θεόν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ήμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 2. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν διακριθήκαμεν ἐν τῇ πίστει ἐὰν τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνεστήκαμεν,

1 εἰχομεν is found in correctors of Ν and B, in FG (not in the Latin of these bilingual MSS.) and many cursives; εχωμεν in Ν, Β, C, D, K, L, LS, cursive, vulg., Syr., etc.

The authority for the latter seems therefore overwhelming; but besides the exegetical reasons which have led interpreters to prefer the former, and which are noticed in the commentary, we have to consider the frequency with which ο and ο are confused even in the best MSS. Thus Weiss (Textkritik, S. 44 f.) gives the following instances in which ο is certainly wrong, and is not adopted by any editor: αφορισας, Gal. i. 15 in B; ην ως αγκυραν εχωμεν, Heb. vi. 19 in DE; δι' ές εγγιζωμεν, Heb. vii. το in Α3 τ: διαταξωμαι, 1 Cor. xi. 34 in ΑDΕFG 37, 44, 47; προεχωμεθα, Rom. iii. g in ΑL; θερισωμεν, I Cor. ix. ΙΙ in CDΕFG 109; αρησωμαι, Phil. i. 22 in Β; εισερχωμεθα, Heb. iv. 3 in ΑC 17, 37; συνεβαλλουσωμεν, 2 Tim. ii. 12 in ΑCLΡ 199; θερισωμεν, Gal. vi. 9 in ΝCFGLP cursives. These are only samples, and though the attestation is more divided in these and similar cases than in Rom. v. 1, they are quite enough to show that in a variation of this kind no degree of MSS. authority could support a reading against a solid exegetical reason for changing ο into ο. That such solid reason can be given here I agree with the expositors named below.

2 τῇ πίστει Ν, Κ, Λ, Ρ, vulg., Syr. Om. BDF old lat. W. and H. bracket.

Ver. 2. Εἰ δὲ οὐ καλ.: through whom also. The fact that we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ corresponds this other fact, that through Him we have had (and have) our access into this grace, etc. προσαγωγή has a certain touch of formality. Christ has "introduced" us to our standing as Christians: cf. Eph. ii. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 18. τῇ πίστει: by the faith referred to in ver. 1. Not to be construed with εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην: which would be without analogy in the N.T. The grace is substantially one with justification: it is the new spiritual atmosphere in which the believer lives as reconciled to God. καυχάσθαι, which always implies the expression of feeling, is to be co-ordinated with εχομεν. επ' ελπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ: on the basis of hope in the glory of God, i.e., of partaking in the glory of the heavenly kingdom. For επ' ελπίδι, cf. iv. 18: the construction is not elsewhere found with καυχάσθαι.

Ver. 3. Οὐ μόνον δὲ ἄλλα καὶ καυχάσθαι: and not only (do we glory on that footing), but we also glory in tribulations. Cf. Jas. i. 2 ff. ἐν τοῖς θλίψεσιν does not simply mean "when we are in tribulations," but also "because we are": the tribulations being the ground of the glorying: see ii. 17, 23, v. 11, 1 Cor. iii. 21, 2 Cor. xii. 9, Gal. vi. 14.
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και καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἑλπίδι τῆς σαφείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. οὐ μόνον ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδὼτες ὅτι ἡ ἁγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ κατεργάζεται. 4. οὐ μόνον δὲ ὡς δοκιμή, ἀλλὰ καυχώμεθα εἰς τοὺς θλίψεις, ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν. 5. ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντως ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν, κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσθενῶν ἀπέθανεν.

1 καυχώμεθα ΝΑΔFKP; καυχώμενοι BC, Origen (twice). The participle is hardly open to suspicion on the ground of being confirmed to ver. 11 (S. and H.): it is more rather the indicative (subjunctive) that is open to suspicion as a “mechanical repetition” (Alford) from the preceding verse. W. and H. put καυχώμεθα in text, καυχώμενοι in marg. Βy the rule proclivity ipraestat ardua Αlf and Τreg. are rather justified for putting καυχώμενοι in the text.

Ver. 4. ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται: has as its fruit, or effect, endurance. ὑπομονὴ has more of the sense of bravery and effort than the English “patience”: it is not so passive. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν: endurance produces approvedness—its result is a spiritual state which has shown itself proof under trial. Cf. Jas. i. 12 (δόκιμος γενόμενος = when he has shown himself proof). Perhaps the best English equivalent of δοκιμὴ would be experience. This in its turn results again in hope: the experience of what God can do, or rather of what He does, for the justified amid the tribulations of this life, animates into new vigour the hope with which the life of faith begins.

Ver. 5. ἢ δὲ ἁπάσα ὡς κατευχόμενοι: and hope, i.e., the hope which has not been extinguished, but confirmed under trial, does not put to shame. Ps. xxii. 6. Spes erit res (Bengel). Here the aura catena comes to an end, and the Apostle points to that on which it is ultimately dependent. All these Christian experiences and hopes rest upon an assurance of the love of God. διτὶ ἡ ἁγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. That the love of God to us is meant, not our love to Him, is obvious from ver. 6 and the whole connection: it is the evidence of God's love to us which the Apostle proceeds to set forth. ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν: the aorist τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν: the aorist τοῦ δοθέντος can hardly refer to Pentecost, in which case ἡμῖν would express the consciousness of the Christian community: the spirit was given to Christians in virtue of their faith (Gal. iii. 2), and normally on occasion of their baptism (1 Cor. xii. 3, Acts xix. 1ff.): and it is this experience, possibly this event, to which the participle definitely refers. What the spirit, given (in baptism) to faith, does, is to flood the heart with God's love, and with the assurance of it.

Ver. 6. The reading εἶπερ is well supported, and yields a good sense (“so surely as”: Evans), though the suggestion is made in W. and H. that it may be a primitive error for εἴπῃ (see note on iii. 30). The assurance we have of the love of God is no doubt conditioned, but the condition may be expressed with the utmost force, as it is with εἴπερ, for there is no doubt that what it puts as a hypothesis has actually taken place, viz., Christ's death for the ungodly. Although he says εἴπερ, the objective fact which follows is in no sense open to question: it is to the Apostle the first of certainties. Cf. the use of εἴπερ in Eph. iii. 2, iv. 21, and Ellicott's note on the former. ἀσθενῶν: the weakness of men who had not yet received the Spirit is conceived as appealing to the love of God. ἔτι ὃ ἄγαν τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. The love of God to us is meant, not our love to Him, is obvious from ver. 5 and the whole connection: it is the evidence of God's love to us which the Apostle proceeds to set forth. ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν: the aorist τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν: the aorist τοῦ δοθέντος can hardly refer to Pentecost, in which case ἡμῖν would express the consciousness of the
7. "μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται. ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ εἰς θεός, τὰχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν. 8. συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ἁγάθην εἰς Ἰησοῦ ὁ Θεός, ὅτι ἐτί ἐμάρτωλῶν ὡς ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπῆθανε. 9. πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον, δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἴματι τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ.

1 ο Θεός om. B.
there love in God equal to it? Yes, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son. To represent κατηλλαγήματι by an active form, e.g., "we laid aside our hostility to God," or by what is virtually one, e.g., "we were won to lay aside our hostility," is to miss the point of the whole passage. Paul is demonstrating the love of God, and he can only do it by pointing to what God has done, not to what we have done. That we on our part are hostile to God before the reconciliation, and that we afterwards lay aside our enmity, is no doubt true; but here it is entirely irrelevant. The Apostle's thought is simply this: "if, when we lay under the Divine condemnation, the work of our reconciliation to God was achieved by Him through the death of His Son, much more shall the love which wrought so incredibly for us in our extremity carry out our salvation to the end." The subjective side of the truth is here completely, and intentionally, left out of sight; the laying aside of our hostility adds nothing to God's love, throws no light upon it, hence in an exposition of the love of God it can be ignored. To say that the reconciliation is "mutual," is true in point of fact; it is true, also, to all the suggestions of the English word; but it is not true to the meaning of κατηλλαγήματι, nor to the argument of this passage, which does not prove anything about the Christian, but exhibits the love of God at its height in the Cross, and argues from that to what are comparatively smaller demonstrations of that love. Εν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ: the ἐν is instrumental: cf. ver. 9 ἐν τῷ αἷμα αὐτοῦ. The Living Lord, in virtue of His life, will save us to the uttermost. Cf. John xiv. 19.

Ver. 11. καυχόμεθα is the best attested reading, but hard to construe. It is awkward (with Meyer) to supply κατηλλαγήματι with οὐ μόνον δὲ, and retain σωθήσομεθα as the principal verb: and not only (as reconciled shall we be saved), but also rejoicing, etc. There is no proportion between the things thus co-ordinated, and it is better to assume an inexact construction, and regard καυχόμεθα as adding an independent idea which would have been more properly expressed by the indicative (καυχόμεθα). But see Winer, 441. The Christian glories in God; for though "boasting is excluded" from the true religion (iii. 27), yet to make one's boast in God is the perfection of that religion. Yet the believer could not thus glory, but for the Lord Jesus Christ: it is in Him, "clothed in the Gospel," that he obtains that knowledge of God's character which enables him to exult. Εἰ δὲ οὖν τὴν καταλλαγήν ἔλαβομεν. Nothing could show more unmistakably that the καταλλαγή is not a change in our disposition toward God, but a change in His attitude toward us. We do not give it (by laying aside enmity, distrust, or fear); we receive it, by believing in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood. We take it as God's unspeakable gift. Cf. 2 Μacc. ii. 5ο. ο καταλειφθείς εν τῷ παντοκράτορος οργή πάλιν εν τῷ μεγάλου δεσπότου καταλλαγή μετά πάσης δόξης επανωρθώθη. For an examination of the Pauline idea of reconciliation, see especially Schmiedel on 2 Cor. v. 21, Exercus. Vers. 12-21. The treatment of the righteousness of God, as a Divine gift to sinners in Jesus Christ, is now complete, and the Apostle might have passed on to his treatment of the new life (chaps. vi.-viii.). But he introduces at this point a digression in which a comparison—which in most points is rather a contrast—is made between Adam and Christ. Up to this point he has spoken of Christ alone, and the truth of what he has said rests upon its own evidence; it is not affected in the least by any difficulty we may have in adapting what he says of Adam to our knowledge or ignorance of human origins. The general truth he teaches here is that there is a real unity of the human race, on the one hand in sin and...
death, on the other in righteousness and life; in the former aspect the race is summed up in Adam; in the latter, in Christ. It is a distinction, apparently, between the two, that the unity in Adam is natural, having a physical basis in the organic connection of all men through all generations; whereas the unity in Christ is spiritual, being dependent upon faith. Yet this distinction is not specially in view in the passage, which rather treats Adam and Christ in an objective way, the transition (morally) from Adam’s doom to that of man being only mediated by the words πάντες ήμαρτον in ver. 12, and the connection between Christ and the new humanity by οι την περισσείαν τής χάριτος λαμβάνοντες in ver. 17.

Ver. 12. διά τούτο refers to that whole conception of Christ’s relation to the human race which is expounded in chaps. iii. 21-v. 11. But as this is summed up in v. 1-11, and even in the last words of v. 11 (through Him we received the reconciliation) the grammatical reference may be to these words only. δοκεῖ: the sentence beginning thus is not finished; cf. Mt. xxν. τ. Α. Τhere is a virtual apodosis in the last clause of ver. 14: ος εστίν τύπος του μέλλοντος; the natural conclusion would have been, “so also by one man righteousness entered into the world, and life by righteousness.” Cf. Winer, p. 712 f. By the entrance of sin into the world is not meant that sin began to be, but that sin as a power entered into that sphere in which man lives. Sin, by Divine appointment, brought death in its train, also as an objective power; the two things were inseparably connected, and consequently death extended over all men (for διήλθεν, cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 17, Ez. v. 17) ίδιος πάντες ήμαρτον. The connection of sin and death was a commonplace of Jewish teaching, resting apparently on a literal interpretation of Gen. iii. Cf. Sap. ii. 23 f. ο θεός έκτετε τον ένθρωπον επ’ άφθαρσίαν: φόνον δι’ διαβόλου έδάνατος εισήλθεν εις τόν κόσμον. Cf. also Sir. xxv. 24, Rom. vi. 23, 1 Cor. xv. 56. Paul no doubt uses death to convey various shades of meaning in different places, but he does not explicitly distinguish different senses of the word; and it is probably misleading rather than helpful to say that in one sentence (here, for example) “physical” death is meant, and in another (chap. vii. 24, e.g.) “spiritual” death. The analysis is foreign to his mode of thinking. All that “death” conveys to the mind entered into the world through sin. The words ίδιος πάντες ήμαρτον, in which the πάντες resumes πάντας of the preceding clause, give the explanation of the universality of death: it rests upon the universality of sin. ίδιος means propter quod as in 2 Cor. v. 4 and perhaps in Phil. iii. 12. Winer, 491. But in what sense is the universality of sin to be understood? In other words, what precisely is meant by πάντες ήμαρτον? Many interpreters take the aorist rigorously, and render: because all sinned, i.e., in the sin of Adam. Omnes peccarunt, Adamo peccante (Bengel). This is supported by an appeal to 2 Cor. v. 14, εις υπέρ πάντων άνθρωπων: έρα όλοι πάντες άνθρωποι: the death of one was the death of all; so here, the sin of one was the sin of all. It seems to me a final objection to this (grammatically quite sound) interpretation, that it really makes the words ίδιος πάντες ήμαρτον meaningless. They are evidently meant to explain how the death which came into the world through Adam’s sin obtained its universal sway, and the reason is that the sin of which death is the consequence was also universally prevalent. The sense in which this was so has been already proved in chap. iii., and the aorist is therefore to be taken as in iii. 23: see note there. Because all men were, in point of fact, sinners, the death which is inseparable from sin extended over all. To drag in the case of infants to refute this, on the ground that πάντες ήμαρτον does not apply to them (unless in the sense that they sinned in Adam) is to misconceive the situation: to Paul’s mind the world consists of persons capable of sinning and of being saved. The case of those in whom the moral consciousness, or indeed any consciousness whatever, has not yet awakened, is simply to be disregarded. We know, and can know, nothing about it. Nothing has been more pernicious in theology than the determination to define sin in such a way that in all its damming import the definition should be applicable to “infants” ; it is to this we owe the moral atrocities that have disfigured most
κ Philem.

13. ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ' ὑμῖν τάντας ἡμαρτον. ἐν τούτῳ νόμον ἤν κόσμῳ; ἡμαρτία δι' οὐκ ἐλλογείται, μὴ καὶ επὶ τοὺς ἡμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς Μοσᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἡμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοίωματι τοῦ τύπου.

1 τοὺς μὴ ἡμαρτήσαντας, so ΝΑΒΣΔΓΚΛ; the μη was wanting in some MSS. known to Origen and in “most Latin MSS.” known to Augustine: see W. and H., Appendix. However the omission may have originated, μη is undoubtedly the true text.

did not sin after the likeness of Adam's transgression. For ἡμιρ., cf. Winer, p. 492. This describes not some, but all of those who lived during the period from Adam to Moses. None of them had like Adam violated an express prohibition sanctioned by the death penalty. Yet they all died, for they all sinned, and in their first father sin and death had been indissolubly united. And this Adam is τόν τοῦ μελαλούς τοῦ ᾿Αδαμ. In the coming Adam and his relations to the race there will be something on the same pattern as this. I Cor. x. 6, 11, Heb. ix. 14, 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45, 49. Parallels of this sort between Adam and the Messiah are common in Rabbinical writings: e.g., Schöttgen quotes Neue Schalom, f. 160-2. "Quemadmodum homo primus fuit unus in peccato, sic Messias erit postremus, ad auferendum peccatum penit.;" and 9, 9 has "Adamus postremus est Messias". Cf. Delitzsch: Brief an die Römer, p. 82 f. The extent to which the thoughts of this passage on sin and death, and on the consequences of Adam's sin to his descendants, can be traced in Jewish writers, is not quite clear. As a rule (see above on ver. 12) they admit the dependence of death on sin, though Schöttgen quotes a Rabbi Samuel ben David as saying, "Etiamsi Adamus primus non peccasset, tamen mors fuisset". On the unity and solidarity of the race in sin and its consequences, they are not perfectly explicit. Weber (Die Lehren des Talmud, p. 217) gives the following summary: "There is an inherited guilt, but not an inherited sin; the fall of Adam has brought death upon the whole race, not however sinfulness in the sense of a necessity to commit sin; sin is the result of each individual's decision; it is, as far as experience goes, universal, yet in itself even after the Fall not absolutely necessary". This seems to agree very closely with the Apostle's teaching as interpreted above. It is the appeal to experience in Paul (πάντες ἡμαρτον),
crossing with a transcendent view of the unity of the race in Adam, which gives rise to all the difficulties of interpretation; but without this appeal to experience (which many like Bengel, Meyer and Gifford reject) the whole passage would hang in the air, unreal. There must be something which involves the individual in Adam's fate; that something comes into view in πάντες ήμαρτον, and there only; and without it our interest dies. A sin which we commit in Adam (and which never becomes ours otherwise) is a mere fancy to which one has nothing serious to say.

Ver. 15. At this point the parallel of Adam and Christ becomes a contrast: not as the παράπτωμα (the word implies the Fall), so also is the χάρισμα (the gift which is freely provided for sinners in the Gospel, i.e., a Divine righteousness and life). οἱ πολλοί means "all," but presents the "all" as a great number. πολλῶ μᾶλλον: the idea underlying the inference is that God delights in mercy, if under His administration one man's offence could have such far-reaching consequences, much more reasonably may we feel sure of the universal influence of one Man's righteous achievement. This idea is the keynote of the whole chapter: see vers. 9, 10, 17. η δωρεά εν χάριτι is to be construed together: to repeat the article before εν χάριτι is not essential, and η δωρεά is awkward standing alone. God's χάρις is shown in the gift of His Son, Christ's in His undertaking in obedience to the Father the painful work of our salvation. οἱ πολλοί like of πολλῶ μᾶλλον is not opposed to "all," but to "one": it is indeed equivalent to "all," and signifies that the "all" are not few. The world is the subject of redemption; if the race suffered through the first Adam, much more may we argue that what has been done by the Second will benefit the race. έπερισσεύσεν: the word is prompted by Paul's own experience: the blessedness of the Christian life far outwent the misery of the life under condemnation.

Ver. 16. A fresh point of contrast. That which God bestows (for δώρημα, see Mayor on James i. 17) is not as through one that sinned: the analogy with Adam breaks down here. For the Divine judgment (κρίμα neutral) starting from one (person) resulted in condemnation (for all); whereas the free gift, starting from many offences (which appealed to the mercy of God), has resulted in a sentence of justification (for all). This abstract way of looking at the matter disregards what the Apostle insists on elsewhere, that this "sentence of justification" only takes effect for the individual on the condition of faith. The εκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων in this verse is a decisive argument for the meaning given above to πάντες ήμαρτον: redemption is not inspired merely by the fall of the race in Adam, but by its actual and multiplied offences, and this is its glory. εξ ενός: ενός is masculine, resuming the ενός άμαρτήσαντος of the previous clause; not neuter, with παραπτωμάτως anticipated from the following clause.

Ver. 17. This verse confirms the preceding. The argument is the same in kind as in ver. 15. The effects of the Fall are indubitable: still less open to doubt are the effects of the work of Christ. With αἱ τὴν περισσεύσιν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεάς τῆς δικαιοσύνης αμβάνοντες we again touch experience, and an empirical condition is attached
to the abstract universality suggested by ver. 12. The abundance of the grace and of (the gift which consists in) righteousness has to be received by faith. But when by faith a connection is formed with Christ, the consequences of that connection, as more agreeable to what we know of God's nature, can be more surely counted upon than the consequences of our natural connection with Adam. Part of the contrast is marked by the change from "death reigned" to "we shall reign in life," not "life shall reign in or over us". The future in βασιλεύσουσιν is no doubt logical, but it refers nevertheless to the consummation of redemption in the Messianic kingdom in the world to come. Cf. vii. 17, 21, Col. iii. 3 f., 2 Tim. ii. 12.

Ver. 18. With ἀρά οὖν (cf. vii. 3, 25, and often in Paul) the conclusion of the argument is introduced. It is simplest to take ἕνος in both clauses as neuter. "As through one offence the result for all men was condemnation, so also through one righteous act the result for all men is justification of life." The result in both cases is mediated; in the former, by men's actual sin; in the latter, by their faith in Christ. It has been questioned whether δικαίωμα can mean a "righteous act,"—that which Christ achieved in His death, conceived as one thing commanding the approval of God. This sense seems to be required by the contrast with παράπτωμα, but Meyer and others argue that, as in ver. 18, the meaning must be "a sentence of justification". "Through one justifying sentence (pronounced over the world because of Christ's death) the result for all men is justification of life." This justifying sentence in vacuo is alien to the realism of Paul's thinking, and no strain is put upon δικαίωμα (especially when we observe its correspondence with παράπτωμα) in making it signify Christ's work as a thing in which righteousness is, so to speak, embodied. Lightfoot (Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, p. 202) adopts this meaning, "a righteous deed," and quotes Arist., Rhet., i., 13, τὰ δικαιώματα πάντα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα, and Eth. Nic., v., 7 (10): καλεῖται δὲ μᾶλλον δικαιοσύνη τοῦ κοινῶν: δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἄδικωμας. This sense of an act by which an injustice is rectified is exactly suitable here. Through this the result for all men is δικαιωσίς ζωῆς: for the genitive, see Winer, p. 235. Simcox, Language of the N.T., 85. "When God justifies the sinner, he enters into and inherits life. But Lightfoot makes it gen. appos.

Ver. 19. The sense of this verse has been determined by what precedes. The γάρ connects it closely with the last words of verse 18: "justification of life; for, as through, etc.". άμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν: "we were constituted sinners". For the word κατεστάθησαν. cf. Jas. iv. 4, 2 Pet. i. 8. It has the same ambiguity as the English word "constituted" (S. and H.); but we cannot say, from the word itself, whether the many constituted sinners, through the one person's disobedience, are so constituted immediately and unconditionally, or mediatly through their own sin (to be traced back, of course, to him); this last, as has been argued above, is the Apostle's meaning. οὖτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἕνος: the application of τῆς ὑπακοῆς has been disputed. By some (Hofmann, Lechler) it is taken to cover the whole life and work of Jesus conceived as the carrying out of the Father's will: cf. Phil. ii. 8. By others (Meyer) it is limited to Christ's death as the one great act of obedience on which the possibility of justification depended: cf. chap. iii. 25, v. 9. Both ideas are Pauline, but the last seems most congruous to the context and the contrast which pervades it. δίκαιοι κατεστάθησαν: "shall be constituted righteous"; the future shows again that Paul is dealing with experience, or at least with possible experience; the logic which finds the key to the passage in Bengel's formula, Omnes pecarunt Adamo pecante, would have written here also δίκαιοι κατεστάθησαν. It is because Paul conceives of this justification as conditioned in the case of each of the πολλοί by faith, and in process of taking place in one after another that he uses the future. A reference to the Judgment Day (Meyer) is forced: it is
not then, but when they believe in Christ, that men are constituted δίκαιοι.

Ver. 20 f. "The comparison between Adam and Christ is closed. But in the middle, between the two, stood the law" (Meyer). Paul must refer to it in such a way as to indicate the place it holds in the order of Providence, and especially to show that it does not frustrate, but further, the end contemplated in the work of Christ. παρεισήλθεν: see ver. 12 above. Sin entered into the world; the Law entered into the situation thus created as an accessory or subordinate thing; it has not the decisive significance in history which the objective power of sin has. Words in which the same prepositions have a similar force are παρεισάγω, 2 Pet. ii. 1; παρεισδύνω, Jude 4; παρεισφέρω, 2 Pet. i. 5: cf. Gal. ii. 4. There is often in such words, though not necessarily, the idea of stealth or secrecy: we might render "the law slipped in". ίνα πλεονάση το παράπτωμα: the purpose expressed by ίνα is God's: Winer, p. 575. The offence is multiplied because the Law, encountering the flesh, evokes its natural antagonism to God, and so stimulates it to disobedience. Cf. Gal. iii. 7 f. As the offence multiplied, the need of redemption, and the sense of that need were intensified. ού δε ἐπλέον ἡ ἁμαρτία: ἁμαρτία seems used here, not as an abstract idea, because it is proper to express the sum total of evil, made up of repeated acts of disobedience to the law. "Sin" bulked larger, as "offence" was added to "offence". ού might seem to refer to Israel only, for it was there that the law had its seat; but there is something analogous to this law and its effects everywhere; and everywhere as the need of redemption becomes more pressing grace rises in higher power to meet it. διακαθιστήσων: "the επλέον had to be surpassed" (Meyer). Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 4. Paul is excessively fond of compounds with ὑπέρ. The purpose of this abounding manifestation of grace is, "that as sin reigned in death, so also should grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord". εν τῷ θανάτῳ: it is more natural to oppose this to ζωή αἰωνίων, and regard death as "a province which sin had won, and in which it exercised its dominion" (Gifford), than to make it parallel (with Meyer) to διὰ δικαιοσύνης, and render "in virtue of death" (dat. instr.). Grace has not yet attained to its full sovereignty; it comes to this sovereignty as it imparts to men the gift of God's righteousness (διὰ δικαιοσύνης): its goal, its limit which is yet no limit, is eternal life. Some, however, construe εἰς ζωήν αἰωνίων with διὰ δικαιοσύνης: through a righteousness which ends in eternal life: cf. εἰς δικαιοσύνην ζωής, ver. 18. διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ημῶν: this full rhetorical close has almost the value of a doxology.

CHAPTER VI.—Ver. 1-14. In the fifth chapter, Paul has concluded his exposition of the "righteousness of God" which is revealed in the Gospel. But the exposition leaves something to be desired—something hinted at in iii. 8 ("Let us do evil that good may come") and recalled in v. 20 f. ("Where sin abounded, grace did superabound"). It seems, after all, as if the gospel did "make void the law" (iii. 31) in a bad sense; and Paul has now to demonstrate that it does not. It is giving an unreal precision to his words to say with Lipsius that he has now to justify his gospel to the moral consciousness of the Jewish Christian, it is not Jewish Christians, obviously, who are addressed in vi. 10 ff., and it is not the Jewish-Christian moral consciousness, but the moral consciousness of all men, which raises the questions to which he here addresses himself. He has to show that those who have "received the reconciliation" (v. 11), who "receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness" (v. 17), are the very persons in whom "the righteous requirement of the law" is fulfilled (viii. 4). The libertine argument is rather Gentile than Jewish, though when Paul speaks of the new religion as establishing Law, it is naturally the Mosaic law of which he thinks. It was the one definite embodiment of the concept. The justification, to the moral consciousness, of the
VI.

ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

1. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; *ἐπιμενοῦμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα η ἁμαρτίᾳ πλεονάσῃ; 2. μὴ γένοιτο. οἴνοις ἐπιθάνωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πώς ἔτι ζησομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; 3. ή ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι δοῦλοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ιησοῦν; 4. συνετάθημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον· τίνες απεθάνομεν τῇ αμαρτίᾳ, πώς ἔτι ζήσομεν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον; 5. ή αγνοεῖτε, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνέγερθη κατὰ τοῦ δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν Χριστῷ κέκρων διά τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν

1 For επιμενοῦμεν read επιμενοῦμεν with ABCDF.

2 *Ιησοῦν om. B and some cursives; W. and H. bracket. But this kind of omission is frequent; see Weiss, Textkritik, S. 88.

Gospel in which a Divine righteousness is freely held out in Jesus Christ to the sinner's faith, fills the next three chapters. In chap. vi. it is shown that the Christian, in baptism, dies to sin; in chap. vii., that by death he is freed from the law, which in point of fact, owing to the corruption of his nature, perpetually stimulates sin; in chap. viii., that the Spirit imparted to believers breaks the power of the flesh, and enables them to live to God.

Ver. 1. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; What inference then shall we draw, i.e., from the relations of sin and grace expounded in v. 20 f.? Are we to continue in sin (cf. xi. 22 f.) that grace may abound? Lightfoot suggests "the sin" and "the grace" just referred to. The question was one sure to be asked by some one; Paul recognises it as a natural question in view of his doctrine, and asks it himself. But he answers it with an indignant negative.

Ver. 2. μὴ γένοιτο, cf. iii. 4. οἴνοις ἐπιθάνωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ: the relative is qualitative: "we, being as we are persons who died to sin". For the dative, see vers. 10, 11, and Winer, p. 263. To have died to sin is to be utterly and for ever out of any relation to it. πώς ἐτι ζησομεν; how after that shall we live in it? impossible.

Ver. 3. But this death to sin, on which the whole argument turns, raises a question. It is introduced here quite abruptly; there has been no mention of it hitherto. When, it may be asked, did this all-important death take place? The answer is: It is involved in baptism. ή ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.: the only alternative to accepting this argument is to confess ignorance of the meaning of the rite in which they had been received into the Church. δοῦλοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν: we all, who were baptised into Christ Jesus, were baptised into His death. The δοῦλοι is not partitive but distributive: there is no argument in the passage at all, unless all Christians were baptised. The expression βαπτισθήναι εἰς Χριστόν does not necessarily mean to be baptised into Christ; it may only mean to be baptised Christward, i.e., with Christ in view as the object of faith. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 2, and the expression βαπτισθήναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦν. In the same way βαπτισθήναι εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ might certainly mean to be baptised with Christ's death in view as the object of faith. This is the interpretation of Lipsius. But it falls short of the argumentative requirements of the passage, which demand the idea of an actual union to, or incorporation in, Christ. This is more than Lipsius means, but it does not exclude what he means. The baptism in which we are united to Christ and to His death is one in which we confess our faith, looking to Him and His death. To say that faith justifies but baptism regenerates, breaking the Christian life into two unrelated pieces, as Weiss does—one spiritual and the other magical—is to throw away the Apostle's case. His whole point is that no such division can be made. Unless there is a necessary connection between justification by faith and the new life, Paul fails to prove that faith establishes the law. The real argument which unites chaps. iii., iv. and v. to chaps. vi., vii. and viii., and repels the charge of antinomianism, is this: justifying faith, looking to Christ and His death, really unites us to Him who died and rose again, as the symbolism of baptism shows to every Christian.

Ver. 4. This symbolism interpreted. Συνετάθημεν οὖν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.: Therefore we were buried with Him (in the act of immersion) through that baptism into His death—burial being regarded as the natural sequence of death, and a kind of seal set to its reality. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3 f. It introduces a false abstraction to say...
καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. 5. Εἰ γὰρ σύμφωνοι γεγόναμεν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς τοῦ πατρὸς δόξης του πατρός: in nothing was the splendour of God's power revealed so much as in the resurrection of Jesus. Eph. i. 19 f. in καινότητι ζωῆς: in life of a new quality; cf. vii. 6, 1 Tim. vi. 17: the construction makes the new quality of the life prominent. Winer, p. 296.

Ver. 5. This verse proves the legitimacy of the reference to a new life in the preceding one: union with Christ at one point (His death) is union with Him altogether (and therefore in His resurrection). Εἰ γὰρ σύμφωνοι γεγόναμεν τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ: if we have become vitally one with the likeness of His death: i.e., if the baptism, which is a similitude of Christ's death, has had a reality answering to its obvious import, so that we have really died in it as Christ died, then we shall have a corresponding experience of resurrection. Τῆς ἀνάστασεως is also dependent on δομισματι: baptism, inasmuch as one emerges from the water after being immersed, is a δομισμα of resurrection, a συμβολή of death. It does not seem a real question to ask whether the ἀνάστασις is ethical or transcendent: one cannot imagine Paul drawing the distinction here. (On the word δομισμα, see Cremer.)

Ver. 6. All this can be asserted, knowing as we do that "our old man" = our old self, what we were before we became Christians—was crucified with Him. Paul says συνεσταυρωμένοι simply because Christ died on the cross, and we are baptised into that death, not because "our old man" is the basest of criminals for whom crucifixion is the proper penalty. The object of this crucifixion of the old man was "that the body of sin might be brought to nought": τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς. This body is to be reduced to impotence του μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ. "that we may no longer be slaves to sin". The body is the instrument we use in the service of sin, and if it is disabled the service must cease. For the gen. inf., see Burton, § 397.

Ver. 7. Ο γάρ ἀποθανὼν κ.τ.λ. Here we have the general principle on which the foregoing argument rests: death annuls all obligations, breaks all ties, cancels all old scores. The difficulty is that by the words από τῆς ἀμαρτίας Paul introduces one particular application of the principle—the one he is concerned with here—as if it were identical with the principle itself. "Death clears men of all claims, especially (to come to the case before us) it clears us, who have died with Christ, of the claim of sin, our old master, to rule over us still." Weiss would reject the introduction into this clause of the idea of dying with Christ, on the ground that the words συν Χριστῷ bring it in as a new idea in the following verse. But it is no new idea; it is the idea of the whole passage; and unless we bring it in here, the quittance from sin (and not from any obligation in general) remains inexplicable. Weiss, in fact, gives it up.

Ver. 8. The Apostle now resumes his main thought. συνεσταυρωμένοι: see note on ἀνάστασις, ver. 5; there is no conscious separation of ethical and transcendent life with Christ—to Paul it is one life. 

Ver. 9. Εἰδότες... οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει: The new life with Christ will be the same which Christ Himself lives, a life inaccessible to death. The post-resurrection life of Jesus was not His old life over
again: in that life death had dominion over Him, because He made Himself one with us in all the consequences of sin; but now the dominion of death has expired. The principle of ver. 7 can be applied to Christ also: He has died, and the powers which in the old relations had claims upon Him—death, e.g.—have such claims no more.

Ver. 10. This is expanded in ver. 10. δ γάρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν: the δ is cognate accus. Winer, p. 209. "The death that He died, He died to sin once for all." The dative τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ must be grammatically the same here as in vers. 2, 11, but the interpretation required seems different. While He lived, Christ had undoubtedly relations to sin, though sin was foreign to His will and conscience (2 Cor. v. 21); but after He died these relations ceased; sin could never make Him its victim again as at the Cross. Similarly while we lived (i.e., before we died with Christ), we also had relations to sin; and these relations likewise, different as they were from His, must cease with that death. The difference in the reference of the dative is no doubt an objection to this interpretation, and accordingly the attempt has been made to give the same meaning to dying to sin in Christ's case as in ours, and indeed to make our dying to sin the effect and reproduction of Ηis. "The language of the Apostle seems to imply that there was something in the mind of Christ in dying for us that was the moral equivalent [italics ours] to that death to sin which takes place in us when we believe in Him, something in its very nature fitted to produce the change in us." Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, p. 100 f.

He died, in short, rather than sin—laid down His life rather than violate the will of God; in this sense, which is an ethical one, and points to an experience which can be reproduced in others under His influence, He died to sin. "His death on the Cross was the final triumph of His holiness over all those desires of the flesh that furnish to man unregenerate the motive power of His life." But though this gives an ethical meaning to the words in both cases; it does not give exactly the same ethical meaning; a certain disparity remains. It is more in the line of all Paul's thoughts to say with Holtzmann (N. T. Theol., ii., 118), that Christ by dying paid to sin that tribute to which in virtue of a Divine sentence (κρίμα, v. 16) it could lay claim, and that those therefore who share His death are like Himself absolved from all claims of sin for the future. For ἀφανές, see Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10. The very idea of death is that of a summary, decisive, never-to-be-repeated end. δ δε ζή κ.τ.λ. "The life that He lives He lives to God."

Ver. 11. In this verse the application is made of all that precedes. The death with Christ, the life with Christ, are real, yet to be realised. The truth of being a Christian is contained in them, yet the calling of the Christian is to live up to them. We may forget what we should be; we may also (and this is how Paul puts it) forget what we are. We are dead to sin in Christ's death; we are alive to God in Christ's resurrection; let us regard ourselves as such in Christ.

The essence of our faith is a union to Ηim in which Ηis experience becomes ours. This is the theological reply to antinomianism.

Ver. 12 f. Practical enforcement of vers. 1-11. The inner life is in union with Christ, and the outer (bodily) life must not be inconsistent with it (Weiss). εν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι: the suggestion of θνητός is rather that the frail body should be protected against the tyranny of sin, than that sin leads to the death of the body. έδωκε παρατέτανε ... ἄλλα παρατησάντες: and do not go on, as you have been doing, putting your members at the service of sin, but put them once for all at the service of God. For the difference between pres. and aor. imper., see Winer, p. 303 f. έδωκα δύνασθαι: the gen. is of quality, cf. Luke xvi. 8, 9. ἔναλα in the N. T. seems always to mean weapons, not instruments: see
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υμών σώματι, εις το υπακούειν αυτή ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αυτοῦ. 13. εἰς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τα ὑμῶν ὑπακούειν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν σπλαχνοῦσιν τῷ Θεῷ. 14. ἀμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύειν. 15. ἐν Χριστῷ Χριστὸς ἡμῶν ἀμαρτήσεως, ὡς εἰς τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς εἰς τὸν ἑαυτὸν, ὡς εἰς τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζώντας. 16. οὐκ οἴδατε ἀμαρτήσεως εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ἀμαρτήσεως εἰς τὸν Θεόν. ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν. 17. Χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν. 18. οὐκ οἴδατε ἀμαρτήσεως εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ἀμαρτήσεως εἰς τὸν Θεόν. ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν Θεόν.

2 Cor. Χ. 4, 6, 7, and cf. οψών, νετ. 23. ἢστε εἰς τοὺς τύπους θεοῦ: they were really such; the ἢστε signifies that they are to think of themselves as such, and to act accordingly.

Ver. 14. They can obey these exhortations, for sin will not be their tyrant now, since they are not under law, but under grace. It is not restraint, but inspiration, which liberates from sin: not Mount Sinai but Mount Calvary which makes saints. But this very way of putting the truth (which will be expanded in chaps. vii. and viii.) seems to raise the old difficulty of iii. 8, vi. 1 again. The Apostle states it himself, and proceeds to a final refutation of it.

Ver. 15. ἀμαρτήσωμεν, deliberative: are we to sin because our life is not ruled by statutes, but inspired by the sense of what we owe to that free pardoning mercy of God? "We were slaves of sin because God justifies the ungodly at the Cross!

Ver. 16. οὐκ οἴδατε: It is excluded by the elementary principle that no man can serve two masters (Matt. vi. 24).

The δοῦλος is the exclusive property of one, and he belongs to that one εἰς ὑπακοίαν, with obedience in view; nothing else than obedience to his master alone is contemplated. The masters here are ἀρπαγή whose service ends in death, and ὑπακοία (cf. v. 19) whose service ends in righteousness. ὑπακοίαν here cannot be "justification," but righteousness in the sense of the character which God approves. οὔτε here only in N.T. = of course these are the only alternatives.

Ver. 17. Paul thanks God that his readers have already made their choice, and made it for obedience. οὔτε ἢτε . . . οὐκεξοκοιστάτε δι': the co-ordination seems to imply that Paul is grateful (1) that their servitude to sin is past - ητε having the emphasis; (2) that they have received the Gospel. Yet the two things are one, and it would have been more natural to subordinate the first: "that though ye were slaves of sin, ye obeyed," etc. ὑπακοίαν εἰς τὸν τύπον τῆς διδαχῆς; the catechumens were handed over to the faith. But what is the τύπος διδαχῆς to which the converts at Rome must be resolved into? Many, in the line of these words of Cyril, conceive of it as a "type of doctrine," a special mode of presenting the Gospel, which had as catchwords, e.g., "not under law but under grace," or "free from sin and slaves to righteousness," or more probably, "dying with Christ and rising with Him." In other words, Paulinism as modern theology conceives it. But this is an anachronism. It is only modern eyes that see distinct doctrinal types in the N.T., and Paul, as far as he knew (1 Cor. xv. 3-11), preached the same Gospel as the other Apostles. It is unnecessary, also, to the argument. In whatever form the Gospel won the obedience of men, it was inconsistent with their continuance in sin. Hence it seems nearer the truth to take τύπος διδαχῆς in a more general sense;
VII. παρεδόθη από τής αμαρτίας, εφ' οίς νυν επαισχύνεσθε; τό γάρ τέλος ἐκείνων ἥγαν θάνατος. 22. τινὰ οὐν καρπὸν εἰχέτε τότε, εφ' οίς νυν επαισχύνεσθε; τό γάρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος. 22. τινὰ οὐν καρπὸν εἰχέτε τότε, εφ' οίς νυν επαισχύνεσθε; τό γάρ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον. 11. τά γάρ οὖν τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διά τήν ασθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὡσπερ γάρ παρεστήσατε τα μέλη υμῶν δούλα τῆς ακαθαρσίας καὶ τῆς ἀνομίας εἰς τήν ἀνομίαν, οὕτω νῦν παραστήσατε τά μέλη υμῶν δούλα τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰς ἡγίασμον. 20. ὅτε γάρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἑλευθερωθέντες δὲ απὸ τῆς αμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἐγένετο τόν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἡγίασμον, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον. 11. τά γάρ οὖν τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διά τήν ασθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὡσπερ γάρ παρεστήσατε τα μέλη υμῶν δούλα τῆς ακαθαρσίας καὶ τῆς ἀνομίας: ἡ καθαρσίς δείχνει τὸν σινὴν, ἡ ἁμορφία διαστέλλει τὸν θεὸν. 20. ὅτε γάρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἑλευθερωθέντες δὲ απὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἐγένετο τόν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἡγίασμον, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον. 11. τά γάρ οὖν τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διά τήν ασθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὡσπερ γάρ παρεστήσατε τα μέλη υμῶν δούλα τῆς ακαθαρσίας καὶ τῆς ἀνομίας: ἡ καθαρσίς δείχνει τὸν σινὴν, ἡ ἁμορφία διαστέλλει τὸν θεὸν. 20. ὅτε γάρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἑλευθερωθέντες δὲ απὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἐγένετο τόν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἡγίασμον, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον. 11. τά γάρ οὖν τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διά τήν ασθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὡσπερ γάρ παρεστήσατε τα μέλη υμῶν δούλα τῆς ακαθαρσίας καὶ τῆς ἀνομίας: ἡ καθαρσίς δείχνει τὸν σινὴν, ἡ ἁμορφία διαστέλλει τὸν θεὸν. 20. ὅτε γάρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἑλευθερωθέντες δὲ απὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἐγένετο τόν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἡγίασμον, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον.
Chapter VII.

The subject of chap. vi. is continued. The Apostle shows how by death the Christian is freed from the law, which, good as it is in itself and in the Divine intention, nevertheless, owing to the corruption of man's nature, instead of helping to make him good, perpetually stimulates sin. Verses 1-6 describe the liberation from the law; verses 7-13, the actual working of the law; in verses 14-25 we are shown that this working of the law is due not to anything in itself, but to the power of sin in the flesh.

Verses 1-6. For " αγνοείτε," cf. vi. 3. Chap. vi. contains the argument which is illustrated in these verses, and the question alludes to it: not to accept the argument that the Christian is free from all legal obligations leaves no alternative but to suppose the persons to whom it is addressed ignorant of the principle by which the duration of all legal obligations is determined. This they cannot be, for Paul speaks " γινώσκουσι νόμον = to people who know what law is. Neither Roman nor Mosaic law is specially referred to: the argument rests on the nature of law in general. Even in

4. ωστε, διδότει μοι, καὶ όμεις ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διά τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ύμᾶς ἑτέρω, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν

general truth of which what has been said of the Romans in ver. 21 f. is an illustration. " All this is normal and natural, for the wages of sin is death," etc. δύναμιν 1 Macc. iii. 28, xiv. 32. The idea of a warfare (see δόλα, νεαν. 13) is continued. The soldier's pay who enlists in the service of sin is death, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα: but the free gift, etc. The end in God's service is not of debt, but of grace. Tertullian (quoted in S. and H.) renders χάρισμα here donatūum (the largess given by the emperor to soldiers on a New Year's Day or birthday), keeping on the military association, but Paul could hardly use what is almost a technical expression with himself in a technical sense quite remote from his own. On ζωή αἰωνίος ἐν Χ. Ι. τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, see on v. 21.

Chapter VII. The subject of chap. vi. is continued. The Apostle shows how by death the Christian is freed from the law, which, good as it is in itself and in the Divine intention, nevertheless, owing to the corruption of man's nature, instead of helping to make him good, perpetually stimulates sin. Verses 1-6 describe the liberation from the law; verses 7-13, the actual working of the law; in verses 14-25 we are shown that this working of the law is due not to anything in itself, but to the power of sin in the flesh.

Verses 1-6. For " αγνοείτε," cf. vi. 3. Chap. vi. contains the argument which is illustrated in these verses, and the question alludes to it: not to accept the argument that the Christian is free from all legal obligations leaves no alternative but to suppose the persons to whom it is addressed ignorant of the principle by which the duration of all legal obligations is determined. This they cannot be, for Paul speaks " γινώσκουσι νόμον = to people who know what law is. Neither Roman nor Mosaic law is specially referred to: the argument rests on the nature of law in general. Even in
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VII.

Matt. xiii. 23; Col. 6, 10.

Gal. v. 24.
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a Εγερθέντι, ίνα "καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ Θεῷ. 5. διε γὰρ ἤμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ καρποφόρησαι τῷ Θεῷ. 6. νῦν ἐγερθεὶς κατηργήθημεν ἄπο τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες ἐν δόκιμῳ θεόν, διότι δουλεύειν ἦμας ἐν καινοτότι πνεύματος, καὶ οὐ παλαιότι γράμματος.

7. Τί οὖν ἔρουμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ γίγανεν, εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθύμιαιν οὐκ ημέρας om. BF[G]. Most edd. (W. and H., Lachm., and Treg.) bracket it; Weiss omits, but allows that the case is disputable.

came to an end. Βια τῶν σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ: Weiss rejects as opposed to the context the "dogmatic" reference to the sacrificial death of Christ as a satisfaction for sin; all the words imply, according to him, is that the Christian, in baptism, experiences a οὐμωμα of Christ's death, or as it is put in vi. 6 is crucified with Him, and so liberated from every relation to the law. But if Christ's death had no spiritual content—if it were not a death "for our sins" (1 Cor. xv. 3), a death having the sacrificial character and atoning virtue described in iii. 25 f.—there would be no reason why a sinful man should be baptised into Christ and His death at all, and in point of fact no one would be baptised. It is because Christ's death is what it is, a sin-expiating death, that it draws men to Him, and spiritually reproduces in them a reflex or counterpart of His death, with which all their old relations and obligations terminate. The object of this is that they may belong to another, a different person. Paul does not say ἑτέρω ἄνδρι: the marriage metaphor is dropped. He is speaking of the experience of Christians one by one, and though Christ is sometimes spoken of as the husband or bridegroom of the Church, there is no Scripture authority for using this metaphor of His relation to the individual soul. Neither is this interpretation favoured by the use of καρποφορήσωμεν; to interpret this of the fruit of the new marriage is both needless and grotesque. The word is used frequently in the N.T. for the outcome of the Christian life, but never with this association; and a reference to vi. 21 shows how natural it is to the Apostle without any such prompting. Even the change from the second person (ἐθανάτηται) to the first (καρποφορήσωμεν) shows that he is contemplating the end of the Christian life quite apart from the suggestions of the metaphor. Christ is described as τῷ ἐν νεκρῶν ἐγερθείς, because we can only belong to a living person. τῷ Θεῷ is dat. comm. God is the person interested in this result.

Ver. 5. Contrast of the earlier life. "ἐν τῇ σαρκῇ" is materially the same as "ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου"; the same state of the soul is described more from within and more from without. The opposite would be εἰς τὸ πνεύματος, ἐν τῷ κάρπῳ: it is through the law that these passions become actualised: we would never know them for what they are, if it were not for the law. εἰς τὸ καρποφόρησαι τῷ θεῷ: there is no allusion to marriage here any more than in ver. 4. Death is personified here as in ν. 17: this tyrant of the human race is the only one who profits by the fruits of the sinful life.

Ver. 6. νῦν δὲ but as things stand, considering what we are as Christians. κατηργήθημεν: cf. ver. 2. We are discharged from the law, by our death to that in which we were held. But what is this? Most expositors say the law; Philippi even makes τοῦ νόμου the antecedent of εἰς τῷ, rendering, we have been delivered, by dying, from the law in which we were held. This construction is too artificial to be true; and if we supply τούτῳ with ἐπιθυμίας, something vaguer than the law, though involving and involved by it (the old life in the flesh, for instance) must be meant. ὅτε δουλεύεις κ.τ.λ.: "enabling us to serve." (S. and H.): for ὅτε with inf. in N.T., see Blass, "Gramm. des N.T. Griech., § 219. ἐν καινοτότι πνεύματος κ.τ.λ. = in a new way, which only the possession of the spirit makes possible, not in the old way which alone was possible when we were under the letter of the law. For the Pauline contrast of πνεύμα and γράμμα, see 2 Cor. iii. ; for ὅ in this expression, see Burton, § 481.

1 ημερα om. BF[G]. Most edd. (W. and H., Lachm., and Treg.) bracket it; Weiss omits, but allows that the case is disputable.
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ἡδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος Ἀγεγείρειν, "Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις". 8. ΄αφορμὴν ἐσ 2 Cor. xi. 13; Gal. v. 13; Ἐρούμεν, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 8. μήν 12; Gal. ν. 13; Tim. ν.14.

Vers. 7-13. The actual working of the law. A very close connection between the law and sin is implied in all that has preceded: especially in vi. 14, and in such an expression as τὰ πάθημα τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου in vii. 5. This connection has to be examined more closely. The object of the Apostle, according to Weiss, is not to answer a false inference from his teaching, "οὐκ εἰρημένη," that the law is sin, but to conciliate for his own mind the idea of liberation from the law with the recognition of the O.T. revelation. But the difficulty of conciliating these two things is not peculiar to the Apostle: it is because we all feel it in some form that the passage is so real to us. Our experience of law has been as tragic as his, and we too ask how this comports with the idea of its Divine origin. The much discussed question, whether the subject of this passage (vers. 7-24) is the unregenerate or the regenerate self, or whether in particular vers. 7-13 refer to the unregenerate, and vers. 14-24 to the regenerate, is hardly real. The distinction in its absolute form belongs to doctrine, not to experience. No one could have written the passage but a Christian: it is the experience of the unregenerate, we may say, but seen through regenerate eyes, interpreted in a regenerate mind.

It is the Apostle's spiritual history, but universalised; a history in which one stage is not extinguished by the next, but which is present as a whole to his consciousness, each stage all the time determining and determined by all the rest. We cannot date the things of the spirit as simply as if they were mere historical incidents. τι σὲ ἠρώθην, cf. vi. 1: What inference then shall we draw? se. from the relations of sin and law just suggested. Is the law sin? Paul repels the thought with horror. ἄλλα τὴν ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἤγνω: ἄλλα may continue the protest = On the contrary, I should not have known sin, etc.; or it may be restrictive, abating the completeness of the negation involved in the protest. The law is not sin—God forbid; but, for all that, there is a connection: I should not have known sin but by the law. The last suits the context better: see ver. 21. On οὐκ ἠγνώ without άν, see Winer, 383: it is possible, however (Gifford), to render simply, I did not know sin except through the law; and so also with οὐκ ἠδειν. η ἀμαρτία of course he thinks of the Mosaic law, but the absence of the article shows that it is the legal, not the Mosaic, character of it which is in view; and it is this which enables us to understand the experience in question. Πώς τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν τ.λ.: the desire for what is forbidden is the first conscious form of sin. For the force of τε here see Winer, p. 561. Simcox, Language of the N.T., p. 160. In the very similar construction in 2 Cor. x. 8 Winer suggests an anacoluthon: possibly Paul meant here also to introduce something which would have balanced the τε (I should both have been ignorant of lust, unless the law had said, Thou shalt not lust, and ignorant of other forms of sin unless the law had prohibited them). But the one instance, as he works it out, suffices him. It seems impossible to deny the reference to the tenth commandment (Exod. xx. 17) when the words οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις are quoted from the law "but the special modes of ἐπιθυμία prohibited are of no consequence, and it is beside the mark to argue that Paul's escape from Pharisaism began with the discovery that a feeling, not an outward act only, might be sinful. All he says is that the consciousness of sin awoke in him in the shape of a conflict with a prohibitive law, and to illustrate this he quotes the tenth commandment. Its generality made it the most appropriate to quote.

Ver. 8. ἄφορμὴν λαβοῦσα means "having received," not "having taken" occasion. η ἀμαρτία is sin as a power dwelling in man, of the presence of which he is as yet unaware. How it "receives occasion" is not stated; it must be by coming face to face with something which appeals to ἐπιθυμία; but when it has received it, it avails itself of the commandment (viz., the one prohibiting ἐπιθυμία) to work in us ἐπιθυμία of
every sort. It really is the commandment which it uses, for without law sin is dead. Cf. iv. 15, v. 13: but especially 1 Cor. xv. 56. Apart from the law we have no experience either of its character or of its vitality.

Ver. 9. ‘έγω δὲ έζων χωρίς νόμου ποτέ’; this is ideal biography. There is not really a period in life to which one can look back as the happy time when he had no conscience; the lost paradise in the infancy of men or nations only serves as a foil to the moral conflicts and disorder of maturer years, of which we are clearly conscious. ‘Ελθούσης δε τῆς εντολῆς κ.τ.λ. In these words, on the other hand, the most intensely real experience is vividly reproduced. When the commandment came, sin “came to life again”; its dormant energies woke, and “I died.” “There is a deep tragic pathos in the brief and simple statement; it seems to point to some definite period full of painful recollections” (Gifford).

To say that “death” here means the loss of immortality (bodily death without the hope of resurrection), as Lipsius, or that it means only “spiritual” death, is to lose touch with the Apostle’s mode of thought. It is an indivisible thing, all doom and despair, too simply felt to be a subject for analysis.

Ver. 10. The result is that the commandment defaces its own intention; it has life in view, but it ends in death. Here also analysis only misleads. Life and death are indivisible wholes.

Ver. 11. Yet this result is not due to the commandment in itself. It is indwelling sin, inherited from Adam, which, when it has found a base of operations, employs the commandment to deceive (cf. Gen. iii. 13) and to kill. “Sin here takes the place of the Tempter” in Genesis (S. and H.).

Ver. 12. The conclusion is that the law is holy (this is the answer to the question with which the discussion started in ver. 7: ‘ο νόμος αμαρτία’), and the commandment, which is the law in operation, holy and just and good. ‘Αγία means that it belongs to God and has a character corresponding; ‘δικαία that its requirements are those which answer to the relations in which man stands to God and his fellow-creatures; ‘αγαθή that in its nature and aim it is beneficent; man’s weal, not his woe, is its natural end. There is no formal contrast to ‘ο μεν νόμος, such as was perhaps in the Apostle’s mind when he began the sentence, and might have been introduced by ‘η δε αμαρτία; but a real contrast is given in ver. 13.

Ver. 13. The description of the commandment as “good” raises the problem of ver. 7 in a new form. Can the good issue in evil! Did that which is good turn out to be death to me! This also is denied, or rather repelled. It was not the good law, but sin, which became death to the Apostle. And in this there was a Divine intention, viz., that sin might appear sin, might come out in its true colours, by working death for man through that which is good. Sin turns God’s intended blessing into a curse; nothing could more clearly show what it
is, or excite a stronger desire for deliverance from it. The second clause with ίνα (ίνα γίνηται καθ’ ὑπερβολήν άμαρτωλός ἢ άμαρτια) seems co-ordinate with the first, yet intensifies it: personified sin not only appears, but actually turns out to be, beyond measure sinful through its perversion of the commandment.

Vers. 14-25. The last section of the chapter confirms the argument in which Paul has vindicated the law, by exhibiting the power of sin in the flesh. It is this which makes the law weak, and defeats its good intention. "Hitherto he had contrasted himself, in respect of his whole being, with the Divine law; now, however, he begins to describe a discord which exists within himself" (Tholuck).

Ver. 14. ο νόμος πνευματικός: the law comes from God who is Spirit, and it shares His nature: its affinities are Divine, not human. ἐγώ δὲ σάρκινος εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν άμαρτιάν: I, as opposed to the law, am a creature of flesh, sold under sin. σάρκινος is properly material = carneus, consisting of flesh, as opposed to σαρκικός, which is ethical = carnalis. Paul uses it because he is thinking of human nature, rather than of human character, as in opposition to the Divine law. He does not mean that there is no higher element in human nature having affinity to the law (against this see vers. 22-25), but that such higher elements are so depressed and impotent that no injustice is done in describing human nature as in his own person he describes it here. Flesh has such an exclusive preponderance that man can only be regarded as a being who has no affinity for the spiritual law of God, and necessarily kicks against it. Not that this is to be regarded as his essential nature. It describes him only as πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν άμαρτιάν: the slave of sin. To speak of man as "flesh" is to speak of him as distinguished from God who is "Spirit"; but owing to the diffusion of sin in humanity, and the ascendency it has acquired, this mere distinction becomes an antagonism, and the mind of "the flesh" is enmity against God. In σάρκικος there is the sense of man's weakness, and pity for it; σαρκικός would only have expressed condemnation, perhaps a shade of disgust or contempt. Weiss rightly remarks that the present tense εἰμι is determined simply by the εστιν preceding. Paul is contrasting the law of God and human nature, of course on the basis of his own experience; but the contrast is worked out ideally, or timelessly, as we might say, all the tenses being present; it is obvious, however, on reflection, that the experience described is essentially that of his pre-Christian days. It is the unregenerate man's experience, surviving at least in memory into regenerate days, and read with regenerate eyes.

Ver. 15. Only the hypothesis of slavery explains his conduct. For what I do οὐ γνώσκω, i.e., I do not recognise it as my own, as a thing for which I am responsible and which I can approve: my act is that of a slave who is but the instrument of another's will. οὐ γαρ δὲ θέλω κ.τ.λ. There is "an incomprehensible contradiction in his action". κατεργάζομαι is to effect, to bring about by one's own work; πράσσειν is to work at, to busy oneself with, a thing, with or without success, but with purpose; τούτον is simply to make or produce.

Ver. 16. δὲ οὐ θέλω takes up δ μισώ: the negative expression is strong enough for the argument. In doing what he hates, i.e., in doing evil against his will, his will agrees with the law, that it is good. καλός suggests the moral beauty or nobility of the law, not like αγαθή (ver. 12) its beneficial purpose.

Ver. 17. Νυνί δὲ οὐκέτι εγώ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, εγώ is the true Ι, and emphatic. As things are, in view of the facts just explained, it is not the true self which is responsible for this line of conduct, but the sin which has its abode in the man: contrast viii. ΙΙ τὸ ενοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν. "Paul said, 'It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me,' and 'I live, yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me'; and both these sayings of his touch on the unsayable" (Dr. John Duncan). To be saved from sin, a man must at the same time own it and disown it; it is this practical paradox which is reflected in this verse. It is safe for a Christian like Paul— it is not safe for everybody—to explain his failings by the watchword, Not I, but indwelling sin. That might be antinomian, or manichean, as well as evan-
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&7; έγώ κατεργάζομαι αυτό νόμον, αλλ' ἡ οἰκούσα εν ἐμοί ἁμαρτία. 18. Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἑμοί (τούτοτις ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου,) ἀγαθὸν· κατεργάζομαι εν τῷ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐχ έὑρίσκω. 19. οἴδαγάρ ὅτι τοῦ κακοῦ "παράκειται μοι, το δόθεν κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν νόμον. 20. εἰ δὲ δ οὔ θέλω ἐγώ, τότῳ ποιῶ, οὐκ έτι έγώ κατεργάζομαι αυτό, αλλ' ἡ οἰκούσα ἐν ἐμοί ἁμαρτία. 21. Εὑρίσκω ἁρὰ τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. 22. Συνήθομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατά τὸν ἐμοὶ παράκειεται.

1 For οἰκούσα ΝΒ read συνεκκουσα, which is right.
2 θέλειν εὐρίσκω DFKLP; οὐ alone without εὐρίσκω ΝABC.

Ver. 18. It is sin, and nothing but sin, that has to be taken account of in this connection, for "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, there dwells no good". For τοῦτο δοκιν έτι see on i.12. εν ἐμοί = εν τῇ σαρκί μου = in me, regarded as a creature of flesh, apart from any relation to or affinity for God and His spirit. This, of course, is not a complete view of what man is at any stage of his life. τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειται μοι: θέλειν is rather wish than will: the want of will is the very thing lamented. An inclination to the good is at his hand, within the limit of his resources, but not the actual effecting of the good.

Ver. 19. In this verse there is a repetition of verse 15, but what was there an abstract contrast between inclination and action is here sharpened into the moral contrast between good inclination and bad action.

Ver. 20. The same conclusion as in ver. 17. If the first εγώ is right, it must go with οὐ θέλειν: Paul distinguishes himself sharply, as a person whose inclination is violated by his actions, from the indwelling sin which is really responsible for them.

Vers. 21-23 summarise the argument. εὑρίσκω ἁρὰ τὸν νόμον . . . δότα: most commentators hold that the clause introduced by δότα is the explanation of τὸν νόμον. The law, in short, which Paul has discovered by experience, is the constant fact that when his inclination is to do good, evil is present with him. This sense of law approximates very closely to the modern sense which the word bears in physical science—so closely that its very modernness may be made an objection to it. Possibly Paul meant, in using the word, to convey at the same time the idea of an outward compulsion put on him by sin, which expressed itself in this constant incapacity to do the good he inclined to—authority or constraint as well as normality being included in his idea of the word. But δ νόμος in Paul always seems to have much more definitely the suggestion of something with legislative authority: it is questionable whether the first meaning given above would have occurred, or would have seemed natural, except to a reader familiar with the phraseology of modern science. Besides, the subject of the whole paragraph is the relation of "the law" to sin, and the form of the sentence is quite analogous to that of ver. 16, in which a preliminary conclusion has been come to on the question. Hence I agree with those who make τὸν νόμον the Mosaic law. The construction is not intolerable, if we observe that εὑρίσκω ἁρὰ τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ. is equivalent to εὗρισκεται ἁρὰ δ νόμος τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ. "This is what I find the law—or life under the law—to come to in experience: when I wish to do good, evil is present with me." This is the answer he has already given in ver. 7 to the question, Is the law sin? No, it is not sin, but nevertheless sin is most closely connected with it. The repeated ἐμοὶ has something tragic in it: me, who am so anxious to do otherwise.

Ver. 22 f. Further explanation: the
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18-25.

κ ἀνθρωπον 23. βλέπω δὲ ἔτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεις μου ἀντιστρατα. 2 Corinthians iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16.

τευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοὸς μου, καὶ ἀναλίποντο τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἀμαρτίας τῷ ὑπὲρ τοῖς μέλεσί μου. 24. ἀνθρωπος τοῦ τῷ Θεῷ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. ἀρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοὶ 3 δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ: τῇ δὲ σαρκί νόμῳ

1 ἀναλιποντο με εν το νομοι NBDFPK; om. εν ACL, most cursive, Syr. and many fathers. The omission, according to Weiss, is manifestly made to simplify the expression. Lachm. omits; W. and H. bracket.

2 εὐχαριστοῦ ΝΑΚLP, most cursive and fathers; W. and H. in marg. χαρις B., Sah., Orig. 1. This is the reading adopted in all the crit. edd. as the one from which the variants are most easily deduced (e.g., η χαρις του θεου D, vulg.; η χ. τ. ευχαριστοῦ F: χαρις δε τω θεω ΔΣ"C)

3 το με νοι, om. μεν ΝFG, vulg., and Lat. fathers. The omission must be accidental, and all edd. except Tischdf. keep μεν.

incongruity between inclination and action has its roots in a division within man's nature. The law of God legislates for him, and in the inner man (Eph. iii. 16) he delights in it. The inner man is not equivalent to the new or regenerate man; it is that side of every man's nature which is akin to God, and is the point of attachment, so to speak, for the regenerating spirit. It is called inward because it is not seen. What is seen is described in ver. 23. Here also νόμος is not used in the modern physical sense, but imaginatively: "I see that a power to legislate, of a different kind (different from the law of God), asserts itself in my members, making war on the law of my mind". The law of my mind is practically identical with the law of God in ver. 22: and the νοὺς itself, if not identical with ὁ εὖ τῳ ἀνθρωπος, is its chief organ. Paul does not see in his nature two normal modes in which certain forces operate; he sees two authorities saying to him, Do this, and the higher succumbing to the lower. As the lower prevails, it leads him captive to the law of Sin which is in his members, or in other words to itself: "of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage". The end therefore is that man, as a creature of flesh, living under law, does what Sin enjoins. It is the law of Sin to which one must give obedience.

Ver. 24. ταλαίπωρος εγὼ ἀνθρωπος: τοι με ρύσεται; "a wail of anguish and a cry for help". The words are not those of the Apostle's heart as he writes; they are the words which he knows are wrung from the heart of the man who realises that he is himself in the state just described. Paul has reproduced this vividly from his own experience, but ταλαίπωρος εγώ ἀνθρωπος is not the cry of the Christian Paul, but of the man whom sin and law have brought to despair. ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου: "This death" is the death of which man is acutely conscious in the condition described: it is the same as the death of ver. 9, but intensely realised through the experience of captivity to sin. "The body of this death" is therefore the same as "the body of sin" in chap. vi. 6: it is the body which, as the instrument if not the seat of sin, is involved in its doom. Salvation must include deliverance from the body so far as the body has this character and destiny.

Ver. 25. The exclamation of thanksgiving shows that the longed-for deliverance has actually been achieved. The regenerate man's ideal contemplation of his pre-Christian state rises with sudden joy into a declaration of his actual emancipation as a Christian. διὰ Ι. Χ. του Κυρίου ημῶν: Christ is regarded as the mediator through whom the thanksgiving ascends to God, not as the author of the deliverance for which thanks are given. With ἀρα οὖν αὐτὸς εγὼ the Apostle introduces the conclusion of this whole discussion. "So then I myself—that is, I, leaving Jesus Christ our Lord out of the question—can get no further than this: with the mind, or in the inner man, I serve a law of God (a Divine law), but with the flesh, or in my actual outward life, a law of sin." We might say the law of God, or of sin; but the absence of the definite article emphasises the
Chapter VIII.

For the place of this chapter in the argument see chap. vi., ad init. The general subject is the life in the spirit, by which the power of sin is broken, and the believer enabled to live to God. It falls into three parts (1) vers. 1-11, in which the spirit as opposed to the flesh is described as the principle of righteousness and life; (2) vers. 12-27, in which it is regarded as a spirit of adoption, the first fruits of a heavenly inheritance for the children of God; and (3) vers. 28-39, in which Paul concludes the argument, glorying in the assurance of God's immutable love in Jesus Christ.


Ver. 1. οὐδέν ἄρανύνκατάκριματοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The οὐδέν is emphatic: condemnation is in every sense out of the question. νύν is temporal: it distinguishes the Christian from the pre-Christian period of life. The bold assertion is an inference (άρα) from what is implied in the thanksgiving to God through Jesus Christ (vii. 25). The description of Christians as "those who are in Christ Jesus" goes back to the words of Jesus Himself in John xv.

Ver. 2. There is no condemnation, for all ground for it has been removed. "The law of the spirit of the life which is in Christ Jesus makes me [this] free from the law of sin and death." It is subject to the law of sin and death which involves condemnation; emancipation from it leaves no place for condemnation. For the meaning of the "law" see on vii. 23. The spirit which brings to the believer the life which is in Christ Jesus brings with it also the Divine law for the believer's life; but it is now, as Paul says in Gal. iii. 21, a νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, "not an impotent law written on tables of stone, and hence righteousness comes by it; it proves more than a match for the authority exercised over man by the forces of sin and death. Paul would not have called the Divine law (even as a series of statutes) a law of sin and death, though he says τὸ γράμμα αποκτεῖνε; Sin and Death are conceived objectively as powers which impose their own law on unredeemed men.

Ver. 3. He now explains how this was done. It was not done by the law: that is the first point. If τὸ ἀδύνατον is active (= "the inability" of the law) we must suppose that Paul meant to finish the sentence, "was overcome," or "was removed" by God. If it is passive (= "that which is impossible" for the law), we must suppose he meant to finish it, "was achieved" or "accomplished" by God. There is really no way of deciding whether ἀδύνατον is active or passive, and the anacoluthon makes it impossible to tell what construction Paul had in his mind, i.e., whether ἀδύνατον is nominative or accusative. For the best examination of the grammar see S. and H. ἐν ώ probably refers to ἀδύνατον: the point at which the law was impotent, in which it was weak through the flesh. This is better than to render ἐν ώ "in that," or "because." For the meaning cf. vii. 18. What the law could not do, God did by sending τὸν ζωοκοιμούσαν Ἰησοῦν. With the coming of so great a Person,
uniquely related to God (for this is implied both here and in ver. 32, as contrasted with ver. 14), a new saving power entered the world. God sent His Son **en omoiowma sarkos amarthias**. The connection implies that sending Him thus was in some way related to the end to be secured. But what do the words mean? **omoiowma** occurs in Rom. i. 23, v. 14, vi. 5, and also in Phil. ii. 7. This last passage, in which Christ is described as **en omoiowma anthrwpwn genoomenos**, is the one which is most akin to Rom. viii. 3, and most easily illustrates it. There must have been a reason why Paul wrote in Philippians **en omoiowma anth. genoomenos** instead of **anthropos genoomenos**, and it may well have been the same reason which made him write here **en omoiowma sarkos amarthias** instead of **en sarki amarthias**. He wishes to indicate that Christ was not really man, or that His flesh was not really what in us is **sarkis amarthias**, but that what for ordinary men is their natural condition is for this Person only an assumed condition (Holtzmann, N. T. Theol., ii., 74). But the emphasis in **omoiowma** is on Christ's likeness to us, not His unlikeness: "flesh of sin" is one idea to the Apostle, and what he means by it is that God sent His Son in that nature which in us is identified with sin. This was the "like" (and "form" rather than "likeness" is what **omoiowma** signifies) in which Christ appeared among men. It does not prejudice Christ's sinlessness, which is a fixed point with the Apostle ab initio; and if any one says that it involves a contradiction to maintain that Christ was sinless, and that He came in a nature which in us is identified with sin, it may be pointed out that this identification does not belong to the essence of our nature, but to its corruption, and that the uniform teaching of the N.T. is that Christ is one with us—short of sin. The likeness and the limitation of it (though the former is the point here urged) are equally essential in the Redeemer. But God sent His Son not only **en omoiowma**, but **kai peri amarthias**. These words indicate the aim of the mission. Christ was sent in our nature "in connection with sin". The R.V. renders "as an offering for sin". This is legitimate, for **peri amarthias** is used both in the LXX (Lev. iv. 33 and passim, Ps. xl. 6, 2 Chr. xxix. 24) and in the N.T. (Heb. x. 6, 8) in the sense of "sin-offering" (usually answering to Heb. *ἱλασία*, but in Isa. liii. 10 to *ζήτημα*); but it is not formally necessary. But when the question is asked, In what sense did God send His Son "in connection with sin"? there is only one answer possible. He sent Him to expiate sin by His sacrificial death. This is the centre and foundation of Paul's gospel (iii. 25 ft.), and to ignore it here is really to assume that he used the words **kai peri amarthias** (which have at least sacrificial associations) either with no meaning in particular, or with a meaning alien to his constant and dearest thoughts. Weiss says it is impossible to think here of expiating sin, because only the removal of the power of sin belongs to the context. But we cannot thus set the end against the means; the Apostle's doctrine is that the power of sin cannot be broken except by expiating it, and that is the very thing he teaches here. This fixes the meaning and the reference of **katêkrinov**. It is sometimes interpreted as if Christ were the subject: "Christ by His sinless life in our nature condemned sin in that nature," i.e., showed that it was not inevitable, and in so doing gave us hope; and this sense of "condemned" is supported by reference to Mt. xii. 41 f. But the true argument (especially according to the analogy of that passage) would rather be, "Christ by His sinless life in our nature condemned our sinful lives, and left us inexcusable and without hope". The truth is, we get on to a wrong track if we ignore the force of **peri amarthias**, or fail to see that God, not Christ, is the subject of **katêkrinov**. God's condemnation of sin is expressed in His sending His Son in our nature, and in such a connection with sin that He died for it—i.e., took its condemnation upon Himself. Christ's death exhibits God's condemnation of sin in the flesh. **En ta sarki** is to be construed with **katêkrinov**: the flesh—that in which sin had reigned—that in which God's condemnation of sin was executed. But Paul does not mean that by His sinless life in our nature Christ had broken the power of
sin at one point for the human race; he means that in the death of His own Son, who had come in our nature to make atonement for sin, God had pronounced the doom of sin, and brought its claims and its authority over man to an end. This is the only interpretation which does not introduce elements quite alien to the Apostle's mode of thought.

Ver. 4. All this was done ἵνα τὸ δίκαιον τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν: that the just requirement of the law (i.e., a righteous life) might be fulfilled in us. See note on iii. 31. ἐν ἡμῖν (not ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν), for it is not our doing, though done in us (Weiss). τοίς μη κατὰ σάρκα κ.τ.λ. = inasmuch as we walk not, etc. This is the condition under which the Divine purpose is fulfilled: there is no physical necessity in it. κατὰ σάρκα: the flesh meant is our corrupt human nature. κατὰ πνεύμα: the spirit is the Divine spirit which is given to those who are in Christ Jesus. It is in them "both law and impulse".

Ver. 5. The meaning of the sentence "is not contained in the repetitions of γὰρ by which it is hooked together" (Jowett). οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες are those whose nature is determined simply by the flesh; their "mind," i.e., their moral interest, their thought and study, is upon τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς: for which see Gal. v. 19 f. οἱ κατὰ πνεύμα are those whose nature is determined by the spirit: for τὸ τοῦ πνεύματος see Gal. v. 22.

Ver. 6. τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θανάτου: this does not so much mean that a man living after the flesh is without the life of God, as that death is the end of this line of conduct, chap. vi. 23, Gal. vi. 8. ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη: these on the other hand are conceived as present results involved in "the mind of the spirit". It is not arbitrary to distinguish thus: θάνατος in Paul is essentially the doom awaiting a certain life, ζωὴ and εἰρήνη possessions and experiences of the believer.

Ver. 7 f. The reason why the mind of the flesh terminates so fatally: it is hostility to God, the fountain of life. Alienation from Him is necessarily fatal. It is the flesh which does not (for indeed it cannot) submit itself to God; as the seat of indwelling it is in permanent revolt, and those who are in it (a stronger expression, yet substantially identically with those who are after it, ver. 5) cannot please God.

Ver. 9. Paul applies to his readers what he has said in vers. 5-8. οὐκ εἰσίς emphatic. You can please God, for you are not in the flesh, etc. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς εἰς ὑμᾶς ἔχει, οὐτος οὐκ εἰσίς. For εἰ followed by οὐ see Winer, 599 f. οὐτος οὐκ εἰσίν: only the indwelling of Christ's spirit proves a real relation to Him.

Ver. 10. Consequences of this indwelling of Christ in the Christian. In one respect, they are not yet so complete as might be expected. τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν: the body, it cannot be denied, is dead because of sin: the experience we call death is inevitable for it. τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ: but the spirit (i.e., the human spirit, as is shown by the contrast with σῶμα) is life, God-begotten, God-sustained life, and therefore beyond the reach of death. As death is due to sin, so is this life to δικαιοσύνη.
whole argument of chaps. vi.-viii. is that neither can exist without the other. No man can begin to be good till he is justified freely by God's grace in Christ Jesus, and no one has been so justified who has not begun to live the good life in the spirit.

Ver. 11. But though the present results of the indwelling of the spirit are not all we might desire, the future is sure. The indwelling spirit is that of Him who raised Jesus from the dead, and as such it is the guarantee that our mortal bodies also (as well as our spirits) shall share in immortality. The same argument, in effect, is used in Eph. i. 20. "The power that worketh in us" is the same with which "God wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places"; and it will work to the same issue in us as in Him. The reading in the last clause is very doubtful, but whether we take the accus. (according to which the indwelling of the spirit is the ground on which God raises our mortal bodies to undying life) or the genit. (according to which the spirit is itself the agent in this resurrection—a conception not found elsewhere in Scripture), in either case a share in the Christian resurrection is conditioned by the possession of the Spirit of Christ. It is clear from the alternation of πνεῦμα θεοῦ and πνεῦμα χριστοῦ in ver. 9 that the Spirit of Christ is the same as the Spirit of God, and the use of χριστοῦ alone in the next verse shows that this same spirit is the alter ego of Christ. Cf Phil. i. 9; Gal. iv. 6; Eph. iii. 17. This is one of the passages in which the presuppositions of the Trinitarian conception of God come out most clearly.

(2) Vers. 12-27. The Spirit as a spirit of adoption, the first-fruits of the inheritance of the children of God.

Ver. 12 f. The blessed condition and hopes of Christians, as described in these last verses, lay them under obligations: to whom, or to what? Not (ver. 12) to the flesh, to live according to it; to it they owe nothing. If they live after the flesh they are destined to die—the final doom in which there is no hope; but if by the spirit (i.e., God's Spirit) they put to death the doings of the body, they shall live—the life against which death is powerless. We might have expected τῆς σαρκὸς instead of τοῦ σώματος, but in the absence of the spirit the body in all it does is only the tool of the flesh: the two are morally equivalent.

Ver. 14. Ye shall live, for as many as are led by God's Spirit are God's sons, and life is congruous to such a dignity. άνοις suggests the rank and privileges of the persons in question; τέκνοι (in ver. 16 f.) their kinship in nature to God. Yet
VIII.

ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

γάρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα
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Ver. 23: το πνεῦμα

εἰς νοεσθείαν, ἐν οἷς κράζομεν, ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατὴρ. 16. οὗτο τὸ πνεῦμα

συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν, ὥστε ἔστω τέκνα θεοῦ. 17. εἶ δὲ

tέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ

οἱ Χριστοῦ· εἰπερ συμπάθειμεν, ὡς καὶ συνδοξασθῆμεν. 18. λογί-

ζομαι γάρ ὅτι οὐκ ἔζη τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν ἱκανοῦ πρὸς τὴν

this cannot everywhere be urged in the N.T.

Ver. 15. Sons, οὗ γάρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας. The aorist refers to the time of their baptism, when they received the Spirit. It was not the Spirit proper to slaves, leading them again to shrink from God in fear as they had done when under the law of sin and death, but πνεῦμα νοεσθείας, a spirit proper to those who were being translated from the servile to the filial relation to God. νοεσθεία is a word used in the N.T. by Paul only, but "no word is more common in Greek inscriptions of the Hellenistic time; the idea, like the word, is native Greek" (E. L. Hicks, quoted in S. and H.), see Gal. iv. 5, Eph. i. 5. The word serves to distinguish those who are made sons by an act of grace from the only begotten Son of God: τὸν εαυτοῦ υἱόν ver. 3, τοῦ ιδίου υἱοῦ ver. 32. But the act of grace is not one which makes only an outward difference in our position; it is accomplished in the giving of a spirit which creates in us a new nature. In the spirit of adoption we cry Αββά, Father. We have not only the status, but the heart of sons. κράζομεν (often with φωνή μεγάλη) is a strong word: it denotes the loud irrepressible cry with which the consciousness of sonship breaks from the Christian heart in prayer. The change to the first person marks Paul's inclusion of himself in the number of those who have and utter this consciousness; and it is probably this inclusion of himself, as a person whose native language was "Hebrew" (Acts xxii. 40), to which is due the double form ἀββᾶ ὁ πατὴρ. The last word certainly interprets the first, but it is not thought of as doing so: "we cry, Father, Father".

Ver. 16. The punctuation in W. and H. margin deserves notice. "In that we cry, Abba, Father, the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit," etc. Our own spirit tells us we are God's children, but the voice with which it speaks is, as we know, prompted and inspired by the Divine Spirit itself. For similar distinctions Gifford compares ii. 15 and ix. 1. τέκνα θεοῦ: τέκνα, not νοεσθείας, is used with strict propriety here, as it is the reality of the filial nature, not the legitimacy of the filial position, which is being proved.

Ver. 17. Yet this last is involved, for "if children, also heirs". Cf. Gal. iv. 7 where κληρονόμος is relative to υἱός; and all the passages in which the Spirit is regarded as "the earnest" of an inheritance: 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, Eph. i. 14. It is from God the inheritance comes, and we share in it with Christ (Mark. xii. 7). For what it is, see 1 Cor. ii. 9 f. The inheritance attached to Divine sonship is attained only on the condition expressed in the clause εἰπερ συμπάθειμεν ὡς καὶ συνδοξασθῆμεν. On εἰπερ, see ver. 9. "Rom. viii. 17 gains in pathos, when we see that the share of the disciples in the Master's sufferings was felt to be a fact of which there was no question." Simcox, Language of N.T., p. 171. Paul was sure of it in his own case, and took it for granted in that of others. Those who share Christ's sufferings now will share His glory hereafter; and in order to share His glory hereafter it is necessary to begin by sharing His sufferings here.

Ver. 18. The passage extending from this verse to ver. 27 is described by Lipsius as a "threefold testimony to the future transfiguration which awaits suffering believers". In vers. 19-22 there is the first testimony—the sighing of creation; in vers. 23-25 the second, the yearning hope of Christians themselves, related as it is to the possession of the first fruits of the Spirit; and in vers. 26 f. the third, the intercession of the Spirit which helps us in our prayers, and lends words to our longing. λογίζομαι γάρ κ.τ.λ. λογίζομαι is a favourite word with Paul: the instance most like this is the one in iii. 28. It does not suggest a more or less dubious result of calculation; rather by litotes does it express the strongest assurance. The insignificance of present suffering compared with future glory was a fixed idea with the Apostle, 2 Cor. iv. 17 f. For οὐκ ἔζη δέ βέβαιον ἀποκαλυφθῆναι cf. in Gal. iii. 23
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19. Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκαλύψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδεχέται. 20. Ἡ γὰρ 根源 ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἔκουσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄπω- εφ Ἐφ. iv. 17. τάξαντα, ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι,

16—21. ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

τὴν μελλ. πίστιν ἀποκαλ. Ἡ δόξα εἰς ημᾶς. 19. Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαράδοκια τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Ἡσθεοῦ ἀπεκδεχέται. 20. Ἡ γὰρ ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἔκουσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄπω- εφ Ἐφ. iv. 17. τάξαντα, ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι,

Ver. 19. First testimony to this glorious future: creation sighs for it. In some sense the hope and promise of it is involved in the present constitution of the world. For a fine speculative interpretation see E. Caird's Evolution of Religion, ii., 124 f. In Paul, however, the spirit of the passage is rather poetic than philosophical. Its affinities are with Gen. iii. 17, where the ground is cursed for man's sake: he conceives of all creation as involved in the fortunes of humanity. But this, if creation be personified, naturally leads to the idea of a mysterious sympathy between the world and man, and this is what the Apostle expresses. Creation is not inert,utterly unspiritual, alien to our life and its hopes. It is the natural ally of our souls. What rises from it is the music of humanity—not apparently so still and sad to Paul as to Wordsworth, but with a note of hope in it rising triumphantly above all the pain of conflict. ἀποκαράδοκια (Phil. i. 20) denotes absorbed, persistent expectation—waiting, as it were, with uplifted head. ἡ κτίσις is the world and all that it contains, animate and inanimate, as distinguished from man. τὴν ἄνθ. τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ: cf. 1 John i. 2. With the revelation of the sons of God humanity would attain its end, and nature too.

Ver. 20. For creation was subjected to vanity, etc. μεταιστής is not classical, but is often used in the I.XX, especially for ἁν. The idea is that of looking for what one does not find—hence of futility, frustration, disappointment. μετατίθεις μετατίθετων is the "vanity of vanities" in Eccl., the complaint of the utter resultlessness of life. Sin brought this doom on creation; it made a pessimistic view of the universe inevitable. ὑπετάγη: the precise time denoted is that of the Fall, when God pronounced the ground cursed for man's sake. Creation came under this doom οὐχ ἔκουσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄπω- εφ τάξαντα: the last words seem best referred to God: it was on account of Him—that His righteousness might be shown in the punishment of sin—that the sentence fell upon man, carrying consequences which extended to the whole realm intended originally for his dominion. The sentence on man, however, was not hopeless, and creation shared in his hope as in his doom. When the curse is completely removed from man, as it will be when the sons of God are revealed, it will pass from creation also; and for this creation sighs. It was made subject to vanity on the footing of this hope; the hope is latent, so to speak, in the constitution of nature, and comes out, in its sighing, to a sympathetic ear.

Ver. 21. Contents of the hope. It makes no difference in meaning, whether we read ὅτι or διότι. αὐτή ἡ κτίσις: creation as well as man. ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς: a system in which nothing continues in one stay, in which death claims everything, in which there is not even an analogy to immortality, is a system of slavery—in subjection to "vanity," with no high eternal worth of its own. From such a condition creation is to be emancipated; it is to share in the liberty which belongs to the glory of the children of God. When man's redemption is complete, he will find himself in a new world matching with his new condition (Isa. lxv. 17, 2 Pet. iii. 13, Rev. xxi. 1): this is
Paul's faith, and the sighing of creation attests it.

Ver. 22. οίδαμεν γάρ κ.τ.λ.: How Christians know this Paul does not say. Perhaps we may say that the Christian consciousness of sin and redemption is in contact with the ultimate realities of the universe, and that no interpretation of nature can be true but one which, like this, is in essential harmony with it. The force of the preposition in συστενάζει and συνωδίνει is not that we sigh and are in pain, and creation along with us; but that the whole frame of creation, all its parts together, unite in sighing and in pain. Weiss is right in saying that there is no reference to the δόεις Μεσσιαὶ, but in συνωδίνει there is the suggestion of the travail out of which the new world is to be born. αὔχρι τοῦ νῦν means up till now, without stopping, ever since the moment of υπετάγη.

Ver. 23. Second testimony to the glorious future. οὐ μόνον δὲ sc. ἡ κτίσις—not only all creation, but we Christians: we ourselves, τὴν ἄραρχήν τοῦ συνώματος ἔχουσε. Τοῦ συνώματος is gen. of apposition: the spirit which Christians have received is itself the first fruits (elsewhere, the earnest: see on ver. 17) of this glory; and because we have it (not although: it is the foretaste of heaven, the heaven begun in the Christian, which intensifies his yearning, and makes him more vehemently than nature long for complete redemption), we also sigh in ourselves υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. The key to these words is found in i. 4. Christ was Son of God always, but was only declared to be so in power εξ αναστάσεως νεκρῶν, and so it is with believers. They have already received adoption, and as led by the spirit are sons of God; but only when their mortal bodies have been quickened, and the corruptible has put on incorruption, will they possess all that sonship involves. For this they wait and sigh, and the inextinguishable hope, born of the spirit dwelling in them, guarantees its own fulfilment. Cf. Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 51; 2 Cor. v. 2; and for ἀπολύτρωσις in this sense, 1 Cor. i. 30.

Ver. 24 f. This sentence explains why Paul can speak of Christians as waiting for adoption, while they are nevertheless in the enjoyment of sonship. It is because salvation is essentially related to the future. "We wait for it: for we were saved in hope." The dat. τῆς ελπίδος is that of mode or respect. Our salvation was qualified from the beginning by reference to a good yet to be. Weiss argues that the sense of ελπίς in the second clause (resβερατα) makes it "absolutely necessary" to take it so in the first, and that this leaves no alternative but to make τῆς ελπίδος dat. comm. and translate: "for, for this object of hope—eternal life and glory—were we delivered from eternal destruction". But the "absolute necessity" is imaginary; a word with the nuances of ελπίς in a mind with the speed of Paul's need not be treated so rigorously, especially as the resulting construction is in itself extremely dubious. Hope, the Apostle argues, is an essential characteristic of our salvation; but hope turned sight is hope no more, for who hopes for what he sees? We do not see all the Gospel held out to us, but it is the object of our Christian hope nevertheless; it is as true
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δι' υπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. 26. Ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ Πνεύμα συναντιλαμβάνεται ταῖς ἁσθενείαις. 27. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ Πνεύμα ἦντυγχάνειν ύπέρ αὐτὸ τὸ στεναγμὸς αλαλήτοις τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, δι' οὗ θεοῦ ἔντυγχανειν ύπέρ ἁγίων.

28. Οἶδαμεν δὲ καὶ τοις ἁγαπώσι τοῦ Θεοῦ πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἁγαθόν,

1 For ταῖς ἁσθενείαις ΝΑΒCD have τῇ ἁσθενείᾳ. υπερ ἡμῶν CKLP; but om. ΝΑΒΔ.

2 After συνεργεῖ, ο θεος is found in AB. W. and H. bracket it, but Lachm. and Weiss regard it as the true text. It was omitted as cumbrous and unnecessary. Cf. i. 28, where ο θεος is omitted in ΝΑ in much the same way; here it is wanting in ΝΑΚΙΡΚΛ.

and sure as the love of God which in Christ Jesus reconciled us to Himself and gave us the spirit of adoption, and therefore we wait for it in patience. For δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεύμα ἦντυγχάνεις αὐτὸ τοῦ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, δι' οὗ θεοῦ ἔντυγχανεις ύπέρ ἁγίων.

Ver. 26. Third testimony to the glorious future: the sighing of creation, our own sighing, and this action of the Spirit, point consistently to one conclusion. συναντιλαμβάνεται, cf. Luke x. 40. The weakness which the Spirit helps is that due to our ignorance: ὧν τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δὲί οὐκ οίδαμεν. The article makes the whole clause object of oίδαμεν: Winer, p. 644. Broadly speaking, we do know what we are to pray for—the perfecting of salvation; but we do not know what we are to pray for καθὸ δὲί—according as the need is at the moment; we know the end, which is common to all prayers, but not what is necessary at each crisis of need in order to enable us to attain this end. ἄλλα αὐτὸ τὸ πνεύμα ἦντυγχάνεις στεναγμοῖς αλαλήτοις. ἦντυγχάνεις is found here only in N.T., but ἔντυγχανεις in this sense in vers. 27, 34. Heb. vii. 25. In Rom. xi. 2 with κατὰ = to make intercession οἰδαμεν δὲ=further, we know: in a sense this is one ground more for be-
believing in the glorious future: God is ever with us, and will not abandon us at last. πάντα συνεργεῖ (ὁ θεός): συνεργεῖ is naturally neuter, and if ὁ θεὸς is the true reading, it is probably best to render "God co-operates for good in all things (πάντα accus. of ref. as in 1 Cor. ix. 25. x. 33) with those," etc. τοὺς ἀγαπ. τὸν θεόν describes the persons in question from the human side; τοὺς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοὶς οὐσιν describes them from the Divine side. It is in pursuance of a purpose of God (for πρόθεσις with reference to the eternal purpose of redemption, see ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9) that they are called. "Calling" in Paul never means, invitation"; it is always "effectual calling".

Ver. 29 f. These verses give the proof that God in all things co-operates for good with the called. They show how His gracious purpose, beginning with foreknowledge and foreordination perfects all that concerns them on to the final glory. οῖς προέγνω: those whom He foreknew—in what sense ? as persons who would answer His love with love? This is at least irrelevant, and alien to Paul’s general mode of thought. That salvation begins with God, and begins in eternity, are fundamental ideas with him, which he here applies to Christians, without raising any of the problems involved in the relation of the human will to the Divine. He comes upon these in chap. ix., but not here. Yet we may be sure that προέγνω has the pregnant sense that γιγνώσκω (ἵνα) often has in Scripture: e.g., in Ps. i. 6, Amos iii. 2: hence we may render, "those of whom God took knowledge from eternity" (Eph. i. 4). καὶ προώρισεν π. τ.λ., "he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son ". This conformity is the last stage in salvation, as προέγνω is the first. The image is in import not merely spiritual but eschatological. The Son of God is the Lord who appeared to Paul by Damascus: to be conformed to His image is to share His glory as well as His holiness. The Pauline Gospel is hopelessly distorted when this is forgotten. εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς: the end in all this is the exaltation of Christ. It is implied in πρωτότοκον that He also is regarded as only having attained the fulness of His Sonship through the resurrection (cf. i. 4, and Col. i. 18 πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν).

The idea of Christ’s dignity as firstborn among many brethren who all owe their salvation to Him is sublimely interpreted in Heb. ii. 10-13. The Apostle now resumes the series of the Divine acts in our salvation. οὐς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ εὐδόκησεν. The eternal foreordination appears in time as “calling,” of course as effectual calling: where salvation is contemplated as the work of God alone (as here) there can be no breakdown in its processes. The next stages are summarily indicated. εὐδίκαιωσεν: God in Jesus Christ forgave our sins, and accepted us as righteous in His sight; ungodly as we had been, He put us right with Himself. In that, everything else is included. The whole argument of chaps. vii.-viii. has been that justification and the new life of holiness in the Spirit are inseparable experiences. Hence Paul can take one step to the end, and write οὐς δὲ εὐδίκαιωσεν, τούτους καὶ εὐδόκησεν.

Yet the tense in the last word is amazing. It is the most daring anticipation of faith that even the N.T. contains: the life is not to be taken out of it by the philosophic consideration that with God there is neither before nor after.

Ver. 31. ὁ Θεός ηὗτος προς ταύτα; the idea underlying all that precedes is that of the suffering to be endured by those who would share Christ’s glory (ver. 17). The Apostle has disparaged the suffering in comparison with the glory (ver. 18); he has interpreted it (vers. 19-27) as in a manner prophetic of the glory; he has in these last verses asserted the presence through all the Christian’s life of an eternal victorious purpose of love: all this is included in ταύτα. For ὁπέρ καὶ κατὰ, cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

Ver. 32. The Christian’s faith in providence is an inference from redemption. The same God who did not spare His own Son will freely give us all things.
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32. δε γε τοι ιδιου ινδου ουκ εφεστατο. Άλλως επερ ημων παντων παρεδωκεν αυτων, τως ουχι και ευν αυτω τα παντα ημων; 33. τις εγκαλεσε γαρ ελεκτων Θεου; 34. τις ο κατακρινων; Χριστος δε αποθανων, μαλλον δε και εγερθησει, δε και έστιν εν δεξια θεου, δε και

1 Χριστος alone BDEK, most cursive, and Treg. Χριστος ιησους MACFL 17, vulg., etc. Weiss puts X. I. in text, thinking the omission in B, etc., accidental; W. and H., and Lachm. bracket ιησους. The και before εγερθης is wanting in ΝΑC. The και before εστιν is wanting in ΝAC but is found in ΝΒDFKL. It is omitted by W. and H., and Tischdf., bracketed by Lachm., but retained by Weiss. After εγερθης ΝΑC insert εκ νεκρων; W. and H. bracket this, but all other crit. edd. omit, with ΝΒDFGKL, etc.

ουκ εφεστατο, cf. Gen. xxii. 12, ουκ εφεστατο τοι ινδου σου του αγαπητου δι' θεου. It vivifies the impression of God's love through the sense of the sacrifice it made. υπερ ημων παντων: none were worthy of such a sacrifice (Weiss). παρεδωκεν sc. to death: ίν. 25. πως ουχι και: the argument of selfishness is that he who has done so much need do no more; that of love, that he who has done so much is certain to do more. συν αυτω τα παντα: τα παντα has a collective force. It is usually taken to mean the whole of what furthers the Christian's life, the whole of what contributes to the perfecting of his salvation; all this will be freely given to him by God. But why should it not mean all things? Without any such qualification: When God gives us His Son He gives us the world; there is nothing which does not work together for our good; all things are ours. Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 22 f.

Ver. 33 f. The punctuation here is a very difficult problem: see the text and margin of R.V. The reminiscence of Is. l. 8 f. in verse 33 makes it more difficult; for it suggests that the normal structure is that of an affirmation followed by a question, whereas Paul begins with a question to which the affirmation (with at least a trace of Isaiah's language in it) is an answer. It is even possible to read every clause interrogatively, though that is less effective. τις εγκαλεσε κατα ελεκτων Θεου; who shall bring a charge against persons who are God's chosen? The absence of the article (cf. υπερ ημων, ver. 27) brings out the character in which the persons in question figure, not their individual personality. For the word see Col. iii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. i. 1; for the thing cf. I Thess. i. 4; Eph. i. 4; John xv. 16. It describes Christians as persons who owe their standing as such to the act of God's grace. All Christians are conscious that this is the truth about their position: they belong to God, because He has taken them for His own. To say that the word designates "not those who are destined for final salvation, but those who are 'summoned' or 'selected' for the privilege of serving God and carrying out His will" (S. and H.), is to leave the rails of the Apostle's thought altogether. There is nothing here (vers. 28-30) about the privilege of serving God and carrying out His will; the one thing Paul is concerned with is the security given by the eternal love of God that the work of salvation will be carried through, in spite of all impediments, from foreknowledge to final glory. The ελεκτοι Θεου are those who ought to have such security: they should have a faith and an assurance proportioned to the love of God. Paul is one of them, and because he is, he is sure, not that he is called to serve God, but that nothing can ever separate him from God's love in Christ. The question τις ο κατακρινων a new question, and find the answer in verse 34: Χριστος [ιησους] δε αποθανων = the only person who can condemn is the Judge, viz., Christ, but He is so far from condemning that He has done everything to deliver us from condemnation. What Christian, Paul seems to ask, can speak of κατακριμα with his eye on Christ, who died for our sins? μαλλον δε εγερθης (εκ νεκρων): cf. Gal. iv. 9; and chap. iv. 25. The correction in μαλλον is formal (Weiss): Paul does not mean that the resurrection is more important than the cross; he improves upon an expression which has not conveyed all that was in his mind.
Our position depends upon Jesus Christ who died, nay rather, over whom death no more has dominion (vi. 9), who is at God's right hand (this phrase, which describes Christ's exaltation as a sharing in the universal sovereignty of God, is borrowed from Ps. cx. 1, and is oftener used in the N.T. than any other words of the Old), who also makes intercession on our behalf. 

δς και εντυγχάνει: a solemn climax is marked by the repetition of δς, and by the και which deliberately adds the intercession to all that has gone before. The Christian consciousness, even in an apostle, cannot transcend this. This is Paul's final security—the last ground of his triumphant assurance: Jesus Christ, at God's right hand, with the virtue of His atoning death in Him, pleads His people's cause. Cf. Heb. ix. 24, vii. 25, 1 John ii. 1 f. 

Ver. 35 f. τίς ημᾶς χωρίσει από τῆς αγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ? If this verse is to be most closely connected with ver. 34, τοῦ Χριστοῦ will appear the more probable reading, for there Christ is the subject throughout; but at vers. 28, 31, 39 the love of God is the determining idea, and at this point it seems to be caught up again in view of the conclusion—facts which favour the reading τοῦ θεοῦ. In any case it is the Divine love for us which is meant. With the list of troubles cf. 2 Cor. vi. 4-10, xi. 26 f., xii. 10. They were those which had befallen Paul himself, and he knew that the love of God in Jesus Christ could reach and sustain the heart through them all. The quotation from Ps. xlv. 23 is peculiar. It exactly reproduces the LXX, even the διά being simply transferred. The καθώς implies that such experiences as those named in ver. 35 are in agreement with what Scripture holds out as the fortune of God's people. Possibly the mention of the sword recalled to the Apostle's memory the εναποίμησα of the psalm, and suggested the quotation. The point of it, both in the psalm and in the epistle, lies in ἐνεκεν σού. This is what the Psalmist could not understand. That men should suffer for sin, for infidelity to God, was intelligible enough; but he and his countrymen were suffering because of their faithfulness, and the psalm is his despairing expostulation with God. But the Apostle understood it. To suffer for Christ's sake was to enter into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, and that is the very situation in which the love of Christ is most real, near, and sure to the soul. Cf. chap. v. 3, 2 Cor. i. 5, Col. i. 24. Instead of despairing, he glories in tribulations.

Ver. 37. υπερνικώμεν: a word probably coined by Paul, who loves compounds with υπερ. The Vulg. gives superamus, with which Lipsius agrees (obsi gen, like over-power): but Cyprian supervincimus. Later Greek writers distinguish νικάν and υπερνικάν (see Grimm, s.τ.), and justify the happy rendering "we are more than conquerors". Perhaps it is a mistake to define in what the "more" consists; but if we do, the answer must be sought on the line indicated in the note on ἐνεκεν σού: these trials not only do not cut us off from Christ's love, they actually give us more intimate and thrilling experiences of it.

διά τοῦ αγαπήσαντος ημᾶς: the aorist points to Christ's death as the great demonstration of His love: cf. Gal. ii. 20, also Rev. xii. 11.

Ver. 38 f. The Apostle's personal conviction given in confirmation of all that has been said, especially of ver. 37. πέπεισμαι cf. 2 Tim. i. 12. οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή: death is mentioned first, either with ver. 36 in mind, or as the most tremendous enemy the Apostle could conceive. If Christ's love can hold us in and through death, what is left for us to fear? Much of the N.T. bears on this
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37. ἀλλ’ ἐν τούτοις πάσιν ὑπερνικώμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. 38. πεπειμαί γὰρ ὅτι οὕτε δάκατος οὕτε ἕμη, οὕτε ἄγγελοι οὕτε ἄρχαι οὕτε δυνάμεις, οὕτε ἐνεστώτα οὕτε μέλλοντα. 39. οὕτε ὕψωμα οὕτε βάθος, οὕτε τις κτίσις ἄλλη δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἡσυχῶ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

very point. cf. John viii. 51, x. 28, xi. 25 f., i Thess. iv. 13-18, i Cor. xv. 2, Cor. iv. 16-18. 5, Rom. xiv. 8, Heb. ii. 14 f. The blank horror of dying is annihilated by the love of Christ. Neither death nor life is to be explained: explanations "only limit the flight of the Apostle's thoughts just when they would soar above all limitation" (Gifford). οὕτε ἄγγελοι οὕτε ἄρχαι: this, according to the best authorities, forms a second pair of forces conceivably hostile to the Christian. As in every pair there is a kind of contrast, some have sought one here also: either making ἄγγελοι good and ἄρχαι evil powers, though both spiritual; or ἄγγελοι heavenly, and ἄρχαι (as in Lc. xii. 16, Tit. iii. 1) earthly powers, in which case either might be either good or bad. But this is arbitrary: and a comparison of i Cor. xv. 24, Eph. i. 21 favours a suggestion in S. and H. that possibly in a very early copy οὕτε δυνάμεις had been accidentally omitted after οὕτε ἄρχαι, and then added in the margin, but reinserted in a wrong place. The T. R. "neither angels nor principalities nor powers" brings together all the conceptions with which the Apostle peopled the invisible spiritual world, whatever their character, and declares their inability to come between us and the love of Christ. οὕτε ἐνεστώτα οὕτε μέλλοντα. cf. i Cor. iii. 22. οὕτε ὕψωμα οὕτε βάθος: no dimensions of space. Whether these words pictured something to Paul's imagination we cannot tell; the patristic attempts to give them definiteness are not happy. οὕτε τις κτίσις ἄλλη: nor any created thing of different kind. All the things Paul has mentioned come under the head of κτίσις; if there is anything of a different kind which comes under the same head, he includes it too. The suggestions of "another world," or of "aspects of reality out of relation to our faculties," and therefore as yet unknown to us, are toys, remote from the seriousness and passion of the Apostle's mind. Nothing that God has made, whatever be its nature, shall be able to separate us from the love of Christ. The love of Christ is God's love, manifested to us in Him; and it is only in Him that a Divine love is manifested which can inspire the triumphant assurance of this verse.

CHAPTERS IX.-XI. With the eighth chapter Paul concludes the positive exposition of his gospel. Starting with the theme of i. 16 f., he showed in i. 18-iii. 20 the universal sinfulness of men —Gentile and Jew; in iii. 21-v. 21 he explained, illustrated and glorified the gospel of justification by faith in Christ, set forth by God as a propitiation for sin; in vi. 1-viii. 39 he has vindicated this gospel from the charge of moral inefficiency, by showing that justification by faith is inseparably connected with a new life in the Spirit, a life over which sin has no dominion and in which the just demands of God's law are fulfilled. He has even carried this spiritual life on, in hope, to its consummation in glory: and no more remains to be said. With chap. ix. a new subject is introduced. There is no formal link of connexion with what precedes. Structurally, the new division of the epistle stands quite apart from the earlier; it might have been written, and probably was written, after a break. But though no logical relation between the parts is expressed, a psychological connection between them is not hard to discover. The new section deals with a problem which presented great difficulty to the early Church, and especially to men of Jewish birth, a problem which haunted the Apostle's own mind and was no doubt thrust on his attention by his unbelieving countrymen, a problem all the more painful to him as he realised more completely the greatness and glory of the Christian salvation. This was the problem constituted by the fact that the Jews as a whole did not receive the Gospel. They were God's chosen people, but if the Christian Gospel brought salvation they had no share in it. The Messiah was to spring from them, but if Jesus was the Messiah this privilege meant not redemption but condemnation, for they rejected Him almost with one consent. In short, if the birth of the Christian Church and the gathering of
Gentiles into it represented the carrying out of God's purpose to bless and save men, God must have turned His back upon Himself; He must have broken His promise to Israel, and cast off His chosen people. But as this must seem impossible, the Jewish inference would be that the Gospel preached by Paul could not be of God, nor the Gentile Churches, as Paul asserted, God's true Israel. This is the situation to which the Apostle addresses himself in the ninth and the two following chapters. It is a historical problem, in the first instance, he has to deal with, not a dogmatic one; and it is necessary to keep the historical situation in view, if we are to avoid illegitimate inferences from the arguments or illustrations of the Apostle. After the introductory statement (ix. 1-5), which shows how deeply his heart is pledged to his brethren after the flesh, he works out a solution of the problem—or an interpretation of the position—along three lines. In each of these there are many incidental points of view, but they can be broadly discriminated. (1) In the first, chap. ix. 6-29, Paul asserts the absolute freedom and sovereignty of God as against any claim, made as of right, on the part of man. The Jewish objection to the Gospel, to which reference is made above, really means that the Jewish nation had a claim of right upon God, giving them a title to salvation, which God must acknowledge; Paul argues that all God's action, as exhibited in Scripture, and especially in the history of Israel itself—to say nothing of the essential relations of Creator and creature—refutes such a claim. (2) In the second, chap. ix. 30-x. 21, Paul turns from this more speculative aspect of the situation to its moral character, and points out that the explanation of the present rejection of the Jews is to be found in the fact that they have wilfully and stubbornly rejected the Gospel. Their minds have been set on a righteousness of their own, and they have refused to submit themselves to the righteousness of God. (3) In the third, chap. xi., he rises again to an absolute or speculative point of view. The present unbelief of the Jews and incoming of the Gentiles are no doubt, to a Jew, disconcerting events; yet in spite of them, or rather—which is more wonderful still—by means of them, God's promises to the fathers will be fulfilled, and all Israel saved. Gentile Christianity will provoke the unbelieving Jews to jealousy, and they too will enter the Messianic Kingdom. In the very events which seem to throw the pious Jewish mind out of its reckoning, there is a gracious providence, a depth of riches and wisdom and knowledge which no words can express. The present situation, which at the first glance is heart-breaking (ix. 2), is only one incident in the working out of a purpose which when completed reveals the whole glory of God's mercy, and evokes the loftiest and most heartfelt praise. "He shut up all unto disobedience that He might have mercy on all... Of Him and through Him and to Him are all things. Unto Him be glory for ever." Since Baur's time several scholars have held that the mass of the Roman Church was Jewish-Christian, and that these three chapters, with their apologetic aim, are specially addressed to that community, as one which naturally felt the pressure of the difficulty with which they deal. But the Roman Church, as these very chapters show (cf. ix. 3, my kinsmen, not our; xi. 13, ὑμῖν ὑπό λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσι), was certainly Gentile, whatever influence Jewish modes of thought and practice may have had in it; and it was quite natural for the Apostle, in writing what he evidently meant from the first should be both a systematic and a circular letter, to include in it a statement of his thoughts on one of the most difficult and importunate questions of the time. The extraordinary daring of chap. xi. ad fin. is not unrelated to the extraordinary passion of chap. ix. ad init. The whole discussion is a magnificent illustration of the aphorism, that great thoughts come from the heart.

CHAPTER IX.—Vv. 1-5. The intense pain with which Paul contemplates the unbelief of his countrymen.

Ver. 1. Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ "ψεύδομαι. The solemn asseveration is meant to clear him of the suspicion that in preaching to the Gentiles he is animated by hostility or even indifference to the Jews. Yet cf. 2 Cor. xi. 31, Gal. i. 20. ἐν Χριστῷ means that he speaks in fellowship with Christ, so that falsehood is impossible. For συμμαρτ. cf. ii. 15, viii. 16. The μοι is governed by ὑπό: conscience attests what he says, and that ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ—the spirit of...
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μεγάλη, καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ἤμων, τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, 3. τὴν καρδίᾳ μου, οποτέ ἐγώ ἀναθήμα αἰνεὶ العربية. εἰναι 1 ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα. 4. οἰστὶν εἰσίν Ἰσραήλ, ἡ δὲ δοξα, καὶ οἱ διαθήκαι, καὶ λατ

1 αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀναθήμα εἰναι, διότι CΚL, ἀλλὰ in δSΑΒDF ἀναθήμα εἰναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ. αἱ διαθήκαι δSCΚ and versions, η διαθήκη BDF; see note 2 (σφραγίς). αὐτος εἰναι, so CΚL ; but in ἈΒΔΦ ἀναθήμα εἰναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ.

Ver. 2. The fact of Paul's sorrow is stated here; the cause of it is revealed in ver. 3. Weiss remarks on the triple climax: λύπη being intensified in οδύνη, μεγάλη in αδιάλειπτος, and μοι in τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. Paul cannot find words strong enough to convey his feeling.

Ver. 3. ηυχόμην γάρ ανάθεμα εἰναι κ.τ.λ. For I could wish that I myself were anathema, etc. For the omission of άν see ΑActs xxν. 22, Gal. ν. 2ο. Paul could wish this if it were a wish that could be realised for the good of Israel. The form of expression implies that the wish had actually been conceived, but in such sentences "the context alone implies what the present state of mind is" (Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 33). ἀναθήμα is to be construed with ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: the idea of separation from Christ, final and fatal separation, is conveyed. For the construction cf. Gal. v. 4 (κατήργηθεν ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ). ἀναθήμα Gal. i. 8 f., 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvii. 22 is the equivalent of the Hebrew טֵבַח, Deut. vii. 26, Josh. vii. 12—that which is put under the ban, and irrevocably devoted to destruction. It is beside the mark to speak of such an utterance as this as unethical. Rather might we call it with Dorner "a spark from the fire of Christ's substitutionary love". There is a passion in it more profound even than that of Moses' prayer in Ex. xxxii. 32. Moses identifies himself with his people, and if they cannot be saved would perish with them; Paul could find it in his heart, were it possible, to perish for them. τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα distinguishes these from his Christian brethren.

Ver. 4 f. The intensity of Paul's distress, and of his longing for the salvation of his countrymen, is partly explained in this verse. It is the greatness of his people, their unique place of privilege in God's providence, the splendour of the inheritance and of the hopes which they forfeit by unbelief, that make their unbelief at once so painful, and so perplexing. οἰστὶν εἰσίν Ἰσραήλ: being, as they are, Israelites. Israelites is not the national but the theocratic name; it expresses the spiritual prerogative of the nation, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 22, Gal. vi. 16. ἡ δοξα: the glory must refer to something definite, like the pillar of cloud and fire, the θυρωρία of the O.T., the ἔρανιμον of later Jewish theology; there is probably reference to it in Acts vii. 2, Heb. ix. 5. al διαθήκαι: in other places Paul speaks of the O.T. religion as one covenant, one (legal) administration of the relations between God and man (e.g., in 2 Cor. iii.): here, where al διαθήκαι is expressly distinguished from η νομοθεσία (the great Sinaitic legislation: 2 Macc. vi. 23), the various covenants God made with the patriarchs must be meant. Cf. Wisd. xviii. 22, Sir. xlv. 11, 2 Macc. viii. 15. ἡ λατρεία is the cultus of the tabernacle and the temple, the only legitimate cultus in the world. al διαθήκαι are the Messianic promises: in the Israelitish religion "the best was yet to be," as all the highest minds knew. Ver. 5. ἐν οἷς θαύματα: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The greatness of its ancestry ennobled Israel, and made its position in Paul's time harder to understand and to endure. Who could think without the keenest pain of the sons of such fathers forfeiting everything for which the fathers had been called?
But the supreme distinction of Israel has yet to be mentioned. υπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα, υπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας. ἀμήν.

The only point in the interpretation of this verse, in which it can be said that interpreters are wholly at one, is the statement that of Israel the Messiah came, according to the flesh. The words τὸ κατὰ σάρκα define the extent to which the Messiah can be explained by His descent from Israel: for anything going beyond σάρξ, or ordinary humanity, the explanation must be sought elsewhere. The limitations suggest an antithesis, and one in which the spiritual or Divine side of the Messiah's nature should find expression, this being the natural counterpart of σάρξ: and such an antithesis has been sought and found in the words which follow. He who, according to the flesh, is of Israel, is at the same time "God Who is over all, blessed for ever."

This interpretation, which refers the whole of the words after ο Χριστός to ὁ Χριστός, is adopted by many of the best scholars: Gifford, Sanday, Westcott (see N.T., vol. ii., app., p. 110), Weiss, etc., and has much in its favour. (1) It does supply the complementary antithesis which τὸ κατὰ σάρκα suggests. (2) Grammatically it is simple, for ο ών naturally applies to what precedes: the person who is over all is naturally the person just mentioned, unless there is decisive reason to the contrary. (3) If we adopt another punctuation, and make the words ο ών επί πάντων Θεός ευλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας a doxology—"God Who is over all, blessed for ever"—there are grammatical objections. These are (a) the use of ὁ, which is at least abnormal. "God Who is over all" would naturally be expressed by ὁ ἐπί πάντων Θεός without ὁ: the ὁ suggests the reference to Christ. (b) The position of εὐλογητός is unparalleled in a doxology; it ought, as in Eph. i. 3 and the LXX., to stand first in the sentence. But these reasons are not decisive. As for (1), though a complementary antithesis to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα is suggested, it is not imperatively demanded here, as in i. 3 f. The greatness reflected upon Israel by the origin of the person in question is sufficiently conveyed by ὁ Χριστός, without any expansion. As for (2), it is true to say that ὁ naturally refers to what precedes: the only question is, whether the natural reference may not in any given case be precluded. Many scholars think it is precluded here. Meyer, for instance, argues that "Paul has never used the express θεός of Christ, since he has not adopted, like John, the Alexandrian form of conceiving and setting forth the Divine essence of Christ, but has adhered to the popular concrete, strictly monotheistic terminology, not modified by philosophical speculation even for the designation of Christ; and he always accurately distinguishes God and Christ." To this he adds the more dubious reasons that in the genuine apostolic writings (he excludes 2 Tim. iv. 18, 2 Pet. iii. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, and Rev.) there is no doxology to Christ in the form usual in doxologies referring to God, and that by ἐπί πάντων the Son's subordination is denied. To these last arguments it may be answered that if the words in question do apply to Christ they are not a doxology at all (Gifford), but a declaration of deity, like 2 Cor. xi. 31, and that Christ's subordination is not affected by His being described as ὁ ἐπί πάντων any more than by His own claim to have all authority in heaven and on earth. But the first of Meyer's arguments has a weight which it is impossible not to feel, and it becomes the more decisive the more we realise Paul's whole habit of thought and speech. To say with Dr. Gifford, "When we review the history of the interpretation it cannot but be regarded as a remarkable fact that every objection urged against the ancient interpretation rests ultimately on dogmatic presuppositions," hardly covers such a position as Meyer represents. For the "dogmatic presuppositions" are not arbitrary, but merely sum up the whole impression made on the mind by the study of Paul's writings, an impression by which we cannot but be influenced, especially in deciding delicate and dubious questions like this. If we ask ourselves point blank, whether Paul, as we know his mind from his epistles, would express his sense of Christ's greatness by calling Him God blessed for ever, it seems to me almost impossible to answer in the affirmative. Such an assertion is not on the same plane with the conception of Christ which meets us everywhere in the Apostle's writings; and though there is some irregularity in the grammar, and perhaps some
difficulty in seeing the point of a doxology, I agree with those who would put a colon or a period at σάρκα, and make the words that follow refer not to Christ but to the Father. This is the punctuation given in the margin by W. and H., and "alone seems adequate to account for the whole of the language employed, more especially when considered in relation to the context" (Hort, N.T., vol. ii., app., p. 110). The doxology is, indeed, somewhat hard to comprehend at first glance without a motive, and no psychological explanation of it yet offered is very satisfying. It is as if Paul, having carried the privileges of Israel to a climax by mentioning the origin of the Messiah as far as regards His humanity, suddenly felt himself face to face with the problem of the time, how to reconcile these extraordinary privileges with the rejection of the Jews; and before addressing himself to any study or solution of it expressed in this way his devout and adoring faith, even under the pressure of such a perplexity, in the sovereign providence of God. The use of ών, which is in itself unnecessary, emphasizes επί πάνω; and this emphasis is "fully justified if St. Paul's purpose is to suggest that the tragic apostasy of the Jews (vers. 2, 3) is itself part of the dispensations of Him Who is God over all, over Jew and Gentile alike, over past, present and future alike; so that the ascription of blessing to Him is a homage to His Divine purpose and power of bringing good out of evil in the course of the ages (xi. 13-16, 25-36)" : W. and H., ii., app., p. 110. Full discussions of the passage are given in Meyer, S. and H., and Gifford; also by Dr. Ezra Abbot in the Journal of the Society of Biblical Exegesis, 1883. With this preface Paul proceeds to justify the ways of God to men; see the introductory remarks above. The first section of his argument (ix. 6-29) is in the narrower sense a theodicy—a vindication of God's right in dealing as He has dealt with Israel. In the first part of this (vers. 6-13) he shows that the rejection of the mass of Israel from the Messianic Kingdom involves no breach or failure of the Divine promise. The promise is not given to all the natural descendants of Abraham, but only to a chosen seed, the Israel of God.

Ver. 6. οὖξ οἶον δὲ δὴ: this unique expression is explained by Buttmann (Grammar, p. 372, Thayer's Transl.) as a blending of two formulas—ουχ οίον followed by a finite verb, and οὐχ ὅτι, which is common in the N.T. The meaning is, But, in spite of my grief, I do not mean to say any such thing as that the Word of God has come to nothing. For not all they that are of Israel, i.e., born of the patriarch, are Israel, i.e., the people of God. This is merely an application of our Lord's words, That which is born of the flesh is flesh. It is not what we get from our fathers and mothers that ensures our place in the family of God. For the use of οὗτοι in this verse to resume and define the subject see Gal. iii. 7.

Ver. 7. Νor because they are Abraham's seed, are they all τέκνα, i.e., children in the sense which entitles them to the inheritance, iv. 11, viii. 17. God from the very first made a distinction here, and definitely announced that the seed of Abraham to which the promise belonged should come in the line of Isaac—not of Ishmael, though he also could call Abraham father. Εν Ἰσαάκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα = Gen. xxi. 12, LXX. The words literally mean that in the line of Isaac Abraham should have the posterity which would properly bear his name, and inherit the promises made to him by God. Isaac's descendants are the true Abrahamidae.

Ver. 8 f. τούτ' έστιν: the meaning of this action of God is now made clear. It signifies that not mere bodily descent from Abraham makes one a child of God—that was never the case, not even in Abraham's time; it is the children of the promise who are reckoned a seed to Abraham, for the word in virtue of which Isaac, the true son and heir, was born, was a word of promise. He was born, to use the language of the Gospel, from above; and something analogous to this is necessary, whenever a man (even a
descendant of Abraham) claims to be a child of God and an heir of His kingdom. From Gal. iv. 28 (Now we, brethren, like Isaac, are children of promise) we see that the relation to God in question here is one open to Gentiles as well as Jews: if we are Christ's, then we too are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise. The argumentative suggestion in vers. 6-9 is that just as God discriminated at the first between the children of Abraham, so He is discriminating still; the fact that many do not receive the Gospel no more proves that the promise has failed than the fact that God chose Isaac only and set aside Ishmael.

Ver. 10 ff. But the argument can be made more decisive. A Jewish opponent might say, "Ishmael was an illegitimate child, who naturally had no rights as against Isaac; we are the legitimate descendants of the patriarch, and our right to the inheritance is indefeasible". To this the Apostle replies in vers. 10-13. Not only did God make the distinction already referred to, but in the case of Isaac's children, where there seemed no ground for making any distinction whatever, He distinguished again, and said, The elder shall serve the younger. Jacob and Esau had one father, one mother, and were twin sons; the only ground on which either could have been preferred was that of priority of birth, and this was disregarded by God; Esau, the elder, was rejected, and Jacob, the younger, was made heir of the promises. Further, this was done by God of His sovereign freedom: the decisive word was spoken to their mother while they were as yet unborn and had achieved neither good nor evil. Claims as of right, therefore, made against God, are futile, whether they are based on descent or on works. There is no way in which they can be established; and, as we have just seen, God acts in entire disregard of them. God's purpose to save men, and make them heirs of His kingdom—a purpose which is characterised as κατ' εκλογὴν, or involving a choice—is not determined at all by consideration of such claims as the Jews put forward. In forming it, and carrying it out, God acts with perfect freedom. In the case in question His action in regard to Jacob and Esau agrees with His word in the prophet Malachi: Jacob I loved but Esau I hated; and further than this we cannot go. To avoid misapprehending this, however, it is necessary to keep the Apostle's purpose in view. He wishes to show that God's promise has not broken down, though many of the children of Abraham have no part in its fulfilment in Christ. He does so by showing that there has always been a distinction, among the descendants of the patriarchs, between those who have merely the natural connection to boast of, and those who are the Israel of God; and, as against Jewish pretensions, He shows at the same time that this distinction can be traced to nothing but God's sovereignty. It is not of works, but of Him Who effectually calls men. We may say, if we please, that sovereignty in this sense is "just a name for what is unrevealed of God" (T. Erskine, The Brazen Serpent, p. 259), but though it is unrevealed we must not conceive of it as arbitrary—i.e., as non-rational or non-moral. It is the sovereignty of God, and God is not ex lex; He is a law to Himself—a law all love and holiness and truth—in all His purposes towards men. So Calvin: "ubi mentionem gloriae Dei audis, illic justitiam cogita". Paul has mentioned in an earlier chapter, among the notes of true religion, the exclusion of boasting (iii. 27); and in substance that is the argument he is using here. No Jewish birth, no legal works, can give a man a claim which God is bound to honour; and no man urging such claims can say that God's word has become of no effect though his claims are disallowed, and he gets no part in the inheritance of God's people.

οὐ μόνον δὲ: cf. v. 11, viii. 23 = Not only is this so, but a more striking and convincing illustration can be given. ἀλλὰ καὶ 'Ρεβέκκα: the sentence thus begun is never finished, but the sense is
13. καθώς γέραπται, "Τὸν Ἰακώβ ἡγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαύ ἐμύσησα".

14. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ δικία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ; μὴ γένοιτο. 15. Τῷ γὰρ Μωυσῆ λέγει, "Ελεήσω δὲν ἰἀν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτερίσῃ δὲν ἰἀν

καθὼς B, Orig. i (instead of καθώς) is read by Weiss and W. and H., though the latter put καθώς in marg. Cf. iii. 4, xi. 8, and 1 Cor. x. 10. continued in ver. 12. Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν: Paul speaks here out of his own consciousness as a Jew, addressing himself to a problem which greatly exercised other Jews; and calls Isaac "father" as the person from whom the inheritance was to come. Ver. 11. μὴ πώς γὰρ γνώσηται καθὼς πράξατον: "the conditional negatives (μὴν, μὴν) represent the circumstances not as mere facts of history, but as conditions entering into God's counsel and plan. The time of the prediction was thus chosen, in order to make it clear that He Who calls men to be heirs of His salvation makes free choice of whom He will, unfettered by any claims of birth or merit" (Gifford). πρόθεσις in this theological sense is a specially Pauline word. The purpose it describes is universal in its bearings, for it is the purpose of One who works all things according to the counsel of His will, Eph. i. 11; it is eternal, a πρόθεσις τῶν αἰῶνων, Eph. iii. 11; it is God's ιδία πρόθεσις, 2 Tim. i. 9, a purpose, the meaning, contents, and end of which find their explanation in God alone; it is a purpose κατ' ἐκλογήν, i.e., the carrying of it out involves choice and discrimination between man and man, and between race and race; and in spite of the side of mystery which belongs to such a conception, it is a perfectly intelligible purpose, for it is described as πρόθεσις ἐν τῷ χριστῷ ιησοῦ, and what God means by Christ Jesus no one can doubt. God's eternal purpose, the purpose carried out κατ' ἐκλογήν, yet embracing the universe, is clearly revealed in His Son. The permanent determining element, wherever this purpose is concerned, is not the works of men, but the will and call of God; and to make this plain was the intention of God in speaking as He did, and when He did, to Rebecca about her children. If we look to Gen. xxv. 23, it is indisputably the nations of Israel and Edom that are referred to: "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger". The same is true also of Mal. i. 2: "I loved Jacob, but Esau I hated, and made his mountains a desolation," etc. Yet it would not be right to say that Paul is here considering merely the parts assigned by God to nations in the drama of providence; He is obviously thinking of Jacob and Esau as individuals, whose own relation to God's promise and inheritance (involving no doubt that of their posterity) was determined by God before they were born or had done either good or ill. On the other hand, it would not be right to say that Paul here refers the eternal salvation or perdition of individuals to an absolute decree of God which has no relation to what they are or do, but rests simply on His inscrutable will. He is engaged in precluding the idea that man can have claims of right against God, and with it the idea that the exclusion of the mass of Israel from the Messiah's kingdom convicts God of breach of faith toward the children of Abraham; and this He can do quite effectually, on the lines indicated, without consciously facing this tremendous hypothesis.

Vv. 14-21. In the second part of his theodicy Paul meets the objection that this sovereign freedom of God is essentially unjust.

Ver. 14. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; cf. vi. 1, vii. 7, viii. 31. It is Paul who speaks, anticipating, as he cannot help doing, the objection which is sure to rise, not only in Jewish minds, though it is with them he is directly concerned, but in the mind of every human being who reads his words. Yet he states the objection as one in itself incredible. μὴ δικία παρά τῷ Θεῷ; surely we cannot say that there is unrighteousness with God? This is the force of the μὴ, and Paul can answer at once μὴ γένοιτο: away with the thought! God says Himself that He shows mercy with that sovereign freedom which Paul has ascribed to Him; and the principle of action which God announces as His own cannot be unjust.

Ver. 15. Τῷ Μωυσεὶ γὰρ λέγει. Τῷ Μωυσεὶ is emphatic by position: the person to whom this declaration was
made, as well as the voice which made it, render it peculiarly significant to a Jew. The words (exactly as LXX, Exod. xxxiii. 19) occur in the answer to a prayer of Moses, and may have been regarded by Paul as having special reference to him; as if the point of the quotation were, 'One who had deserved so well as Moses experienced God's mercy solely because God willed that He should. But that is not necessary, and is not what the original means. The emphasis is on δὲ ἄν, and the point is that in showing mercy God is determined by nothing outside of His mercy itself. οἰκτείρειν is stronger than ελεεῖν; it suggests more strongly the emotion attendant on pity, and even its expression in voice or gesture.

Ver. 16. Conclusion from this word of God. It (namely, the experience of God's mercy) does not depend on man's resolve or effort (for τρέχειν cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24 ft.), but on God's merciful act. This, of course, merely repeats vers. 12, 13, buttressing the principle of God's sovereign freedom in the exercise of mercy by reference to His own word in Exod. xxxiii. 19.

Ver. 17 f. But Paul goes further, and explains the contrary phenomenon—that of a man who does not and cannot receive mercy—in the same way. Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή: it is on Scripture the burden of proof is laid here and at ver. 15. A Jew might answer the arguments Paul uses here if they were the Apostle's own; to Scripture he can make no reply; it must silence, even where it does not convince. τὸ Φαραώ: All men, and not those only who are the objects of His mercy, come within the scope of God's sovereignty. Pharaoh as well as Moses can be quoted to illustrate it. He was the open adversary of God, an avowed, implacable adversary; yet a Divine purpose was fulfilled in his life, and that purpose and nothing else is the explanation of his very being. εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ θάνατον ἐξήγειρά σε. The LXX in Exod. ix. 16 read: καὶ ἐνεκεντούτου διετήρηθης, the last word, answering to the Hebrew πητριπ, being used in the sense of 'thou wast kept alive'—the sense adopted by Dillmann for the Hebrew; probably Paul changed it intentionally to give the meaning, 'for this reason I brought thee on the stage of history': cf. Hab. i. 6, Zec. xi. 16, Jer. xxvii. 41 (S. and H.). The purpose Pharaoh was designed to serve, and actually did serve, on this stage, was certainly not his own; as certainly it was God's. God's power was shown in the penal miracles by which Pharaoh and Egypt were visited, and his name is proclaimed to this day wherever the story of the Exodus is told.

Ver. 18. From the two instances just quoted Paul draws the comprehensive conclusion: So then on whom He will He has mercy, and whom He will He hardens. The whole emphasis is on θέλει. The two modes in which God acts upon man are showing mercy and hardening, and it depends upon God's will in which of these two modes He actually does act. The word σκληρύνει is borrowed from the history of Pharaoh, Ex. vii. 3; 11.; viii. 19; ix. 12; xiv. 17. What precisely the hardening means, and in what relation God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart stood to Pharaoh's own hardening of it against God, are not unimportant questions, but they are questions which Paul does not here raise. He has one aim always in view here—to show that man has no claim as of right against God; and he finds a decisive proof of this (at least for a Jew) in the opposite examples of Moses and Pharaoh, interpreted as these are by unmistakable words of God Himself.
It was through God, in the last resort, that Moses and Pharaoh were what they were, signal instances of the Divine mercy and the Divine wrath.

Ver. 19 ff. But human nature is not so easily silenced. This interpretation of all human life, with all its diversities of character and experience, through the will of God alone, as if that will by itself explained everything, is not adequate to the facts. If Moses and Pharaoh alike are to be explained by reference to that will—that is, are to be explained in precisely the same way—then the difference between Moses and Pharaoh disappears. The moral interpretation of the world is annulled by the religious one. If God is equally behind the most opposite moral phenomena, then it is open to any one to say, What Paul here anticipates will be said, Why does he still find fault? For who withstands his resolve? To this objection there is really no answer, and it ought to be frankly admitted that the Apostle does not answer it. The attempt to understand the relation between the human will and the Divine seems to lead of necessity to an antinomy which thought has not as yet succeeded in transcending. To assert the absoluteness of God in the unexplained unqualified sense of verse 18 makes the moral life unintelligible: but to explain the moral life by ascribing to man a freedom which makes him stand in independence over against God reduces the universe to anarchy. Up to this point Paul has been insisting on the former point of view, and he insists on it still as against the human presumption which thought has not as yet succeeded in transcending. To assert the absoluteness of God in the unexplained unqualified sense of verse 18 makes the moral life unintelligible: but to explain the moral life by ascribing to man a freedom which makes him stand in independence over against God reduces the universe to anarchy. Up to this point Paul has been insisting on the former point of view, and he insists on it still as against the human presumption which thought has not as yet succeeded in transcending.

Ver. 20. ούτως stands before μενούνγε in Ν1AB (B omits γε), and so in all crit. edd.
not clay, and the relation of God to man is not that of the potter to dead matter. To say that it is, is just to concede the objector’s point—the moral significance is taken out of life, and God has no room any longer to pronounce moral judgments, or to speak of man in terms of praise or blame.

Vv. 22-29. Paul’s argument, to speak plainly, has got into an impasse. He is not able to carry it through, and to maintain the sovereign freedom of God as the whole and sole explanation of human destiny, whether in men or nations. He does, indeed, assert that freedom to the last, against the presumptuousness of man, but in this third section of his theodicy, he begins to withdraw from the ground of speculation to that of fact, and to exhibit God’s action, not as a bare unintelligible exercise of will, which inevitably provokes rebellion, but as an exercise of will of such a character that man can have nothing to urge against it. ει δε: the δε marks the transition to the new point of view. It is as if Paul said: You may find this abstract presentation of God’s relations to man a hard doctrine, but if His actual treatment of men, even of those who are σκεύη θρίας κατ. ες επώλειας, is distinguished by longsuffering and patience, what can you say against that? ηθήνων has been rendered (1) because it is His will; (2) although it is His will. In the former case, God bears long with the vessels of wrath in order that the display of His wrath and power may be more tremendous at last. But (a) such an idea is inconsistent with the contrast implied in ει: it is an aggravation of the very difficulty from which the Apostle is making his escape; (b) it is inconsistent with the words εν πολλή μακροθυμία; it is not longsuffering if the end in view is a more awful display of wrath; there is no real longsuffering unless the end in view is to give the sinner place for repentance. Hence the other view (2) is substantially right. Although it is God’s will to display His wrath and to show what He can do, still He does not proceed precipitately, but gives ample opportunity to the sinner to repent and escape. We are entitled to say “the sinner,” though Paul does not say so explicitly, for η θρίας, the wrath of God, is relative to sin, and to nothing else: except as against sin, there is no such thing as wrath in God. In σκεύη θρίας the word σκεύη is perhaps prompted by the previous verse, but the whole associations of the potter and the clay are not to be carried over: they are expressly precluded by εν πολλή μακροθυμία. Paul does not say how the σκεύη θρίας came to be what they are, the objects upon which the wrath and power of God are to be revealed; he only says that such as they are, God has shown great patience with them. It seems a mistake in W. and H. to print σκεύη θρίας as a quotation from Jer. i. (LXX xxvii.) 25; for there the words mean “the instruments by which God executes His wrath,” les armes de sa Colère (Reuss). Κατηρτισμένος εις απώλειαν: Απώλεια (Phil. i. 28, iii. 19) means perdition, final ruin; by what agency the persons referred to have been fitted for it Paul does not say; what he does say is, that fitted for such a doom as they are, God has nevertheless endured them in much longsuffering, so that they at least can not say, Why dost thou find fault? For κατηρτισμένος = perfected, made quite fit or ripe, see Luke vi. 40, 1 Cor. i. 10: cf. also 2 Tim. iii. 17.

Ver. 23 f. The sentence beginning with ει δε ηθήνων is not grammatically completed, but ver. 23 is an irregular parallel to ver. 22. God’s purpose is regarded as twofold. It is on the one hand to show His wrath and make known His power; it is on the other hand to make known the riches of His glory (cf. Eph. iii. 16). The first part of it is carried out on those who are σκεύη θρίας, the latter on those who are σκεύη δέλλων; but, in carrying out both parts
δόξαν. 24. ους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἑθνῶν. 25. (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὀσεὴ λέγει, "Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαὸν μου, λαὸν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἤγατπημένην, ἤγατπημένην") 26. "Καὶ ἐσται, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἔφηξεν αὐτοῖς. 1 Οὐ λαὸς μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται γιὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱώτως." 27. Ἡσαίας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἡ Ἰε. «Εάν γὰρ ὁ ἄριστος τῶν ὑιῶν Ἰσραήλ ὡς ὁ ἄριστος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ

1 αὐτοίς is wanting in BFG and the best MSS. of the vulg. As no reason can be suggested for its omission, if it was original, Weiss supposes it was added in conformity with the LXX. He therefore omits it altogether; W. and H. bracket.

alike, God acts in a way which is so far from giving man room to complain that it commands his wonder and adoration; for the σκεύη δόξης there is much long-suffering, for the σκεύη δόξας a preparation and a calling in which God's free unmerited mercy is conspicuous. καὶ ἐν γνώμῃ : This is mentioned as a principal purpose of God. ἐν σκεύῃ δόξας : the glory is conceived as something shed upon the persons concerned; they are irradiated with the Divine brightness. Cf. 2 Thess. i. 10. δόξα in such connections has usually a super-sensible eschatological meaning; its content was fixed for Paul by his vision of Christ as Lord of Glory. The end of God's ways with the vessels of mercy is to conform them to the image of His exalted Son. ζα προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν : Paul does not shrink from introducing God as subject here. The vessels of mercy, in whom the Divine glory is to be revealed, are such as God prepared before for that destiny. That Paul is not speaking here abstractly, as in his discussion of the relations of creature and Creator in ver. 21 f., but on the basis of experience, is shown by the words which immediately follow: σὺ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὅ = whom he also called in us. The σκεύη δόξας in other words, are not a mere theological conception = "God's elect": they are the actual members of the Christian Church, Jew and Gentile: and it is not a deduction from the necessities of the Divine nature, but an account of real experiences of God's goodness, which is given both in προητοίμασεν and in ἐκάλεσεν. How much is covered by προητοίμασεν is not clear, but the text presents no ground whatever for importing into it the idea of an unconditional eternal decree. Those who are called know that the antecedents of their calling, the processes which lead up to and prepare for it, are of God. They know that in all these processes, even in the remote initial stages of them, to the significance of which they were blind at the time, glory was in view. The fact that both Jews and Gentiles are called shows that this preparation is not limited to any one nation; the fact that the called are from among both Jews and Gentiles shows that no one can claim God's mercy as a right in virtue of his birth in some particular race.

Ver. 25 f. This result of God's ways with man—His calling not only from the Jews but from the Gentiles—agrees with His own declarations in Scripture. Ver. 25 answers roughly to Hos. ii. 23, LXX: I will love her who was not beloved, and will say to that which was not My people, Thou art My people. Not My people (= Lo-ammi) and Not beloved (= Lo-ruhamah) were the names of a son and a daughter of Hosea, who symbolised the kingdom of Israel, rejected of God but destined to share again in His favour. Paul here applies to the calling of the Gentiles words which spoke originally of the restoration of Israel—an instance which shows how misleading it may be to press the context of the other passages quoted in this chapter. Ver. 26 is also a quotation from Hos. i. 10 (LXX): the εκεῖ is supplied by Paul. The application of it is similar to that of ver. 25. In Hosea the promise is that the Israelites who had lost their standing as God's people should have it given back to them, in all its dignity. This also Paul reads of the calling of the Gentiles. They were once no people of God's, but now have their part in the adoption. But what is the meaning of "in the place where . . . there shall they be called"? It is not certain that in Hosea there is any reference to a place at all (see margin of R.V.), and it is not easy to see what Paul can mean by the emphatic εκεῖ. The ordinary explanation—the Gentile lands—is as good as any, but seems hardly equal to the stress laid on εκεῖ.
Ver. 27 f. From the calling of the Gentiles, as foretold in prophecy, Paul passes now to the partial, but only partial, calling of Israel, as announced by the same authority. The Jews cannot quarrel with the situation in which they find themselves when it answers so exactly to the Word of God. ὑπέρ is here indistinguishable from περί: it is not a loud intercession on Israel's behalf, but a solemn declaration concerning Israel, that the prophet makes; see Grimm, s.v., i., 5. The quotation in ver. 27 is from Isa. x. 22 f., but the opening words are modified by recollection of Hos. i. τὸ just quoted. The LXX reads καὶ εάν γένηται ο λαός Ισραήλ ώς ή άμμος της θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αυτῶν σωθήσεται. λόγον συντελών και συντέμνων [ἐν δικαιοσύνη, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον] κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ. The words bracketed are omitted by most editors, but the sense is not affected. τὸ υπόλειμμα has the emphasis: only the remnant shall be saved. This doctrine Paul apparently finds confirmed by the words λόγον γάρ συντελών καὶ συντέμνων ποιήσει κύριος ἐν τῇ γῆς. It is doubtful whether any one could assign meaning to these words unless he had an idea beforehand of what they ought to or must mean. Cheyne renders the Hebrew to which they answer, "For a final work and a decisive doth the Lord execute within all the land"; and there is the same general idea in Sanday and Headlam's version of Paul: "For a word, accomplishing and abridging it, that is, a sentence conclusive and concise, will the Lord do upon the earth". Weiss, who retains the words bracketed, makes λόγον = God's promise: God fulfils it indeed (συντελών), but He at the same time limits or contracts it (συντέμνων), i.e., fulfils it to some of Israel, not to all. This, no doubt, is the sense required, but can any one say that the words convey it? We should rather say that Paul put his own thought into the words of the LXX, in which a difficult passage of Isaiah was translated almost at haphazard, and in doing so lent them a meaning which they could not be said to have of themselves.

Ver. 29. But his last quotation is in verbal agreement with the LXX Isa. i. 9, and transparently clear. The σπέρμα or seed which God leaves is the same as the υπόλειμμα. The figure is not to be pressed. The remnant is not the germ of a new people; Paul expects Israel as a whole to be restored.

With this the theodicy proper closes. The unbelief of the Jews was a great problem to the Apostolic age, and one which easily led to scepticism concerning the Gospel. The chosen people without a part in the kingdom of God —impossible. This chapter is Paul's attempt to explain this situation as one not involving any unrighteousness or breach of faith on the part of God. It is not necessary to resume the various stages of the argument as they have been elucidated in the notes. The point of greatest difficulty is no doubt presented by vers. 22 and 23. Many good scholars, Meyer and Lipsius for example, hold that Paul in these verses is not withdrawing from, but carrying through, the argument from God's absoluteness stated so emphatically in ver. 21. They hold that the σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα els ἀπώλειαν would not be σκεύη ὀργῆς at all, if their repentance and amendment were conceivable; and although God bears long with them—that is, defers their destruction—it is only in order that He may have time and opportunity to manifest the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy. But the answer to this is plain. It assumes that human life, in its relation to God, can be inter-
CHAPTER IX.—Ver. 30-32. We come now to the second main division of that part of the epistle in which Paul discusses the problem raised by the relation of the Jews to the Gospel. He has shown in chap. ix. 6-29 that they have no claim as of right to salvation: their whole history, as recorded and interpreted in the Scriptures, exhibited God acting on quite a different principle; he now proceeds to show more definitely that it was owing to their own guilt that they were rejected. They followed, and persisted in following, a path on which salvation was not to be found; and they were inexcusable in doing so, inasmuch as God had made His way of salvation plain and accessible to all.

Ver. 30 f. Τί οὖν ἔρωμεν; usually, as in ver. 14, this question is followed by another, but here by an assertion. The conclusion of the foregoing discussion is—not that God has been faithless or unjust, but—this paradoxical position: Gentiles (ἐθνῶν, not τὰ ἔθνη) that did not follow after righteousness attained righteousness, the righteousness which comes of faith; while Israel, which followed after a law of righteousness, did not attain that law. Δικαιοσύνης κατέλαβεν are correlative terms: see Wetstein. The repetition of δικαιοσύνη is striking: it is the one fundamental conception on which Paul's gospel rests; the questions at issue between him and the Jews were questions as to what it was, and how it was to be attained. Τὸ μὴ διώκεστα δικαιοσύνης is not an unfair description of the pagan races as contrasted with the Jews; how to be right with God was not their main interest. Δικαιοσύνης δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως: for the form of the explanatory clause with δὲ cf. iii. 22, 1 Cor. ii. 6. It is not surprising that a righteousness of this sort should be found even by those who are not in quest of it; its nature is that it is brought and offered to men, and faith is simply the act of appropriating it. Ισραήλ δὲ κ.τ.λ.: this is the astonishing thing which does need explanation. Δικαιοσύνη νόμον δικαιοσύνης. The idea is not that Israel was in quest of a law of righteousness, in the sense of a rule by the observance of which righteousness would be attained: every Israelite believed himself to be, and already was, in possession of such a law. It must rather be that Israel aimed incessantly at bringing its conduct up to the standard of a law in which righteousness was certainly held out, but was never able to achieve its purpose. The νόμος δικαιοσύνης, the unattained goal of Israel's efforts, is of course the Mosaic law; but it is referred to, not definitely, but in its characteristic qualities, as law, and as exhibiting and enjoining (not bestowing) righteousness. Ισραήλ δὲ κ.τ.λ.: this is the astonishing thing which does need explanation. Δικαιοσύνης νόμον δικαιοσύνης: did not attain to, arrive at, that law—it remained out of their reach. Legal religion proved a failure.

Ver. 32. Διὰ τί; Why? A result so confounding needs explanation. Οὐκ ἔχει πίστιν ἀλλ' ὡς εἰς ἐργανόμον: it seems too precise to supply with Weiss ἐδίωξεν νόμον δικαιοσύνης. The reason of Israel's religious failure was that its whole religious effort and attitude was not of faith, but (so they conceived the case) of works. By inserting ὡς Paul dissociates himself from this conception, and leaves it to Israel; he does not believe (having
learned the contrary by bitter experience) that there is any outlet along this road. Everything in religion depends on the nature of the start. You may start εξ εργών, from an utter abandonment to God, and an entire dependence on Him, and in this case a righteousness is possible which you will recognise as δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, God’s own gift and work in you; or you may start εξ εργών, which really means in independence of God, and try to work out, without coming under obligation to God, a righteousness of your own, not a truth on which life can be carried out, that you are in any sense independent of God. Such an idea, however, rooted in the mind, may effectually pervert and wreck the soul, by making the Divine way of attaining righteousness and life offensive to it; and this is what happened to the Jews. Because of that profoundly false relation to God προσέκομπαν τῶ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος. The stone on which they stumbled was Christ, and especially Ηis Cross. Τhe σκάνδαλον of the Cross, at which they stumbled, is not simply the fact that it is a cross, whereas they expected a Μessianic throne; the Cross offended them because, as interpreted by Ρaul, it summoned them to begin their religious life, from the very beginning, at the foot of the Crucified, and with the sense upon their hearts of an infinite debt to Him, which no “ works” could ever repay.

Ver. 33. Yet paradoxical as this may seem, it agrees with the words of Scripture. The quotation is a mixture of Isa. xxviii. 16 and vii. 14: and it is interesting to remark that the same passages are quoted in conjunction, though they are not mixed as here, in 1 Ρet. ii. 6-8. The original reference of them is not exactly Messianic. The stone laid in Ζion (Isa. xxviii. 16) is indeed interpreted by Delitzsch of the kingdom of promise as identified with its Sovereign Head, but the stone of stumbling (Isa. viii. 14) is unequivocally God Himself: all who do not give Him honour are broken against His government as on a stone, or caught in it as in a snare. Ρaul inserts επ’ αυτῷ after δ’ εργῶν (as Peter also does), and applies the figure of the stone in both cases to Christ, and to the contrary relations which men may assume to Him. Some stumble over Him (as the Jews, for the reasons just given); others build on Him and find Him a sure foundation, or (without a figure) put their trust in Him and are not put to shame. Cf. Ps. cxviii. 22, Mt. xxi. 42, 1 Cor. iii. 11, Acts. iv. 12, Eph. ii. 20.

Chapter X.—Ver. 1. The Apostle cannot enlarge on this melancholy situation without expressing once more the deep grief which it causes him. Since the Jews are referred to in the third person (υπέρ αυτῶν) it is clear that the persons addressed are a Gentile Church. αδελφοί: Paul’s heart seems drawn to his spiritual kindred as he feels the deep gulf which separates him meanwhile from his kinsmen according to the flesh. η μενευδοκίατης εμής καρδίας: the meaning of ευδοκία must be gathered from such examples as Mt. xi.26, Eph. i. 5, 9, Phil. i. 15, ii. 13, 2 Thess. i. 11. His heart’s ευδοκία is that in which his heart could rest with complacency; that which would be a perfect satisfaction to it. This is virtually the same as “desire,” and an “Etymologicum ineditum” quoted in Schleusner explains it by βουλήμα, γνώμη, προαίρεσις, επιθυμία. His inmost desire and his supplication to God are in their interest, with a view to their salvation. ο ημῖν εὐδοκία has no corresponding δέ; the sad reality which answers to it does not need again to be expressed.

Ver. 2. Their good qualities compel his affection. έξαλον θεοῦ εχθρών: they have a zeal for God, are intensely (though mistakenly) religious. Cf. Gal. i. 14. An unbelieving Jew could interpret his opposition to the lawless gospel of Paul as zeal for the divinely-given rule of life, and his opposition to the crucified Messiah as zeal for the divinely-given promises. It was God’s honour for which he stood in refusing the Gos-
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Χ. ΗΜΕΡΑΙΑ. Η μεν ευδοκία τῆς ψυχῆς καρδιάς, καὶ η δέσποινα 1

Χ. τ. ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ, η μενευδοκία τῆς ψυχῆς καρδιάς, καὶ η δέσποινα

ν ν. Μ. 4 ν. - 2

προς τὸν Θεόν υπέρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐστὶν σωτηρίαν. γαρ αὐτοῖς ζήλον Θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, αλλ' οὐ κατ' επίγνωσιν.

2. b Acts xvii. 3. μαρτυρω",

3. Τim. i. 13. c Ga!. vi. 5.

αγνοοῦντες γάρ τῆς Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ τῆς ἰδιαίτερα

ητούμεν ἢτηματικόν τῆς δικαιοσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπέταγμαν. 4. τέλος

1 η before προς τὸν θεον om. ΝABDF. For τον ισραηλ εστιν read αυτων with ΝABDFP 47, etc.

2 ην ἰδιαιτερα δικαιοσυνη ΝFGKL and most cursives, is adopted by Tischdf., but most edd. with ΑΒDΡ 47, vulg. omit δικαιοσυνην.

pel. ἀλλ' ου κατ' επίγνωσιν: this religious earnestness is not regulated by adequate knowledge. For επίγνωσις see Eph. iv. 13, Phil. i. 9, ii. 2, I Tim. ii. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 25; it is especially used of religious knowledge, and suggests attainment in it (ἐπίγνωσις ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ επιγνώσομαι, I Cor. xiii. 12).

Ver. 3. This verse goes to the root of the matter, and explains the failure of the Gospel among the Jews. It was due to their ignorance of the righteousness of God. All men need and crave righteousness, and the Jews, in their ignorance of God's, sought to establish a righteousness of their own. Their idea was the key to the situation. Their idea was that they could be good men without becoming God's debtors, or owing anything at all to Him. Such an idea, of course, shows complete ignorance of the essential relations of God and man, and when acted on fatally perverts life. It did so with the Jews. When the Gospel came, revealing the righteousness of God—that for which man must be absolutely indebted to God's grace, and which he can never boast of as "his own"—it cut right across all the habits and prejudices of the Jews, and they did not submit themselves to it. Paul interprets the position of his nation through the recollection of his own experience as a Pharisee—no doubt rightly on the whole. For ὑπετάγματα in middle sense see VIII. 7, xiii. 1, Heb. xii. 9, Jas. iv. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 13.

Ver. 4. Further proof that the pursuit of a righteousness of one's own by legal observances is a mistake, the act of men "in ignorance". τέλος γὰρ νόμου χρηστοτέρα τῇ δικαιοσὺνῃ παντὶ τῇ πιστεύω: For Christ is law's end, etc. The sense required—a sense which the words very naturally yield—is that with Christ in the field law as a means of attaining righteousness has ceased and determined. The moment a man sees Christ and understands what He is and what He has done, he feels that legal religion is a thing of the past: the road to righteousness is not the observance of statutes, no matter though they have been promulgated by God Himself; it is faith, the abandonment of the soul to the redeeming judgment and mercy of God in His Son. The meaning is virtually the same as that of our Lord's words in Luke xvi. 16. νόμον without the article is "law" in the widest sense; the Mosaic law is only one of the most important instances which come under this description; and it, with all statutory conceptions of religion, ends when Christ appears. It is quite true to say that Christ consummates or fulfils the law (hence Calvin would prefer complementum or perfectio to finis as a rendering of τέλος); quite true also that He is the goal of the O.T. dispensation, and that it is designed to lead to Him (cf. Mt. ν. 17, Gal. iii. 24); but though both true and Pauline, these ideas are irrelevant here, where Paul is insisting, not on the connection, but on the incompatibility, of law and faith, of one's own righteousness and the righteousness of God. Besides, in limiting νόμος to the Mosaic O.T. law, this interpretation does less than justice to the language, and misses the point of παντὶ τῷ πιστεύω: there is no believer, Gentile or Jew, for whom law, Mosaic or other, retains validity or significance as a way to δικαιοσύνῃ, after the revelation of the righteousness of God in Christ.

Ver 4. Further proof that the pursuit of a righteousness of one's own by legal observances is a mistake, the act of men "in ignorance". τέλος γὰρ νόμου χρηστοτέρα τῇ δικαιοσὺνῃ παντὶ τῇ πιστεύω: For Christ is law's end, etc. The sense required—a sense which the words very naturally yield—is that with Christ in the field law as a means of attaining righteousness has ceased and determined. The moment a man sees Christ and understands what He is and what He has done, he feels that legal religion is a thing of the past: the way to righteousness is not the observance of statutes, no matter though they have been promulgated by God Himself; it is faith, the abandonment of the soul to the redeeming judgment and mercy of God in His Son. The meaning is virtually the same as that of our Lord's words in Luke xvi. 16. νόμον without the article is "law" in the widest sense; the Mosaic law is only one of the most important instances which come under this description; and it, with all statutory conceptions of religion, ends when Christ appears. It is quite true to say that Christ consummates or fulfils the law (hence Calvin would prefer complementum or perfectio to finis as a rendering of τέλος); quite true also that He is the goal of the O.T. dispensation, and that it is designed to lead to Him (cf. Mt. ν. 17, Gal. iii. 24); but though both true and Pauline, these ideas are irrelevant here, where Paul is insisting, not on the connection, but on the incompatibility, of law and faith, of one's own righteousness and the righteousness of God. Besides, in limiting νόμος to the Mosaic O.T. law, this interpretation does less than justice to the language, and misses the point of παντὶ τῷ πιστεύω: there is no believer, Gentile or Jew, for whom law, Mosaic or other, retains validity or significance as a way to δικαιοσύνῃ, after the revelation of the righteousness of God in Christ.

In ver. 5 ff. Paul describes more fully, and in O.T. terms, the two ways of attaining δικαιοσύνῃ—law and faith. His aim is to show that they are mutually exclusive, but that the latter is open and accessible to all.

Ver. 5. Μωυσῆς γὰρ γράφει: Moses' authority is unimpeachable on this point. The righteousness that comes from law
γάρ νόμου Χριστός εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. 5. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, ἕνα νόμος ἀνθρώπου ἥν ἐγέρσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. 6. ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη φθινεῖ, ἀνθρώπος ἔγραψεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἑκ νομοῦ, "οτι ο ποιήσας αὐτά τὸν νόμον, " εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; " λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, Τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; " εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; " "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ νόμου δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 7. Τούτ' ἐστιν Χριστὸς καταγαγείν. μή εἴπῃς εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 8. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; " εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; " Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 9. Τούτ' ἐστιν Χριστὸς καταγαγείν. μή εἴπῃς εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 10. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; " εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; " Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 11. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 12. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 13. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 14. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 15. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 16. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 17. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 18. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 19. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν την ἐκ τοῦ χυμον δικαιοσύνην τῆς ᾿ΟΤ. 20. Εἶ λέγει, "Μή εἴπης εἰς τῇ καρδία σου, τίς αναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ή τίς καταβήσει
the righteousness of God depends. τῆς πίστεως is obj. gen. The whole idea of the verses is that righteousness has not to be achieved, but only appropriated.

Ver. 9. Apparently this verse gives the content of what the Apostle describes as "the word of faith which we preach". φθι to καρδία γάρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὀμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. The parallelism is like that in the previous verse, though the order of the clauses is reversed. To be saved one must attain δικαιοσύνη, and this depends on heart-faith; such faith, again, leading to salvation, must confess itself. A heart believing unto righteousness, and a mouth making confession unto salvation, are not really two things, but two sides of the same thing. The formalism which seems to contrast them is merely a mental (perhaps only a literary) idiosyncrasy of the writer. It is true to say that such a confession as is meant here was made at baptism, but to limit it to baptism, or to use this verse to prove baptism essential to salvation, is, as Weiss says, unerhört Dogmatismus.
Ver. 13. For every one who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved. The words are from Joel iii. 5 (= ii. 32 LXX). "The Lord" in the original is Jehovah; here, manifestly, Christ—a proof how completely Christ stands in God's place in all that concerns salvation.

Ver. 14 f. It is difficult to trace very clearly the line of the Apostle's thought here. Many scholars (including W. and H. and Lipsius) connect vers. 14 and π5 closely with what precedes, and mark a break between ver. 15 and ver. 16. It is as if Paul were expanding the πάς of ver. 13 and justifying that universal preaching of the Gospel which was itself a stumbling block to the Jews. Every one who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved, and therefore the conditions of such invocation must be put within reach of every one. It is no argument against this interpretation that the ideas it introduces are not essential to the main purpose of the chapter, which is to prove the culpability of the Jews: the eager fulness of Paul's mind often carries him on thus. Others read vers. 14-21 continuously, and mark a break at ver. 13 (e.g., Weiss, Sanday and Headlam). They lay stress on the oύν in ver. 14 (cf.ix.14,ix.30,xi.1,11) as indicating that a paragraph has ended, and that the writer is facing the consequences which flow from it, the objections which can be made to it, etc. In this case the connection would be something like this. Salvation depends upon invoking Christ, but to invoke Christ depends upon certain conditions which the θετυs may say it has been beyond their power to fulfil: let us inquire into the conditions, and see whether such a plea holds good. The first of these connections seems to me much the simpler, and it has the advantage of covering the second. For if the invocation of Christ, which is the sole and universal condition of salvation, has been made possible for all men, it


χωρίς κηρύσσοντος; 15. πώς δὲ κηρύσσουν, ἕνεκ' ἀποσταλών; καθὼς γέγραπται, "Ας ἄρα ὁ πόθες τῶν εὐαγγελιζόμενων εἰρήνην," τῶν εὐαγγελιζόμενων τὰ ἀγάδα "; 16. Ἀλλ', ἔναν πάντες ἐπηκολύσαιν ἀπὸ τῆς εὐαγγελίας ὁ Κύριος γὰρ λέγει, "Κύριε, τις επικάλεσώτα ἄρα έκ θεοῦ; τῆς εἰρήνης τῶν εὐαγγελιζόμενων τα αγαθά"; 17. ἄρα ἡ πίστις εἶ ἀκοής, ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ἰδίαν θεοῦ. |

1 For κηρύσσοντος read κηρύξουσιν with NABDKLP. For καθὼς read καθαπερ with B. See note 1, page 598.

2 εὐαγγελιζόμενων εἰρήνην τῶν om. N1ABC 47; ins. N2DFKLP. The omission may be due to homoeoteleuton. Weiss thinks it is, and keeps these words in the text; Treg. thinks it possible, and brackets them in margin. On the other hand, they may have been inserted to make the quotation agree better (it does not even then agree closely) with the LXX. The MSS. authority by itself is decisive for the omission. το αγάδα N1,KL; om. το N2ABCD (and LXX). W. and H. read εις εφραί οι τόθες τῶν εὐαγγελιζόμενων αγάδα.

3 θεοῦ AD (gr.) KL; Χριστοῦ N1BCD 47 and all edd.

has been made possible for the Jews. The special application to them, in which the argument of the chapter is clinched, is not made till ver. 19; here they are only involved with the rest of the world which has heard the Gospel. πώς οὐν ἐπικάλεσώτα τοις τούτον τῶν διὰ τιστευόμενον οὐκ ἐκκουσαν; It is simplest to render, How are they to believe on Him Whom they have not heard και identifying the voice of the preachers with that of Christ. Winer, p. 249. Cf. Eph. ii. 17. The rendering, Him of Whom they have not heard, would be legitimate in poetry. πώς δὲ ἐκκουσαν: this deliberative form is in all probability right: see critical note and Bliss, Gramm des Neut. Griech., 205. ἐν μὴ ἀποσταλών: τοις, by the Lord Whom they preach, and Who is heard speaking when they speak. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 17, διεκπερατεῖν μι χριστός . . . εὐαγγελιζέσθαι. To find here the idea of an official ministry, as something belonging essentially to the constitution of the Church, is grotesque. "St. Paul argues back from effect to cause, through the series of Prayer, Faith, Hearing, Preaching, Sending; thus the last link in his argument must be the first in the realisation from which the rest follow; this one therefore he confirms by the prophetic announcement in Isa. lli. 7" (Gifford). ἄρα ἄρας: the true text of Romans greatly abbreviates the prophet's words, but the joy with which the deliverance from Babylon was foreseen is in keeping with that with which Paul contemplates the universal preaching of the Gospel.

Ver. 16. The fact remains, however, in spite of this universal preaching, that there has not been a universal surrender to the Gospel. οἱ πάντες: the Jews are present to the writer's mind here, though the words might apply more widely; hence the compassionate mode of statement. Cf. iii. 3: τις επικάλεσον τοις αὐτοῖς; Yet this quantum of unbelief does not discomfit the Apostle; for it also, as well as the proclamation of the Gospel, is included in the prophecy. τις επικάλεσον τοις αὐτοῖς is a lament over practically universal unbelief. ἡ ἀκοή in Isaiah means "that which we heard," but who the "we" are is not clear. If a representative prophet speaks, ἀκοή will mean that which he and other prophets heard from God: = Who hath believed the revelation made to us? Cf. Isa. xxviii. 9, 19. If a representative of repenting Israel speaks, ἀκοή will mean that which he and his countrymen have heard from the prophets: = Who hath believed the message delivered to us! Assuming that Paul as a preacher instinctively used the words to express his own thought and experience in his vocation, they will mean here, Who has believed the message delivered by us Apostles?

Ver. 17. This verse is really parenthetic: Paul's logical mind cannot let slip the chance of showing how this quotation confirms the connection of ideas in ver. 14. ἄρα suits a rapid passing inference better than the more deliberate ἐνούν which is much more frequent in Romans. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 14, Gal. ii. 17. So then faith comes from a message (that which is received by the hearer of the Gospel), and the message διὰ ἰδίᾳ χριστοῦ through the Word concerning Christ.
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Χ.

4&

τ8. αλλά λέγω, Μή ουκ ήκουσαν, μενούνγε εις πάσαν την γην
εξήλθεν ο φθόγγος αυτών, και εις τα πέρατα της οικουμένης τα
Ch. xi 14: οή
"αυτών ".
Αλλά λέγω, Μή ουκ έγνω Ισραήλ", πρώτος
"θεμιρήματα
αυτών Εγώ19. "παραζηλώσω
υμάς επ' ουκ έθνει, επί έθνει
Μωσης λέγει,
22,

4 & 2.

Ισραηλ before ουκ εγνω δS ΑΒCD", "F.
Τhat which when heard is ακοή is when ability to understand God's Word, ought
spoken ρήμα, and it is the condition of to be incompatible ideas. πρώτος Μωυσής

faith. Τhe construction in ρήμα Χριστού λέγει, Deut. xxxii. 2τ. πρώτος suggests
is the same as in το βήμα της πίστεως the beginning of a line of witnesses to
in ver. 8. Τhe words could not signify this effect : virtually it means, even
Christ's command.

Μoses, at the very beginning of their
Ver. τ8. Τhe process of convicting history. Τhe point of the citation is not
the Jews is now under way, and αλλά very clear. Like the passages guoted in
λέγω introduces a plea on their behalf. ix. 25, 26, it might have been adduced by
Ιt is Paul who speaks : hence the form Ρaul as a proof that the Gentiles were
of the question μη ουκ ήκουσαν suggests to be called into God's kingdom, and
his opinion as to the answer. Το heaν called in order to rouse the Jews to
is necessary in order to believe , you do jealousy, but to be in place here, there
not mean to say they did not hear " Cf. must be also the latent idea that if
Ι Cor. ix, 4, 5, xi. 22. μενούνγε is immo peoples beyond the covenant (who were
τero. Τhe contrary is so clearly the not peoples at all), and unintelligent
case that there is a touch of derision in peoples (i.ε., idol worshippers) could
the word with which Ρaul introduces the understand the Gospel, a privileged and
proof of it. Cf. ix. 2ο. Τhe Gospel has religiously gifted people like the Jews
been preached in all the world : the was surely inexcusable if it failed to
words of Ps. xix. 4 (exactly as in LΧΧ) understand it. Τhe same idea seems to
are at once the expression and the proof be enforced again in ver. 2ο. Ησαίας
of this. Οf course they refer to the δε αποτολμά : " breaks out boldly '
revelation of God in nature, but their (Gifford).
It was an act of great
use will seem legitimate enough if we daring to speak thus to a nation with
remember that Ρaul knιeτυ the extent to the exclusive temper of Israel, and
which the Gospel had been proclaimed Ρaul who needed the same courage in
in his day. Cf. Col. i. 6, 23. It was as carrying the Gospel to the Gentiles was
widely diffused as the Diaspora, and the the man to see this. oι έμε μη
poetic inspired expression for this had a επερωτώντες means those who put no
charm of its own.
αuestion to me, sc., about the way of
Ver. τg. αλλά λέγω : another attempt salvation. In Isa. Ιχν. I the clauses
to introduce a plea on behalf of Israel. occur in reverse order. What the pro
Υou cannot say, " they did not hear "; phet has in view is God's spontaneous
surely you do not mean to say, then, unmerited goodness, which takes the
Ιsrael did not understand P
Αt first initiative, unsolicited, in showing mercy
sight there seems an unnatural emphasis to faithless Jews who made no appeal to
here on Israel, but this is not the case. Ηim and never sought Ηim ; the Αpostle
Τhe generality of the argument must be applies this, like the similar passages in
abandoned now, for the passages next ix. 25 f., to the reception of the Gospel
to be φuoted, which are already present by the Gentiles.* Ιf God was found
to Paul's mind, contrast Israel with and recognised in Ηis character and pur
the Gentiles, and so bring it into pro poses, where all the conditions seemed
minence ; and it is in the case of Israel, so much against it, surely Israel must be
of all nations, that the plea of not under inexcusable if it has missed the meaning
standing is most out of place. Αbove all of the Gospel. Τhe very calling of the
ηations Ιsrael ought to have understood Gentiles, predicted and interpreted as it
a message from God: Israel, and in is in the passages quoted, should itself
* Τhe part of Isa. 1xν. I which is not quoted here (I said, Βehold Μe, behold
Μe, unto a nation that was not called by Μy name) is meant, as usually pointed,
to refer to the Gentiles, and this tradition of its application Paul may have learned
from Gamaliel (Cheyne), but the pointing is wrong: see Cheyne.


have been a message to the Jews, which they could not misunderstand; it should have opened their eyes as with a lightning flash to the position in which they stood—that of men who had forfeited their place among the people of God—and provoked them, out of jealousy, to vie with these outsiders in welcoming the righteousness of faith.

Ver. 21. προς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραήλ λέγει: That is what he says of the Gentiles, but as for Israel, he says, etc., Isa. ix. 2. For προς = with reference to, see Heb. i. 7 f., Luke xii. 41. The arms outstretched all the day long are the symbol of that incessant pleading love which Israel through all its history has consistently despised. It is not want of knowledge, then, nor want of intelligence, but wilful and stubborn disobedience, that explains the exclusion of Israel (meanwhile) from the Kingdom of Christ and all its blessings. This is not inconsistent with ver. 3, if we go to the root of the matter. For the ignorance there spoken of is one which has its root in the will, in the pride of a heart which is determined to have a righteousness of its own without coming under any obligation to God for it, and which therefore cannot assume the attitude to which the Gospel becomes credibly Divine; while the ignorance suggested as a plea for unbelief is that of men to whom the Gospel has never been presented at all. The latter ignorance might annul responsibility; the former gives its full significance to guilt.

Chapter XI. On the place of this chapter in the argument, see introduction to chap. ix. above. Briefly, the ninth chapter means, God is sovereign, and the tenth chapter means, Israel has sinned. Both of these are presented in relative independence as explanations of the perplexing fact which confronted the Apostle, namely, that the Jews did not receive the Gospel, while the Gentiles did; in this chapter, the two are brought into relation to each other, and we are shown (to some extent) how in the sovereign providence of God even the sin of Israel is made to contribute to the working out of a universal purpose of redemption—a redemption in which Israel also shares, in accordance with the inviolable promise of God. The chapter can be naturally divided into three sections: (1) vers. 1-10, in which the question immediately arising out of chap. x. is discussed, viz., whether the unbelief of which Israel as a whole has been convicted involves God's rejection of the chosen people; (2) vers. 11-24, in which the result to be attained by the partial and temporary exclusion of the Jews from the Messianic kingdom is enlarged upon, and the Gentiles warned against self-exaltation; and (3) vers. 25-36, in which Paul magnifies the unsearchable wisdom, love and faithfulness of God, as revealed in securing by a common method the salvation alike of Israel and the Gentiles.

(t) Vv. 1-10. λέγω οὖν: the οὖν intimates that it is with the conclusion reached in chap. x. before his mind that Paul puts the following question: the unbelief of Israel naturally suggested it. μὴ ἀπώσατο ο θεός τον λαὸν αὐτοῦ; For the words, cf. Ps. cxv. 14 (xcii. LXX), 1 Sam. xii. 22. In both places the promise is given οὐκ ἀπώσεται τῷ Κ. τ. Λ. αὐτοῦ, and the familiar words give the effect of asking, Has God broken His express and repeated promise? μὴ suggests the negative answer, which is expressed more passionately in μὴ γένοιτο. Cf. iii. 6, ix. 14. Israel may be faithless to Him, but He abides faithful. But this is hardly conciliatory, to say the least; and it is better to take the words as explaining why Paul puts the question with μὴ (suggesting the negative answer), and why he then gives the denial with such vehemence. "I, too, am an Israelite, to whom the very idea of God's rejection of His people is an impious and incredible idea, to be repelled with horror." ἐκ σπέρματος Ἄβραμ
XI. 1. LEXΩ οὖν, Μῆ ἄπωσατο ὁ Θεὸς τῶν λαῶν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο ἡ

2. οὖν ἄπωσατο ὁ Θεὸς τῶν λαῶν αὐτοῦ, ἐν προέγνω. η οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλίᾳ τί λέγει η γραφή; ὡς ἔπυργκανε τῇ Θεῷ κατα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, λέγων. 3. "Κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια σου κατέσκαψαν καὶ ἦν ὑπελείφθη μόνος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχήν μου". 4. ἀλλά τί λέγει αὐτὸς ο χρηματισμός; "Κατελπότο ἐπακακίλιους ἄνδρες, οἴνοις οὐκ ἐκαμψαν γόνη τῇ Βάαλ."

5. οὔως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν "καίρῳ λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος".
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

γέγονεν. εἰ δὲ χάρις, οὐκ ἐτί ἐξ ἐργῶν· ἐτί ἡ χάρις οὐκ ἐτί γίνεται χάρις. εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἐργῶν, οὐκ ἐτί ἡ χάρις· ἐτί ἡ τοῦ ἐργῶν οὐκ ἐτί ἡτίν ἐργῶν. 1. 7. Τί οὖν; δ ἐπιλείψει Ἰσραήλ, τούτου ὑπὸ ἐκπέμφη, ἢ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐκπέμφη· ὅ δὲ λοιποῖ ἐπιρώθησαν 8. (καθὼς γέγραται, "Ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός πνεῦμα κατανόησις, ὁ φθαλμοῦ τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ μὴ ἀκούσειν"). ἔως τῆς ὁμορος ἡμέρας. 2. d 2 Cor. iii.

1 καθὼς; read with ΝΒ καθαπερ. See note 1, page 673.

Ver. 6. Expansion of χάριτος in ver. 5: grace and works are mutually exclusive. Nothing a man can do gives him a claim as of right against God to be included in the remnant. άς: otherwise. Cf. ver. 22, iii. 6. Gratia nisi gratis sit gratia non est. Avg. The fact that there is a remnant, and one owing its existence to God's grace, is the proof that (in spite of the wholesale defection of Israel) God has not cast off His people.

Ver. 7. τί οὖν; What then? How are we to describe the present situation, if not in the painful language of verse 1? Thus: δ ἐπιλείψει Ἰσραήλ κ.τ.λ. What Israel is in quest of is δικαιοσύνη: the present conveys more sympathetically than the impft. of some MSS. the Apostle's sense of the ceaseless and noble (though misdirected) efforts of his countrymen. ἐκτιναγον: were hardened, 2 Cor. iii. 14, John xii. 40, Mc. vi. 52, v. 17. Paul does not say how they were hardened or by whom: there is the same indefinite ness here as in κατηρτισμένοι εἰς ἀπώλειαν in ix. 22. It may be quite possible to give a true sense to the assertion that they were hardened by God (cf. the following verse), although the hardening in this case is always regarded as a punishment for sin, that is, as a confirming in an obduracy which originally was not of God, but their own; as if the idea were, first they would not, and then, in God's just reaction against their sin, they could not; but it is a mistake to import into the text a definiteness which does not belong to it. It is rather essential to Paul's argument that he should not be bound down to one-sided interpretations of what he has intentionally left vague.

Ver. 8 ff. This hardening (at the present day ver. 5) agrees with God's action toward Israel in the past, as exhibited in Scripture. The words from the O.T. can hardly be called a quotation; Deut. xxix. 4, Is. xxix. 10, Is. vi. 9, 10, all contributed something to them. The πνεῦμα κατανόησις is from Is. xxix. 10, and answers to the Heb. πνεῦμα ἠμέρα, a spirit of deep sleep or torpor. Virtually it is defined by what follows—unseeing eyes, unhearing ears: a spirit which produces a condition of insensibility, to which every appeal is vain. κατανόησις only occurs in LXX, Is. xxix. 10, Ps. l. 4 (οίνον κατανόησις); but the verb κατανόησιμαι is used by Theod. in Dan. x. 15 to translate ὑπνοια (cognate to ὑπνοῖ)., and in other places of any overpowering emotion: see Fritzschke ad loc. Winer, p. 117. It is God Who sends this spirit of stupor, but He does not send it arbitrarily nor at random: it is always a judgment. ἔως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας: in Deut. xxix. 4 for τῆς ἡμέρας. The change emphasizes the fact that what Israel had been from the beginning it was when Paul wrote,
and that God had acted toward it from the beginning on the same principle on which He was acting then. Cf. Acts vii. 51 f. καὶ Δαυείδ λέγει: another proof of ἐπωρώθησαν, though strictly speaking a wish or an imprecation cannot prove anything, unless it be assumed that it has been fulfilled, and so can be taken as the description of a fact. Paul takes it for granted that the doom invoked in these words has come upon the Jews. γεγένθαι ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their table in the psalm is that in which they delight, and it is this which is to prove their ruin. παγίς, θήρα, and σκάνδαλον are all variations of the same idea, that of snare or trap - i.e., sudden destruction. What the Jews delighted in was the law, and the law misunderstood proved their ruin. In seeking a righteousness of their own based upon it they missed and forfeited the righteousness of God which is given to faith in Christ. καὶ εἰς ανταπόδομα αὐτῶν: this does not exactly reproduce either the Heb. or the LXX, but it involves the idea that the fate of the Jews is the recompense of their sin - not a result to be simply referred to a decree of God. Their perverse attitude to the law is avenged in their incapacity to understand and receive the Gospel. τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν: for this Gen. both in ver. 8 and ver. το, see Buttman, Gram. of N.T. Greek. τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν διὰ παυόντος σύγκαμψον: keep them continually in spiritual bondage, stooping under a load too heavy to be borne: cf. Acts xv. 10.

This is the condition in which by God's act, requiring their own sins, and especially their self-righteous adherence to the law as a way of salvation, the Jews find themselves. It is a condition so grievous, and so remote from what one anticipates for a people chosen by God, that it confronts Paul again with the difficulty of ver. τ, and obliges him to state it once more - this time in a way which mitigates its severity, and hints that the fall of Israel is not the last thing concerning them to be taken into account. What if God's purpose includes and uses their fall? What if it is not final? with new ideas of this sort, introduced to take the edge from the stern utterances of vers. 8-10, that Paul deals in vers. 11-24.

Ver. 11. λέγω οὖν: I say then, taking up the problem again. μὴ ἔπτασαν ἵνα πέσωσιν: surely they did not stumble so as to fall? The subject is the mass of the Jewish nation, all but the elect remnant. The contrast here between stumbling and falling shows that the latter is meant of an irremediable fall, from which there is no rising. This is one of the cases in which ἵνα is loosely used; it cannot possibly be translated "in order that". For similar examples cf. 1 Thess. v. 4, 1 Cor. vii. 29, Gal. v. 17. ἀλλά: on the contrary, by their (moral) fall salvation has come to the Gentiles to provoke them (the unbelieving Israelites) to jealousy. The fact stated here is illustrated at every point in Paul's own ministry; he turned to the Gentiles because the Jews would not hear him. See Acts xiii. 46 ff., xviii. 6, xxviii. 25-28. The end in view in it (cf. x. 19) is his proof that the stumbling of the Jews is not to be interpreted in the sense of a final fall. A recovery is in prospect.

Ver. 12. Βοθ ἡττήμα and πλήρωμα are difficult words, but it is not necessary to suppose that they answer mathematic ally to one another, though Wetstein explains them by - and +. ήττήμα may mean (as in Is.xxxi. 8) defeat, or (as in 1 Cor. vi. 7) loss; it can hardly mean diminutio eorum, or paucitas fudeorum credentium; το πλήρωμα αυτῶν must mean the making up of them to their full numbers. There is an exhaustive study of the word πλήρωμα by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson in The Expositor, April, 1898. His paraphrase of this verse is very good. "If the Gentiles have been enriched in a sense through the very miscarriage and disaster of Israel, what wealth is in store for them in the great Return, when all Israel shall be saved - 'when God hath made the pile complete'!" The enrichment referred to is in both cases that which comes through participating in the blessings of the Gospel.
13. Υμίν γὰρ λέγω τοῖς έθνεσιν, εφ' ὧσον μέν εἰμι εὐφραυτόλος, τὴν διακοινίαν μου δοξάζω, εἰς τὸ παρα-βαλλήσθω μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ σῶσον τινὰς ἐκ αὐτῶν.

14. εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολή αὐτῶν καταλαμβάνει κόσμου, τίς ἡ πρόσληψις, εἰ μὴ ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἄνθρωποις; 15. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἀγία, καὶ τὸ φῶς, καί εἰ ἡ μία σώσεως 2ος.

16. εἰ μὲν δὲ λέγω τοῖς έθνεσιν.

Paul does not here address a new class of readers. He has been speaking all along to a Gentile church, and speaking to it in that character (see above, pp. 567 ff.); and he feels it necessary to show the relevance, in such circumstances, of bestowing so much attention on the condition and prospects of the Jews. His mission to the Gentiles has an indirect bearing on his own countrymen, the more successful he can make it, the greater is the prospect that some of the Jews also may be provoked to jealousy and saved. Every Jew, again, who is saved, goes to make up the πλήρωμα of ver. 12, and so to bring on a time of unimaginable blessing for the Gentile world.

εφ' ὧσον μέν L, vulg., D3 lat. For µέν ὑπὲρ ΝABCP have µέν ὑπὲρ, and so all edd.

For the interpretation of δοξάζω see 2 Thess. iii. 10. The word is printed in all the critical editions, but Sanday and Headlam would read μεν ὑπὲρ as one word, and discount the restrictive force of the µέν, which suggests that apostleship to Gentiles was but one part of Paul's mission. ειγάρ: the pronoun expresses not merely a noble consciousness of vocation, but Paul's feeling that in his particular case at all events a mission to the Gentiles could not but include this ulterior reference to the Jews. His devotion, accordingly, to his Gentile ministry, never let them fall out of view. "As far then as apostleship to Gentiles is represented by me (as no doubt it is) I glorify my ministry (by faithful discharge of it), if by any means I may save some of the Jews." For the interpretation of δοξάζω see 2 Thess. iii. 10. The word is printed in all the critical editions, but Sanday and Headlam would read µεν ὑπὲρ as one word, and discount the restrictive force of the µέν, which suggests that apostleship to Gentiles was but one part of Paul's mission. ειγάρ: the pronoun expresses not merely a noble consciousness of vocation, but Paul's feeling that in his particular case at all events a mission to the Gentiles could not but include this ulterior reference to the Jews. His devotion, accordingly, to his Gentile ministry, never let them fall out of view. "As far then as apostleship to Gentiles is represented by me (as no doubt it is) I glorify my ministry (by faithful discharge of it), if by any means I may save some of the Jews." For the interpretation of δοξάζω see 2 Thess. iii. 10. The word is printed in all the critical editions, but Sanday and Headlam would read µεν ὑπὲρ as one word, and discount the restrictive force of the µέν, which suggests that apostleship to Gentiles was but one part of Paul's mission. ειγάρ: the pronoun expresses not merely a noble consciousness of vocation, but Paul's feeling that in his particular case at all events a mission to the Gentiles could not but include this ulterior reference to the Jews. His devotion, accordingly, to his Gentile ministry, never let them fall out of view. "As far then as apostleship to Gentiles is represented by me (as no doubt it is) I glorify my ministry (by faithful discharge of it), if by any means I may save some of the Jews." For the interpretation of δοξάζω see 2 Thess. iii. 10. The word is printed in all the critical editions, but Sanday and Headlam would read µεν ὑπὲρ as one word, and discount the restrictive force of the µέν, which suggests that apostleship to Gentiles was but one part of Paul's mission. ειγάρ: the pronoun expresses not merely a noble consciousness of vocation, but Paul's feeling that in his particular case at all events a mission to the Gentiles could not but include this ulterior reference to the Jews. His devotion, accordingly, to his Gentile ministry, never let them fall out of view.

Ver. 15 f. From the personal explanation of ver. 13 f., which interrupts the argument, Paul reverts to the ideas of ver. 12. To save any Jew was a great object, even with an apostle of the Gentiles: εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their ἀποβολὴ is their rejection by God on the ground of unbelief. καταλαμβάνει κόσμου: the assumption of the Jews into God's favour. ζωή εκ νεκρών. Modern expositors almost all find in these words a reference to the resurrection; the restoration of the Jews at once brings on the era, and that Paul shared in the apocalyptic ideas current in his time; but it does not follow that he was thinking of the resurrection here. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ αγία, καὶ τὸ φῶς, καί εἰ ἡ μία σώσεως 2ος.

Ver. 15 f. From the personal explanation of ver. 13 f., which interrupts the argument, Paul reverts to the ideas of ver. 12. To save any Jew was a great object, even with an apostle of the Gentiles: εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their ἀποβολὴ is their rejection by God on the ground of unbelief. καταλαμβάνει κόσμου: the assumption of the Jews into God's favour. ζωή εκ νεκρών. Modern expositors almost all find in these words a reference to the resurrection; the restoration of the Jews at once brings on the era, and that Paul shared in the apocalyptic ideas current in his time; but it does not follow that he was thinking of the resurrection here. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ αγία, καὶ τὸ φῶς, καί εἰ ἡ μία σώσεως 2ος. This explains Paul's assurance that Israel has a future. For ᾖς. and φῶς. see Num. xv. 19-21. By the offering of the first fruits the whole mass, and the whole produce of the land, were consecrated. Both this figure, and that of the root and the branches, signify the same thing. As the application in ver. 28 proves, what is presented in both is the relation of the
17. εἰ δὲ tινὲς tῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλασθησαν, οὐ
dὲ ἀγριέλαιος ὑπὲρ ἑνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ συνκοινωνὸς tῆς ῥίζης
καὶ tῆς πιότης tῆς ελαίας έγένου, 18. μὴ κατακαυχώ τῶν κλάδων:
eἰ δὲ κατακαυχάσας, οὐ σου tὴν ῥίζαν βαστάσεις, ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα σε. 19. "Ερείς οὖν, Ἐξεκλασθησαν οἱ 2 κλάδοι, ὡς ἐγώ ἐγένους.
20. καλός· τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλασθησαν, οὐ δὲ tῇ πιστείᾳ ἀστήκας. μὴ
patriarchs to the people as a whole. As
chosen by God, the fathers were ἄγιοι,
i.e., God's people, and this standing (in
spite of the arguments in chap. ix., and in
spite of the hard facts of the situation
when Paul wrote) belongs inalienably to
their children. They are God's, and it
will yet become apparent that they are.

Vers. 17-24. In these verses, which
in a sense are a long parenthesis,
Paul anticipates an objection which
Gentile readers might take to his use
of the last figure, the root and the
branches; and he draws from it two
special lessons—one, of humility, for
the objectors; the other, of hope, for Israel.

Ver. 17. A Gentile Christian might
feel that the very fact that Jews were re
jected and Gentiles accepted qualified
the assurance with which Paul had just
spoken of the future of Israel. It is the
disposition to think so, and to presume
on one's own favoured position, which
the Apostle rebukes in μὴ κατακαυχώ
τῶν κλάδων. εἰ δὲ tινὲς τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλασθησαν· tίνες puts the case mildly: cf.
iii. 3. Ἐξεκλασθησαν, sc., as fruitless. οὐ
dὲ ἀγριέλαιος ὑπὲρ ἑνεκεντρίσθης: οὐ is the presumptuous
individual before the Apostle's mind,
not the Gentile Church collectively. The
ἀγριέλαιος is the olive in its natural
uncultivated state. Ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν
αὐτοῖς, sc., among the native branches of
the cultivated olive. The process here
supposed is one that in horticulture is
never performed. The cultivated branch
is always engrafted upon the wild stock,
and not vice versa. This Paul knew
quite well (see παρά φύσιν, ver. 24), and
the force of his reproof to the presuming
Gentile turns on the fact that the process
was an unnatural one. [Ordine commute
res magis causis quam causas
rebus aptavit (Origen).] It gave the
Gentile no room to boast over the re
jected Jews. συνκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης τῆς
πιότης τῆς ελαίας: there is an argument
in συν. At the best, the Gentile only
shares with Jews in the virtues of a root
which is not Gentile, but Jewish: he
has his part in the consecration of the
patriarchs, the one historical root of the
people of God, and in the blessings God
attached to it. For πιότης cf. Jud. ix.
7. The accumulation of genitives is
apparently an imitation of such Hebrew
constructions as Isa. xxviii. 1, 16: the
meaning is, a partaker in the root of the
fat olive tree.

Ver. 18. μὴ κατακαυχώ τῶν κλάδων:
for the genitive see Buttm., 185. Be
tween "if thou boastest," and "thou
bearest not the root," there is no formal
connection: for such breviloquence,
which requires us to supply "consider"
or "remember," see Winer, p. 773. The
sense is, You owe all you are proud of
to an (artificially formed) relation to the
race you would despise.

Ver. 19. Ερείς οὖν: the presumptuous
Gentile persists. "It is not to the root
I compare myself, but branches were
broken off that I might be engrafted:
that surely involves some superiority in
me."

Ver. 20. καλὸς: "a form of partial
and often ironical assent" (Gifford).
Paul does not think it worth while to
dispute the assertion of ver. 19, though
as it stands it is by no means indisputa
ble; he prefers to point out what it
overlooks—the moral conditions of being
broken off and of standing secure—and
to urge them on the conscience. τῇ
ἀπιστίᾳ: an account of unbelief, cf.
Gal. vi. 12, Winer, p. 270. τῇ πιστείᾳ.
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

17—24.

17. ὡσποδρομεῖ, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ. 21. εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων ὁκόν ἐφείσατο· μὴ πως 1 οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται. 22. ἢδε ὁ θεός χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς κατάφυσιν ἀποτομίαν· ἐπὶ δὲ σοὶ. Here only in N.T. χρηστότητα, ἐὰν ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σοῦ ἐκκοπήσατο. 22. ἦδεν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ επίμεντος πεσόντας ἀποτομίαν ἐπίδεσε· ἦδεν χρηστότητα, εἴαν επιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι ἐπεῖκες, καὶ εἰκοστήσ. 23. καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δὲ, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμείνης· τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐγκεντρισθοῦσα· τὸν δὲ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσεται αὐτοῖς. 24. εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐκκοπῆς, καὶ παρὰ ὁ ὕπως έκκοπη· Ch. i. 36. τρισθήσ. εἰς "καλλιέλαιον, πόσω μάλλονοι κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεν-

1. ὁμ. μῆς ΝΑΒCFL read φείσεται. All crit. edd. read φείσεται, but while most edd. omit μῆς. it is retained by Weiss (with DEFGL, most majusc. and fathers) and bracketed by Alford. Weiss finds it impossible to regard it as an insertion, since it makes an easy text irregular and difficult; but its omission, he thinks, need not have been intentional; it may be a mere overlook of the transcriber's.

2. χρηστότητα the second time DFL; but χρηστότητα Θεου ΑΒCD, and so all edd. For ἐπιμεινης δΣΒD read επιμενης, see also last verse.

3. For ἐπιμεινωσιν ΝΒDSL read επιμεινωσιν; see also last verse.

διστήσα: the security of the Gentiles depended on faith, and it is the most elementary principle of a religion of faith (iii. 27) that it excludes boasting. μὴ υψηλοφρόνει: cf. xii. 16. Tim. vi. 17 has μὴ υψηλοφρόνειν. Neither is classical. φοβού: consistent with πίστις. Τιμὸς ἄποψίστως φιλουεῖ αὐτόν. Here only.

Ver. 21. As far as comparisons can be made at all in such things, the Jews had been more securely invested in the kingdom than the Gentiles. They were, in the language of the figure, not artificially grafted, but native branches, on the tree of God's people; yet even that did not prevent Him from cutting off those who did not believe. And if He did not spare them, He will not spare Gentiles either, if in pridethey fall from faith. On εἰ...οὐκ ἐφείσατο see Winer, 509 f. The true reading of the last word is φείσεται (not φείσεται), but Weiss would retain μῆς (see crit. note) even with this future, and supply the missing link of thought from φοβοῦ: one may fear that he will not, etc. The ironical reserve of this (though the future makes the thing to be feared as certain as possible) is quite Pauline, and the μῆς (DFGL) may be genuine.

Ver. 22. Behold then God's goodness and severity, etc., in the case of the Gentiles and Jews as now before us. ἀποτομή: here only in N.T. The moral idea is that of peremptoriness, inexorableness; in Greek writers it is contrasted with ἀπαράκτης, ἀτέλεια, κρατός.

Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 10. ἦδεν ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι: if you remain on in the goodness, i.e., continue to be indebted to it, and to it alone, for your religious position. This excludes presumption, and in general all such temper as is betrayed in taking an attitude of superiority to the Jews. The Jews lost their standing because they had come to believe that it was indefectible, and independent of moral conditions; and if the Gentiles commit the same mistake they will incur the same doom. It is not to Israel only God may say, The kingdom is taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. εἰ...οὐκ ἐφείσατο see vers. 6. Ver. 23. κακεῖνοι δὲ: and they too, they on the other hand, viz., the unbelieving Jews. εὰν μή κ.τ.λ., unless they remain on in their unbelief. It is assumed that they need not do this. The hardening spoken of in vers. 7—10, though it is a judgment upon sin, and may seem from the nature of the case to be irre- mediable, is not to be so absolutely taken. Even in the most hardened rejector of the Gospel we are not to limit either the resources of God's power, or the possibilities of change in a self-conscious, self-determining creature. All things are possible to him that believeth, and we are not to say that in this man or that, Jew or Gentile, unbelief is final, and belief an impossibility. If the Jews give up their unbelief ἐγκεντρισθοῦσας they will be incorporated again in the true people of God. ἐνεργεῖτο γὰρ ἐστὶν...
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

1 Το όνομα του θεού κατά φύσιν ἀγριελαίου, from what is in its own nature an uncultivated olive, with no suitableness for the uses which the olive is intended to subserve, and (2) παρά φύσιν in violation of nature was engrafted into a good olive, in comparison with this doubly unnatural process one may well argue πόσω μάλλον κ.τ.λ. how much more shall these, the Jews who κατά φύσιν (in their own nature) belong to the good tree, have their connection with it re-established? Weiss takes εγκεντρισθήσονται as a logical future, and it may be so; but Paul believes in his logic, and has probably in view in the word that actual restoration of the Jews of which he now proceeds to speak.

Ver. 24. God's power to engraft the Jews again into the stock of His people proved a fortiori by comparison with what He has done for the Gentiles. To restore His own is more natural, conceivable, and one may even say easy, than to call those who are not His own. The Gentile Christian (1) was cut εκ της κατά φύσιν ἀγριελαίου, from what is in its own nature an uncultivated olive, with no suitableness for the uses which the olive is intended to subserve, and (2) παρά φύσιν in violation of nature was engrafted into a good olive; in comparison with this doubly unnatural process one may well argue πόσω μάλλον κ.τ.λ. how much more shall these, the Jews who κατά φύσιν (in their own nature) belong to the good tree, have their connection with it re-established? Weiss takes εγκεντρισθήσονται as a logical future, and it may be so; but Paul believes in his logic, and has probably in view in the word that actual restoration of the Jews of which he now proceeds to speak.

Vv. 25-32. In this concluding section Paul abandons the ground of argument for that of revelation. He has discussed the problems arising out of the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles, when taken in connection with the promises of God to His people; and he has tried to make it clear that in all His dealings with His people, God has acted righteously, that for all that has befallen the Jews they have full responsibility, and that a Divine purpose, with blessing in it to both Jew and Gentile, has in directly been getting itself carried into effect through this perplexing history. The restoration of the Jews has led to the calling of the Gentiles, and the calling of the Gentiles, by provoking the Jews to jealousy, is eventually to lead to their conversion too. All this, it may be said, is matter of argument; it is more or less convincing as the argument appeals with less or greater force to our minds. It is Paul's construction and interpretation of the facts before him, and his anticipation of the result in which they are likely to issue; but it has no greater authority than the reasoning by which he supports it, or the motives which suggest one line of reasoning upon the facts rather than another. We can understand how patriotism, and religious faith in God's promise, and insight into the psychological influences which determine human conduct, all contribute some weight to his argument; but he is not content to rest upon argument alone the central truth he has been expounding—that the hardening of Israel is temporary as well as partial, and that when "the fulness of the Gentiles" has come in the hardening will cease, and all Israel be saved. He expressly puts this truth forward as a revelation (μυστήριον, ver. 25). What this means psychologically we cannot tell, but it is clear that for Paul it was an essential part of the true religion, so far as he could make out the manner of its working in the world. It might try to lead the mind up to it along various lines of argument, or to confirm it by considerations of various kinds; but for him it had a Divine authority, antecedent to argument and independent of it. He sought arguments to make it credible and intelligible, not for his own sake, but for the sake of others. How much a revelation of this kind will weigh with the modern reader depends on the extent to which on general grounds he can recognise in Paul an inspired interpreter of Christianity. History, it must be admitted, throws no light on his words. The Gentiles are not fully gathered in; the time to say whether Israel as a whole is to have any distinct or decisive place in the final fulfilment of God's gracious purpose is therefore not yet. One feels as if the nationalism of the passage fell short of Paul's great word, There is neither Greek nor Jew; but there the Jews are, a problem to unbelief as well as to faith; think what we will of it, it is
of them salvation comes; and it is at least as credible as the reverse (without considering Paul's arguments at all) that Providence is not preserving them for nothing, and that in such some way as is here indicated there is a close connection between their salvation and the salvation of the world.

Ver. 25. ου γαρ θέλω υμάς αγνοείν:

εf.i.13, Ι Cor. χ. 1, xii.τ, 2 Cor. i.8, but especiallyΙ Τhess. iv. 13, where as here it is used to introduce a revelation. An often-repeated phrase tends to be formal, but the thing of which Paul would not have his readers ignorant is usually important. Αs the phrase is invariably followed by αδελφοί, the latter also tends to be formal: it is at least a mistake to see anything of peculiar intimacy or affection in it in such connections. As ver. 28 and ver. 30 prove, in which they are contrasted with the Jews, the αδελφοί are Gentiles, and they are practically identical with the Roman Church. το μυστήριον τούτο: the word μυστήριον only occurs once in the Synoptical Gospels (Μark iν.ΙΙ and parallels) and not at all in John, but Paul uses it often (twenty-one times, including two in Ι Τim.). Αs ver. 28 and ver. 30 prove, in which they are contrasted with the Jews, the αδελφοί are Gentiles, and they are practically identical with the Roman Church. το μυστήριον τούτο: the word μυστήριον only occurs once in the Synoptical Gospels (Mark iv. 11 and parallels) and not at all in John; but Paul uses it often (twenty-one times, including two in Ι Τim.). It always refers to something which though once hidden, or in its nature a secret, is now revealed. In some passages it is applied to the Christian revelation as a whole (e.g., in Rom. xvi. 25, 1 Cor. ii. 1, Eph. i. 9, Col. ii. 2: in the last it is identified simpliciter with Christ). In others it is applied to the Christian revelation as a whole, but with some special aspect of it in view: thus in Eph. iii. 3 the special aspect of "revelation" or "mystery"—for it is all one—in the Gospel is the destined inclusion of the Gentiles among the people of God, while in Col. i. 26 f. it is the indwelling Christ, as the pledge of immortality. In others, again, any particular element in the great revelation is called a "mystery". Thus in 1 Cor. xv. 51 the truth communicated about those who live to see the second advent is described by this name, and it might have been used in the similar passage in 1 Thess. iv. 15, where Paul says instead that he speaks εν λόγῳ κυρίου. This is merely to claim for his words the authority of revelation in another way. The passage before us comes under this last head. It is a piece of revelation—something which has been communicated to Paul εν ἀποκαλύψει for the good of the Church—that hardening in part has come upon Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles has come in. The new ideas in this revelation are the limits in extent (ἀπό ρους) and in time (ἐκ χρόνου). Το τι μέχρι εἶναι λαυτοῦ φρονήσας: it would tend to self-conceit if the Gentiles in ignorance of this Divine appointment concluded off-hand that the Jews could never be converted as a whole, and that they themselves therefore were in a place of permanent and exclusive privilege. For εν λαυτοῖς (ΑΒ) παρ' εαυτοῖς is found in ΝCDL, etc. Both occur in LXX but the former is much more likely to have been changed. το πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνων = the full number, totality, of the Gentiles. It does not mean a number pre-determined beforehand, which has to be made up, whether to answer to the blanks in Israel or to the demands of a Divine decree, but the Gentiles in their full strength. When the Gentiles in their full strength have come in, the power which is to provoke Israel to jealousy will be fully felt, with the result described in ver. 26.

Ver. 26. καὶ οὕτως = and thus; not merely temporal, but = under the influence of the jealousy so excited—under the impression produced on the Jews by the sight of the Gentiles in their fullness peopling the kingdom—all Israel shall be saved. This is an independent sentence. For πάς Ισραήλ see Ι Κings xii. 1, 2 Chron. xii. 1. It means Israel as a whole. Paul is thinking of the historical people, as the contrast with Gentiles shows, but he is not thinking of them one by one. Israel a Christian nation, Israel as a nation a part of the Messianic kingdom, is the content of his thought. To make πάς Ισραήλ refer to a "spiritual" Israel, or to the elect, is to miss the mark: it foretells a "conversion of the Jews so universal that the separation into an ' elect remnant ' and ' the rest who were hardened ' shall disappear" (Gifford). Καθώς γέγραπται Ιsa. lx. 20 f., but the last words οὖν ἐφιλμαί κ.τ.λ. from Ιsa. xxvii. 9. The prophet says εν εαυτοῖς
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27. καὶ αὐτὴ αὐτοῖς ἢ πάρ ἐρωὶ διαθήκη, διαν ἄφηλμα τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν; 28. Κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἢ ἐχθροὶ δὲ τὰς αμαρτίας αὐτῶν. 29. ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. 30. Ὄμεντο γὰρ καὶ ὅμεις ποτε ἤπειροντες τῇ Θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἥλεξητε τῇ τούτῳ.

1 καὶ before ιμισο ρ. Νεκκ. For νυν, which is found in ΑCDΕFGL, νυνι is read in Β. W. and H. put νυν in text, νυνι in margin. Weiss puts νυνι in text, thinking that the double νυν in ver. 31 may have induced the dropping of the ν. For other cases, see Textkritik, S. 62.

Σίων: Paul's εκ Σιών is probably a lapse of memory, due to the impression of passages like Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 7, Isa. ii. 3, though Philippi thinks it intentional—the object being to emphasise the title of the Jews, as against the Gentiles, to a share in the kingdom. It is then as if he said: Salvation is of the Jews, and surely therefore for them. It is impossible to say that ήξει refers to the first or to the second advent: the distinction is not present to Paul's mind as he writes; all he is concerned with is the fact that in prophetic scripture language is used which implies that Israel as a people is to inherit the Messianic salvation. ὁ ρυόμενος, Hebrew Ρξς, is the Messiah.


Ver. 27. καὶ αὕτη κ.τ.λ. This is My covenant with them = this is the constitution which I give them to live under. Weiss interprets this by what follows, making the αὕτη prospective, but this is somewhat forced. The διαθήκη is not equivalent to the removal of sins, though it is based upon it: it covers the whole condition introduced by that removal. Cf. Jer. xlix. 31 ff. The deliverance referred to in vers. 26 and 27, though promised to Israel as a whole, is a religious and ethical one. It has no political significance, and nothing to do with any assumed restoration of the Jews to Canaan. This is obvious even apart from the argument of Weiss that the deliverance in question is to be immediately followed by the resurrection; an argument which depends on a doubtful interpretation of ζωή εκ νεκρῶν νερ. For νυν, which is found in ΑCDΕFGL, νυνι is read in Β. W. and H. put νυν in text, νυνι in margin. Weiss puts νυνι in text, thinking that the double νυν in ver. 31 may have induced the dropping of the ν. For other cases, see Textkritik, S. 62.

Ver. 29. Proof that the Israelites, in virtue of their relation to the fathers, are objects of God's love. αμεταμέλητα ε. Cf. Bar. iii. 7, 1 Macc. iv. 58.

Ver. 28. κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. In both clauses κατὰ defines the rule by which God's relation to Israel is determined. When He looks at the Gospel, which they have rejected, they are ἐχθροὶ, objects of His hostility, and that ήξει, ὅμεις, for the sake of the Gentiles, to whom the Gospel in this way comes; when He looks at the διαθήκη, the choice which He made of Israel to be His people, they are ἀγαπητοί, objects of His love, and that δι' ὑμῶν πατέρας, on account of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with whom He made an everlasting covenant (cf. Gen. xvii. 19, Luke i. 54 f.). The passive meaning of ἐχθροῖ is fixed by the contrast with ἀγαπητοῖ, as well as by the logic of the passage: cf. ν. το.

Ver. 30. There is the less need, too, that they should be withdrawn, because God makes the very misuse of them contribute to the working out of His universal purpose of redemption. The past unbelief of the Gentiles and the mercy they presently enjoy, the present unbelief of the Jews and the mercy they are destined to enjoy in the future—these things not only correspond to each other, but they are interwoven with each other; they are parts of a system which God controls, and in which every element conditions and is conditioned by all the rest: there is a Divine necessity pervading and controlling all the freedom of men—a Divine purpose mastering all the random activity of human wills; a purpose which is read
After autov | BD' ins. νυν; and so Tischdf. and W. and H., not Weiss, who regards it as a mere mechanical repetition. Some cursive have υστερον.

out by the Apostle in verse 32: God shut them all up into disobedience that He might have mercy upon them all. Ver. 30. ποτέ: once, in the past, chap. i. 18-32. τη τούτων απειθεία = owing to their disobedience. Cf. vers. 11, 15. Ver. 31. το θεός τοις πάντας εις απειθείαν: this is the nearest approach made in the N.T. to putting the sin of man into a direct and positive relation to the act and purpose of God. But it would be a mistake to draw inferences from the concrete historical problem before the Apostle—viz., God’s dealings with Jew and Gentile, and the mutual relations and influence of Jew and Gentile in the evolution of God’s purpose—and to apply them to the general abstract question of the relation of the human will to the Divine. Paul is not thinking of this question at all, and his authority could not be claimed for such inferences. Salvation, he sees, as he looks at the world before him, is to come to Jew and Gentile alike by the way of free grace; and it answers to this, that in the providence of God, Jew and Gentile alike have been made to feel the need of grace by being shut up under disobedience. It is within Paul’s thought to say that the sin of Jews and Gentiles, to whom he preached the Gospel, did not lie outside the control, or outside the redeeming purpose, of God; but it does not seem to me to be within his thought to say that God ordains sin in general for the sake of, or with a view to, redemption. This is a fancy question which an apostle would hardly discuss. God subordinates sin to His purpose, but it is not a subordinate element in His purpose. The same order of considerations ought to guide us in the interpretation of τοις πάντας. "Them all" certainly refers in the first instance to Jews and Gentiles. It is not the same as τους αμφοτέρους, "both parties"; but it differs from it in its present connection only by giving emphasis to the fact that both parties consist of numbers, to all of whom the truth here stated applies. To find here a doctrine of universal salvation—a dogmatic assertion that every man will at last receive mercy—is simply to desert the ground on which the Apostle is standing. It is to leave off thinking about the concrete problem before his mind, and to start thinking about something quite different. It is gratuitous to contrast, as, e.g., is done by Lipsius, this passage with others in which Paul speaks of ἀπολλύμενοι as well as σωζόμενοι, and to say that they represent irreconcilable view-points—the Apostle speaking in the present instance from the standpoint of Divine teleology, in the other, from that of actual experience. The truth is, as Weiss puts it, there is not a word here to show how far, when the history of man has reached its term, Paul conceived God’s saving purpose to be realised. συνελεκύνω answering to αρνηται is frequent in LXX: the συν does not refer to the fact that Jews and Gentiles are shut up together, but indicates that those who are shut up are shut up on all sides, so that they cannot escape: cf. concludo and examples in Gal. iii. 22, Ps. xxx. 9 LXX.
“to have mercy upon” means “to make partakers of that common salvation” (Jude 3) which is emphatically a dispensation of mercy” (Gifford).

Ver. 33. ο βάθος πλούτου κ.τ.λ. In ver. 32 the content of the chapter is no doubt condensed, but it is more natural to regard the doxology as prompted by the view of God's Providence which pervades the whole discussion than by the one sentence in which it is summed up. βάθος: a universal figure for what is immeasurable or incalculable: cf. I Cor. ii. 10, Apoc. ii. 24, Eph. iii. 18. The genitives πλούτου, σοφίας and γνώσεως are most simply construed as co-ordinate. For πλούτος used thus absolutely see Eph. iii. 8, Phil. iv. 19. Perhaps the key to the meaning here is to be found in x. 12: what Paul adores is the unsearchable wealth of love that enables God to meet and far more than meet the appalling necessities of the world; love less deep would soon be bankrupt at the task. In σοφία and γνώσις the intellectual resources are brought into view with which God has ordered, disposed and controlled all the forces of the world and of man's history so as to make them subservient to His love. The world, with its conflict of races, religions, passions and even vices, may seem to be a realm of chaos; but when we see it in the light of God as Paul did, we see the signs of wisdom and knowledge, of a conscious purpose transcending human thought, and calling forth adoring praise. For the distinction of σοφία and γνώσις, which especially in relation to God is to be felt rather than defined, see Trench, N.T. Synonyms, § lxxv. τα κρίματα αυτού: except 1 Cor. vi. 7 which is different, this is the only example of κρίματα (plural) in the N.T. It is probably used not in the narrower sense (which would be illustrated by reference, e.g., to the “hardening” of Israel), but in the wider sense of the Hebrew דֶּלֶחַ, which it often answers in the LXX. In Ps. xxxvi. 6 we have τα κρίματα δι' αυτού και αι οδοί αυτού are practically the same. As Moses says (Deut. xxxii. 4), All His ways are judgment.

Ver. 34. Proof from Scripture of the unsearchableness of God's ways: He has had no confidant. Isa. xi. 13, 1 Cor. ii. 16. It is mere pedantry to refer half the verse to σοφία and the other half to γνώσις.

Ver. 35. ή τίς προέδωκεν αυτῷ, καὶ ανταποδοθήσεται αυτό; see Job xli. 11 (A.V.). The translation of Job xli. 3, Hebrew, is perhaps Paul's own, as the LXX is entirely different and wrong. The point of the quotation has been variously explained. If it continues the proof of ver. 33, the underlying assumption is that God's ways would be finite and comprehensible if they were determined by what men had done, so as merely to requite that. It seems better, however, to read the words in the largest sense, and then they express the fundamental truth of religion as Paul understood it—viz., that the initiative in religion belongs to God; or as he puts it elsewhere, that we have nothing we did not receive, and that boasting is excluded. The relation of man to God in these conditions is one which naturally expresses itself in doxology.

Ver. 36. δι' αυτού κ.τ.λ. Strictly speaking, the δι' confirms the last truth—man's absolute dependence on God—by making it part of a wider generalisation. αυτού: from Him as their source; αι οδοί: through Him, as the power by whose continuous energy the world is sustained and ruled; αι δι' αυτού: unto Him, as their goal, for whose glory they exist. A reference of any kind to the Trinity is out of the question. It is a question, however, whether τα πάντα means "all things" in the sense of the universe (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6, Col. i. 16, Heb. ii. 10) or whether it is not limited by the article to all the things which have just been in contemplation, the whole marvellous action of God's riches and wisdom and knowledge, as interpreted by the Apostle in regard to the work of redemption (for an example of τα πάντα in this sense see 2 Cor. v. 18). I incline to the last view. The universe of grace, with all that goes on in it for the common salvation of Jew and Gentile, is of God and through God and to
God. To Him be the glory which such a display of wisdom and love demands.

Chapter XII. The distinction of doctrinal and practical is not one that can be pressed anywhere in the N.T., and as little in Paul as in any other writer. It is under practical compulsion of some kind that he develops most of his characteristic doctrines, and he has no doctrines which do not imply a corresponding practice. Yet the distinction does exist, and the remainder of this epistle, especially chaps. xii. 1-xv. 13, may be properly described as the practical part of it. Not that it is independent of the other. On the contrary, it is nothing but the application of it. (οὖν ver. 1.)

Christian ethics are relative to the Christian revelation. It is the relations in which we stand that determine our duties, and the new relations in which we are set both to God and to other men by faith in Jesus Christ have a new morality corresponding to them. There is such a thing as a Christian ethic with a range, a delicacy, a flavour, all its own. There is no formal exposition of it here, though perhaps the nearest approach to such a thing that we have in the N.T., but a comprehensive illustration of it in a variety of bearings. Paul starts (xii. 1 f.) with a general exhortation, covering the whole Christian life. From this he proceeds to the spirit and temper which ought to characterise Christians as members of the same society, dwelling especially on the graces of humility and love (xii. 3-21).

In the following chapter he discusses the duties of the individual to his legal superiors (xiii. 1-7); his duties to his neighbour, as comprehended in the love which fulfils the law (xiii. 8-10); and the urgent duty of sanctification in view of the Parousia. With chap. xiv. he comes to a different subject, and one apparently of peculiar interest in Rome at the time. It is one of those questions in which the claim of Christian liberty has to accommodate itself to the social necessity created by the weakness of brethren, and the discussion of it extends from xiv. 1-xv. 13, and concludes the "practical" part of the epistle.

Ver. 1. τονοῦν: the reference is to all that has been said since i. 16, but especially to what more closely precedes. Cf. Eph. iv. 1, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 1 Cor. iv. 16. The οὖν connects the two parts of the epistle, not formally but really, and shows the dependence of the "practical" upon the "doctrinal." It is the new world of realities to which the soul is introduced by the Christian revelation on which Christian morality depends. It is relative to that world, and would become unreal along with it. 

The mercies are those which God has shown in the work of redemption through Christ. παραστήσαι is not sacrificial: in chap. vi. 13, 16, 19 it is used of putting the body at the disposal of God or of sin: see also 2 Cor. iv. 14, xi. 2, Col. i. 22, 28, Eph. v. 27. τα σώματα υμών is not exactly the same as υμάς αυτούς, yet no stress is to be laid on the words as though Paul were requiring the sanctification of the body as opposed to the spirit: the body is in view here as the instrument by which all human service is rendered to God, and the service which it does render, in the manner supposed, is not a bodily but a spiritual service. θυσίαν ζώσαν: "living," as opposed to the slain animals offered by the Jews. This seems to be the only case in which the new life as a whole is spoken of by Paul as a sacrifice—a thank offering—to God. A more limited use of the idea of θυσία is seen in Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18; cf. also Heb. xiii. 15 f., 1 Pet. ii. 5. 

"living," as opposed to the slain animals offered by the Jews. This seems to be the only case in which the new life as a whole is spoken of by Paul as a sacrifice—a thank offering—to God. A more limited use of the idea of θυσία is seen in Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18; cf. also Heb. xiii. 15 f., 1 Pet. ii. 5. 

λατρεία (ix. 4, Heb. ix. 1, 6, John xvi. 2) is cultus, ritual service, worship; and such a presentation of the body, as the organ of all moral action, to God, is the only thing that can be characterised as λογική λατρεία, spiritual worship. Any other worship, any retention of Jewish or pagan rites, anything coming under the description of opus operatum, is foreign to the Christian θυσία: it is λατρεία which is not λογική, not appropriate to a being whose essence is λόγος, i.e., reason or spirit.
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b: Pet. ii. το Θεόν, την λογικήν λατρείαν υμών. 2. και μη συνεχματίζεσθε τῷ Θεῷ

1 Τῷ ΘΕΟŨ ὑμῶν ἀγαθόν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον. 3. Λέγω γὰρ, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, παντὶ τὸ διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μη ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' δει φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τῶν θεῶν ὑμῶν ἑνώτων, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ανακαινώσει τοῦ νοοῦ υμῶν, εἰς τῷ δοκιμάζειν υμᾶς τῷ Θελμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον.

2 συνεχματίζεσθαι... μεταμορφοῦσθαι; so BL, W, and H. text; but συνεχματίζεσθαι and μεταμορφοῦσθαι in ABD¹ (gr.) F. The infinitive is read by Lachm. and in marg. by Treg. and W, and H., but is obviously an alteration of the imperative to have it construed with παρακαλεῖν (Weiss).

3. ΤΟ ΘΕΟΝ ΛΕΓΩ, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, παντὶ τῷ ΘΕΟΝ ὑμῶν, μη ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' δεί φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τῶν θεῶν υμῶν ἑνώτων, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ανακαινώσει τοῦ νοοῦ υμῶν, εἰς τῷ δοκιμάζειν υμᾶς τῷ Θελμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον.

4. ΕΓΕΡΜΕΝΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΕΧΜΑΤΙΣΜΕΝΟΝ: Εὐρ., Ἰφ., Π., 292, καί Σχήματα) and Wetstein (Sext. Εμπ., ἤ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ ὑποστάσει, ἐνάλλο εἶδος ἀντ' ἐλλου μεταλαμβάνον γεννάται, ὡς ἡ μεταχειματιζόμενος κηρός, καὶ ἄλλοτε ἄλλη μορφήν αναδεχόμενος) it is impossible not to regard the distinctions in question as very arbitrary. For the best supported and most relevant, reflected in Sanday and Headlam's paraphrase("do not adopt the external and fleeting fashion of this world, but be ye transformed in your innermost nature"), see Lightfoot on Phil. ii. 7, or Gifford on the same passage (The Incarnation, pp. 22 ff., 88 ff.).

5. ΤΟ ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ: This world or "age" is opposed to that which is to come; it is an evil world (Gal. i. 4) of which Satan is the God (2 Cor. iv. 4). Even apparent or superficial conformity to a system controlled by such a spirit, much more an actual accommodation to its ways, would be fatal to the Christian life. By nature, the Christian is at home in this world (cf. Eph. ii. 2); such as it is, its life and his life are one; and his deliverance is accomplished as he is transformed τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοοῦ, by the renewing of his mind. νοος in the Apostle's usage (see chap. vii.) is both intellectual and moral—the practical reason, or moral consciousness. This is corrupted and atrophied in the natural man, and renewed by the action of the Holy Spirit. The process would in modern language be described rather as sanctification than regeneration, but regeneration is assumed (Tit. iii. 5).

6. ΤΗΝ ΑΙΩΝΙΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ: "This world" or "age" is opposed to that which is to come, it is an evil world (Gal. i. 4) of which Satan is the God (2 Cor. iv. 4). Even apparent or superficial conformity to a system controlled by such a spirit, much more an actual accommodation to its ways, would be fatal to the Christian life. By nature, the Christian is at home in this world (cf. Eph. ii. 2); such as it is, its life and his life are one; and his deliverance is accomplished as he is transformed τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοοῦ, by the renewing of his mind.
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τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἕκαστῷ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμίρουεν μέτρον πίστεως. 4. Καθάπερ εἰς Cor. ν.15; Tit. ii. 6.
γὰρ ἐν ἐνί σώματι μῆλη πολλὰ ἦχομεν, τὰ δὲ μῆλη πάντα ὀδ τῆς Ἐφ. iv. 7, ώστε ἐξει πράξειν. 5. οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἐσμέν ἐν Χριστῷ, δὲ καθ' εἰς ἄλλην μῆλη. 6. ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα: εἰτε προφητεῖαι, κατὰ τὴν

1 For μῆλη πολλὰ ALP read πολλὰ μῆλη with ΝΒDF latt. and most eed; but W. and H. give μηλῆ πολλὰ a place in marg.

2 For τὸ δὲ (altered to agree with εἰς ?) read τὸ δὲ ΝΑΒD Φ gr. Ρ. 47.
dosis to be supplied; but while in the former case it is hinted at in the second half of every clause (as is seen in our English Bibles), in the latter it is simply forgotten. It is as if Paul had said, "We are members one of another, and have gifts differing according to the grace given to us; our gift may be prophecy, prophecy in the proportion of our faith; it may be διακονία in the sphere appropriate for that; another instance would be that of the teacher in his department, or of the exhorter in his; or again you may have the distributor, whose gift is in the form of ἀπλότης; or the ruler, who is divinely qualified for his function by the gift of σπουδή, moral earnestness; or the man who to show mercy is endowed with a cheerful disposition". All this requires an apodosis, but partly because of its length, partly because of the changes in construction as the Apostle proceeds, the apodosis is overlooked. Its import, however, would not vary, as in the A.V., from clause to clause, but would be the same for all the clauses together. Even with the ordinary punctuation, which puts a period at the end of ver. 5, I prefer this reading of the passage. The varying apodoses supplied in the English Bible to the separate clauses are really irrelevant; what is wanted is a common apodosis to the whole conception. "Now having gifts differing according to the grace given to us—as one may see by glancing at the phenomena of church life—let us use them with humility (remembering that they are gifts) and with love (inasmuch as we are members one of another)." It is easier to suppose that the construction was suspended, and gradually changed, with some general conclusion like this before the mind from the beginning, than that it broke down, so to speak, as soon as it began; which we must suppose if we insert προφητεύωμεν in ver. 6. But it is not a question which can be infallibly decided. It ought to be observed that there is no hint of anything official in this passage; all ministry is a function of membership in the body, and every member has the function of ministry to some intent or other. χάρισμα: i. ΙΙ, 1 Cor. i. 7, xii. 4, 9, 31, 1 P. iv. 10. With the exception of 1 P. iv. 10 (which is not without relation to this passage) Paul alone uses χάρισμα in the N.T. Every χάρισμα is a gift of the Holy Spirit given to the believer for the good of the Church. Some were supernatural (gifts of healings, etc.), others spiritual in the narrower sense: this passage is the best illustration of the word. τὴν δοθείσαν, sc., when we believed. προφητεύωμεν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. προφητεία is the highest of χάρισματα. 1 Cor. xiv. τff. When one has it, he has it κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογ. τῆς πίστεως = in the proportion of his faith. The faith meant is that referred to in ver. 3, the measure of which is assigned by God: and since this is it is obviously absurd for a man to give himself airs—ὑπερφρονείν—on the strength of being a προφήτης: this would amount to forgetting that in whatever degree he has the gift, he owes it absolutely to God. The expression προφητεύωμεν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως implies that the more faith one has—the more completely Christian he is—the greater the prophetic endowment will be. [In theology, "the analogy of the faith" is used in quite a different sense, though it was supposed to be justified by this passage. To interpret Scripture, e.g., according to the analogy of the faith meant to interpret the parts, especially difficult or obscure parts, in consistency with the whole. The scope of the whole, again, was supposed to be represented in the creed or rule of faith; and to interpret κατὰ τ. α. τ. πίστεως meant simply not to run counter to the creed. In the passage before us this is an anachronism as well as an irrelevance. There was no rule of faith when the Apostle was thinking out the original interpretation of Christianity contained in this epistle; and there is no exhortation or warning, but only a description of fact, in the words.] διακονία as opposed to προφητεία and the other functions mentioned here probably refers to such services as were material rather than spiritual: they were spiritual however (though connected only with helping the poor, or with the place or forms of worship) because prompted by the Spirit and done in it. One who has this
gift has it in τῇ διακονίᾳ, i.e., in the qualities and in the sphere proper to it: it is in its own nature limited; it is what it is, and nothing else, and fits a man for this function and no other. This is not "otiose," and it provides a good meaning without importing anything. ὁ διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ: it is in his teaching that the didaskalos possesses the gift peculiar to him: 1 Cor. xiv. 26. ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει: so again with the exhorter, the man who speaks words of encouragement: cf. xv. 4, 5; Acts iv. 36, ix. 31, xiii. 15. It is in his παράκλησις, and not in something else, that his χάρισμα lies. Thus far Paul has not defined the quality of the χαρίσματα, or shown in what they consist; the functionary is merely said to have his gift in his function—teaching, exhorting, or service. But in the cases which follow, he tells us what the gift, proper to the special functions in view, is; in other words, what is the spiritual quality which, when divinely bestowed, capacitates a man for this function and no other. This is not otiose, and it provides a good meaning without importing anything. ὁ διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ: it is in his teaching that the didaskalos possesses the gift peculiar to him: 1 Cor. xiv. 26. ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει: so again with the exhorter, the man who speaks words of encouragement: cf. xv. 4, 5; Acts iv. 36, ix. 31, xiii. 15. It is in his παράκλησις, and not in something else, that his χάρισμα lies. Thus far Paul has not defined the quality of the χαρίσματα, or shown in what they consist; the functionary is merely said to have his gift in his function—teaching, exhorting, or service. But in the cases which follow, he tells us what the gift, proper to the special functions in view, is; in other words, what is the spiritual quality which, when divinely bestowed, capacitates a man for this function and no other. This is not exactly liberality, though in these passages it approaches that sense: it is the quality of a mind which has no arrière-pensée in what it does; when it gives, it does so because it sees and feels the need, and for no other reason; this is the sort of mind which is liberal, and God assigns a man the function of μεταδίδοναι when He bestows this mind on him by His Spirit. ὁ προφήτημα is the person who takes the lead in any way. He might or might not be an official (1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17, 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12; cf. also πρόδοτας xvi. 2, and Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, p. 126 f.); but in any case he had the χάρισμα which fitted him for his special function in στουήδια, moral earnestness or vigour. A serious masculine type of character is the pre-supposition for this gift. Finally ὁ λευκός, he who does deeds of kindness, has his χαρίσμα in λαρότης. A person of a grudging or despondent mood has not the endowment for showing mercy. He who is to visit the poor, the sick, the sorrowful, will be marked out by God for His special ministry by this endowment of brightness and good cheer. Cf. 2 Cor. ix. 7 = Prov. xxii. 8 and Sir. xxi. (xxxv.) 11: ἐν πάση δόσει ἑλάστην τῷ προσώπῳ σου, καὶ ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ ἐγίασον δεκάτην.

Vv. 9-21. As far as any single idea pervades the rest of the chapter it is that of the first words in ver. 9: ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. The passage as a whole has a strong affinity to 1 Cor. xiii., and along with what may be a reminiscence of our Lord's words, it has something intensely and characteristically Christian. Whatever the grammatical construction may be—and all through the chapter Paul displays an indifference in this respect which is singular even in him—the intention must be supposed to be hortatory, so that it is most natural to supply imperatives (έστω or εστέ) with the numerous participles.

Ver. 9. ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος: see 2 Cor. ix. 17; 1 Pet. i. 17. Probably the following clauses ἀποστυγοῦντες... κολλᾶσθαι are meant to explain this. Love is undissembled, it is the unaffected Christian grace, when it shrinks, as with a physical horror, from that which is evil (even in those whom it loves), and cleaves to that which is good. οικκολόμηθαι is used of persons (1 Cor. vi. 16) as well as things.

Ver. 10. ἡ πιστεύειν: in point of brotherly love, i.e., your love to each other as children in the one family of God. Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 9. 1 Pet. i. 22, 2 Pet. i. 7, 1 Pet. iii. 8. ἦλεος in the apostolic writings does not mean fellow-man, but fellow-Christian; and φιλαδελφία is the mutual affection of the members of the Christian community. In this they are to be philosophers, "tenderly affectioned". The moral purity required in ver. 9 is not to be the only mark of Christian love; since they are members of one family, their love is to have the characters of strong natural
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ΠΙΤΤΗΛΗΛΟΥΣ

For κυριω "ABDLP, etc., some Western authorities (DFG gr. G lat.) read καιρω, and this appears in the received text, though not in the A.V. The confusion may have arisen from a contraction of the one word being mistaken for that of the other; but was "probably supported by a sense of the difficulty of so comprehensive a clause as τω κυριω δουλευοντες in the midst of a series of clauses of limited sense" (W. and H., Appendix, p. 110).

Ver. 12. τη ελπίδι χαίροντες: the hope in which they are to rejoice is that of Christians: cf. v. 2. The meaning is practically the same as in that passage, but the mental representation is not. τη ελπίδι is not = επ' ελπίδι there, but in a line with the other datives here: in point of hope, rejoicing. τη θλίψει υπομένοντες: υπομ. might have been construed with the accusative (την θλίψιν), but the absolute use of it, as here, is common (see Mt. χ.22, Jas. ν.11, 1 Pet. ii. 20), and its employment in this instance enables the writer to conform the clause grammatically to the others. τη προσευχή προσκαρτερούντες: cf. Col. iv. 2, Acts i. 14, ii. 42. The strong word suggests not only the constancy with which they are to pray, but the effort that is needed to maintain a habit so much above nature.

Ver. 13. ταίς χρείαις των αγίων κοινωνούντες: "the saints'' as in viii. 27, 1 Tim. ν. 10 are Christians generally. The curious variant ταίς μελείαις—"taking part in the commemorations of the saints''—dates from an age at which "the saints'' were no longer Christians in general, but a select few, as a rule martyrs or confessors in the technical sense. Weiss asserts that the active sense of κοινωνείν, to communicate or impart, is foreign to the N.T., but it is difficult to maintain this if we look to such examples as this and Gal. vi. 6, and also to the use of κοινωνία in 2 Cor. ix. 13 (where ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτούς means the liberality of your contribution to them), and Heb. xiii. 16, where κοινωνία is a synonym of αὐτοκλία.
11—17. ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

αγίων κοινωνούντες, την φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. 14. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς· εὐλογεῖτε, καὶ μὴ ἑταρσάθε. 15. Χαίρετε μετὰ 1 Luke vi. χαιρόντων, καὶ τα συναπαγόμενοι. 16. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἄλλους φρονοῦντες· μὴ τὰ ψήλα φρονοῦντες, ἄλλα τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς· 17. μηδεὶς κακοὶ ἀντὶ κακοῖς ἀποδίδοντες.

1 καὶ before καλεῖ om. ΝBD1F; ins. AD1LP 47. W. and H. put in marg.; Weiss in text, regarding its omission as merely accidental.

and certainly active. τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντας: to devote oneself to entertaining them when they were strangers was one chief way of distributing to the needs of the saints. Hospitality, in the sense of the N.T. (Heb. xiii.2, 1 Pet. iv. 9), is not akin to "keeping company," or "open house"; it is a form of charity much needed by travelling, exiled, or persecuted Christians. The terms in which it is spoken of in Clem. Rom. (quoted in S. and H. : διά πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν εδόθη αὐτῷ·, Abraham—οὐς ἐν γῇρᾳ· or, διὰ φιλοξενίαν καὶ εὐσεβείαν λατ' ἵσωθη) may seem extravagant; but the key to them, and to all the apostolic emphasis on the subject, is to be found in Matt. xxv. 34-36.

Ver. 14. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εἰς κ. μὴ καταράσθε· not a quotation of Mt. v.44, but probably a reminiscence of the same saying of Jesus. The change in construction from participle to imperative, the participle being resumed in the next sentence, suggests that the form of the sentence was given to Paul—i.e., he was consciously using borrowed words without modifying them to suit the sentence he had begun on his own account. It may be that when Paul said διώκονται in ver. 13, the other sense of the word passed through his mind and prompted ver. 14; but even if we could be sure of this (which we cannot) we should not understand either verse a whit better.

Ver. 15. χαίρετε μετὰ χαιρόντων κ.τ.λ. The infinites give the expression the character of a watchword (see Hofmann in Weiss). For the grammar see Winer, 397, n.6. To weep with those that weep is easier than to rejoice with those who rejoice. Those who rejoice neither need, expect, nor feel grateful for sympathy in the same degree as those who weep.

Ver. 16. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἄλλους φρονοῦντες: here the Apostle returns to his own grammar (or disregard of grammar), and holds to it till ver. 19, when he changes to the imperative (μη δότε) with which he concludes (ver. 21 μη νικώ, νικά). τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, xv. 5, is a favourite expression, best explained by reference to Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2, 2 Cor. xiii. 11. The idea is that of loving unanimity, and the εἰς ἄλλους points to the active manifestation of this temper in all the mutual relations of Christians. "Let each so enter into the feelings and desires of the other as to be of one mind with him" (Gifford). It is a more abstract expression of the Golden Rule, Mt. vii. 12. The negatives which follow introduce explanatory clauses: they forbid what would destroy the unanimity of love. μὴ τὰ ψήλα φρονοῦντες: see on ver. 3 above and xi. 21. Selfish ambition in the Church is fatal to perfect mutual consideration. τοίς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. Elsewhere in the N.T. (seven times) ταπεινός is only found in the masculine, and so some would render it here: condescend to men of low estate; let yourself be carried along in the line of their interests, not counting such people beneath you. Cf. Gal. ii. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 17. The bad connotation of συναπάγεσθαι in both these places is due not to itself, but to the context. The contrast with τὰ ψήλα leads others to take τοίς ταπεινοῖς as neuter: and so the R.V. has it, condescend to things that are lowly. Certainty on such points must always be personal rather than scientific; the first of the two alternatives impresses me as much more in harmony with the nature of the words used than the other. For the idea cf. Wordsworth's sonnet addressed to Milton . . . "and yet thy heart the lowest duties on herself did lay"· μη γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι κ.τ.λ. Prov. iii. 7. Be not men of mind in your own conceit. It is difficult to put our judgment into a common stock, and estimate another's as impartially as our own; but love requires it, and without it there is no such thing as τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἄλλους φρονεῖν.
Ver. 17. From this point the subject treated is chiefly the Christian's attitude to enemies. μηδενικαν αντι κακου αποδ. μηδενι is emphatic: to no one, Christian or un-Christian. Nothing can ever justify revenge. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 9, but especially Matt. v. 38-48. προνοουμενοι καλα εντοπιοι κ.τ.λ. Prov. iii. 4, LXX. 2 Cor. viii. 21. What the words mean in Prov. iii. 4 is not clear; they are not a translation of the Hebrew. In 2 Cor. viii. 21 the idea is that of taking precautions to obviate possible slanders; here it is apparently that of living in such a way as not to provoke enmity, or give any occasion for breach of peace. εντοπιοι: constricted with καλα. παντων has the same kind of emphasis as μηδενι: Requite evil to no one; let your conduct be such as all must approve.

Ver. 18. ει δυνατον: cf. Matt. xxiv. 24. το εξ υμων: for what depends on you. Cf. i. 15. Over others' conduct we have no control; but the initiative in disturbing the peace is never to lie with the Christian.

Ver. 19. μη δαυτους εκδικουντες, άγαπητοι. Even when the Christian has been wronged he is not to take the law into his own hand, and right or vindicate himself. For εκδικειν see Lc. xviii. 3, 5. άγαπητοι is striking, and must have some reason: either the extreme difficulty, of which Paul was sensible, of living up to this rule; or possibly some condition of affairs in the Church at Rome, which made the exhortation peculiarly pertinent to the readers, and therefore craved this affectionate address to deprecate it, as were, the "wild justice" with which the natural man is always ready to plead his cause. άλλα δοτε τοπον τη δραγη: the wrath spoken of, as the following words show, is that of God; to give place to God's wrath means to leave room for it, not to take God's proper work out of His hands.

For the expression cf. Lc. xiv. 9, Sir. xiii. 22, xix. 17, xxxviii. 12, Eph. iv. 27.
made to be the bringing down of Divine judgment on him — which is not only absurd in itself, but in direct antagonism to the spirit of the passage.

Ver. 21. μη νικώ: the absence of any connecting particle gives the last verse the character of a summary: in a word, be not overcome by evil. "υπό του κακού = by the evil your enemy inflicts. The Christian would be overcome by evil if it were able to compel him to avenge himself by repaying it in kind. Wrong is not defeated but doubly victorious when it is repelled with its own weapons; we can only overcome it "υπό του ἄγαθου through the good we do to our adversary, turning him so from an enemy into a friend.

Vincent malos, says Seneca, pertinax bonitas: Wetst. accumulates similar examples from classical writers. The " in "υπό του ἄγαθου is probably = τοί: it might be explained as instrumental, or rendered "at the cost of".

CHAPTER XIII. There is not a word to indicate how the transition is made from the discussion of the duties of Christians as members of one body, especially the duties of humility and love in chap. xii., to the special subject which meets us in chap. xiii. — the duty of Christians in relation to the civil authorities. There is nothing exactly like vers. 1-7 elsewhere in Paul's epistles, and it is difficult not to believe that he had some particular reason for treating the question here. The Christians in Rome, though mainly Gentile, as this epistle proves, were closely connected with the Jews, and the Jews were notoriously bad subjects. Many of them held, on the ground of Deut. χνii.15, that to acknowledge a Gentile ruler was itself sinful: and the spirit which prompted Pharisees to ask, Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not? Shall we give or shall we not give? (Mark xii. 14) had no doubt its representatives in Rome also. As believers in the Messiah, "in another King, one Jesus" (Acts xvii. 7), even Christians of Gentile origin may have been open to the impulses of this same spirit; and unbalanced minds, then as in all ages, might be disposed to find in the loyalty which was due to Christ alone, an emancipation from all subjection to inferior powers. There is here an apparent point of contact between Christianity and anarchism, and it may have been the knowledge of some such movement of mind in the Church at Rome that made Paul write as he did. There is perhaps nothing in the passage which is not already given in our Lord's word, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's"; yet nothing can be more worthy of admiration than the soberness with which a Christian idealist like Paul lays down the Divine right of the state. The use made of the passage to prove the duty of "passive obedience," or "the right divine of kings to govern wrong," is beside the mark; the Apostle was not thinking of such things at all. What is in his mind is that the organisation of human society, with its distinction of higher and lower ranks, is essential for the preservation of moral order, and therefore, one might add, for the existence of the Kingdom of God itself; so that no Christian is at liberty to revolt against that organisation. The state is of God, and the Christian has to recognise its Divine right in the persons and requirements in which it is presented to him; that is all. Whether in any given case — say in England in 1642 — the true representative of the State was to be found in the king or in the Commons, Paul, of course, does not enable us to say. Neither does he say anything bearing on the Divine right of insurrection. When he wrote, no doubt, Nero had not yet begun to rage against the Christians, and the imperial authorities had usually protected the Apostle himself against popular violence, whether Jewish or pagan; but even of this we must not suppose him to be taking any special account. He had, indeed, had other experiences (Acts xvi. 37, 2 Cor. xi. 25 ff.). But the whole discussion presupposes normal conditions: law and its representatives are of God, and as such are entitled to all honour and obedience from Christians.

Ver. 1. ταυτα ψυχη is a Hebraism:
XIII.
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της ἣν ἐστώ τεταμένων τῇ ἔξωσίᾳ, τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθετετεθείναι, οἱ δὲ ἀνθετετικῆςς οἱ τῶν κακῶν κρίμα λήφονται. 3. οἱ γὰρ ἀρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος τῶν ἁγαθῶν ἴργων, ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν.1 θελεῖς δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἔξωσίαν; τὸ ἁγαθὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ ἐξείς ἐπάνω εἰς αὐτήν. 4. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος ἐστι οἱ ἐς τὸ ἁγαθὸν. ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῆσῃ, φοβοῦ ὦ γὰρ εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος ἐστιν, ἐκδικοὶ εἰς ὡργὴν τῷ τῷ

1 τῶν ἁγαθῶν ἴργων ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν D3 gr. L, etc.; τὸ ἁγαθὸν ἴργῳ τὸ κακῷ ΝΑΒΔF. The vulg. and lat. fathers have non sunt timoribonί οφcris, from which W. and H. deduce another reading του αγαθου εργου. They suspect a primitive error, and Hort favoursthe correction τω αγαθοεργω, comparing Tim. vi. τ8. cf. Acts ii.43, iii.23, and chap. ii.9. For ἔξωσίαι cf. Luke xii.11: it is exactly like "authorities" in English—abstract for concrete. ἱπερεχούσαι describes the authorities as being actually in a position of superiority. Cf. 1 P. ii. 13, and 2 Macc. iii. 11 (ἀνδρός εἵνεκρεχοῦσας κειμένου). οὐ γὰρ ἔστων ἔξωσίας εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ: ὑπὸ is the correct reading (ΝΑΒ), not ἀπό. Weiss compares Bar. iv. 27. ἕτετα γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπάγοντος μνεία. It is by God's act and will alone that there is such a thing as an authority, or magistrate; and those that actually exist have been appointed—set in their place—by Him. With αἱ δὲ ούσαι the Apostle passes from the abstract to the concrete; the persons and institutions in which for the time authority had its seat, are before his mind—in other words, the Empire with all its grades of officials from the Emperor down. In itself, and quite apart from its relation to the Church, this system had a Divine right to be. It did not need to be legitimated by any special relation to the Church; quite as truly as the Church it existed Dei gratia.

Ver. 2. ὥστε cf. vii. 4, 12. The conclusion is that he who sets himself against the authorities withstands what has been instituted by God: διαταγῇ (Acts vii. 53) recalls τεταμένων, ver. 1. The κρίμα, i.e., the judgment or condemnation which those who offer such resistance shall receive, is of course a Divine one—that is the nerve of the whole passage; but most commentators seem to regard it as coming through the human authority resisted. This is by no means clear; even a successful defiance of authority, which involved no human κρίμα, would according to Paul ensure punishment from God. For λήψονται κρίμα cf. Mark xii. 40, Jas. iii. 1: where also God's judgment alone is in view. But to say that it is God's judgment only is not to say that it is eternal damnation. There are many ways in which God's condemnation of sin is expressed and executed.

Ver. 3. οἱ γὰρ ἁρχοντες κ.τ.λ. The γὰρ can only be connected in a forced and artificial way with the clause which immediately precedes: it really introduces the reason for a frank and unreserved acceptance of that view of "authorities" which the Apostle is laying down. It is as if he said: Recognise the Divine right of the State, for its representatives are not a terror—an object of dread—to the good work, but to the bad. φόβος as in Isa. viii. 13. It is implied that those to whom he speaks will always be identified with the good work, and so have the authorities on their side: it is taken for granted also that the State will not act in violation of its own idea, and identify itself with the bad. θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ. This is most expressive when read as an interrogation, though some prefer to take it as an assertion: that is, to regard Paul as assuming that the reader does not want to be afraid of the magistrate, rather than as inquiring whether he does or not. To escape fear, τὸ ἁγαθὸν ποιεῖ: do what is (legally and morally) good.

Ver. 4. θεού γάρ διάκονος εστιν σοί εἰς τὸ ἁγαθὸν. διάκονος is feminine agreeing with ἔξωσία, which is "almost personified." (Sanday and Headlam). The σοί is not immediately dependent on διάκονος, as if the State were conceived as directly serving the person; the State serves God, with good in view, as the end to be secured by its ministry, vis., the maintenance of the moral order in society; and this situation is one the benefit of which redounds to the individual. ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῆσῃ, φοβοῦ: only when the individual does that which
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ
κακὸν πράσσοντι. 5. διὰ άνάγκη υποτάσσεσθαι, οù μόνον διὰ τὴν
όργην, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν "συνείδησιν. 6. διὰ τούτω γὰρ καὶ φόρους (Cor. x.
tελείτε: λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσίν, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσπαθητοῦτες.
7. ἀπόδοτε οùν πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλὰς τῶν φόρων, τῶν φόρων. τῇ
ἀποδοτε οùν NABFLP: om. οùν NABD and all ecd.

is contrary to the end set before the State
by God—commits τὸ κακὸν, which frustrates τὸ ἁγαθὸν—need he fear: but then
he must fear. οù γὰρ εἰκή: for not for
nothing, but for serious use, does the
ruler wear the sword. For εἰκή cf. 1
Cor. xv. 2, Gal. iii. 4. φορεῖ is wear,
rather than bear: the sword was carried
habitually, if not by, then before the
higher magistrates, and symbolised the
power of life and death which they had
in their hands. “The Apostle in this
passage,” says Gifford, “expressly
vindicates the right of capital punish-
ment as divinely entrusted to the magistrate”.
But “expressly” is perhaps too much,
and Paul could not deliberately vindicate
what no one had assailed. He did, in-
deed, on a memorable occasion (later
than this) express his readiness to die if
his life had been forfeited to the law
(Acts xxv. 11); but to know that if an
individual sets himself to subvert the
moral order of the world, its representa-
tives can proceed to extremities against
him (on the ground, apparently, that it,
as of God’s institution, is of priceless
value to mankind, whereas he in his
opposition to it is of no moral worth
at all) is not to vindicate capital punish-
ment as it exists in the law or practice
of any given society. When the words
θεοῦ γαρ διάκονός εστιν are repeated, it
is the punitive ministry of the magistrate
which is alone in view. έκδικος εἰς
όργην: an avenger for wrath. οργή in the
Ν.Τ. almost always (as here) means the
wrath of God. It occurs eleven times in
Romans: always so. The exceptions
are Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8,
Jas. i. 19 f. τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι =
to him who works at evil. οργή in the
N.T. almost always (as here) means the
wrath of God. It occurs eleven times in
Romans: always so. The exceptions
are Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8,
Jas. i. 19 f. τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι =
to him who works at evil. The process
is presented in πράσσειν rather than the
result. Cf. i. 32.

Ver. 5 f. διὰ άνάγκη υποτάσσεσθαι:
there is a twofold necessity for submis-
sion—an external one, in the wrath of
God which comes on resistance; an in-
ternal one, in conscience. Even apart
from the consequences of disobedience
conscience recognises the Divine right
and function of the θεοῦ and freely
submits to it. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους

Ver. 7. At this point Weiss begins a
new paragraph, but W. and H. make ver.
7 the conclusion of the first part of this
chapter. In view of the close connection
between vers. 7 and 8 (cf. ὀφειλᾶς, ὀφει-
λεται) it is better not to make too decided
a break at either place. All the words
in ver. 7. θέσεις, τέλος, φόρος, τιμή, do
indeed imply duties to superiors, and
seem therefore to continue and to sum
up the content of vers. 1-6: but ver. 8,
in which μὴ δέθην μὴ δέθην ὀφειλεῖται seems
expressly written as the negative counter-
part to ἀπόδοτε πάσιν τὰς ὀφειλὲς in
ver. 7, introduces at the same time a
wider subject—that of the duties of all
CH. II.
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ


1 οφειλετε seems the only possible reading, yet is not given by any authority. οφειλετε Νο; οφειλοτε Νο; οφειλετε B. For αγαπάν αλλήλους ΝΑBDFP read αλλήλους αγαπαν; so alledd. αλλοφειλοντεςδααι αγαπαν αλληλους δααι ΒΑDFL and alledd. η λος αγαπαν; so alledd.

2 ου ψευδομαρτυρήσεις om. ABDFL and all edd. The insertion is made by ΝP, etc., to complete the reference to the decalogue. εν τω before αγαπήσεις is ins. by ΝΑDLΡ; om. by ΒFlatt., Orig.-interp. and W. and Η.: omitted entirely by Weiss. Instead of σαυτον FLP read σαυτων with ΝABD.

individuals toward each other. το τόν φόρον τον φόρον: this is quite intelligible, but nothing can make it grammatical: see Winer, p. 737. For the distinction of φόρος and τέλος see Trench, Sym., p. 392. For φόρος and τιμή see Ch. i. 1, and W. and H.; omitted entirely by Weiss. Instead of σαυτον FLP read σαυτων with ΝABD.

the meaning is not exactly the same. άγαθήσεις τον πλησίον σου κ.τ.λ. In Lev. xix. 18 this is given as a summary of various laws, mostly precepts enjoining humanity, in various relations; by our Lord (in Matt. xxii. 39) and by Paul (here and in Gal. v. 14) an ampler, indeed an unlimited range, is given to it. Its supreme position too seems to be what is indicated in James ii. 8 by calling it νόμος βασιλικός.

* πλήρωμα οὐ νόμον ή άγάθη.

Ver. 9. το γάρ ου μαχαιρίσεις. Cf. viii. 26. The order of the commandments here is different from that in Exod. xx. or Deut. v. (Hebrew), but it is the same as in Luke xviii. 20, and (so far) in James ii. 11. This order is also found in Cod. B of the LXX in Deut. v. και εις την επιφανείαν: this shows that the enumeration does not aim at completeness, and that the insertion in some MSS. of ου ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, to complete the second table, is beside the mark. άνακεφαλαίοταί: it is summed up—the scattered particulars are resumed and brought to one. The only other instance of this word in the N.T. (Eph. i. 10) illustrates the present one, though
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

11. ΚΑΙ τούτο, εἰδότες τόν καιρόν, ὅτι ὥρα ἡμῶν εἰς ὑπνοῦ ἐγερθήναι. νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ή σωτηρία, ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν.


1. ἡμῶν DEFGL; but ἡ A B C D P give νυμα. ἡμας is put in text by Weiss, W. and H., and Tischdf. and by W. and H. and Treg. in margin. All put ἡ with ABC before the pronoun.

2. και ενδυσώμεθα read ενδυσώμεθα δε with A B C D P. W. and H. bracket δε; and a MS. of Sah. have neither και nor δε. For σπλα AD read ἐργα. μη εριδι και ζηλοίς, which W. and H. put in margin, but it is probably a case of conforming instinctively to the other clauses: cf. the converse change of plural (αιδιαθηκαι) into singular in note 2, page 657 (also in B).

3. For κυριον I. X. B and Clem. give Χριστον Ιησουν without κυριον, which W. and H. print in margin, keeping κ. Ι.Χ. in text.

νυν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ή σωτηρία: for now is salvation nearer us than when we believed. ή σωτηρία has here the transcendent eschatological sense: it is the final and complete deliverance from sin and death, and the reception into the heavenly kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. This salvation was always near, to the faith of the Apostles; and with the lapse of time it became, of course, nearer. Yet it has often been remarked that in his later epistles Paul seems to contemplate not merely the possibility, but the probability, that he himself would not live to see it. See 2 Cor. v. 1-10, Phil. i. 23. ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν: when we became Christians, 1 Cor. iii. 5. xv. 2, Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 12. ἡ νύξ πρόκειται: the true day dawns only when Christ appears; at present it is night, though a night that has run much of its course. ἐνδυσώμεθα τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ἄλλα ἐνδύσατε τὸν Κ. Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. ἄλλα emphases the contrast between the true Christian life and that things that can only be done in the dark—that cannot bear the light of day—are therefore to be put away by the Christian. For αποθώμεθα (properly of dress) cf. Jas. i. 21, Ι. Ρετ. ii. Ι, Ηεβ. xii. Ι. τα όπλα του φωτός: for τα όπλα see on chap. ν. 13, Eph. vi. τI, Τhess. ν.8. Τhe idea is that the Christian's life is not a sleep, but a battle, τα όπλα του φωτός does not mean "shining armour"; but (on the analogy of τα ἐργα του σκότους) such armour as one can wear when the great day dawns, and we would appear on the Lord's side in the fight. An allusion to the last great battle against the armies of anti-Christ is too remote, and at variance with Paul's use of the figure elsewhere.

Ver. 13. ὅτε εἰς ἡμέρα: as one walks in the day, so let us walk εὐσχημόνως. The same adverb is found with the same verb in 1 Thess. iv. 2: A.V. in both places "honestly". The meaning is rather "in seemly fashion," "becomingly"; in 1 Cor. xiv. 40 it is rendered "decently," where also regard for decorum (the aesthetic side of morality) is in view. κώμοι and μέθαι are again found joined in Gal. ν. 21, ίψους καὶ ζηλοὶς in Gal. ν. 20 and 1 Cor. iii. 3. W. and H. following B. put έριδι καὶ ζηλοῖς in margin; the plurals in this case as in the others would indicate the various acts or manifestations of excess, whether in self-indulgence or self-will.

Ver. 14. ἄλλα ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κ. Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. ἄλλα emphases the contrast between the true Christian life and that
which has just been described. The Christian puts on the Lord Jesus Christ, according to Paul's teaching, in baptism (cf. Gal. iii. 27), as the solemn deliberate act in which he identifies himself, by faith, with Christ in His death and resurrection (chap. vi. 3). But the Christian life is not exhausted in this act, which is rather the starting-point for a putting on of Christ in the ethical sense, a "clothing of the soul in the moral disposition and habits of Christ" (Gillford); or as the Apostle himself puts it in vi. 11, a 

recounting of ourselves to be dead to sin but alive to God in Christ Jesus. Every time we perform an ethical act of this kind we put on the Lord Jesus Christ more fully. But the principle of all such acts is the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us (chaps. vi.-viii.), and it is the essential antagonism of the spirit to the flesh which determines the form of the last words: και της σαρκος προνοιαν μη ποιεσθε εις επιθυμιας. It is to inquire too curiously if we inquire whether σαρκ does here in the physiological sense = the body, or in the moral sense = libidinosa caro (as Fritzsch argues): the significance of the word in Paul depends on the fact that in experience these two meanings are indubitably if not inseparably related. Taking the flesh as it is, forethought or provision for it—an interest in it which consults for it, and makes it an object—can only have one end, viz., its οποιανα. All such interest therefore is forbidden as inconsistent with putting on the Lord Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Chapter XIV. 1-XV. 13. One subject is before the Apostle's mind throughout the whole of this section—the relations of "the strong" and "the weak" in the Church at Rome. It is connected in a variety of ways, which are felt rather than expressed, with what precedes. Thus it is pervaded by the same sense of the supreme importance of mutual love among Christians which characterises chaps. xii. and xiii. It makes use, in much the same way as chap. xiii. 11-14, of the impending judgment (xiv. 10), to quicken the sense of individual and personal responsibility. Possibly, too, there is a more formal connection with chap. xiii: Paul has been warning against the indulgence of the flesh (xiii. 14), and this prompts him, by contrast, to speak of those who by an inadequate appreciation of Christian liberty were practising an "over-scrupulous asceticism". There has been much discussion as to who "the weak" and "the strong" respectively were. The weakness is weakness in respect of faith; the weak man is one who does not fully appreciate what his Christianity means; in particular, he does not see that the soul which has committed itself to Christ for salvation is emancipated from all law but that which is involved in its responsibility to Him. Hence his conscience is lettered by scruples in regard to customs dating from pre-Christian days. The scruples in question here were connected with the use of flesh and wine, and with the religious observance of certain days (whether as fasts or feasts is open to question). Possibly the persons indulging such scruples were Jewish Christians, but they need not have been. They were certainly not legalists in principle, making the observance of the Jewish law or any part of it an essential condition of the Christian salvation; otherwise Paul, as the Epistle to the Galatians shows, would have addressed them in a different tone. Further, the Jewish law does not prescribe abstinence from wine or from animal food; and there is no suggestion here, as in 1 Cor. 8, that the difficulty was about food that had been offered in sacrifice to false gods. Hence the influence at work in the Roman Church in producing this scrupulosity of conscience was probably of Essene origin, and akin to that which Paul subsequently treats at Colossae (Col. ii. 16). At Rome the scruples were only scruples, and though there was danger in them because they rested on a defective apprehension of Christianity, they could be tenderly dealt with; at Colossae they had grown into or adapted themselves to a philosophy of religion which was fatal to Christianity; hence the change of tone. But though "the weak" need not have been Jews, the scruples in which their weakness was expressed, had so far Jewish connections and Jewish affinities; and it is probable, from the way in which (chap. xv. 7-13) the discussion of the relations of the weak and the strong passes over into an exhortation to unity between Jew and Gentile in the Church, that the two classifications had a
1. Ο Προσωποφορός Ρωμαίους

3. Ο ισθίων τον μή ισθιοντα μή έξουθενείτω, εσθίει. Οι ισθιονται μή κρινέτων. Ο θεός γάρ αυτόν προσελήφθη. 4. Οι δια τις οι κρινων άλλων οικήτην; το ίδιον κρίνεται ο Θεός γάρ αυτόν. 5. Οσ ομέν κρινετα; Το μήραν παρ’ ήμεραν, δε δε κρίνεται πάσαν

1. For καί ο μη Ν’ΑΒCD, read with Ν’ΑΒCD ο δε μη.
2. For δυνατος γαρ εστιν Ν’ΑΒCD and all edd. read δυνατος γαρ εστιν ο Θεος DFL; but Ν’ΑΒCD (and all edd.) ο κυριος.
3. Ο σε μεν κρινε Ν’ΒDFL; Ο μεν γαρ κρινε Ν’ΑACP latt. Weiss regards the γαρ as a mere interpolation (cf. the case in note 1, page 6ο2); Tischd. inserts W. and H. bracket.

general correspondence: the weak would be Jews or persons under Jewish influence: the strong would be Gentiles, or persons at least who understood the Gospel as it was preached to the Gentiles by Paul.

Ver. 1. τον δε ασθενωντα: as Godet points out, the part. as opposed to ασθενης, denotes one who is for the time feeble, but who may become strong. τη πιστει: in respect of faith, i.e., in Paul’s sense of the word — in respect of his saving reliance on Christ and all that it involves: see above. One is weak in respect of faith who does not understand that salvation is of faith from first to last, and that faith is secured by its own entireness and intensity, not by a timorous scrupulousness of conscience. προσλαμβανεται is often used of God’s gracious acceptance of men, but also of men welcoming other men to their society and friendship, 2 Macc. viii. 1, x. 15.

Ver. 2. η εις διακρινοντας διαλογισμον: not with a view to deciding (or passing sentence on) his doubts. The διαλογισμοι are the movements of thought in the weak man, whose anxious mind will not be at peace; no censure of any kind is implied by the word. The strong, who welcome him to the fellowship of the Church, are to do so unreservedly, not with the purpose of judging and ruling his mind by their own. For διακρινοντας see 1 Cor. xii. 10. Heb. v. 14.

Ver. 3. ιδιω κυριω στηκει ή πιπτει: for the verbs in the moral sense see 1 Cor. x. 12. The dative is dat. comm. It is his own Lord who is concerned — it is His interest which is involved and to Him (not to you) he must answer — as he stands or falls. σταθησεται δε: but he shall be made to stand, i.e., shall be preserved in the integrity of his Christian character. δυνατος γαρ ο Κυριος στησει αυτον: for the Lord has power to keep...
Paul does not contemplate the strong man falling and being set up again by Christ; but in spite of the perils which liberty brings in its train—and the Apostle is as conscious of them as the most timid and scrupulous Christian could be—he is confident that Christian liberty, through the grace and power of Christ, will prove a triumphant moral success.

Ver. 5. The Apostle passes from the question of food to one of essentially the same kind—the religious observance of days. This is generally regarded as quite independent of the other; but Weiss argues from ver. 6, where the text which he adopts in common with most editors seems to contrast “him who observes the day” with “him who eats,” that what we have here is really a subdivision of the same general subject. In other words, among those who abstained from flesh and wine, some did so always, others only on certain days. “To observe the day” might in itself mean to observe it by fasting—this would be the case if one’s ordinary custom were to use flesh and wine; or it might mean to observe it by feasting—this would be the case if one ordinarily abstained. Practically, it makes no difference whether this reading of the passage is correct or not: Paul argues the question of the distinction of days as if it were an independent question, much as he does in Col. ii. It is not probable that there is any reference either to the Jewish Sabbath or to the Lord’s Day, though the principle on which the Apostle argues defines the Christian attitude to both. Nothing whatever in the Christian religion is legal or statutory, not even the religious observance of the first day of the week; that observance originated in faith, and is not what it should be except as it is freely maintained by faith. For δὲ μὴν see ver. 2. κρίνει ἡμ. παρ’ ἡμέραν means judges one day “in comparison with,” or “to the passing by of” another: cf. i. 25, Winer, 503 f. Side by side with this, κρίνει πάσαν ἡμέραν can only mean, makes no distinction between days, counts all alike. In such questions the important thing is not that the decision should be this or that, but that each man should have an intelligent assurance as to his own conduct: it is, indeed, by having to take the responsibility of deciding for oneself, without the constraint of law, that an intelligent Christian conscience is developed. For πληροφορεῖσθαι cf. iv. 21, and Lightfoot’s note on Col. iv. 12. νοῦς (vii. 23) is the moral intelligence, or practical reason; by means of this, enlightened by the Spirit, the Christian becomes a law to himself.

Ver. 6. The indifference of the questions at issue, from the religious point of view, is shown by the fact that both parties, by the line of action they choose, have the same end in view—viz., the interest of the Lord. δὲ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν cf. Col. iii. 2. The setting of the mind upon the day implies of course some distinction between it and others. The clause καὶ οὐ βοήθησιν. . . σε φρονεῖ is omitted by most editors, but its absence from most MSS. might still be due to homoeoteleuton. εὐχαριστεῖ: thanksgiving to God consecrates ετέρν meal, whether it be the ascetic one of him who abstains from wine and flesh (ομη εσθίων), or the more generous one of him who uses both (ο εσθίων): cf. Acts xxvii. 35, 1 Cor. χ. 30, 1 Tim. iv. 3-5. The thanksgiving shows that in either case the Christian is acting εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ (1 Cor. x. 31), and therefore that the Lord’s interest is safe.

Ver. 7 f. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν καιρόν ἐν τῇ πληροφορεῖσθαι. The truth which has been affirmed in regard to the Christian’s use of food, and observance or non-observance of days, is here based on a larger
ἐαυτῷ ἦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐαυτῷ ἀποθνῄσκει. 8. ἐὰν τε γὰρ ἢμεν, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἢμεν· ἐὰν τε ἀποθνῄσκομεν, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀποθνῄσκομεν.

ἐάν τε οὖν ἢμεν, ἐὰν τε ἀποθνῄσκομεν, τοῦ Κυρίου ἔσομεν. 9. εἰς εἰπές εἰς Χρ. viii. τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς καὶ ἐπέθεσεν καὶ ἀνέφησεν, ἵνα καὶ ἐκρηκτος καὶ ξώτως κυριεύσῃ. 10. Σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἄνδρό σου; ή καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενείς τὸν ἄνδρό σου; πάντες γὰρ ταρατημόσθενα A εἰς τῷ βήματί τοῦ Χριστοῦ. II. γέραρται γὰρ, "Χω ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, δι οὐ θηκαί πάν γονί, καὶ πάσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσετα. τῷ

1 Om. καί before ἐπέθηκε with ΝΑΒCDI-FP. For ἐπέθηκε καί ἐνέργησαν read only εἴσηγαν with ΝΑBCDLP and all edd.
2 τοῦ Χριστοῦ ΝΑC-LP: τοῦ θεοῦ ΝΑBCDF and all edd.
3 ἐξομολογηθήναι πάσα γλώσσα BD13-F (and A of LXX); but πάσα γλώσσα εξομολογηθηθα εἰς ΝΑCDI-FP. The latter order is followed by Weiss, W. and H., and Tischd. Probably the verb was put first in BF, etc., to conform to the parallel clause.

truth of which it is a part. His whole life belongs not to himself, but to his Lord. "No one of us liveth to himself," does not mean, "every man's conduct affects others for better or worse, whether he will or not"; it means, "no Christian is his own end in life; what is always present to his mind, as the rule of his conduct, is the will and the interest of his Lord". The same holds of his dying. He does not choose either the time or the mode of it, like a Roman Stoic, to please himself. He dies when the Lord will, as the Lord will, and even by his death glorifies God. In ver. 14 ff. Paul comes to speak of the influence of conduct upon others; but here there is no such thing in view; the prominence given to τῷ κυρίῳ (τοῦ κυρίου) three times in ver. 8 shows that the one truth present to his mind is the all-determining significance, for Christian conduct, of the relation to Christ. This (ideally) determines everything, alike in life and death; and all that is determined by it is right.

Ver. 9. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ . . . ἵνα: cf. 2 Cor. ii. 9. ἔσθηκεν refers to the resurrection, as is shown by the order of the words, the connection elsewhere in Paul of Lordship with the resurrection (cf. Phil. ii. 9 ff.), and the aorist tense which describes an act, and not the continued existence of Christ on earth (Sanday and Headlam): cf. Rev. ii. 8 (ἐν ἔσθεντον νεκρὸς κ. ἔσθηκεν), xx. 4 f. ἵνα denotes God's purpose in subjecting His Son to this experience. We must not suppose that ἐπέθηκε is specially connected with νεκρὸς and ἔσθηκεν with ζωτῷ; there is the same mannerism as in iv. 25. Rather is it through Christ's resurrection that His lordship over the realm of death is established, so that not even in that dark world do those who are His cease to stand in their old relation to Him. τοῦ κυρίου έσμέν holds alike in the seen and the unseen.

Ver. 10. Σὺ δὲ: thou, in contrast with the one Lord and Judge of all. In face of our common responsibility to Him, how dare we judge each other? τὸν ἄνδρόν σου: another reason for not judging: it is inconsistent with a recognition of the brotherhood of believers. ἡ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενείς κ.τ.λ. Or thou, again, why despisest thou? etc. This is addressed to the strong and free thinking, as the first question is to the weak and scrupulous Christian. Censoriousness and contempt are never anything but sins, not to be practised but shunned, and that all the more when we remember that we shall all stand at one bar. ταρατημόσθενα τῷ βήματί τοῦ θεοῦ: God is the universal Judge. In 2 Cor. iv. 10 we have τῷ βήματί τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but here τοῦ θεοῦ is the correct reading. We cannot suppose that by τοῦ θεοῦ here Paul means Christ in His Divine nature; the true way to mediate between the two expressions is seen in chap. ii. 16, Acts xvii. 31. When we all stand at that bar—and it should be part of our spiritual environment always—no one will look at his brother with either censoriousness or contempt.

Ver. 11. γέραρται γὰρ: the universal judgment proved from Scripture, 18. iv. 23. Paul follows the LXX, but very freely. For ἔσθηκεν κυρίῳ και in the LXX has κατ' ἰμαντίου ἰμαντί. The same passage is quoted more freely still.
12. ἀρα οὖν ἡ ἁμάρτωλιν ἔως τῇ ἀντίθεσιν εἰς τὴν ἁμάρτωλιν. 13. Μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν: ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τίθεναι πρὸς κομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον. 14. οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ ἡσυχοῦ, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κοινὸν διὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἔλεη. 15. εἰ δὲ διὰ βρομίας τὸ ἀδελφὸς σου λυπεῖται, οὐκ ἔτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς; μητὸς τὸ κομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον ἐκείνῳ.
thy brother is grieved. *βρώμα* is the food which the strong eats in spite of his brother's scruples. *λυπείται* need not imply that the weak is induced, against his conscience, to eat also (though that is contemplated as following); it may quite well express the uneasiness and distress with which the weak sees the strong pursue a line of conduct which his conscience cannot approve. Even to cause such pain as this is a violation of the law of Christ. He who does it has ceased to walk κατά ἀγάπην, according to love, which is the supreme Christian rule. In the sense of this, and at the same time aware that the weak in these circumstances may easily be cajoled or overcome into doing what his conscience disapproves, the Apostle exclaims abruptly, μη τό βρώματί σου εκείνον ἀπόλλυεν ὑπέρ οὗ Χριστός ἀπέθανεν. *Το* tamper with conscience, it is here implied, is ruin. And the selfish man who so uses his Christian liberty as to lead a weak brother to tamper with his conscience is art and part in that ruin. The wanton contempt such liberty shows for the spirit and example of Christ is emphasised both here and in Ι Cor. ν.ι.Ιο. \*Νε pluris feceris tum cibum quam Christus vitam suam.\

Ver. 16. *μη βλασφημεῖσθω διὰ τούτου* ὑμῶν τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἄγαθον. τὸ ἄγαθον is somewhat in definite. It has been taken (1) as the good common to all Christians—the Messianic salvation—which will be blasphemed by the non-Christian, when they see the wantonness with which Christians rob each other of it by such conduct as Paul reprobrates in ver. 15; and (2) as Christian liberty, the freedom of conscience which has been won by Christ, but which will inevitably get a bad name if it is exercised in an inconsiderate loveless fashion. The latter meaning alone seems relevant. For *βλασφ.* see Ι Cor. χ. 30, Ver. 17. Insistence and strife on such matters are inconsistent with Christianity: οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κ.τ.λ. Usually in Paul ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, the kingdom, is transcendent; the kingdom is that which comes with the second advent, and is the inheritance of believers; it is essentially as it is called in 2 Tim. iv. 18 a βασιλεία ἐν οὐρανοῖς. See Ι Thess. ii. 12, 2 Thess. i. 5, Ι Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50, Gal. v. 21. This use of the expression, however, does not exclude another, which is more akin to what we find in the Gospels, and regards the Kingdom of God as in some sense also present: we have examples of this here, and in Ι Cor. iv. 20: perhaps also in Acts xx. 25. No doubt for Paul the transcendent associations would always cling to the name, so that we should lose a great deal of what it meant for him if we translated it by "the Christian religion" or any such form of words. It always included the reference to the glory to be revealed. *βρώσις κ. πόσις* : eating and drinking—the acts, as opposed to *βρώμα*, ver. 15, the thing eaten. *αλλὰ δικαιοσύνη κ. εἰρήνη κ. χαρὰ* εν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ: are these words ethical or religious? Does δικ. denote "justification," the right relation of man to God? or "righteousness," in the sense of just dealing? Is *εἰρήνη* peace with God, the result of justification (as in ν. 1), or peace among the members of the Church, the result of consideration for each other? The true answer must be that Paul did not thus distinguish ethical and religious: the words are religious primarily, but the ethical meaning is so far from being excluded by the religious that it is secured by it, and by it alone. That the religious import ought to be put in the forefront is shown by *χαρὰ* εν πν. ἀγ., which is a grace, not a virtue. In comparison with these great spiritual blessings, what Christian could trouble the Church about eating or drinking! For theirsake, no self-denial is too great.

Ver. 18. *ἐν τούτῳ* : "on the principle implied by these virtues" (Sanday and Headlam). One may serve Christ either eating or abstaining, but no one can serve Him whose conduct exhibits indifference to righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. *δέκιμος τοῖς ἀθρόων*: so that there can be no occasion given to any one to blaspheme. Cf. xvi. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 15, Jas. i. 12. A sound Christian character wins even the world's approval.
ος θεος, και δοκιμος των ανθρωπων. 19. Αρα ουν τα
της ειρήνης διωκομεν, και τα της οικοδομης της εις άλλους.
18. Μη ένεκεν βραμματος καταλιπε τη εργον του θεου. παντα μεν
καθαρα αλλα κακον τω ανθρωπω τυ δια προσκομματος έσθιοντι.
19. Ημερα τας φαγειν κρεα, ημηθε πει οινον, ημηθε εν φ ο δε

διωκομεν CDE, latt.; διωκομεν ΝΑΒFLP. According to S. and H. διωκομεν
is a "somewhat obvious correction," and less expressive than διωκομεν. This
is also the view of Weiss and Tischdf. But W. and H. put διωκομεν in text and διωκομεν
in marg.

Ver. 19. Αρα ουν: see ver. 12. τα της ειρήνης is not materially
different from την ειρήνην: all that belongs to, makes
for, peace: we cannot argue from its use
here that the word must have exactly
the same shade of meaning in ver. 17.

διωκομεν: the indicative διωκομεν is very
strongly supported, and would indicate
the actual pursuit of all true Christians:
"Our aim is peace," and τα της οικο
dομης της εις άλλους = mutual up
building. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 11, 1 Cor. xiv.
26. The practical rule implied here is
that, when anything is morally indifferent
to me, before I act on that conviction, I
must ask how such action will affect the
peace of the Church, and the Christian
growth of others.

Ver. 20. Paul repeats the rule of ver.
15. μη καταλιπε: the opposite of οικο
dομειν. See Matt. xxvi. 61, Gal. ii. 18.
το εργον του θεου (1 Cor. iii. 9) what
God has wrought, i.e., the Christian
Church (which is destroyed by such
wanton conduct) or the Christian char-
acter and standing of an individual
(which may be ruined in the same way).

παντα μην καθαρα: this is the principle
of the strong, which Paul concedes (μεν);
the difficulty is to get the enlightened to
understand that an abstract principle can
never be the rule of Christian conduct.
The Christian, of course, admits the
principle, but he must act from love.
To know that all things are clean does not
(as is often assumed) settle what the
Christian has to do in any given case.
It does not define his duty, but only
makes clear his responsibility. Acknow-
ledging that principle, and looking with
love at other Christians, and the effect of
any given line of conduct on them, he
has to define his duty for himself. All
meat is clean, but not all eating. On
the contrary (αλλα), κακον τη ανθρωπω
tυ δια προσκομματος έσθιοντι; sin is
involved in the case of the man who
eats with offence. Some take this as a
warning to the weak; but the whole
tone of the passage, which is rather a
warning to the strong, and the verse
immediately following, which surely con-
tinues the meaning and is also addressed
to the strong, decide against this. The
man who eats with offence is therefore
the man by whose eating another is
made to stumble. For δια προσκομ-
ματος see ii. 27, Winer, p. 475.

Ver. 21. A maxim for the strong.
For καλον cf. Mark xiv. 6. Abstinence
in order that others may not be made to
stumble is morally noble. ιν ουν;
usually προσκομματεν takes the Dat., ix. 32, 1
Pet. ii. 8. That there were those in the
Church at Rome who had scruples as to
the use of flesh and wine, see on ver. 2.
Paul would not have written the chapter
at all unless there had been scruples of
some kind; and he would not have taken
these examples if the scruples had con-
cerned something quite different.

Ver. 22. The true text is συ πιστιν
ην έχεις: "the faith that thou hast, have
thou to thyself in the sight of God ".
The verse is still addressed to the strong.
The faith he has is the enlightened faith
which enables him to see that all things
are clean; such faith does not lose its
value though it is not flaunted in reckless
action. Ον κατα σεαυτον Wetstein
αυτος Ηeliod. vii. 16: κατα σεαυτον έχε
και μηδενι φράζε. Cf. I Cor. xiv. 28
(δια τε λαλειτω κατα τη θεω). έντονον
του θεου reminds the strong once more
(ver. 10) that the fullest freedom must be
balanced by the fullest sense of responsi-
bility to God. In another sense than
that of I Cor. ix. 21 the Christian made
free by faith must feel himself μη ένομος
θεου άλλ ένομος Χριστου, μακαρος ο
μη κρινων αυτον έν θ θεω δικαιος:
"a motive to charitable self-restraint ad-
dressed to the strong in faith" (Gifford).
It is a rare felicity (this is always what
μακαρος denotes) to have a conscience
untroubled by scruples—in Paul's words,
not to judge oneself in the matter which
one approves (απε, by his own practice);
and he who has this felicity should ask no more. In particular, he should not run the risk of injuring a brother's conscience, merely for the sake of exercising in a special way the spiritual freedom which he has the happiness to possess —whether he exercises it in that way or not.

Ver. 23. ο δε διακρινόμενος εαν φάγη κατακέκριται: such, on the other hand, is the unhappy situation of the weak—a new motive for charity. For διακριν. cf. iv. 20, Jas. i. 6, Mark xi. 23. The weak Christian cannot be clear in his own mind that it is permissible to do as the strong does; it may be, he thinks one moment, and the next, it may not be; and if he follows the strong and eats in this state of mind, κατακέκριται he is condemned. The condemnation is absolute: it is not only that his own conscience pronounces clearly against him after the act, but that such action incurs the condemnation of God. It is inconsistent with that conscientiousness through which alone man can be trained in goodness; the moral life would become chaotic and irredeemable if conscience were always to be treated so. οτι ουκ εκ πίστεως. The man is condemned because he did not eat εκ πίστεως: and this is generalised in the last clause πάν δε δι' ουκ εκ πίστεως αμαρτία ἐστίν. All that is not of faith is sin; and therefore this eating, as not of faith, is sin. It is impossible to give πίστεως here a narrower sense than Christianity: see ver. 1. Everything a Christian man does that cannot justify itself to him on the ground of his relation to Christ is sin. It is too indefinite to render omne quod non est ex fide as Thomas Aquinas does by omne quod est contra conscientiam: it would need to be contra Christianam conscientiam. All a man cannot do remembering that he is Christ's —all he cannot do with the judgment-seat (ver. 20) and the Cross (ver. 15) and all their restraints and inspirations present to his mind—is sin. Of course this is addressed to Christians, and there is no rule in it for judging the character or conduct of those who do not know Christ. To argue from it that works done before justification are sin, or that the virtues of the heathen are glittering vices, is to misapply it altogether.

CHAPTER XV.—VV. 1-13. The fourteenth chapter has a certain completeness in itself, and we can understand that if the Epistle to the Romans was sent as a circular letter to different churches, some copies of it might have ended with xiv. 23: to which the doxology, xvi. 25-27, might be loosely appended, as it is in A. L. and many other MSS. But it is manifestly the same subject which is continued in xv. 1-13. The Apostle still treats of the relations of the weak and the strong, though with a less precise reference to the problems of the Roman Church at the time than in chap. xiv. His argument widens into a plea for patience and forbearance (enforced by the example of Christ) and for the union of all Christians, Jew and Gentile, in common praise. It seems natural to infer from this that the distinction between weak and strong had some relation to that between Jew and Gentile; the prejudices and scruples of the weak were probably of Jewish origin.

Ver. 1. οφείλομεν δε: what constitutes the obligation is seen in chap. xiv. It arises out of our relation to others in Christ. Looking at them in the light of what He has done for them as well as for us, and in the light of our responsibility
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

ΧV. -Αει. Σιν. ΧV. Ι. Οφείλομεν ημείς δυνατοί τα ασθενήματα των αδυνάτων βαστάζειν, και μη εαυτοίς αρέσκειν. 2. έκαστος γάρ ημών αρέσετω εις το αγαθόν προς οικοδομήν. 3. και γάρ ο Χριστός ουχ εαυτώ ήρεσεν, αλλά, καθώς γέγραπται, "Οι ονειδισμοί των ονειδιζόντων σε επέπεσον επ' εμε". 4. έσται γάρ προεγραφή, εις την ημετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγραφήν, ην δια της υπομονής και της πάθεως και σε έπεπεσον επ' εμε". 5. οσα γαρ προεγραφή "εις την ημετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγραφήν, ίνα διά της υπομονής και της πάθεως και σε έπεπεσον επ' εμε".

1 Om. γαρ with ΝABCDFLHP.
2 έσται γάρ προεγραφή "Εγραφη ΝΑCD"; σοι most edd. B, latt., Aeth. give "Εγραφη ΝΑCD"; but "Εγραφη ΝΑCD"; D and F have "Προεγραφή ΝΑCD"; σοι and ΝABCL. After εις, B adds ης της παρακλήσεως, which W. and H. put in marg.; but the addition is as inept as that of λογων in the same ΜS. at ver. 18, and to be explained in the same way (an anticipation of a later word).

to the Judge of all, we cannot question that this is our duty. ήμεις οι δυνατοί: Paul classes himself with the strong, and makes the obligation his own. δυνατοί is of course used as in chap. xiv.: not as in Ι Cor. i.26. τα ασθενήματα των αδυνάτων: the things in which their infirmity comes out, its manifestations: here only in Ν.Τ. Paul says "bear'' their infirmities: because the restrictions and limitations laid by this charity on the liberty of the strong are a burden to them. For the word βαστάζειν and the idea see Μatt. viii.τ7, Gal. vi.2,5, Ι7. μη εαυτοίς αρέσκειν: it is very easy for self-pleasing and mere wilfulness to shelter themselves under the disguise of Christian principle. Βut there is only one Christian principle which has no qualification-love.

Ver. 2. τώ πλησίον αρεσκέτω: this rule is qualified by εις το αγαθόν προς οικοδομήν. Without such qualification it is "men-pleasing'' (Gal. i.10) and inconsistent with fidelity to Christ. Cf. Ι Cor. x. 33, where Paul presents himself as an example of the conduct he here commends. For εις and προς in this verse cf. chap. iii. 25 f. According to Gifford εις marks the "aim''-the advantage or benefit of our neighbour—and προς the standard of reference; the only "good'' for a Christian is to be "built up'' in his Christian character.

Ver. 3. και γάρ ο Χριστός κ.τ.λ. The duty of not pleasing ourselves is enforced by the example of Christ: He did not please Himself either. If this required proof, we might have expected Paul to prove it by adducing some incident in Christ's life; but this is not what he does. He appeals to a psalm, which is in many places in the N.T. treated as having some reference to Christ (e.g., John i. 17 = Ps. lxix. 9, John xv. 25 = Ps. lxix. 4, Matt. xxvii. 27-30 = Ps. lxix. 12, Matt. xxvii. 34 = Ps. lxix. 21, Rom. xi. 9 = Ps. lxix. 22, Acts i. 20 = Ps. lxix. 25: see Perowne, The Psalms, i., p. 56 f.); and the words he quotes from it—words spoken as it were by Christ Himself—describe our Lord's experiences in a way which shows that He was no self-pleaser. If He had been, He would never have given Himself up willingly, as He did, to such a fate. It is hardly conceivable that σε in Paul's quotation indicatesthe man whom Christ is supposed to address: it can quite well be God, as in the psalm. Some have argued from this indirect proof of Christ's character that Paul had no acquaintance with the facts of His life; but the inference is unsound. It would condemn all the N.T. writers of the same ignorance, for they never appeal to incidents in Christ's life; and this summary of the whole character of Christ, possessing as it did for Paul and his readers the authority of inspiration, was more impressive than any isolated example of non-selfpleasing could have been.

Ver. 4. Here Paul justifies his use of the O.T._ οσα γάρ προεγραφή = the whole O.T. εις την ημετέραν διδασκαλίαν εγραφής: was written to teach us, and therefore has abiding value. 2 Τιμ. iii. 16. Ινα introduces God's purpose, which is wider than the immediate purpose of the Apostle. Paul meant to speak only of bearing the infirmities of the weak, but with the quotation of Ps. lxix. 9 there came in the idea of the Christian's sufferings generally, and it is amid them that God's purpose is to be fulfilled. Βια της ημετέρας διδασκαλίας των γραφών κ.τ.λ.: "that through the patience and the comfort wrought by the
5. **ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ**

5. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δῶῃ ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸν Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν. 6. Ἡ ὑπομονὴ μοιχωμένοι ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι δοξάζει τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦν ὑμῖν Χριστόν.

7. ο Θεός τῆς υπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δωῃ υμίν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ. 8. Λέγω δὲ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν διάκονον εἰς δόξαν εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. 9. Διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελήφθη εἰς δόξαν εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. 10. ο Θεός τῆς παρακλήσεως δωῃ υμίν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ.
Το ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

11 Ι Ι.


1 For τον κυριον πάντα τα έθνη (so LXX), read παντα τα εθνη τον Κυριον (ABDP and all edd. For επαινεσατε (so LXX, B) FLP read επαινεσατωσαν (LXX, A) ΝΑCDLP.

2 Against all edd., who keep the received text, Weiss finds himself compelled, instead of υπέρ ελέους δοξάσαι τον Θεόν, to read έλπιοῦσιν Αγίου. The other reading is supported by ΝΑCDLP.

The idea that God's glory (the glory of His faithfulness and of His mercy) is the end contemplated by Christ's reception alike of Jew and Gentile.

Ver. 8. λέγω γάρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενησθαι περιτομής = what I mean is this—Christ has been made, etc. διά κοπον περιτομής is usually understood as "a minister to the Jews, to circumcised people" (cf. iii. 30, iv. 9), and this seems to me the only intelligible explanation. In exercising this ministry (and He exercised directly no other: Matt. xv. 24) Christ was of course circumcised Himself and set from His birth (Gal. iv. 4 f.) in the same relation to the law as all who belonged to the old covenant; but though this is involved in the fact that Christ was sent to the Jews, it is not what is meant by calling Him διά κοπον περιτομής. ινέλθειας θεοῦ: in the interest of God's truth (cf. i. 5: ινε του οὖν οἴδαμος αὐτοῦ). The truth of God, as the giver of the promises to the fathers, was vindicated by Christ's ministry; for in Him they were all fulfilled, 2 Cor. i. 20. ινα ἐπαγγ. των πατέρων: the promises belonged to the fathers, because they were originally made to them.

Ver. 9. τα δε έθνη υπέρ ελέους δοξάσαι τον Θεον: Some expositors make this depend directly on λέγω, as if Paul had meant: "I say Christ has become a minister of circumcision, in the interest of the truth of God . . . and that the Gentiles have glorified God for His mercy," the only contrast being that between God's faithfulness, as shown to the descendants of Abraham, and His mercy as shown to those without the old covenant. But if τα δε έθν ινα τ.λ. is made to depend on εις το, as in the A.V., there is a double contrast brought out: that of faithfulness and mercy being no more emphatic than that of the fathers and the Gentiles. Indeed, from the passages quoted, it is clear that Paul is preoccupied rather with the latter of these two contrasts than with the former; for all the passages concern the place of the Gentiles in the Church. At the same time it is made clear—even to the Gentiles—that the salvation which they enjoy is "of the Jews". Hence the Gentiles must not be contemptuous of scruples or infirmities, especially such as rise out of any associations with the old covenant; nor should the Jews be censorious of a Gentile liberty which has its vindication in the free grace of God, καθώς γέγραπται: the contemplated glorification of God answers to what we find in Ps. xviii. 50, LXX. Christ is assumed to be the speaker, and we may say that He gives thanks to God among the Gentiles when the Gentiles give thanks to God through Him (Heb. ii. 12).

Ver. 10. και πάλιν λέγει: Deut. xxxii. 43, LXX. The Hebrew is different.

Ver. 11. και πάλιν, ἀληθεῖ: Ps. xxvii. 1, LXX—only the order of the words varying.

Ver. 12. και πάλιν Ἡσαίας λέγει: Isa.
14. Πέπεισμαι δὲ, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, διὸ καὶ αὕτως μεστοὶ ἦστε ἁγιασθήσεσθε, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἄλληλους νουθετεῖν. 15. τολμηρότερον δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀπὸ τῶν μέρων, ὡς ἐπαναμιμηθέν τοις ὑμῖν, διὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

1 After πᾶσης ins. τῆς ΒΒΠ, Clem.; om. ACDFL.
2 τολμηρότερον ΝCDFLP; τολμηρότερως ΑΒ. The latter is read by Weiss, W., and H., and Treg. π made by DFG in Phil. ii. 28. του θεου ΝΒФ and most edd.

xi. 10. Paul again follows the LXX, only omitting ἐν τῇ ἡμέρῃ καταγείν after ἐσται. The words are meant to describe the Messianic kingdom and its Davidic head. It is a universal kingdom, and the nations set their hope in its King, and therefore in the God of salvation whose representative He is. Such a hope in God, the Apostle’s argument implies, will result in the praise which glorifies Him for His mercy (ver. 9).

Ver. 13. Prompted by ἐλπιούσιν, the Apostle closes this section, and the body of the epistle, by calling on “the God of hope” to bless those to whom it is addressed. For the expression δοθείσαν μοι: cf. ver. 5; it means the God Who gives us the hope which we have in Christ. The joy and peace which He imparts rest on faith (ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν). Hence they are the joy and peace specially flowing from justification and acceptance with God, and the more we have of these, the more we abound in the Christian hope itself. Such an abundance of the power of the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 8, Luke iv. 14), is the end contemplated in Paul’s prayer that the God of hope would fill the Romans with all joy and peace in believing. For the kind of supremacy thus given to hope compare the connection of ver. 5 with ver. 2 in chap. xiv.

Ver. 15 f. τολμηρότερως ... ἀπὸ μέρους: the description does not apply to the letter as a whole, but only to parts of it: Gifford refers to vi. 22, xi. 17 ff., xii. 3, and especially chap. xiv. throughout. ὡς ἐπαναμιμηθέν τοις ὑμῖν: in a sense therefore self-sufficient.

Ver. 14. πέπεισμαι δὲ: the tone in which he has written, especially in chap. xiv., might suggest that he thought them very defective either in intelligence, or love, or both; but he disclaims any such inference from his words. ἀδελφοί μου has a friendly emphasis: cf. vii. 4. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ cf. vii. 25: it means “even I myself, who have taken it upon me to address you so plainly”. διὰ τὴν χάριν την δοθείσαν μοι: this is the real justification of his writing. As in i. 5, xii. 3, the χάριν is that of Apostleship. It is not wantonly, but in the exercise of a Divine vocation, and a divinely-bestowed competence for it, that he writes. θεοῦ: there is a certain emphasis on
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

ΧV.

την δοθείσαν μοι υπό τοῦ Θεοῦ, τεις τα εἶναι με λατουργόν Ἰησοῦ

Χριστοῦ εἰς τα ζήνη, ἵ περονοῦντα τα εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται. ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ζήνη εὐπρόσδεκτον, ἤ γιωσιμένη εν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.

17. Ἐκὼ οὖν καθὼς εἰς Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ το πρὸς Θεόν. 18. οὸ γὰρ τὸ «τολμήσαι» λαλέει τι δὲν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστὸς δι’ ἐμοῦ, εἰς ὑπακοὴν

1 For γενναίον Weiss, against all edd., reads γενηται with B. The change of this into the commoner form γενηται is an emendation current in all the groups into which the MSS. can be classified.

2 After σικ ins. την ΒCDF; om. ΝΑLΡ; W. and H. bracket. For πρὸς θεόν read πρὸς τον Θεον with ΝΑΒCDFL and all edd.

For τολμησῳ B has τολμω, which W. and H. put in margin. The fut. is retained by most edd. with ΝΑCDFGLP. For λαλεῖν τι τι λαλεῖν with ΝΑΒCDF.

εἰς τα ζήνη, and the whole sentence would be inept, as a justification of Paul for writing to Rome, unless the Roman Church had been essentially Gentile. For λατουργόν see note on xiii.6. The word here derives from the context the priestly associations which often attach to it in the LXX. But obviously it has no bearing on the question as to the "sacerdotal" character of the Christian ministry. The offering which Paul conceives himself as presenting to God is the Gentile Church, and the priestly function in the exercise of which this offering is made is the preaching of the Gospel. Paul describes himself as λειτουργούντα τα εὐαγγελία του Θεοῦ sacerdotis modo evangelium ad administrantem. Fritzsche (on whose note all later expositors depend) explains the sacerdotis modo by accurate et religiose; just as a Levitical offering was not acceptable to God unless the prescribed ceremonial was precisely observed, so the offering of the Gentiles at God's altar would be unacceptable unless Paul showed a priestlike fidelity in his ministry of the Gospel. But this is to wring from a word what an intelligent appreciation of the sentence as a whole, and especially of its pictorial character, refuses to yield: the clause ιὰ γενηται.. εὐπρόσδεκτος depends not on λατουργοῦντα, but on the whole conception of Paul's ministry, i.e., on εἰς τα εἶναι με λατουργόν κ.τ.λ. For η προσφορὰ τῶν ζήνη, genitive of object, cf. Heb. x. 10. This great offering is acceptable to God (1 Pet. ii. 5) because it is ἁγιασμενη consecrated to Him εν Πνευματι Ἁγίῳ. Those who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the result of Paul's sacred ministry of the Gospel, received the Holy Spirit: this (as distinct from the ceremonial "without spot or blemish") was the ground of their acceptance (cf. xii. 1 f.).

Ver. 17. Ἐκὼ οὖν καθὼς: I have therefore ground of boasting. In spite of the apologetic tone of ver. 14 f. Paul is not without confidence in writing to the Romans. But there is no personal assumption in this; for he has it only in Christ Jesus, and only τα προς τον Θεον in his relations to God. Cf. Heb. ii. 17, v. 1.

Ver. 18 f. All other boasting he declines. οὐ γαρ τολμησῳ τι λαλεῖν δὲν οὐ κατειργάσατο δι’ ἐμοῦ δ Ἡ: in effect this means, I will not presume to speak of anything except what Christ wrought through me. This is the explanation of Ἐκὼ οὖν καθὼς: in Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The things which Christ did work through Paul He wrought εἰς θυσίαν δὲν with a view to obedience on the part of the Gentiles: cf. i. 5. This combination—Christ working in Paul to make the Gentiles obedient to the Gospel—is the vindication of Paul's action in writing to Rome. It is not on his own impulse, but in Christ that he does it; and the Romans as Gentiles lie within the sphere in which Christ works through him. λόγος καὶ ἐργον: λόγος refers to the preaching, ἐργον to all he had been enabled to do or suffer in his calling. 2 Cor. x. 11, Acts vii. 22, Lc. xxiv. 19. ἐν θυσίαις ἐρμαὶς καὶ τέρας καὶ σημείαις are the words generally employed in the N. T. to designate what we call miracle: often, too, συμβαίνει is used as synonymous (Mark vi. 2). All three are again applied to Paul's miracles in 2 Cor. xii. 12, and to similar works in the Apostolic age of the Church in Heb. ii. 4: all three are also found in 2 Thess. ii. 9, where they are ascribed to the Man of Sin, whose Parousia in this as in other respects is
προς ρωμαίους

εἴθνων, λόγω καὶ ἑργῆς, 19. εν δυναμεὶ σημείων καὶ τεράτων, εν δυναμεὶ Πνεύματος Θεοῦ. 18 ὡστε με ἀπὸ ἱεροσολύμων καὶ κύκλω μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 20. οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμοῦμαι εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, οὐχ οὐκ οἴνωμαθείς Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα μὴ ἔπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἴκοδομῶ. 21. ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Οἱ οὐκ ἄνηγγελε περὶ αὐτοῦ, διώκονται. 2 καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀνηγγέλησαν συνήσουσι".

1 Θεοῦ ΝΔLΡ; ἀγίου ΑCD-3L, Orig.; φιλοτιμοῦμαι BD (gr.) FP. Edd. seem to regard the latter as a change made to simplify the construction, and the case is one of those in which the value of Β may be lessened by Western influence; hence they prefer, as a rule, the former reading. But Weiss reads φιλοτιμοῦμαι because it is exegetically necessary, and says he is not aware of any such arbitrary change of a participle into a finite verb.

2 ὄφοταί before οἰς Β; and so W. and Η. and Weiss. The order in received text conforms to the LXX and the next clause.

regarded as counterfeiting that of Christ. τέρας is always rendered "wonder" in the A.V., and, as though the word were unequal to the phenomenon, it is never used alone: in all the places in which it occurs σημείον is also found. The latter emphasises the significance of the miracle; it is not merely a sight to stare at, but is suggestive of an actor and a purpose. In this passage, "the power" of signs and wonders seems to mean the power with which they impressed the beholders: more or less it is an interpretation of ἑργῆς. So "the power" of the Holy Ghost means the influence with which the Holy Spirit accompanied the preaching. It can be less or more or less it answers to λόγω: see 1 Thess. ii. 16 and cf. the ἄνθρωποι τενυμάτος κ. τ. οὐκόματο, 1 Cor. ii. 4. ὡστε με κ.τ.λ. "The result of Christ's working through His Apostle is here stated as if the preceding sentence had been affirmative in form as well as sense" (Gifford). ἀπὸ ἱεροσολύμων: this agrees with Acts ix. 26-29, but this, of course, does not prove that it was borrowed from that passage. Even if Paul began his ministry at Damascus, he might quite well speak as he does here, for it is not its chronology, but its range, he is describing; and to his mind Jerusalem (to which, if let alone, he would have devoted himself, see Acts xxii. 18-22) was its point of departure. καὶ κύκλω: most modern commentators have rendered this as if it were τοῦ κύκλω—from Jerusalem and its vicinity, by which they mean Syria (though some would include Arabia, Gal. i. 17): for this use of κύκλω see Gen. xxxv. 5, Judith i. 2. But most Greek commentators render as in the A.V.—"and round about unto Illyricum". This is the interpretation taken by Hofmann and by S. and H., and is illustrated by Xen., Anab., vii. i. 14 (quoted by the latter): πότερα διὰ τοῦ λειτουργοῦ δεότι πορεύεσθαι, καὶ κύκλῳ διὰ μέσης τῆς Θράκης, μέχρι τοῦ 'Ιλλυρικοῦ can (so far as μέχρι is concerned) either exclude or include Illyricum. Part of the country so called may have been traversed by Paul in the journey alluded to in Acts xx. 1 f. (διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέχρι ἑκείνα), but the language would be satisfied if he had come in sight of Illyricum as he would do in his westward journey through Macedonia. ἐπεξεργασάτο τὸ εὐαγ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ: have fulfilled (fully preached) the Gospel of Christ. Cf. Col. i. 25. Paul had done this in the sense in which it was required of an Apostle, whose vocation (to judge from Paul's practice) was to lay the foundation of a church in the chief centres of population, and as soon as the new community was capable of self-propagation, to move on.

Ver. 20. οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμοῦμαι (1 Thess. iv. 11, 2 Cor. v. 9): making it my ambition, however, thus to preach the Gospel, etc. This limits πεπληρωκέναι: he had never sought to preach where Christianity was already established. A point of honour, but not rivalry, is involved in φιλοτιμοῦμαι. οὐμάθεις: cf. 2 Tim. ii. 15 and Isa. xxvi. 13, Amos vi. 10. To name the name of the Lord is to confess Him to be what He is to the faith of His people. ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον κ.τ.λ. The duty of an
22. ήδο και ένεκιτημόν τα πολλά του ἔθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 23. νυνί δὲ μηκέτι τότεν ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἐπιτολὰν δὲ ἔχων τού ἐπ. Luke viii. έθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς τούς πολλοὺς τούς ἐτῶν, 24. διό εὖν ἠποτεῖμαμι εἰς την Σπανίαν, ἠλυσόμασι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐλπίζω γάρ διαπορευόμενος διασα- σθαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑμων προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ, εἰδών ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀντί μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ. 25. Νυνί δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς ἱεροσόλυμ, διακονῶν τα πολλα ΔΣΑCLΡ; πολλακις ΒDF.

For πολλων ΔΣΑDFL read ικανων with BCP, Weiss, W. and H., Alford. For ως εαν read ως αν with ΔΣΑΒC. Οm. ελευσομαι προς υμας ΝΑΒCDF and all edd.

Apostle was with the foundation, not the superstructure. 1 Cor. iii. 10. The same confidence in his vocation, and the same pride in limiting that confidence, and not boasting of what Christ had done through others, or intruding his operations into their sphere, pervades the tenth chapter of 2 Cor.

Ver. 22. έλλα καθα γέγραται: Paul's actual procedure corresponded with, and indeed led to the fulfilment of, a famous O.T. prophecy. Isa. lii. 11 exactly as in LXX. It is absurd to argue with Fritzsche that Paul found a prediction of his own personal ministry (and of the principles on which he discharged it), in Isaiah, and equally beside the mark to argue that his use of the passage is "quite in accordance with the spirit of the original". The LXX is quite different from the Hebrew, and Paul quotes it because he liked to be able to express his own opinion or practice in Scripture language. It seemed to him to get a Divine confirmation in this way; but an examination of various passages shows that he cared very little for the original meaning or application.

Vv. 22-33. The Apostle’s programme. He is at present on his way to Jerusalem with the gifts which his Gentile churches have made for the relief of the poor Christians there. The issue of this visit is dubious, and he begs their prayers for its success. After it is over, he means to proceed to Spain. and on the way he hopes to pay his long deferred visit to Rome.

Ver. 22. διό και ένεκιτημόν τα πολλά: the work which detained the Apostle in the East also hindered him from visiting Rome. For another ένεκιτημόν see 1 Thess. ii. 18. τα πολλά is more than πολλακις in i. 13: it is distinguished in Greek writers both from ἐνιοτέ (sometimes) and αλ (always) and is rightly rendered in Vulg. plerumque. As a rule, it was his work which kept Paul from visiting Rome, but he may have had the desire to do so (e.g., when he was in Corinth) and have been prevented by some other cause. The rendering of R.V. "these many times" (apparently, all the definite times included in πολλακις i. 13) is unsupported by examples.

Ver. 23. νυνί δὲ: but now — the sentence thus begun is interrupted by ελπίζω γάρ and never finished, for the words ελεύσομαι πρὸς υμᾶς in T.R. are an interpolation. μηκέτι τότεν ἔχων: not that every soul was converted, but that the Apostolic function of laying foundations had been sufficiently discharged over the area in question. κλίμα is only found in the plural in N.Τ. 2 Cor. xi. το, Gal. i. 2τ. επιπόθειαν: here only in N.Τ. από ικανών ετῶν: the desire dated "from a good many years back". Cf. εντὸς κτίσεως κόσμου, i. 20, Acts xv. 7.

Ver. 24. ώσ τούτω εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν: it is here the apodosis begins, which being broken in on by ελπίζω is never formally resumed, though the sense is taken up again in ver. 28 f. ώσ δι’ είπε προπεμφθηναι εκεί: it has been said that Paul expected or claimed "quasi pro jure suo" to be escorted all the way to Spain by sea (by members of the Roman Church); but this is not included in προπεμφθῆναι. Practical illustrations are seen in Acts xx. 35, xxii. 5: similar anticipations in 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11. For πρώταν see Mt. vii. 5, viii. 21. ἀντί μέρους indicates that no such stay would be equal to the Apostle’s longing
for fellowship with the Romans, but it would be at least a partial satisfaction of it.

Ver. 25. ἕνων δὲ is not a resumption of ἕνων δὲ in ver. 23: there is an entire break in the construction, and Paul begins again, returning from the Spanish journey, which lies in a remote and uncertain future, to the present moment. "But at this moment I am on the way to Jerusalem, ministering to the saints." διακονῶν does not represent this journey as part of his apostolic ministry, which might legitimately defer his visit once more (Weiss); it refers to the service rendered to the poor by the money he brought (see 2 Cor. viii. 4). For whatever reason, Paul seems to have used "the saints" (a name applicable to all Christians) with a certain predilection to describe the Jerusalem Church. Cf. ver. 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, ix. 12: all in this connection.

Ver. 26. εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαία: Macedonia and Achaia would include all the Pauline Churches in Europe, and we know from 1 Cor. xvi. 1 that a similar contribution was being made in Galatia. εὐδόκησαν expresses the formal resolution of the churches in question, but here as in many places with the idea that it was a spontaneous and cordial resolution (though it had been suggested by Paul): see chap. x. 1 (Fritzsche's note there), Luke xii. 32, Gal. i. 15, 1 Cor. i. 21, 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1. κοινωνίαν τινὰ: τινὰ marks the indefiniteness of the collection. It was no assessment to raise a prescribed amount, but "some contribution," more or less according to will and circumstances. For κοινωνίαν in this sense see 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13: where the whole subject is discussed. εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων: from the partitive genitive it is clear that not all the saints in Jerusalem were poor. But Gal. ii. 10, Acts vi. show that the community at least included many poor, towards whom it assumed a responsibility so burdensome that it was unable to discharge it unaided.

Ver. 27. εὐδόκησαν γὰρ: they have resolved, I say. Paul felt bound to let this resolution affect his own conduct, even to the extent of delaying his journey westward. Indeed he explains in 2 Cor., chaps. viii. and ix., that he expected great spiritual results, in the way of a better understanding between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, from this notable act of Gentile charity; hence his desire to see it accomplished, and the necessity laid on him to go once more to Jerusalem. εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαία: Macedonia and Achaia would include all the Pauline Churches in Europe, and we know from 1 Cor. xvi. 1 that a similar contribution was being made in Galatia. εὐδόκησαν expresses the formal resolution of the churches in question, but here as in many places with the idea that it was a spontaneous and cordial resolution (though it had been suggested by Paul): see chap. x. 1 (Fritzsche's note there), Luke xii. 32, Gal. i. 15, 1 Cor. i. 21, 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1. κοινωνίαν τινὰ: τινὰ marks the indefiniteness of the collection. It was no assessment to raise a prescribed amount, but "some contribution," more or less according to will and circumstances. For κοινωνίαν in this sense see 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13: where the whole subject is discussed. εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων: from the partitive genitive it is clear that not all the saints in Jerusalem were poor. But Gal. ii. 10, Acts vi. show that the community at least included many poor, towards whom it assumed a responsibility so burdensome that it was unable to discharge it unaided.

Ver. 28. τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας: having brought this business to a close. It is a mistake to find in Paul's use of ἐπιτελεῖν any reference to the performance of a religious rite: see 2 Cor. viii. 6, 11, Gal. iii. 3, Phil. i. 6. σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον. "This fruit" is, of course, the collection; it is one of the gracious results of the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles, and Paul loves to conceive and to speak of it spiritually rather than materially. Thus in 2 Cor. viii. and ix. he calls it a χάρις, a διακονία, a κοινωνία, a δόσις, a σύμμορφη: never money. The point of the figure in σφραγισάμενος cannot be said to be clear. It may possibly suggest that Paul, in handing over the money to the saints, authenticates it to them as the fruit of their πνευματικά, which have been sown among the Gentiles (so S.
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ
ΧV. 29-33.

ΕΕ, 29. οίδαδε ότι, ερχόμενος πρὸς υμᾶς, εν πληρώματι ευλογίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔλευσομαι. 30. Παρακαλῶ δὲ υμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν Κυρίου ἡμῶν ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Πνεύματος, συναγωνίσασθαι μοι εν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπέρ ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. 31. ίνα μουθὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθοῦντων ἐν τῇ ιουδαίᾳ, καὶ ἵνα ἡ διακονία μου ἐντὸς ἱεροσολυμίας εὐσφαγίζω μετὰ τοῦτος ἀγίους. 32. ἵνα ἐν ἑραῖ ἐλθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν υμῶν διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ, καὶ συναναπαύσω με ὑμῖν. 33. δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης μετὰ πάντων υμῶν. ἀμήν.

1 Om. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ ΝΑΒCDF and all edd.

2 After καὶ om. τῶν with ΝΑΒCDF; διακονία ΝΑCD*L; δωροφορία BD¹F. W. and H. regard δωροφορία as a Western reading which belongs to the interior element in Β, and therefore adopt διακονία; so Tischdf. But Weiss thinks διακονία obviously suggested here by its use in 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12 f., and puts δωροφορία, which occurs nowhere else in the Ν.Τ., in his text. The change of it to διακονία induced, he believes, the further change of εν before Ιερουσαλημ (which is also the reading of ΒD¹F) into εἰς (which is found like διακονία in ΝΑCD*L). This argument seems to have real weight, even though ΒDF is not always a strong combination of authorities.

3 εν χαρᾷ ελθω. This is the reading of BDEFLP, and is retained by Weiss. It has the critical advantage of making it possible to understand how Β could have come to omit the clause καὶ συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν, and the exegetical advantage of properly defining the end aimed at in the prayer, which was that Paul might come with joy to Rome, not that he might refresh himself after that. W. and H. put the received text in margin, but read in text εν . . . ελθων . . . θεου συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. ελθων is the reading of ΝΙΑΚ, and these MSS. also omit καὶ. For θεου Β has κυριου ἤσου; D¹F Χριστου ἤσου; alii aliter. Possibly the original reading was θελήματος alone (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 12), which has been variously supplemented.

4 ομην om. AF; ins. ΝΑΒCDLP and all edd.

and H.); or it may only mean "when I have secured this fruit to them as their property," (so Meyer). The ideas of "property," "security," "formality," "finality," are all associated with σφραγίς and σφραγίζω in different passages of the Ν.Τ., and it is impossible to say which preponderated in Paul's mind as he wrote these words. Cf. John iii. 33, vi. 27. ἀπελεύσομαι is simply abibo; the idea of departing from Jerusalem is included in it, which is not brought out in the R.V., "I will go on". καὶ ομον. cf. 2 Cor. i. τοῦ Πνεύματος: there is no evidence that this intention was ever carried out except the well-known passage in Clem. Rom. i. 5 which speaks of Paul as having come ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑτέρας ἡμῶν: an expression which, especially if the writer was a Jew, may as well mean Rome as Spain. But all the more if it was not carried out is this passage in Romans assuredly genuine; a second-century writer would not gratuitously ascribe to an apostle intentions which he must have known were never accomplished.

Ver. 29. For ερχόμενος . . . ελεύσομαι cf. 1 Cor. ii. 1. εν πληρώματι εὐαγγελίας Χριστοῦ. Paul's desire was to impart to the Romans χάρην καὶ πνευματικόν (i. 11), and he is sure it will be satisfied to the full. When he comes he will bring blessing from Christ to which nothing will be lacking. On πληρώματα see xi. 12.

Ver. 30. τερακαλὸς δὲ ἤμας. In spite of the confident tone of ver. 29, Paul is very conscious of the uncertainties and perils which lie ahead of him, and with the δὲ he turns to this aspect of his situation. ἀδελφοί (which W. H. bracket) is an appeal to their Christian sympathy. διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. For διὰ in this sense see xii. 1. The Romans and Paul were alike servants of this Lord, and His name was a motive to the Romans to sympathise with Paul in all that he had to encounter in Christ's service. διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος:
the love wrought in Christian hearts by the Spirit of God (Gal. v. 22) is another motive of the same kind. συναγωνίζομαι ἵνα αὐτήν προσδέξησθε ἐν Κυρίω ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ παραστήτε αὐτὴν ἐν ὧν ὑμῖν ἡμετέρᾳ πράγματι καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴν προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἀναγώγημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἄλλως (2 Cor. xii. 44) seems to demote awful fear rather than intense striving. πΡΟς τὸν θεόν is not otiose: Paul felt how much it was worth to have God appealed to on his behalf.

Ver. 3 τοῖς ἀπειθούντοις, ἵνα ὑμῖν ἐλθών . . . συναναπάυσω ὑμίν. συναναπ. here only in N.T. but αγών and αγωνίζομαι in a spiritual sense are found in each of the groups into which the Pauline epistles are usually divided. What Paul asks is that they should join him in striving with all their might—in wrestling as it were—against the hostile forces which would frustrate his apostolic work. Cf. Just. Mart., Aχιλ., ii., 13: καὶ εὐχόμενος καὶ παμμάχως αγωνιζόμενος. αγωνία in Lc. xxii. 44 seems to denote awful fear rather than intense striving.

Ver. 4 After τὸν θεόν ins. καὶ Δ; so Weiss. W. and H. bracket.

Ver. 33. ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης: there is an appropriateness in this designation after ver. 31, but "peace" is one of the ruling ideas in Paul's mind always, and needs no special explanation in a benediction: 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Phil. iv. 9, 1 Thess. v. 23.

CHAPTER XVI. On this chapter see introduction. It consists of five distinct parts: (1) The recommendation of Phœbe to the Church, vers. 1 and 2; (2) a series of greetings from Paul himself, vers. 3-16; (3) a warning against false teachers, vers. 17-20; (4) a series of greetings from companions of Paul, vers. 21-23; (5) a doxology.

Ver. 1 f. Συνίστημι δὲ υμῖν Φοίβην. συνιστημι is the technical word for this kind of recommendation, which was equivalent to a certificate of church membership. Paul uses it with especial frequency in 2 Cor., both in the technical sense (iν. 12), and in a kindred but wider sense, in a kindred but wider sense, in a kindred but wider sense (iν. 12), and in a kindred but wider sense (iν. 12, 18). τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἡμῶν: our (Christian) sister, 1 Cor. vii. 15, ix. 5. The spiritual kinship thus asserted was a recommendation of itself, but in Phœbe's case Paul can add another. οὐσαν καὶ διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαίᾳ: who is also a servant of the Church in Cenchreae. It is not easy to translate διάκονον, for "servant" is too vague, and "deaconess" is more technical than the original. Διάκονια was really a function of membership in the Church, and Phœbe might naturally be described as she is here if like the house of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 15) she had given herself εἰς διάκονιαν τοῖς ἁγίοις. That
is, a life of habitual charity and hospitality, quite apart from any official position, would justify the name διάκονος. On the other hand it must be remembered that the growth of the Church, under the conditions of ancient society, soon produced “deaconsesses” in the official sense, and Phoebe may have had some recognised function of διακονία assigned to her. Cenchreae was on the Saronic gulf, nine miles E. of Corinth: as the port for Asia and the East, many Christians would pass through it, and a Christian woman who gave herself to hospitality (xii. 13) might have her hands full. ἐν Κυρίω: no mere reception of Phoebe into their houses satisfies this — their Christian life was to be open for her to share in it; she was no alien to be debarred from spiritual intimacy. ἐξίσου τῶν ἄγιων: with such kindness as it becomes Christians to show. καλ παραστήτη αὕτη (Jer. xv. 11): after the Christian welcome is assured, Paul bespeaks their help for Phoebe in whatever affair she may require it. He speaks indefinitely, but his language suggests that she was going to Rome on business in which they could assist her. καλ γὰρ αὕτη: in complying with this request they will only be doing for Phoebe what she has done for others, and especially for Paul himself. προστάτις (feminine of προστάτης) is suggested by παραστήτη. Paul might have said παραστήτη, but uses the more honourable word. προστάτης (patronus) was the title of a citizen in Athens who took charge of the interests of μέτοικοι and persons without civic rights; the corresponding feminine here may suggest that Phoebe was a woman of good position who could render valuable services to such a community as a primitive Christian Church usually was. When she helped Paul we cannot tell. Dr. Gifford suggests the occasion of Acts xviii. 18. Paul's vow "seems to point to a deliverance from danger or sickness," in which she may have ministered to him. It is generally assumed that Phoebe was the bearer of this epistle, and many even of those who regard vers. 3-16 as addressed to Ephesus still hold that vers. 1 and 2 were meant for Rome.

Ver. 3 f. Greeting to Prisca and Aquila. ἀσπάσασθε: only here does Paul commission the whole Church to greet individual members of it (Weiss). For the persons here named see Acts xviii. 2. Paul met them first in Corinth, and according to Meyer converted them there. Here as in Acts xviii. 18, 26 and 1 Tim. iv. 19 the wife is put first, probably as the more distinguished in Christian character and service; in 1 Cor. xvi. 19, where they send greetings, the husband naturally gets his precedence. τοῦς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: on first acquaintance they had been fellow-workers, not in Christ Jesus, but in tent-making; they were ὑπήρξον, Acts xviii. 3. οἵτινες: quippe ui. τὸν εαυτῶν τράχηλον: the singular (as Gifford points out) shows that the expression is figurative. To save Paul's life Prisca and Aquila incurred some great danger themselves; what, we cannot tell. They were in his company both in Corinth and Ephesus, at times when he was in extreme peril (Acts xviii. 12, xix. 39 f.), and the recipients of the letter would understand the allusion. The technical sense of ὑποθέναι, to give as a pledge, cannot be pressed here, as though Prisca and Aquila had given their personal security (though it involved the hazard of their lives) for Paul's good behaviour. οίς οὐκ έγὼ μόνος ἐξαριστῶ κ.τ.λ. The language implies that the incident referred to had occurred long enough ago for all the Gentile Churches to be aware of it, but yet so recently that both they and the Apostle himself retained a lively feeling of gratitude to his brave friends. καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὕτων ἐκκλησίαν: these words do not mean "their Christian household," nor do they imply that the
whole Christian community (in Rome or in Ephesus) met in the house of Prisca and Aquila. They signified the body of believers meeting for worship there, a body which would only be part of the local Christian community. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Col. iv. 15, Philemon 2, Acts xii. 22. "There is no clear example of a separate building set apart for Christian worship within the limits of the Roman Empire before the third century, though apartments in private houses might be specially devoted to this purpose" (Lightfoot on Col. iv. 15). ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαινετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου: after Priscilla and Aquila, not a single person is known of all those to whom Paul sends greetings in vv. 3-16. Ἀρχη τῆς Ἀσίας: Ἐπαινετος was the first convert in Asia (the Roman province of that name). Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 15. There is no difficulty in supposing that the first Christian of Asia was at this time—temporarily or permanently—in Rome: but the discovery of an Ephesian Epenetus on a Roman inscription (quoted by Sanday and Headlam) is very interesting.

Ver. 6. It is not certain whether Μαριάμ (which is Jewish) or Μαρίαν (Roman) is the true reading. ήτις πολλά ἐκοπίασεν: the much labour she had bestowed is made the ground (ήτις) of a special greeting. εἰς ὑμᾶς is much better supported than εἰς ημᾶς: there is something finer in Paul's appreciation of services rendered to others than if they had been rendered to himself. Cf. Gal. iv. 11.

Ver. 7. Andronicus is a Greek name, which, like most names in this chapter, can be illustrated from inscriptions. Λουκίας may be masculine (from Λουκίας, or Λουκίας contraction of Junianus), or feminine (from Λουκίας): probably the former. τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου: i.e., Jews, Cf. ix. 3. It is hardly possible that so many people in the Church addressed (see vv. 11, 21) should be more closely connected with Paul than by the bond of nationality. But it was natural for him, in writing to a mainly Gentile Church, to distinguish those with whom he had this point of contact. Cf. Col. iv. 11. συναιχμαλώτους μου: this naturally means that on some occasion they had shared Paul's imprisonment: it is doubtful whether it would be satisfied by the idea that they, like him, had also been imprisoned for Christ's sake. The αἰχμάλωτος is a prisoner of war: Paul and his friends were all Salvation Army men. The phrase ἐτίσημοι εἰς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, men of mark among the Apostles, has the same ambiguity in Greek as in English. It might mean, well-known to the apostolic circle, or distinguished as Apostles. The latter sense is that in which it is taken by "all patristic commentators" (Sanday and Headlam), whose instinct for what words meant in a case of this kind must have been surer than that of a modern reader. It implies, of course, a wide sense of the word Apostle: for justification of which reference may be made to Lightfoot's essay on the name and office of an Apostle (Galatians, 92 ff.) and Harnack, Lehre der zwolf Apostel, S. 111-118. On the other hand, Paul's use of the word Apostle is not such as to make it easy to believe that he thought of a large class of persons who might be so designated, a class so large that two otherwise unknown persons like Andronicus and Junias might be conspicuous in it. Hence scholars like Weiss and Gifford hold that what is meant here is that Andronicus and Junias were honourably known to the Twelve. οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ: they had evidently been converted very early, and, like Mnason the Cypriot, were ἀρχαίοι μαθηταί, Acts xx. 16. On γέγοναν see Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 82. The English idiom does not allow of a perfect translation, but "were" is more idiomatic than "have been".

Ver. 8. Ἀμπλιάτον: "a common Roman slave name". Sanday and Head-
lam give inscriptions from the cemetery of Domitilla, which make it probable that a person of this name was conspicuous in the earliest Roman Church, and may have been the means of introducing Christianity to a great Roman house.

τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου ἐν Κυρίω: Paul has none but Christian relations to this man.

Ver. 9. Οὐρβανόν: also a common slave name, “found, as here, in juxtaposition with Ampliatus, in a list of imperial freedmen, on an inscription A.D. 115” (Gifford).

By τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὅντας ἐν Κυρίω: the last words may suggest that, though only the Christians in this household have a greeting sent to them, there were other members of it with whom the Church had relations. The Narcissus meant is probably the notorious freedman of Claudius, who was put to death shortly after the accession of Nero (Tac., Ann., xiii., 1), and therefore two or three years before this epistle was written. His slaves would probably pass into the emperor’s hands, and increase “Caesar’s household” as Narcissiani (Lightfoot, loc. cit.).

Ver. 10. Ἀπελλήν τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ: Apelles, that approved Christian. In some conspicuous way the Christian character of Apelles had been tried and found proof: see Jas. i. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 15. The name is a familiar one, and sometimes Jewish: Credat θεός Ἀφελλά, Ηορ., Σατ., Ι., ν., Ιοο. By τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβοῦλοι are meant Christians belonging to the household of Aristobulus. Lightfoot, in his essay on Caesar’s Household (Philippians, 171 ff.), makes Aristobulus the grandson of Herod the Great. He was educated in Rome, and probably died there. “Now it seems not improbable, considering the intimate relations between Claudius and Aristobulus, that at the death of the latter his servants, wholly or in part, should be transferred to the palace. In this case they would be designated Aristobuliani, for which I suppose St. Paul’s οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβοῦλοι to be an equivalent. It is at least not an obvious phrase, and demands explanation” (Philippians, 175).

Ver. 11. Ἡρωδίωνα τὸν συγγενήν μου. This agrees very well with the interpretation just given to τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβοῦλοι. In the household of Herod’s grandson there might naturally be a Jew with a name of this type, whom Paul, for some cause or other, could single out for a special greeting. τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὅντας ἐν Κυρίω: the last words may suggest that, though only the Christians in this household have a greeting sent to them, there were other members of it with whom the Church had relations. The Narcissus meant is probably the notorious freedman of Claudius, who was put to death shortly after the accession of Nero (Tac., Ann., xiii., 1), and therefore two or three years before this epistle was written. His slaves would probably pass into the emperor’s hands, and increase “Caesar’s household” as Narcissiani (Lightfoot, loc. cit.).

Ver. 12. Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφώσαν: “It was usual to designate members of the same family by derivatives of the same root” (Lightfoot): hence these two women were probably sisters. The names, which might be rendered “Dainty” and “Disdain” (see Jas. v. 5, Is. lxvi. 11) are characteristically pagan, and unlike the description τὰς κοπιώσας, “who toil in the Lord.” They are still at work, but the “much toil” of Persis, the beloved, belongs to some occasion in the past. τὴν ἀγαπητὴν: Paul does not here add μου as with the men’s names in vv. 8 and 9. Persis was dear to the whole Church.

Ver. 13. Ρούφον τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίω: for the name see Mark xv. 21. If Mark wrote his gospel at Rome, as there is ground to believe, this may be the person to whom he refers. In the gospel he is assumed to be well known, and here he is described as “that choice Christian”. ἐκλεκτὸν cannot refer simply to the fact of his election to be a Christian, since in whatever sense this is true, it is true of all Christians alike; whereas here it evidently expresses some distinction of Rufus. He was a noble specimen of a Christian. καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ κ. ἐμοῦ: where she had “mothered” Paul we do not know. For the idea cf. Mark x. 30.
14. Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέγοντα, Ἐρμήν, Πατρόβαν, Ἐρμήν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφοὺς. 15. Ἀσπάσασθε Φιλόλογον καὶ Ιουλίαν, Νηρέα καὶ τὴν αδελφήν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ολυμπᾶν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους. 16. Ἀσπάσασθε ἅλλοις ἐν φίληματι ἁγίῳ. ἄσπαζονται ὅμας αἱ ἐκκλησίαι. 17. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὅμας, ἀδελφοί, εἰς τὸν διοικητικόν καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα, παρὰ τὴν εἰς: Cor. iii. διδαχήν ἑν ὑμεῖς ἀμέν. 18. Ἀπέκτεινας ἑαυτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν. 19. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὅμας, ἀδελφοί, σκοπεῖν τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα, παρὰ τὴν εἰς. 20. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὅμας, ἀδελφοί, σκοπεῖν τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα, παρὰ τὴν εἰς.

Ver. 14. Of Asyncritus, Phlegon and Hermes nothing is known. Patrobas (or Patrobius) may have been a depend- ant of a famous freedman of the same name in Nero's time, who was put to death by Galba (Tac., Hist., i., 49, ii., 95). Hermes has often been identified with the author of The Shepherd, but though the identification goes back to Origen, it is a mistake. "Pastorem vero supertime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit sedente cathedra urbis Rome ecclesia Pio ep. fratre ejus": these words of the Canon of Muratori forbids the identification. τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφοῖς indicates that the persons named, and some others designated in this phrase, formed a little community by themselves—perhaps an ἐκκλησία κατ' οἰκόν τινος.

Ver. 15. Philologus and Julia, as connected here, were probably husband and wife; or, as in the next pair, brother and sister. Both, especially the latter, are among the commonest slave names. There are Acts of Nereus and Achilleus in the Acta Sanctorum connected with the early Roman Church. "The sister's name is not given, but one Nereis was a member of the [imperial] household about this time, as appears from an inscription already quoted" (Lightfoot, loc. cit., p. 177). Olympas is a contraction of Olympiodorus. τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίοις: see on last verse. The πάντας may suggest that a larger number of persons is to be included here.

Ver. 16. ἅλλοις. When the epistle is read in the Church the Christians are to greet each other, and seal their mutual salutations εν φίληματι ἁγίῳ. In Ἱ Thess. v. 26 the προσέχοντο apparently are to salute the members of the Church so. In Ἱ Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, exactly the same form is used as here. The custom of combining greeting and kiss was oriental, and especially Jewish, and in this way became Christian. In 1 Pet. v. 14 the kiss is called φίλημα ἁγάπης; in Αpost. Const., ii., 57, 12, τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φίλημα; in Tert. de Orat., xiv., oecum. pacis. By ἄγιον the kiss is distinguished from an ordinary greeting of natural affection or friendship; it belongs to God and the new society of His children; it is specifically Christian. αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ: "this phrase is unique in the N.T." (Sanday and Headlam). The ordinary form is "the Church" or "the Churches of God": but in Matt. xvi. 18 Christ says "my Church": cf. also Acts xx. 28, where τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου is found in many good authorities. For "all the Churches" cf. ver. 4, 1 Cor. vii. 17, xiv. 33, 2 Cor. viii. 18, xi. 28. Probably Paul was commissioned by some, and he took it on him to speak for the rest. If the faith of the Romans were published in all the world (chap. i. 8), the Churches everywhere would have sufficient interest in them to ratify this courtesy. "Quoniam cognovit omnium erga Romanos studium, omnium nomine salutat."

Vv. 17-20. Warning against false teachers. This comes in very abruptly in the middle of the greetings, and as it stands has the character of an afterthought. The false teachers referred to are quite definitely described, but it is clear that they had not yet appeared in Rome, nor begun to work there. Paul is only warning the Roman Church against a danger which he has seen in other places. There is a very similar passage in Phil. iii. 18 f., which Lightfoot connects with this, arguing that the persons denounced are not Judaizing teachers, but antinomian reactionists. It is easier to see grounds for this opinion in Philippians than here: but chap. vi. 1-23 may be quoted in support of it.
προς ρωμαίους

ΧV οι γὰρ τοιούτων τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ δουλεύουσιν, ἂν ἄλλα τῇ αὐτῶν κοιλίᾳ· καὶ διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἔβαταις τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀδικών. 

διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας: acc. to Gr. χρηστολογία refers to the insinuating tone, εὐλογία to the fine style, of the false teachers. Examples from profane Greek bear out this distinction (εὐάρχος εστιν ὁ λόγος καὶ πολλήν την εὐλογίαν επιδεικνύμενος καὶ εὐλεξίας), but as εὐλογία in Biblical Greek, and in Philo and Josephus invariably has a religious sense, Cremer prefers to take it so here also: "pious talk".

εξαπατώσι: vii.11, 2 Th. ii.2. ακάκων: all the English versions, except Gen. and A.V., render "of the innocent" (Gifford). See Heb. vii.26. In this place "guileless" is rather the idea: suspecting no evil, and therefore liable to be deceived.

ο θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης: used here with special reference to τοὺς διχοστάσιας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα ποιοῦντας: both the persons and their conduct are supposed to be known; "the divisions" and "the scandals," which had been occasioned in other Churches, are assumed to be familiar to the Romans. τὰ σκάνδαλα refers more naturally to conduct which would create a moral prejudice against the Gospel, and so prevent men from accepting it, than to any ordinary result of Jewish legal teaching. But if the latter caused dissension and generated bad tempers in the Church, it also might give outsiders cause to blaspheme, and to stumble at the Gospel.

σκοπεῖν: to keep your eye upon, either as an example to be followed (Phil. iii.17), or (as in this case) as a peril to be avoided. τοὺς τὰς διχοστάσιας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα ποιοῦντας: both the persons and their conduct are supposed to be known; "the divisions" and "the scandals," which had been occasioned in other Churches, are assumed to be familiar to the Romans. τὰ σκάνδαλα refers more naturally to conduct which would create a moral prejudice against the Gospel, and so prevent men from accepting it, than to any ordinary result of Jewish legal teaching. But if the latter caused dissension and generated bad tempers in the Church, it also might give outsiders cause to blaspheme, and to stumble at the Gospel.

εἰρήνης: with special reference to αἱ διχοστάσιαι. Cf. I Cor. xiv.33. συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν: divisions in the Church are Satan's work, and the suppression of them by the God of peace is a victory over Satan. Cf. 2 Cor. xi.14 f. There is an allusion to Gen iii.15, though it is
χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 1 μὲν ὁμοίως ἡμῶν. ἀμήν. 21.

ἸΔΟΝ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ ἐν χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μὲν ὁμοίως ἡμῶν. ἀμήν. 22. Ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς Ἐραστος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως, καὶ Κούαρτος ὁ ἄδελφος.

1 Χριστοῦ om. Β, edd.
2 For Ἀσπάζομαι read Ἀσπάζεται ΝΑΒCD F. Om. first μου Β 67; W. and H. bracket.

is meant that Gaius was Paul's host in Corinth; ὁ Τιμόθεος ἴδια τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ might either mean that the whole Christian community met in his house (cf. vv. 5, 14, 15), or that he made all Christians who came to Corinth welcome. Ἐραστος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως. We cannot be sure that this is the Erastus of Acts xix. 22, 2 Tim. iv. 20: the latter seems to have been at Paul's disposal in connection with his work. But they may be the same, and Paul may here be designating Erastus by an office which he had once held, but held no longer. The city treasurer (arcarius civitatis) would be an important person in a poor community (1 Cor. i. 26 ff.), and he and Gaius (whose boundless hospitality implies means) are probably mentioned here as representing the Corinthian Church. Κούαρτος ὁ ἄδελφος: Quartus, known to Paul only as a Christian, had perhaps some connection with Rome which entitled him to have his salutation inserted.

Ver. 24. The attestation of this verse is quite insufficient, and it is omitted by all critical editors.

Vv. 25-27. The doxology. St. Paul's letters, as a rule, terminate with a benediction, and even apart from the questions of textual criticism, connected with it, this doxology has given rise to much discussion. The closest analogies to it are found in the doxology at the end of Ephes., chap. iii., and in Jude (vv. 24 and 25); there is something similar in the last chapter of Hebrews (xiii. 20 f.), though not quite at the end; Pauline doxologies as a rule are briefer (i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, Phil. iv. 20), and more closely related to what immediately precedes. This one, in which all the leading ideas of the Epistle to the Romans may be discovered, though in a style which reminds one uncomfortably of the Pastoral Epistles rather than of that to which it is appended, would seem more in place if it stood where AL and an immense num-
24. 'H xárís tōu Kýrīou ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ metá pátōn òmwn. ἀμήν. 25. Té ἐν δυνάμει òmws sτηρίζαι káti tó εὐαγγελίων μου kai tó kírýmμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, káti1 ἀποκάλυψις μυστηρίων κρώνος ἀληθίου = σεσιγημένων, 26. φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, διὰ τὰ γραφὰ προφητικῶν, κατ' επιταγήν τοῦ αἰῶνος Θεοῦ, εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς Μ. This verse is wanting in ἩΣABC; ins. in DFL. See Introduction, p. 578.

1 This verse is wanting in ἩΣABC; ins. in DFL. See Introduction, p. 578.
ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

Πάντα τὰ ἑδή γνωρισθέντος, 27. μόνον σοφό "Θεω, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν Θεῷ τελεσθεντες, 27. μόνω σοφώ "Θεω, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν Θεῳ τελεσθεντες, 27. μόνω σοφώ "Θεω, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν Θεῳ τελεσθεντες, 27. μόνω σοφώ "Θεω, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν Θεω ἄνω τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαίς ἐκκλησίας. 2

1 οκτώ is wanting in B, in F-lat., Orig.-interp., Syr., and is bracketed by W. and H. But whether this is to be explained as an intentional correction to simplify the construction, or a mere oversight (of which Weiss gives examples, Textkritik, S. 93), it can hardly be right. Neither can αὐτο, which is found in P, be original; it is too natural a correction. Hence edd. are practically unanimous in keeping οκτώ.

Ver. 27. μόνω σοφώ "Θεω: this description of God suits all that has just been said about His great purpose in human history, and the hiding and revealing of it in due time. The true text in 1 Tim. i. 17 has no σοφώ. The absence of the article here indicates that it is in virtue of having this character that God is able to establish the Romans according to Paul's Gospel. ϒ ἡ δόξα: it is impossible to be sure of the reading here. If ϒ be omitted, there is no grammatical difficulty whatever: glory is ascribed to God through Jesus Christ, through Whom the eternal purpose of the world's redemption has in God's wisdom been wrought out. But its omission is almost certainly a correction made for simplification's sake. If it be retained, to whom does it refer? (i) Some say, to Jesus Christ; and this is grammatically the obvious way to take it. But it seems inconsistent with the fact that in τῷ διὰ θυσίαν and μόνω σοφώ "Θεω Paul wishes unequivocally to ascribe the glory to God. And though it saves the grammar of the last clause, it sacrifices that of the whole sentence. Hence (2) it seems necessary to refer it to God, and we may suppose, with Sanday and Headlam, that the structure of the sentence being lost amid the heavily-loaded clauses of the doxology, the writer concludes with a well-known formula of praise, ϒ ἡ δόξα κ.τ.λ. (Gal. i. 15, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21). This might be indicated by putting a dash after Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The thread is lost, and the writer appends his solemn conclusion as best he can.
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CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH OF GOD IN CORINTH.

The establishment of the Church of Corinth was the crowning work of Paul's second missionary journey, and one of the greatest achievements of his life. By repeated interventions crossing his plans of travel, the hand of God had compelled him to enter Europe, through the gate of Macedonia; thence Jewish persecution drove him onwards to Achaia, and prevented his returning to the work left unfinished in the northern province (1 Thess. ii. 14 ff., cf. Acts xvii. 5-15). At Athens, where he first touched Greek soil, the Apostle met with scant success; he arrived at Corinth dispirited and out of health (1 Cor. ii. 3, cf. 1 Thess. iii. 7), with little expectation of the harvest awaiting him. Loneliness aggravated the other causes of the "weakness and fear and trembling" that shook Christ's bold ambassador. His appearance and bearing conveyed an impression of feebleness which acted long afterwards to his prejudice (1 Cor. iv. 10, 2 Cor. x. 1-11, xii. 5, etc.). The new friendship of Aquila and Priscilla proved, however, a cordial to him (Acts xviii. 2 f., cf. Rom. xvi. 3 f.); and the return of Silas and Timothy with good news from Macedonia revived the confidence and vigour of their leader (Acts xviii. 5, cf. 1 Thess. iii. 6-9). Free from the anxiety which had distracted him, and rising above his late defeat, "Paul was constrained by the word [cf. for this verb 2 Cor. v. 14, and see Blass' Acta Apostol., ad loc.], testifying to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ". The decision with which he now spoke brought about a speedy rupture. The Jews were affronted by the doctrine of a crucified Messiah, which Paul pressed with unsparing rigour (Acts xviii. 5 f., 1 Cor. i. 17, 23, ii. 2). In this crisis the Apostle showed neither weakness nor fear; shaking off the dust of the synagogue, he established a rival ecclesia hard by at the house of the proselyte...
Titius Justus, marked by his name as a Roman citizen of the *colonia*, who could offer a secure and honourable refuge. The seceders included the Synagogue-chief Crispus and his family, with some other persons of importance. A vision in the following night assured Paul of success and personal safety at Corinth; accordingly "he sat down,"\(^1\) resolved to make full proof of his ministry (Acts xviii. 9-11, cf. 2 Cor. i. 18 f.) and staying at least eighteen months in the city—a period much longer than he had spent in any place since first setting out from Antioch. The assault of the Jews miscarried through the firmness and impartiality of the proconsul Gallio. The Apostle found in the Roman Government "the restrainer" of the lawless violence which would have crushed his infant Churches (2 Thess. ii. 6 f.). At Corinth popular feeling ran against the Jews, and their futile attack favourably advertised Paul's work. The murderous plot formed against him some years later (Acts xx. 3) shows how fiercely he was hated by his compatriots in Corinth. He tells us that his success in Macedonia had excited public attention in many quarters, and prepared for his message an interested hearing (1 Thess. i. 8 f.). Outside of Corinth the Gospel was preached with effect throughout Achaia (2 Cor. i. 1); in Cenchreae, *e.g.*, a regularly constituted Church was formed (Rom. xvi. 1). At his departure (Acts xviii. 18) the Apostle left behind him in this province a Christian community comparatively strong in numbers and conspicuous in the talent and activity of its members (1 Cor. i. 4-8, xiv. 26 ff.), consisting mainly of Gentiles, but with a considerable Jewish infusion (i. 12, vii. 18, xii. 13).

This city, the capital of Roman Greece and the fourth perhaps in size in the empire, was a focus of pagan civilisation, a mirror of the life and society of the age. The centre of a vast commerce, Corinth attracted a crowd of foreigners from East and West, who mingled with the native Greeks and adopted their language and manners. Though not a University town like Athens, Corinth nevertheless prided herself on her culture, and offered a mart to the vendors of all kinds of wisdom. "Not many wise, not many mighty, not many high-born" joined the disciples of the Crucified; but some of Paul's converts came under this description. There were marked social differences and contrasts of wealth and poverty in the Church (1 Cor. vii. 20-24, xi. 21 f., 2 Cor. viii. 12 ff., ix. 6 ff.). Along with slaves, a crowd of artisans and nondescript people, engaged in the petty handicrafts of a great emporium, entered the new society;

\(^1\) ἐκδικηθεὶς (Acts xviii. 11): the expression indicates that Paul had been up to this point unsettled, and made up his mind to remain; cf. Luke xxiv. 49.
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"the foolish things of the world," its "weak" and "baseborn," formed the majority of its constituency (1 Cor. i. 27 ff.)—amongst them many who had been steeped in pagan vice (vi. 9 ff.).

The moral transformation effected in this corrupt material was accompanied by a notable mental quickening. The Hellenic intellect awoke at the touch of spiritual faith. This first Christian society planted upon Greek soil exhibited the characteristic qualities of the race—qualities however of Greece in her decadence rather than her prime. Amongst so many freshly awakened and eager but undisciplined minds, the Greek intellectualism took on a crude and shallow form; it betrayed a childish conceit and fondness for rhetorical and philosophical jargon (i. 17, ii. 1-5, etc.), and allied itself with the factiousness that was the inveterate curse of Greece. The Corinthian talent in matters of "word and knowledge" ran into emulation and frivolous disputes. "The habit of seeming to know all about most things, and of being able to talk glibly about most things, would naturally tend to an excess of individuality, and a diminished sense of corporate responsibilities. This fact supplies, under many different forms, the main drift of 1 Corinthians" (Hort, Ecclesia, p. 129). Even the gifts of the Holy Spirit were abused for purposes of display, edification being often the last thing thought of in their exercise (xii., xiv.). The excesses which profaned the Lord's Table (xi. 20 ff.), and the unseemly conduct of women in the Church meetings (xi. 3 ff., xiv. 34 ff.), were symptoms of the lawless self-assertion that marred the excellencies of this Church, and turned the abilities of many of its members into an injury rather than a furtherance to its welfare.

Still graver mischief arose from the influence of heathen society. For men breathing the moral atmosphere of Corinth, and whose earlier habits and notions had been formed in this environment, to conceive and maintain a Christian moral ideal was difficult in the extreme. Deplorable relapses occurred when the fervour of conversion had abated, and the Church proved shamefully tolerant towards sins of impurity (1 Cor. v., 2 Cor. xii. 20 f.). The acuteness of the Greek mind showed itself in antinomian sophistry; the "liberty" from Jewish ceremonial restrictions claimed by Paul for Gentile Christians was by some construed into a general licence, and carried to a length which shocked not merely the scruples of fellow-believers but the common moral instincts (vi. 12 ff., viii. 9-13, x. 23 ff., xi. 13 b). The social festivities of Corinth, bound up as they were with idolatry and its impurities, exposed the Church to severe temptation. To draw a hard and fast line in such questions
and to forbid all participation in *idolothyta*, after the precedent of Acts xv., would have been the simplest course to take; but Paul feels it necessary to ground the matter on fundamental principles. He will not acknowledge any dominion of the idol over “the earth and its fulness” (x. 26); nor, on the other hand, is it right to prevent neighbourly intercourse between Christians and unbelievers (x. 27 ff.). But where the feast is held under the auspices of a heathen god and as the sequel to his sacrifice the case is altered; participation under these circumstances becomes an act of apostasy, and the feaster identifies himself with the idol as distinctly as in the Lord’s Supper he identifies himself with Christ (x. 16 ff.).

The working of the old leaven is patent in the denial of the resurrection of the dead made by some Corinthian Christians (xv.). Here the radical scepticism of the age opposed itself to the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, upon which the whole weight of Christian faith and hope, and the entire Christian conception of the world and of destiny, rest as upon their fulcrum and rock of certainty. The disbelief in bodily resurrection and the indifference to bodily sin manifested at Corinth had a common root. They may be traced to the false spiritualism, the contempt for physical nature, characteristic of the theosophy of the times, which gave rise a few years later to the Colossian heresy and was a chief factor in the development of Gnosticism. The teaching of chap. vi., that “your bodies are limbs of Christ,” and the command to “glorify God in your bodies,” are aimed against the same philosophical assumptions that are combated in chap. xv.; the demand for bodily purity finds in the doctrine of the resurrection its indispensable support and counterpart.

No reference is made in the Epistle to Church officers of any kind. Submission to “the house of Stephanas,” and to others rendering like service, is enjoined in xvi. 15 f., but by way of voluntary deference. So early as the first missionary journey in South Galatia Paul had assisted in the “appointing of elders in every Church” (Acts xiv. 23; cf. Acts xx. 17, I Thess. v. 12, Rom. xii. 8, Phil. i. 1). He had refrained from this step at Corinth for some specific reason—a reason lying, it may be supposed, in the democratic spirit of the Church, which might have ill brooked official control. In xii. 28 the Apostle alludes, however, to “governments” as amongst the things which “God set [as part of a plan, Hort] in the Church”; and his promise to “set in order other things” (beside the Lord’s Supper) when he comes (xi. 34) may cover the intention to remedy this defect, the consequences of which are painfully apparent (xiv. 26-33, etc.).
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This Epistle discloses the interior life of an apostolic Church; hence its surpassing historical interest. We must not, indeed, apply its data without qualification to contemporary Christian societies, even those of Gentile origin. The Corinthian Church presented material of uncommon richness, but intractable to the founder's hand. Its turbulence and party heat are unparalleled in the N.T. records. But while the Church life here portrayed was exceptional in some features, and Paul's Church policy at Corinth may have differed from that pursued elsewhere, this Epistle is peculiarly full in its teaching on the nature and rights of the Church, and in the light it throws upon the conditions under which the first Gentile-Christian communities were moulded. Chaps. xii. and xiii. are the true centre of the Epistle. The very formlessness of this Church, its rudimentary and protoplasmic state, reveals the essence of the Christian society, its substratum and vital tissue, as these can hardly be seen in a more developed and furnished condition. The Apostle Paul is contending for the bare life of the Church of God in Corinth.

Corinth now became the advanced post and gateway for Christianity in its westward march. The new Corinth, in which Paul laboured, dates from the year 46 B.c., when the city was refounded by Julius Cæsar under the name Colonia Julia Corinthus (or Laus Julii Corinthus). Just a century earlier the old Corinth had been razed to the ground by Lucius Mummius, upon the defeat of the Achaean league which, with Corinth for its fortress, made a last despairing effort to retrieve the liberties of Greece. Corinth and Carthage fell and rose again simultaneously, marking the epochs at which republican Rome completed the destruction of the old world and imperial Rome began the construction of the new. The fame of ancient Corinth, reaching back to heroic times (see the Iliad, ii., 570; Pindar, Olym., 13)—where "the sweetly breathing Muse" and "death-dealing Ares" flourished side by side—and her later prowess as the bulwark of the Peloponnesse and the maritime rival of Athens, were traditions with little interest or meaning for Paul and his disciples. The geographical position of Corinth gave to it enduring importance, and explains the fact that on its restoration the city sprang at once into the foremost rank. Corinth occupies one of the finest sites in Europe. With the Acrocorinthus (nearly 2,000 feet high) and the Oneion range shielding it on the south, it commands the narrow plain of the isthmus, and looks down, eastwards and westwards, upon the Saronic and Corinthian gulfs, which furnished the main artery of commerce between the Ægean and the Buxine seas on the one hand, and the Western Mediterranean upon the
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other. (See the descriptions in Stanley's Ep. to the Cor., p. 4, also article "Corinth" in Hastings' Bib. Dict.; and more at large, Leake's Morea, iii., 229-304, Curtius' Peloponnesus, ii., 514 f.; and for the antiquities, Pausanias, II., i., 2; Strabo, VIII., vi., 20-24; Dio Chrys., Orat., 37; AELius Arist., Ad Poseid.) The western port, Lechæum, 1½ miles distant, was linked by double walls to the city; Cenchreae lay 8½ miles eastwards; and a shipway, running north of Corinth, connected the two harbours.

The presiding deities of this maritime city were the sea-god Poseidon, under whose patronage the famous Isthmian games were held (see ix. 24 ff. and notes), and Aphrodité, whose temple crowned the Acrocorinthus. The cultus of Aphrodité (worshipped in her debasing form as Aphr. Pandemos) dates back, it is supposed, to prehistoric Phoenician times; its features were more Oriental than Greek—especially the institution of the ἱερόδοιολοι, or priestess-courtesans, of whom more than a thousand were attached to the shrine of the goddess. Temples of Serapis and Isis were also conspicuous at Corinth, representing the powerful leaven of Egyptian superstition that helped to demoralise the empire. The luxury and refinement of the elder Corinth were associated with its vice; so notorious was its debauchery that κορινθιάζεσθαι was a euphemism for whoredom; in our own literature "a Corinthian" still means a polished rake. By all accounts, the new Corinth more than rivalled the old in wickedness. Here the Apostle drew, from life, the lurid portraiture of Gentile sin that darkens the first page of his Epistle to the Romans. Within this stronghold of paganism and focus of Greek corruption Paul planted the cross of his Redeemer, rising out of his weakness and fear to a boundless courage. He confronted the world's glory and infamy with the sight of "Jesus Christ and Him crucified," confident that in the word of the cross which he preached there lay a spell to subdue the pride and cleanse the foulness of Corinthian life, a force which would prove to Gentile society in this place of its utter corruption the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. In "the Church of God in Corinth," with all its defects and follies, this redeeming power was lodged.
CHAPTER II.

PAUL'S COMMUNICATIONS WITH CORINTH.

Assuming 49 A.D. as the date of the conference in Jerusalem (Acts xv.), 57 as that of Paul's last voyage to the Holy City, we calculate that he arrived at Corinth first in the latter part of the year 50, closing his mission in 52. He was engaged in the interval, until the spring of 56, mainly in the evangelisation of the province of Asia (Acts xix. 10, 22, xx. 1 ff.). When he writes this letter the Apostle is still at Ephesus, intending to remain until Pentecost, and with Passover approaching (xvi. 8 f., v. 7 f.: see notes). Paul's departure from Ephesus was hastened by the riot (Acts xix. 23-xx. 1); and we may take it that this Epistle was despatched in the early spring of 56, very shortly before Paul left Ephesus for Troas in the course of his third missionary journey.

The Apostle had previously sent Timothy and Erastus forward to Corinth, by way of Macedonia, to prepare for his arrival, in pursuance of the plan now sketched in his mind for completing his work in these regions with a view to advancing upon Rome and the further west (Acts xix. 21 f., cf. Rom. xv. 16-25). Timothy is likely to arrive soon after this letter, and will be able to enforce its prescriptions (iv. 17; see also xvi. 10 f., and notes). Apollos, who had migrated to Corinth fresh from the instructions of Priscilla and Aquila in Ephesus and had "watered" there what Paul had "planted" (iii. 6, Acts xviii. 27 f.), is back again at Ephesus in the Apostle's company (xvi. 12); he is clear of complicity in the party quarrels with which his name was associated in Corinth (i. 12, iii. 4-8, iv. 6). Quite recently "the people of Chloë" have brought an alarming report of these "strifes" (i. 11); and the Apostle learns from general rumour of the case of incest polluting the Church

1 See article "Chronology of the N.T." in Hastings' Bib. Dict.; and for the latter date, article "Paul," i., 5. It is now generally recognised that the dates assigned to Pauline events by Wieseler and Lightfoot are, from 49 onwards, at least a couple of years too late.
(v. 1). More agreeable tidings have come with Stephanas and his companions (xvi. 17 f.), who bear a dutiful letter of inquiry addressed to Paul, which he answers in chap. vii. ff. Through their lips, as well as from the Church letter, he receives the assurances of the general loyalty and goodwill of the Corinthian believers. From all these sources occasion is drawn and material furnished for the writing before us.

This Epistle is not the first which Paul had addressed to Corinth. In chap. v. 9 the writer refers to an earlier letter forbidding intercourse with immoral persons. The terms of this admonition had raised debate. Some read it as though all dealings with vicious men were inhibited—a restriction that was as good as to tell Corinthian Christians to "go out of the world"! They could not imagine Paul to mean this; but his words allowed of this construction, and thus opened the door for discussion and for temporising. The tenor of the lost Epistle probably resembled that of 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 (see this Comm., ad loc.). This letter had arrived some months previously to our Epistle; for the Church had had time to consider and reply to it, and the condition of things to which it relates has undergone some changes. It may be referred as far back as the previous autumn (55 A.D.). Inasmuch as the Church-letter touched on "the collection for the saints" (xvi. 1: see note), it seems likely that the Apostle had made some appeal in the lost Epistle on this subject, eliciting a favourable reply (cf. 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2), but with a request for directions as to the mode of gathering the money.

There is reason to believe that Paul had himself visited Corinth not very long before writing the aforesaid letter. The allusions of 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, 20—xiii. 2 (see notes), imply that he had been twice in Corinth before the Second Epistle. If with Clemen (Chronol. d. Paulin. Briefe), Schmiedel (Handcomm., 1 and 2 Kor., Einleitung), and Krenkel (Beiträge s. Aufhellung d. Paul. Briefe, vi.) we could spread the composition of 1 and 2 Cor. over two years, space would be found for interposing such a visit between them, but at the cost of creating fresh and insuperable chronological difficulties. In 2 Cor. i. 15 ff. the Apostle defends himself for having failed to come recently to Corinth; he had sent Titus, and with him a letter (2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8)—distinct, as the present writer holds, from 1 Cor. (a second lost letter of Paul to Corinth: see Hastings' Bib. Dict., article "Paul," i. d.), and occasioned by an emergency that arose subsequently to its despatch—which gave a new turn to the Apostle's relations with the Church. Meanwhile he has himself left Ephesus (as contemplated in 1 Cor. xvi.), has pushed forward to Macedonia (2 Cor. ii. 12 f.), where at
last Titus meets him with the cheering news reflected in 2 Cor. i.-vii. As already shown, a space of but a few weeks elapsed between Paul's writing 1 Cor. and leaving Ephesus for Troas.

We have traced Paul's steps through the months separating the two Epistles, and neither time nor occasion is found for an interjected trip to Corinth. We are thrown back upon the period before the first Epistle. Yet 1 Cor. makes no express reference to any recent visit; and its silence, *prima facie*, negatives the supposition of any such occurrence. There are circumstances however which relieve this adverse presumption. For one thing, the *lost letter* had intervened; this other Epistle, not our 1 Cor., was the sequel of the visit in question. The main thing that occupied Paul's mind on that occasion, and which caused the "grief" referred to in 2 Cor. ii. 1, had been the impurity of life manifest within the Church. Against this he had given solemn warning, while forbearing discipline (2 Cor. xiii. 2). It was with a moral situation of this kind that the missing letter dealt (1 Cor. v. 9-12); the alarm it expressed is still felt in 1 Cor. vi., x., xv. 33 f. Meantime, the horrible case of incest has eclipsed previous transgressions; and while Paul reaffirms the general directions already sent and prompted (*ex hypothesi*) by personal observation, he fastens his attention upon the new criminality just brought to his ears. That previous meeting had been so unhappy for both parties that Paul might well avoid allusion to it; it was an experience he was resolved never to repeat (2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 20). If he comes again under like conditions, it will be "rod" in hand (1 Cor. iv. 21, 2 Cor. xiii. 2). His forbearance had been misconstrued; some of the offenders were emboldened to defy him, and his Judaistic supplanters subsequently contrasted the severity of his letters with his timidity in face of the mutineers (2 Cor. x. 6, xiii. 1-7)—a taunt which drags from him the allusions of the second Epistle. After all, 1 Cor. is not without traces of the second visit. Nothing so well accounts for the doubts of Paul's disciplinary power hinted in 1 Cor. iv. 18-21 as the encounter supposed. When after his threat, and while the plague grows in virulence (1 Cor. v.) and his opponents challenge him to come (iv. 18)—still more, when he has announced, while fulminating anathemas on paper (v. 4 f., xvi. 22), that his return is postponed, without any imperative reason given for delay (xvi. 5 ff.)—after all this, it is no wonder that even his friends felt themselves aggrieved, and that the most damaging constructions were put upon the Apostle's changes of plan (2 Cor. i. 15 ff., x. 9 ff., xiii. 3 ff.). At last he explains, in 2 Cor., that the postponement is due to his continued desire to "spare" instead of striking. If, notwithstanding these
apprehensions, Paul speaks in 2 Cor. i. 15 of the double visit that had been for a while intended (a third and fourth from the beginning) as "a second joy" (or "grace"), he is probably quoting words of the Church letter. Further, one detects in 1 Cor. iv. 1-10 a sharp note of personal feeling that indicates some recent contact between writer and readers, and ocular observation on the Apostle's part of the altered bearing of his spoilt children at Corinth. This Epistle manifests a mastery of the situation and a vivid realisation of its detailed circumstances such as we can best account for on the supposition that Paul had taken a personal survey of the development of the Church since his first departure, and that behind all he has heard latterly from others and seen through their eyes, he is also judging upon the strength of what he has himself witnessed and knows at first hand.
CHAPTER III.

THE TEACHING OF THE EPISTLE.

While the doctrine of the companion Epistles to the Galatians and Romans lies upon the surface, the theology of this Epistle has to be disentangled from a coil of knotty practical questions. The Apostle writes under constraint, unable to count on the full sympathy of his readers or to say all that is in his mind (ii. 6, iii. 1). Instead of giving free play to his own reflexions, he is compelled through the greater part of the letter to wait upon the caprices of this flighty young Greek Church. At first sight one fails to observe any continuous teaching in the Epistle; a doctrinal analysis of its contents seems out of place. But closer attention discovers a real coherence behind this disconnectedness of form. While Paul comments on the sad news from Corinth and answers seriatim the questions addressed to him, his genius grasps the situation, and the leaven of the Gospel all the while assimilates the discordant mass. The Pauline standpoint is firmly maintained. The Christian principle shows itself master of the Gentile no less than the Jewish field, and gives earnest of its power to meet the changeful and multiplying demands that will be created by its expansion through the world. There is a unity of thought in this letter as real as that stamped upon the Epistle to the Romans, a unity the more impressive because of the baffling conditions under which it is realised.

Paul's Gospel stands here on its defence against the pretensions of worldly wisdom and the corruptions of the fleshly mind; from the height of the Cross it sends its piercing rays into the abyss of pagan sin disclosed at Corinth in its turpitude and demonic force. Amongst the four Evangelical Epistles, this is the epistle of the cross in its social application. It bears throughout a realistic stamp. "The Church of God that exists in Corinth," the men and women that compose it, are constantly present to the writer's mind—their diverse states and relationships, their debasing antecedents and surroundings, their crude ideas and conflicting tempers and keen ambitions, their high religious enthusiasm and their low moral sensibilities, their
demonstrative but fickle affections and unsteady resolutions. Two things he strives to bring into full contact—Christ crucified and these half-Christianised Corinthian natures. What Romans does for the Gospel in the field of theological exposition, and Galatians in that of doctrinal polemic, and 2 Corinthians in that of personal experience and ministerial vocation, this 1 Corinthians has done in respect of its bearing upon human intercourse and the life of the community.

The foundation upon which Paul had built at Corinth is "Jesus Christ"—i.e., "Jesus Christ crucified" (iii. 11, i. 17 f., ii. 2, xv. 1-3). He does not, any more than in 1 Thessalonians, enter into an exposition of his λόγος τοῦ σταύρου. Not yet, in Corinth at least, had the legalists openly contested Paul's doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ; the first sketch of its argumentative defence appears in 2 Cor. v. 14 ff. The chief peril comes from the opposite quarter, from the dissolving influences of Hellenic scepticism and demoralisation. The form, rather than the contents, of Paul's message is just now in question; he is reproached with the μωρία του κηρύγματος (i. 18-25). But the form of presentation is determined by the substance of the truth presented; the cross of Christ cannot appear draped in the robes of Greek philosophy. The mere fact that it is "the word of the cross" convicts the Gospel of folly in the eyes of the Greek lover of wisdom, as of weakness before the Jewish believer in "signs". A "wise" world that knows not God (i. 21, ii. 6, 14, cf. Rom. i. 19-23) will not understand His message, until it learns its ignorance.

1. To the source of the Gospel must therefore be traced that scorn of the Corinthian world which so much troubles the Church. It was "the testimony of God" that Paul had first announced (ii. 1); the Corinthian believers are "of Him in Christ Jesus," and have learnt to worship God as "Father of us and of our Lord Jesus Christ" (i. 3, 26-31: observe the emphasis thrown in vv. 18-31 upon ο Θεός in contrast with ο κόσμος). Impotent and even absurd "the preaching of the cross" may appear to the Corinthian public; "to the saved" it is "the wisdom" and "the power of God".

(1) The λόγος τοῦ σταύρου is God's power at work in its most characteristic and sovereign energy, destined to shatter all adverse potencies (i. 27 ff., xv. 24 ff.). Veiled under a guise of weakness, it thus ensnares the world and exposes its folly (i. 19-21, ii. 6-8, iii. 19); it chooses for its instruments feeble and ignoble things to overthrow the mightiest. The power of God acting in this λόγος is administered by "our Lord Jesus Christ"—His mediator in the universe, and specifically in the Church (viii. 6)—whom the world crucified (ii. 8);
so that it is in effect the power of Christ, and "in Christ Jesus" men "come to be of God". God has made Him unto us "righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (i. 30, cf. vi. 11); with the "price" of His blood He "bought" us, the body not excepted, for God's property (i. 2, iii. 16, vi. 19 f.); from "the strength of sin" and the reign of death Christians are consciously delivered through the death, crowned by the resurrection, of the Lord Jesus and through faith in His name (xv. 1-4, 11, 17 f., 56 f.).

The Holy Spirit constitutes this mysterious power of God in operation. His "demonstration and power" attended Paul's mission to Corinth, giving it an efficacy otherwise unaccountable (ii. 1-6); all Christian revelations come by this channel (ii. 11-16). Only "in the Holy Spirit" does any man truly say, "Jesus is Lord" (xii. 3); "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God," the foulest sinners of Corinth had been "washed" and "sanctified" (vi. 11). The gifts possessed by this favoured Church are of the Spirit's "distribution," while of God's omnipresent "working" and held under Christ's dominion (xii. 4-11). The manifestations of the Spirit in the Gospel and in the Church differ from all forms of power the world has known; they reveal a kingdom rich in blessings such as "eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor man's heart conceived" (ii. 9 f.).

(2) The word of the cross discloses, to those who can understand, God's wisdom hitherto shrouded "in mystery," whose manifestation was determined for this epoch from the world's beginning (ii. 6-9). By it the pretentious "wisdom of the age" will be overthrown. The world scorns to be saved by a crucified Messiah, and "the natural man cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God"; but wisdom is justified of her children. Bringing such a message, the Apostle discards adornments and plausibilities of speech; his word must speak by its inherent truth and force (ii. 1 ff.). As Christian men advance, the revelation of God increasingly approves itself to them; it discloses its σοφία τοῖς τελείοις. No longer does the opinion of the world sway them nor its temper cleave to them, they become "men of the Spirit," who "judge all things" and are "judged of none" (ii. 6-iii. 3). One day they shall "judge the world" (vi. 2).

From the standpoint thus gained, in view of the operation of God in whatever belongs to the Gospel, the Apostle defines in chaps. iii. and iv. the position of Christ's ministers: "We are God's fellow-workers"; Paul the planter, Apollos the waterer—they are nothing; God "gives the increase". "Assistants of Christ, stewards of God's mysteries," their qualifications are fidelity and
the possession of the Master's mind (ii. 10, 16, vii. 25, 40). To their Lord, not to their fellow-servants, they are answerable. By His "call" and "compulsion" they serve the Gospel (i. 1, ix. 16 f., xii. 28). How presumptuous for the Corinthians to be "puffed up for one against the other" of God's servants! All alike are theirs, while they are Christ's and Christ is God's (iii. 4 f., 21-iv. 6). Let men look above the stewards to the Master, above the instruments to God who "worketh all things in all" (xii. 4 ff.). The Christian teachers are God's temple-builders; heavy their loss, if they build amiss; terrible their ruin, if instead of strengthening they destroy the fabric (iii. 10-17). Their maintenance is not bestowed by the Church as wages by an employer, but enjoined on the Church by the Lord's ordinance, upon the same principle of justice which allows the threshing ox to feed from the corn (ix. 7-12).

The readers must learn what it means to belong to "the Church of God". Despite their presumed knowledge (viii.), "ignorance of God" is at the root of their errors (xv. 34). Newly emancipated from heathenism, they are slow to realise the character and claims of the God revealed to them in Christ. The first four chapters seek at every point to correct this ignorance; indeed, this underlying vein runs through the Epistle (cf. in this respect 1 Thess. passim). Πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ is the maxim that Paul dictates to his readers (x. 31), and that governs his mind throughout the letter.

2. The nature of the Christian community is the subject of chaps. xii. and xiv., but it pervades the Epistle no less than that of the sovereign claims of God: "to the Church of God in Corinth" the Apostle writes.

The Græco-Roman cities at this time were honey-combed, in all grades of life, with private associations—trade-guilds, burial clubs and friendly societies, religious confraternities; their existence supplied a great social need, and formed a partial substitute for the political activity suppressed by the levelling Roman empire. These organisations prepared heathen society for Church life; and Christianity upon Gentile soil largely adopted the forms of combination in popular use, borrowing from the Greek club almost as much as from the Jewish synagogue. But it transformed what it borrowed. In the Churches of God established in Thessalonica and Corinth the first stones were laid of the Christian structure of society. New conceptions of duty and kinship are unfolded in this Epistle, which have yet to receive full development. Paul's sociology naturally met with resistance from men reared in Paganism; human nature is still against it. The Corinthians brought into the Church their
Greek contentiousness, their lack of loyalty and public spirit. The mental stimulus and large freedom of the new faith, where reverence and self-control were wanting, resulted for the time in greater turbulence rather than in a nobler and happier order.

(1) As we have seen, the Apostle insists above all that the Christian community is the building of God. Injury to this "temple of God" is the worst sacrilege (iii. 16 f.). The Church consists of those whom God has "called into the communion of His Son Jesus Christ" (i. 9); who "were, in one Spirit, all baptised into one body . . . all were made to drink of one Spirit"—"the Spirit that is from God" (ii. 12, xii. 13). This creative, informing Presence determines the nature, constitution and destiny of the Church.

(2) In relation to each other, Christian men form a brotherhood. Paul addresses his readers as "brethren" not by way of courtesy or personal friendliness, but to enforce upon them mutual devotion. Each Christian looks upon his fellow as "the brother for whom Christ died"; to "sin against the brethren" is "to sin against Christ" (viii. 11 ff.). By communion of faith and worship in Christ a union of hearts is created more intimate and tender than the world had ever seen. Christians are to each other as eye to ear and hand to foot (xii. 14 ff.). Each has his honourable place in the body, fixed by God; each is necessary to all, all to each (xii. 21-31). The rapturous outburst of chap. xiii. is a song to the praise of Love as the law of Christian brotherhood. Knowledge, faith, miracles are useless or unreal unless yoked to love, which points out the "way" to the right employment of every faculty (xii. 31). "The collection for the saints" of Jerusalem (xvi. 1) was dictated by the affection that binds the scattered parts of the Church of God.

(3) The relations of Christians to God the Father, and to their believing brethren, alike centre in their relationship to Christ: the Church is His body—"a κοινωνία of the Son of God" (i. 9). The whole consciousness of the new life—personal or corporate—is grounded there; ἐν Χριστῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν Κυρίῳ, is the Apostle's standing definition of Christian states and relations. To use Paul's strong expression (vi. 17), "he who is cemented to the Lord, is one spirit". By the fact that they severally inhere in Him, men are constituted "a body of Christ, and members individually" (xii. 27). No man in Christ is self-complete; the eye finds its mate in the hand, the head in the foot. This reciprocal subordination dictates the law of the life in Christ Jesus and controls all its movements. The Apostle claims to be himself ἐνομος Χριστοῦ, because he "seeks not his own profit but that of the many" (x. 21 ff.). The question of i. 13,
μεμέρισται δ Χριστός; reveals the radical mischief at work in Corinth. The Church was in the eyes of some of its members a kind of debating club or philosophical school, in which αἵρεσις and σχίσματα were matters of course; to others it was a benefit society, to be used so far as suited inclination and convenience. Against all such debased notions of social life, and selfish abuse of Church privilege, this Epistle is a sustained protest.

This fellowship of Christ is symbolised and sealed by the bread and cup of the Lord's Supper (x. 16 ff.)—the "one loaf" and "one cup" in which all participate, since it is a "communion of the body of Christ" and "of the blood of Christ". The "word of the cross" is made by this ordinance a binding "covenant in Christ's blood". The Christian Society is thus known as the fraternity of the Crucified; evermore it "proclaims the Lord's death, till He come" (xi. 26). Such fellowship in Christ, appropriating the whole man, the body with the spirit (vi. 15, 19), excludes ipso facto all intercourse with "the demons" and feasting at their "table" (x. 20 ff.); their communion is abhorrent and morally impossible to those who have truly partaken with Christ (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff.).

The introductory thanksgivings signally connects the κοινωνία τοῦ Χριστοῦ with His παρουσία. Hope is a uniting principle, along with faith and love (xiii. 13, cf. Eph. iv. 4). The Church of God is no mere temporal fabric. The "gold, silver, precious stones" of its construction will brave the judgment fires (iii. 12-15). "Those who are Christ's, at His coming," form the nucleus of the eternal kingdom of God (xv. 23-28). "The day" which reveals the completed work of Christ "will declare every man's work, of what sort it is"; each of Christ's helpers will then receive his meed of "praise from God," and the approved "saints," as Christ's assessors, will "judge the world" and "angels" (iii. 13, iv. 5, vi. 2 f.).

(4) The regulation of the charismata, the wealth and the embarrassment of this Church, is deduced from the above principles. These powers, however manifold, are manifestations of "the same Spirit," who inhabits the entire body of Christ and whose "will" determines the various endowments of its several members (xii. 7-11). They are distributed, as the bodily functions are assigned to their proper organs, for the service of the whole frame. The possessor, of one cannot dispense with, and must not despise, his differently gifted brother (xii. 14 ff.). Yet there is a gradation in the charisms; it is right to covet "the greater" among them. Love supplies the criterion; the most edifying gifts are the most desirable (xii. 31-xiv. 19). Self-restraint must be exercised by gifted persons, and
order enforced by the community, so that individual talents may be combined for the common good (xiv. 26-33). To the direction of these matters a manly practical sense must be applied; "the understanding" aids the service of "the spirit" (xiv. 14-20).

This charismatic ministry, diffused through the body of Christ, is the basis of all Christian agency. As yet there are only "functions, not formal offices" (Hort); the function is anterior to the office, and may exist without it. Each man in the Church of Corinth spontaneously speaks, sings, serves in whatever fashion (xiv. 26), in virtue of his χάρισμα,—the particular form which the common χάρις assumes in him for the benefit of others. The realisation of the life of Christ in the Christian Society is the aim imposed on each Christian by the Spirit whose indwelling makes him such.

3. The teaching of the Epistle takes a wide outlook in its consideration of the relations of the Christian to the world. This relationship is exhibited mainly on its negative side. The believer in Christ, "elect" and "sanctified" (i. 2, 27), built on the foundation of Jesus Christ into God's temple, is separated from the world. The Spirit he has from God makes him a πνευματικός; he has new faculties, and lives in a changed order of things. There are two worlds—a new world of the Spirit formed within the old κόσμος but utterly distinct from it, unintelligible to it, and destined soon to overthrow and displace it (i. 25-29, ii. 6-14, iii. 18 f., vii. 31).

(1) With the world's sin the Church of God holds truceless war. Living in the world, Christians cannot avoid contact with its "fornicators, extortioners," and the rest; but it can and must keep them out of its ranks (v. 9-13); the old leaven is to be "cleansed out" of the "new kneading," since Christ is our paschal lamb (v. 6-8). The sin of the world culminates in its idolatry; from this the Corinthians, unconditionally, must "flee" (x. 1-14).

(2) The Apostle recognises the natural order of life as one who sees through and beyond it. He cherishes, up to this date, the hope of his Lord's speedy return (xv. 51 f.). Hence the provisional character of his advices respecting marriage in chap. vii. He writes at a juncture of suspense, when men should keep themselves free from needless ties. He admits the necessity of marriage in the case of many Corinthians, and applies the law of Christ carefully to the mixed unions so troublesome at Corinth. He fears for his disciples the burdens imposed by domestic cares in times so uncertain, and in a society at war with the world. Christians may not "go out of the world," nor cease to "use" it; but they must hold it lightly and refrain from "using it to the full".
In discussing the question of the *idolothyla* Paul gives a glance to the more positive side of the Christian's relations with external nature. He recalls the attitude of the Old Testament towards earthly blessings by quoting, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof" (x. 28). The idols have no power to usurp God's creatures, nor to limit His children's use of them. An enlightened conscience will not scruple at the enjoyment of food sacrificed to an idol, though circumstances will often make this inexpedient (viii., x. 23 ff.). The Jewish distinctions of meat are obsolete (vi. 12 f.); it was in this sense that Paul had enunciated the much-abused maxim, "All things are lawful to me". The *σαρκικά* of life he enlists in the service of its *πνευματικά*; they serve to multiply and strengthen the bonds of mutual necessity arising from our kinship in Christ (ix. 7-12, cf. Rom. xv. 27, Gal. vi.).

In the relationship of man and woman the Apostle sees the natural and spiritual order blended; he passes from the one to the other with perfect congruity, and appeals to the teaching of "nature," expressed in secular customs of dress, as an exponent of the Divine will (xi. 1-15). While censuring the greed and arrogance displayed by the rich (xi. 17 ff.), he leaves distinctions of wealth and rank uncondemned; from the analogy applied in chap. xii. 13 ff. we infer that he viewed these as a part of "the fashion of this world," necessary but transient.

(3) Death, like sin which gives to it its "sting," belongs to the system of the present evil world. Since the resurrection of Christ, death is in principle "abolished" for those who are His (xv. 26, 55 ff.). The resurrection is no mere immortality of the spirit, such as philosophers conceived; it is the reversal of death, the recovery of the entire man from its power. Christ's people, to be sure, will not be reclad in mortal habiliments, nor resume the corpse that was laid in the grave. The new frame will differ from the old as the plant from its perished seed. Heavenly bodies must surpass earthly in unimaginable ways. Adam and Christ are types of two modes of being: in our present "natural body" we "wear the image" of the former; our future body will be "spiritual" after the image of God's Son (xv. 35-57).

This glorious and inconceivable change will supervene—for Christians living or departed alike (xv. 51 f.)—at "the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ," which the Corinthian Christians are awaiting (i. 7). This is "the end" of the course of revelation and of God's dealings with mankind—when Christ's redemption is complete, when His enemies throughout creation are overcome, and He
is able to lay at the Father's feet an empire wholly subdued and everywhere accordant with the Creator's will. Then "the Son Himself" will give the crowning example of submission, "that God may be all in all" (xv. 28). In this sublime issue the teaching of the Epistle culminates. The relation of the Church of Corinth to God, though marred upon its part yet real and sanctifying, which gave the Apostle his starting-point, has been unfolded in ever-widening circles, until it is seen to embrace the universe; there is formed within it the beginning of a Divine realm that stretches on into unknown worlds, and will bring all finite powers and beings under its sway.

Through this entire development of thought and life Christ is all things. His presence and lordship, the redeeming power of His cross, extend over every field within our view. They cover alike the relations of the individual man to God, of man to man within society, and of man, individually and collectively, to the world around him in the present and before him in the future. Christ is all in all, that through Him finally God may be all in all.
CHAPTER IV.


1. Language. "The dialect of these Epistles (1 and 2 Cor.) is not Hebraistic, but moves upon the lines of Hellenistic Greek. It finds its analogue, in a multitude of characteristics, in the language of Polybius, the classic of Hellenism, in Epictetus, in Plutarch, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and others, in such a way as to imply for it and them a common life-sphere" (Heinrici). Paul has become in this Epistle, more than elsewhere, τοις Ἑλλησιν Ἑλλην. Its atmosphere and colouring and movement are distinctively Greek of the period,—when compared, e.g., with the style of Romans or 2 Thessalonians. While Old Testament references are numerous in 1 Cor., they are employed by way of illustration rather than of proof, and in a Hellenistic not a Rabbinical manner.

The Epistle has a rich vocabulary. Out of the 5,594 Greek words of the New Testament it employs 963—103 peculiar to itself. In the hapax legomena one expects the idiosyncrasy of the Epistle to manifest itself. Sixty-eight of these—about two-thirds—are classical, occurring in Attic writers earlier than Aristotle; twenty-two belong to post-classical authors of the κοινή, or to the Greek of the contemporary inscriptions and papyri. In the residue there is one specifically Septuagint term, εἰδωλεῖον (viii. 10, see note); and the Aramaean sentence, μαράνθα. Eleven words are left, so far unknown from other documents, or used only by Christian writers after Paul— Dionysius, εὐπάρεδρος, ὀλοβρευτής, πιθός (ii. 4), περίψημα, συνζητητής, τυπικός, υπέρακμος, χοϊκός, χρηστεύομαι; but every one of these has close kindred or analogues in common Greek; it is likely enough that all were current in the speech of Corinth: εὐπάρεδρος however, with its transparent sense, has the look of a Pauline coinage. The forty-two additional words of 1 Corinthians (24 if the Pastorals be excluded) limited in their N.T. range to the Pauline Epistles— Pauline, but not First-Corinthian, h. lgg.—yield a similar analysis.

Out of the 150 words enumerated by Kennedy in his useful Sources of N.T. Greek (pp. 88-91) as "strictly peculiar to the LXX
or N.T.," with the forty or fifty added to this list by including Philo Judæus, twenty-five occur in this Epistle; but apart from Hebrew loan-words (such as πάσχα), and excluding near relations and correlates of recognised classical or post-classical words, there remains, after the researches of Deissmann (in his Bibelstudien and Neue Bibelstudien) and other students of the Greek inscriptions and papyri, only a handful, perhaps half a dozen of the twenty-five, that can be called properly and exclusively "Biblical"—a scanty residue which further discovery may diminish. So far as 1 Corinthians is concerned, we may dismiss, with Deissmann, "the legend of a Biblical Greek". What is said of the Greek character of the vocabulary holds good in general of the grammar of this Epistle. The idioms of Paul's epistolary style form a distinct subject, on which it is not necessary to enter here.

2. Text. The Greek Text of this Epistle stands on the same footing as that of the rest—all usually contained in the collected volume entitled Ο ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ. Eighteen of the twenty-three known Pauline uncial Codices belong to 1 Cor.: ΝΒΑΔΕΣΛ are complete; ΚΡΙΓΚΠ, approximately complete; Σ2 contains half, and ΗΓΙΩΣΜΩΞΠ fragments of the Epistle. ΝΒΑΚ were Codices of the whole New Testament; ΚΛΠΣ included the Acts and Catholic Ep., P the Apocalypse also. In point of date, ΒΝ belong to the fourth century; ΣΑΚΙΩ to the fifth century; DH to the sixth century; F5 to the seventh century; the rest to the ninth century. Amongst the numerous correctors of R, SS, of the seventh century, is important here as elsewhere. Σl (a palimpsest in the Vatican Library) and Σ2 (Athous Lauræ) are not yet critically edited or collated: see on these MSS., and for full details respecting the textual material, C. R. Gregory's Prolegomena to Tischendorf's N.T. Graece, ed. major. Out of the 480 catalogued minuscule (or cursive) MSS. of Paul few deserve attention. "The ancient elements" found in them "appear with extreme irregularity in different places of the Epistles," and Western readings in a remarkably small proportion (Westcott and Hort, Introd. to the N.T. in Greek, § 212). The most notable, and those oftenest cited below, are 17 (same as 33 of Gospels and 18 of Acts), 37 (Gospels 69, Acts 31, Rev. 14), 47 (Gospels 49)—all extending to viii. 10; and 67 ** (Acts 66, Rev. 34)—the marginal corrections of an ordinary cursive, which "include a relatively large number of very ancient readings," akin to those of Μ (W. H.); 71; 109 (Acts 96). The 265 numbered Lectionaries containing Acts and Epistles are but partially explored; none as yet appear of sufficient value to be regularly cited.
The ancient Versions are of fairly uniform character through the N.T. The most valuable are all available here, except the Curetonian Syriac confined to the Gospels.

From the fourth century onwards Patristic references to 1 Corinthians become numerous and full, and afford the critic greater help than in some other Epistles. But the definite and certain aid forthcoming from this quarter is less than might have been expected.

Considering the length of the Epistle, it contains few conspicuous textual difficulties, none of grave exegetical importance. Its text has been from the first carefully preserved. In the following conspectus of various readings all Greek words are spaced in which the Textus Receptus is emended by the note. Where the reading is doubtful, a query follows the alternative reading supplied in the notes—a query after the spacing indicating a reading more likely than not, a query without the spacing indicating a possible but less probable reading. Orthographical corrections occurring passim, which belong to the N.T. written dialect as this is represented by the five great uncials and exhibited in the standard N.T. Grammars, must be taken for granted throughout.

Excluding the numberless corrections of the kind just noticed and those concerning only points of grammar or the ordo verborum, there are more than 200 emendations which affect the sense of the Epistle. Chapters vii. 29, 33 f., xv. 51 are instances of special complication. The restoration of the true text in iii. 1, 4, iv. 2, vii. 3, xi. 29, xv. 47 brings out the finer edge of Paul's style. The Received Text of vi. 20 and vii. 5 contains ecclesiastical glosses; in iv. 6 and ix. 15 it has helped out Paul's anacolutha; its habit of extending the shorter names of Christ blunts his meaning—notably in ix. 1 and xvi. 22. The group of (liturgical?) additions to the genuine text in xi. 24 ff. deserves particular attention. Συνήθεια (viii. 7) and λεπόθυτον (x. 28) are interesting words restored by criticism. A few readings are noted in the digest which have little or no intrinsic worth, but are of interest in their hearing on the history of the text, especially where they illustrate the peculiarities of the "Western" tradition. One conjectural emendation is adopted, viz., that of Westcott and Hort in ch. xii. 2.

3. HISTORY OF THE EPISTLE. This is the first N.T. writing to be cited by name in Christian literature. "Take up," says Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (1 Ep., xlvii.), "the letter of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What was the first thing he wrote to you in the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth he wrote to you in the Spirit
touching himself and Cephas and Apollos, because even then you had formed factions." Like other post-apostolic writers, Clement shows an imperfect grasp of Pauline teaching, but his Salutation, with §§ xxiv., xxxiv. 8, xxxvii., xl., and lxxv. 2, bears unmistakable impressions of this Epistle. The Epistle of Barnabas (iv. 9-11, v. 6, vi. 5, xvi. 7-10; Hermas, Mand. iv. 4 (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 39); Ignatius, Ad Eph., xvi., xviii., Ad Rom., iv. 3, v. 1, ix. 2; Polycarp, Ad Phil., xi. 2, Ad Diognetum, xii. 5; the Didaché, i. 5, iii. 3, iv. 3, x. 6, etc., attest the use of this writing in primitive Christian times. From Irenæus onwards it is quoted as Holy Scripture. The Gnostics used it with predilection. The testimony of early Christianity to its Pauline authorship and Apostolic authority is unequivocal and full.

But our Epistle did not at first take a leading place among N.T. writings. Its influence has been "broken and fitful". It had little to say directly upon the questions (except that of the Resurrection) which chiefly interested the ante-Nicene Church. Tertullian, however, expounded it in his Adv. Marcionem; and Origen wrote annotations, partly preserved in Cramer’s Catena. In the fourth century, when "controversies on Church discipline and morals began to sway the minds of thoughtful men, this Epistle came to the front" (Edwards). Many of the Church leaders of that time wrote upon 1 Corinthians. Only fragments of the Greek commentators earlier than John Chrysostom (+407 A.D.) are extant; later expositors—the most notable, Theodoret (420 A.D.), Oecumenius (c. 950), Theophylact (1078)—built upon him; his versatile powers shine in the exposition of this Epistle. The Latin commentaries of Pelagius (for long ascribed to Jerome) and of Ambrosiaster (Hilary of Rome?) testify to the wide use of this Scripture in the West in the fourth and fifth centuries. To Thomas Aquinas we owe the only interpretation of value bequeathed by the Middle Ages. Though subordinated, like all mediaeval exegesis, to scholastic theology, his exposition contains fresh and vigorous thought.

Colet’s Oxford Lectures on this Epistle (A.D. 1496), and the N.T. Paraphrase of Erasmus (1519), breathe the new spirit of the Reformation, which brought 1 Corinthians to the front again, along with Romans and Galatians. The adjustment of liberty and order, the application of evangelical faith to secular life, the reconstitution of the Church with its sacraments and ministry started a multitude of problems calling for its aid. Calvin excelled himself in his interpretation of this Epistle, offending many of his followers by his breadth and candour. Estius, his Romanist contemporary, is no mean rival. Amongst the German Reformers, Melanchthon, W. Musculus, Bul-
linger handled this Epistle with effect. Beza's Annotationes, and especially his Latin translation, are always worth consulting. The illustrious Grotius—Arminian, humanistic, practical—found here a congenial subject. In the seventeenth century 1 Corinthians suffered another eclipse; no Commentary upon it of any mark appeared between the time of Grotius and Bengel. All later interpreters are Bengel's disciples.

This Epistle at present suffers no lack of attention. Beside the larger critical N.T. Commentaries of Germany—those of De Wette, Meyer (re-written, in 1 and 2 Cor., by Heinrici), v. Hofmann, the Handcommentar (Schmiedel), and the Kurtzgesammt (Schnedermann) —and Alford's great work in this country, the following are of special value: Billroth's Vorlesungen z. d. Briefen an d. Kor. (1833), Rückert's Der 1 Br. Pauli an d. Kor. (1836), Neander's Auslegung d. beiden Br. an d. Kor. (1859),—above all, Heinrici's Das erste Schilderung d. Ap. Paulus an d. Kor. (1880), a work rich in illustration of Greek thought and manners, and throwing new light on the social development of primitive Christianity. Godet's Commentaire sur la prem. ép. aux Corinthiens (1887 : transl. in Clarks' F. T. Libr.), though not his most successful exposition, is marked by his fine spiritual and literary qualities, and is full of instructive matter.

English scholars have addressed themselves zealously to 1 Corinthians, which interests them by its relations to the ethical and social questions of the time. A. P. Stanley (The Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians, 1855) has illuminated the historical and picturesque aspects of the Epistle, C. Hodge (American, 1857) its theological side. Beet tracks the thought of the Apostle with exceeding closeness, and presents it with concise force (Epistles to the Corinthians, 1882). Freshness and vivacity, with strokes of keen grammatical insight, distinguish the work of T. S. Evans in the Speaker's Commentary. Ellicott's interpretation (1887) is a model of exact and delicate verbal elucidation; no better book can be placed in the hands of a working Greek Testament student. The posthumous "Notes" of Lightfoot on chaps. i.-vii. (1895) are written with his ripe knowledge, balanced judgment, and sure touch. Edwards' Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1885) ranks with Heinrici's and Ellicott's as a classical piece of exegesis; it is strong both on the linguistic and philosophical side, and shows a rare power of luminous statement. M. Dods supplies, in The Expositor's Bible, a genial and masterly homiletic application. Hort's Christian Ecclesia and Knowling's Witness of the Epistles to Christ exhibit.
in the use they make of this document, its decisive bearing on questions of early Church History and Apologetics.

4. Criticism. Until quite recently the authenticity and integrity of 1 Corinthians were never doubted. The criticism of F. C. Baur and the Tübingen School left it standing as one of the “four undisputed Epistles”; Bruno Bauer’s attack (Kritik d. Paul. Briefe, 1851) was quite isolated. In Holland, however, a more radical criticism has arisen—whose exponents are Loman (Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1882-86), Pierson and Naber (Verisimilia, 1886), van Manen (Paulus, i., ii., 1890-91; and Prot. Kirchenseitung, 1882-86), Meyboom (Theol. Tijdschr., 1889-91); aided by Steck (Gal.-Brief, 1888) in Germany, and “Edwin Johnson” (Antiqua Mater, 1887) in England—which sweeps away these four with the rest, leaving nothing but morsels surviving of the genuine Paul. These scholars premise a slow development, along a single line, in early Christian thought. They claim to be the uniformitarians, as against the catastrophists, of Biblical science. The universalism with which Paul is credited, they set down as the final issue, reached in the second century, of the continued interaction of Judaic and Hellenic thought. In support of this view they point out numerous alleged contradictions within the four Epistles and the traces of various tendencies and times affording evidence of compilation, so reducing them to a many-coloured patchwork, the product of a century of conflict and hardly won progress. They attempt to prove the literary dependence of the four on post-Pauline writings, both within and without the New Testament. This theory presents no consistent shape in the hands of its advocates, and has been subjected to a destructive examination by Holtzmann and Jülicher in their N.T. Einleitungen (recent editions), by Lipsius (Romans) and Schmiedel (1 and 2 Corinthians) in the Handcomentar; also by Knowling in chap. iii. of his “Witness of the Epistles”. A sound exegesis is the best refutation of extravagances which are, in effect, the reductio ad absurdum of the Baurian method.

Another group of critics, maintaining the genuineness of the Corinthian Epistles in substance, desire to redistribute their contents. Hagge (Jahrbuch für prot. Theologie, 1876) finds four older documents behind the two; Völter (Theol. Tijdschrift, 1889) discovers three, making considerable excisions besides; Clemen, who discusses all the schemes of rearrangement in his Einheitlichkeit d. paul. Briefe (II., Die Corintherbr. : cf. Schmiedel in the Handcom., an d. Kor., Einleitung, ii.), dissects the canonical Epistles into five originals. These re-combinations are highly ingenious; Clemen’s
scheme, which is really piausible, substitutes a carefully marshalled topical order for the spontaneity and discursiveness of the true epistle. The hypotheses of reconstruction have no historical basis, no external evidence in their favour; their sole appeal is to internal probability. The actual 1 Corinthians vindicates its unity to the sympathetic reader who transports himself into the situation.

Other critics, again, who regard the reconstruction of the Epistle as needless or impracticable, see reason to eliminate certain passages as interpolations. Holsten (Das Evang. d. Paulus, 1., i., 1880), Baljon (De Tekst d. Brieven aan de Rom., Cor., en Gal., 1884), Bois (Adversaria critica de I. ad Cor.: Toulouse, 1887), are fertile in suggestions of this kind. Heinrici will not exclude the supposition of "improvements in detail, attempts [made by the first editors] to smooth over or supplement rough or defective passages of the Apostle, which criticism may be able to detect". Such insertions he finds in the Εγώ δε Χριστού of i. 12, and in xv. 56: so Schmiedel and Clemen in the latter place. We do not deny the abstract possibility of the Epistle having been "touched up" in this way; glosses such as those the Codices reveal in ii. 4, iv. 6, vii. 3, etc., for aught we know may have crept in before, as well as after the divergence of our extant witnesses. None, however, of the alleged "primitive corruptions" are made out convincingly,—except perhaps the transcriptional error which W. H. have detected in xii. 2. Some of these conjectures there will be occasion to notice in the course of the exposition.

**Analysis.** After the Introduction (i. 1-9), the body of the Epistle falls into six principal divisions, as follows: Div. I., The Corinthian Parties and the Gospel Ministry, i. 10-iv. 21; Div. II., Questions of Social Morals, v.-vii.; Div. III., Contact with Idolatry, viii.-xi. 1; Div. IV., Disorders in Worship and Church Life, xi. 2-xiv.; Div. V., The Resurrection of the Body, xv.; Div. VI., Business, News, and Greetings, xvi. Within these main Divisions, the matter is broken up for clearer elucidation into sixty short Sections, each furnished with a heading and prefatory outline.

**ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE EXPOSITION.**

acc. = accusative case.
act. = active voice.
adj. = adjective.
ad loc. = ad locum, on this passage.
adv., advl. = adverb, adverbial.
Al. = Alford's Greek Testament.
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aor. = aorist tense.
art. = grammatical article.
Bg. = Bengel's Gnomon Novi Testamenti.
Bm. = A. Buttmann's Grammar of the N.T. Greek (Eng. Trans., 1873).
c. = classical.
Cm. = John Chrysostom's Homiliae († 407).
comm. = commentary, commentator.
constr. = construction.
Cor. = Corinth, Corinthian or Corinthians.
Cr. = Cremer's Bibliico-Theological Lexicon of N.T. Greek (Eng. Trans.).
Cv. = Calvin's In Nov. Testamentum Commentarii.
dat. = dative case.
Did. = Didache of the Twelve Apostles.
diff. = difference, different, differently.
D. W. = De Wette's Handbuch s. N. T.
ecl. = ecclesiastical.
Ed. = T. C. Edwards' Commentary on the First Ep. to the Corinthians.
El. = C. J. Ellicott's St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians.
Er. = Erasmus' In N.T. Annotationes.
E. V. = English Version.
Ev. = T. S. Evans in Speaker's Commentary.
ex. = example.
exc. = except.
Ff. = Fathers.
fut. = future tense.
Gd. = F. Godet's Commentaire sur la prem. Ep. aux Corinthiens (Eng. Trans.).
gen. = genitive case.
Gm. = Grimm-Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T.
Gr. = Greek, or Grotius' Annotationes in N. T.
Heb. = Hebrew.
h. l. = hapax legomenon, a solitary expression.
Hn. = C. F. G. Heinrici's Erklärung der Korintherbriefe (1880), or 1 Korinther in Meyer's krit.-exegetisches Kommentar (1896).
impf. = imperfect tense.
impv. = imperative mood.
ind. = indicative mood.
indir. = indirect.
inf. = infinitive mood.
interr. = interrogative.
Lidd. = Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon.
The ordinary contractions are employed in the textual notes. Other abbreviations will explain themselves. The references in the marginal parallels and textual notes are made to the Greek Text of the O.T.; in the Commentary, to the English text, unless otherwise stated.
ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ
Η ΠΡΟΣ
ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΤΣ
ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΡΩΤΗ.¹

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ, διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, καὶ Σωθῆναι ἀδελφοῦ, ἑτεροτρόπως Ρωμ., Θεού τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς Οὔης, τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς Οὔης.

1 The oldest form of Title, in ΝΑΒΟ, is ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΤΣ ΠΡΩΤΗ. This was gradually extended as the epp. came to be treated as separate books. FG read ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΤΣ ΠΡΩΤΗ. The title of the T.R. and A.V. comes from Bz. and Elzevir, without MS. authority.

2 Χριστοῦ Ιησοῦ (?) in BDG, vg. (older copies), Chr., Ambrst., Aug.: the Western reading. Ιησοῦ τῆς Θεοῦ, ΠΑΛΤΑΣ, etc., cop. syrr., Cyril. and Syriam. W.H. mark the group BDG as untrustworthy; but Pauline usage speaks for it. L. I. in the certain reading in other Addresses where this combination occurs, exc. Rom. and Tit. The Eds. are doubtful; Tisch., Al., Tr., Nestle, prefer X. I.; W.H., Χ. I. in text, Χ. I. in margin.

THE INTRODUCTION. § 1. The Title and Salutation, i. 1-3. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΤΣ (so in Rom.)—not ap. by merit or human choice, but called thereto διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ (so in later epp.), through an express intervention of the Divine will, cf. ix. 16 f., Gal. i. 15 f., Eph. iii. 2 f., also Acts ix. 15, etc. “A called apostle” as the Cor. are “called saints”: he summoned to be herald and dispenser (17, 23, iv. 1), their receivers of God’s Gospel (26-31). The κλητοί are in P. identified with the ἐκλεκτοί (26 f., Rom.
Ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἡ ἡγιασμένοι "ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ," κλητοίς "ἄγιοι," σύν εὐνοοῦντες τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητοῖς "ἀγίοις" επικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιον, 29, Ἰο. xvii. 17.

f2 Cor., Eph., Ph., Col., Acts ix. 13, etc. Το ματαίον τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Christ Jesus: Church status is grounded on personal relationship to God in Christ. Now this relationship began with God's call, which summoned each to a holy life within the Christian fellowship; hence the further apposition, αὐτοῖς ἀγίοις (see note on εις, and Rom. i. 7; cf. Acts xviii. 10, λαὸς ἐστίν μοι πολὺς κ.τ.λ.). The pf. pass. ptp. expresses a determinate state: once for all the Cor. readers have been devoted to God, by His call and their consent. This initial sanctification is synchronous with justification (vi. 11), and is the positive as that is the negative side of salvation: ἐκκλησία ἡγιασμένη. The verb "λαῷς" (anaptychos) αὐτοῖς (see note on εις, and Rom. i. 7; cf. Acts xviii. 10, λαὸς ἐστίν μοι πολὺς κ.τ.λ.). The pf. pass. ptp. expresses a determinate state: once for all the Cor. readers have been devoted to God, by His call and their consent. This initial sanctification is synchronous with justification (vi. 11), and is the positive as that is the negative side of salvation: ἐκκλησία ἡγιασμένη.

Ver. 2. ἡ εἰκήσει τοῦ Θεοῦ (in salutation of 1 and 2 Cor. only) gives supreme dignity to the assembly of Cor. addressed by the Απ. of Christ Jesus—the assembled citizens of God's kingdom and commonwealth (Eph. ii. 12, 19; cf. Tit. ii. 14, 1 Peter ii. 9 f.). Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Κορ., "that exists in Corinth."—letum et ingens paradoxon (Bkg.): so far the Gospel is arrested (2 Cor. x. 13 f.); in so foul a place it flourishes! (vi. 11 f.). Not as earlier, "the assembly of Thessalonians," etc.: the conception of the ecclesia widens; the local Christian gathering is part of one extended "congregation of God," existing in this place or that (see last clause). Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τ. Θεοῦ is aspowed, by way of predicative definition (hence anarthrous), ἡ ἡγιασμένοι "ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ," "the Church of God (consisting of men) sanctified in Christ Jesus": Church status is grounded on personal relationship to God in Christ. Now this relationship began with God's call, which summoned each to a holy life within the Christian fellowship; hence the further apposition, αὐτοῖς ἀγίοις (see note on εις, and Rom. i. 7; cf. Acts xviii. 10, λαὸς ἐστίν μοι πολὺς κ.τ.λ.). The pf. pass. ptp. expresses a determinate state: once for all the Cor. readers have been devoted to God, by His call and their consent. This initial sanctification is synchronous with justification (vi. 11), and is the positive as that is the negative side of salvation: ἐκκλησία ἡγιασμένη.

The adjunction συν πάσιν . . . τοῖς may qualify ἡγιασμένοις κ.τ.λ. (so some moderns), or the main predicate (Gr. Ff.): i.e., the Church shares (a) in its Christian sanctity, or (b) in the Apostle's good wishes, "with all that can appertain to the name," etc. (b) gives a better balanced sentence, and a true Pauline sentiment: cf. Eph. vi. 24, also the Benediction of Clem. Rom. ad Cor., Ἴου ἐν πάντι τῷ τόπῳ, an expression indefinitely large (see par.); approaching "in all the world" of Rom. i. 8, Col. i. 6;
3-5. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ

εν παντί τοπίω, καί ἡμών· 3. χάρις ὑμίν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ

πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

4. Εὐχαριστοῦ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ μοι πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, εἰς τῇ χάριτι
tοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ δοθείσιν ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 5. οὕτων εἰς παντὶ

and other Pauline Salutations; cf., however, 1 and 2 Tim., 1 and 2 Pet., m xiv. 18; Rom. i. 8; Ph. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Th. i. 2; Phm. 4. n Twelve times in P.; in Jas. iv. 6 besides.

there is nothing here to indicate the limit given in 2 Cor. i. 1. The readers belong to a widespread as well as a holy community; Paul insists on this in the sequel, preeoming in reproof to "other churches". To "call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ"—to invoke Him in prayer as "Lord"—is the mark of the Christian, by which Saul, e.g., once recognised his victims (see parl.), the index of saving faith (xii. 3, Rom. x. 12 ff.). The afterthought αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν, correcting the previous ἡμῶν (Cn., Cv., Gd., Sm.), heightens the sense of wide fellowship given by the previous clause; "one Lord" (viii. 6; Rom. x. 12, xiv. 9, Eph. iv. 5) unites all hearts in the obedience of faith. To attach these pronouns to τόπω (in omni loco ipsorum et nostro, Vg.) gives a sense strained in various ways: "their place and ours,"—belonging to us equally with them (Mr., El., f.d.); "illorum (prope Cor.), nostro (ubi P. et Sosth. versa bantur," Βg.); in non-Pauline and Pauline Churches (Hn.); and so on.

Ver. 3. χάρις ὑμίν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.: Paul's customary greeting; see note on Rom. i. 7. "The occurrence of the peculiar phrase grace and peace in Paul, John, and Peter intimates that we have here the earliest Christian password or symbolum" (Ed.). κυρίου might grammatically be parl. to ἡμῶν, both depending upon πατρός, as in 2 Cor. i. 3, etc.; but 1 and 2 Thess. i. 1 (Θεοῦ πατρὶ κ. Κυρίῳ Ἰ. Χ.) prove Father and Lord in this formula to be parl.: cf. vii. 6, 2 Cor. xii. 13; nowhere does P. speak (as in John xx. 17) of God as Father of Christ and of men co-ordinately, and for ἡμῶν to come first in such connexion would be incongruous.

"The union of" Θεοῦ and Κυρίου "under the vinculum of a common prp. is one of the numberless hints scattered through St. Paul's epp. of the conscientiously felt and recognised co-ordination" of the Father and Christ (El.).

§ 2. The THANKSGIVING, i. 4-9. The Pauline thanksgiving holds the place of the captatio benevolentiae in ancient speeches, with the diff. that it is in solemn sincerity addressed to God. The Ap. thanks God (1) for the past grace given the Cor. in Christ, ver. 4; (2) for the rich intellectual development of that grace, according with the sure evidence upon which they had received the Gospel, and attended by an eager anticipation of Christ's advent, vv. 5-7; (3) for the certainty that they will be perfected in grace and found unimpeached at Christ's return—a hope founded on God's fidelity to His own signal call, vv. 8 f. Paul reflects gratefully on the past, hopefully on the future of this Church; he is significantly silent respecting its present condition: contrast with this the Thess. and Phil. Thanksgivings. He extracts from a disquieting situation all the comfort possible.

Ver. 4. On εὐχαριστοῦ κ.τ.λ. and the form of Paul's introductory thanksgivings, see Rom. i. 8. εἰς τῇ χάριτι κ.τ.λ. —εἰς (at), of the occasioning cause; cf. xiii. 6, xiv. 16, etc. τ. δοθείση, like (aor. ptp.)—"the grace that was given you," sc. at conversion (see 6); contrast the pr. ptp. of continuous bestowment in xv. 57, and the pf. of abiding result in 2 Cor. vi. 1. For εἰς Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, see note on ver. 2. P. refers not to the general objective gift of grace in Christ (as in Rom. viii. 32), nor to its eternal bestowment in the thought of God (as in 2 Tim. i. 9), but to its actual conferment at the time when the Cor. became God's κλητοί ἄγιοι (2).

Ver. 5. δι' εἰς κ.τ.λ. stands in explicative apposition to the foregoing τ. χάριτι τ. δοθείση, bringing out the matter of thanksgiving eminent in the conversion of the Cor.—"(I mean), that in every-
thing you were enriched," etc. For this
defining оτί after a νbl. noun, cf. νer. 26
and 2 Cor. i. 8. The affluence of en-
dowment conferred on the Cor. stirred
the Apostle's deep gratitude(cf. 7, 2 Cor.
viii. 9): this wealth appears in another
light in i. 6-10, vii. 1-3; see also
Introd., p. 730 f. The Church doubtless
dwelt upon this distinction in its recent
letter, to which P. is replying. εν παντί
is defined, and virtually limited, by εν
παντί λόγω και πάση γνώσει (kindred
gifts, linked by the single prp.): the
exuberance of grace in the Cor. shone
"in all (manner of) utterance and all
(manner of) knowledge". λόγος in this
connexion signifies not the thing said
(as in 18), but the saying of it, loquendi
facultas (Bz.). "Relatively to γνώσις,
λόγος is the ability and readiness to say
what one understands; γνώσις the power and
ability to understand" (Hn.). "Knowledge"
would naturally precede, but the
Cor. excelled and delightedin "speech"
above all: see ii. 1-4, 13, vii. 1-3; see also
Acts xviii. 5-11.

Ver. 6. του Χριστοῦ is objective gen.
to το μαρτύριον —"the witness to Christ,"
—coming from both God and man (xv.
3-11, 2 Thess. i. 10); otherwise in ii. 1; cf.
Rom. i. 2, "the good news of God
about His Son". μαρτύριον indicates
the well-established truth of the message
(see, e.g., xv. 15), ευαγγέλιον its beneficent
and redemptive aspect (see rom. i. 16 f.).
Δέβεβαιωθή ἐν ὑμῖν, "(the witness about
Christ) was made sure among you"; its
reality was verified. By outward de-
monstration—miracles, etc.—or by the
inner persuasion of a firm faith, "intera
Spiritus virtus" (Cv.)? The latter cer-
tainly, in Pauline usage (see parl.; but
not to the exclusion of the former); cf. ii.
4 f. and notes; xii. 10, ἀνερχόμενοι
δυνάμεως; also i Thess. i. 5 f., ii. 13,
Gal. iii. 5; the two went together
—πολλών θαυμάτων, αφάντων χάριτος
(Cm.). At first discouraged, Paul had
preached at Cor. with signal power, and
his message awakened a decided and
energetic faith, see ii. 1-5, xv. 1, 11;
Acts xviii. 5-11.

Ver. 7 describes the result of the firm
establishment of the Gospel: δόθη ὑμῖν
μὴ διατεθῆ προς γις (δόθη with inf. of
contemplated result: see Bn. §§ 369 ff.),
"causing you not to feel behindhand in
any gift of grace"; the mid. διατεθῆ
implies subjective reflection, the con-
sciousness of inferiority (Ev.): similarly
in Rom. iii. 23, "find themselves short of
the glory of God" (Sanday and Headl.); and
in Luke xv. 14, "he began to feel his
destitution". The pr. inf. and ptp. of the
vbs. bear no ref. to the time of writing;
their time is given by the governing
δέβεβαιωθή: the strong assurance with
which the Cor. embraced the Gospel
was followed by a shower of spiritual
energies, of which they had a lively
sense. Α χάρισμα (see parl.) is χάρις
in some concrete result (see Cr. s. ν.),—
a specific endowment of (God's) grace,
whether the fundamental charism, em-
bracing all others, of salvation in Christ
(Rom. v. 16), or, e.g., the special and in
dividual charism of continence (vii. 7). No
curch excelled the Cor. in the
variety of its endowments and the satis-
faction felt in them. Chaps. xii.—xiv.
enumerate and discuss the chief Cor.
χαρίσματα, setting ἁγία in their
midst; ethical qualities are included
under this term, xv. 8 f.—ἀπεδεχόμεν-
οις τ. ἀποκάλυψιν κ.τ.λ., "while you
eagerly awaited (or eagerly awaiting, as you did) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The vb. is one of P.'s characteristic intensive compounds (see parls.). The anarthrous pr. ptp. implies a continuous state conditioning that of the foregoing clause: the unstinted plenty of Divine gifts continued while the recipients fixed their thought upon the day of Christ; xν. Ι2, 33 f. show that this expectation had been in many instances relaxed. Rom. viii. and Col. iii. (also 1 John ii. 28-iii. 3) illustrate the bearing of faith in the παρουσία on Christian character; cf. Matt. xxv., Luke xii. 32 ff., etc. It is an απόκαλυψις, an "unveiling" of Christ that the Cor. looked for; since although they are "in Christ," still he is hidden (Col. iii. 3 f.); His presence is a mystery (Col. i. 27, Eph. v. 32). "Παρουσία" denotes the fact of Christ's (future) presence, ανάφέρεται its visibility" and splendour," απόκαλυψις its inner meaning" (Ed.); φανέρωσις (it might be added: Col. iii. 4) its open display. The Cor. were richly blessed with present good, while expecting a good fare exceeding it: "a tacit warning against fancied satisfaction in the present" (Gd.: cf.iv.8).

Ver. 8. δς και βεβαιώσει υμάς echoes ἔβεβαιώθη (6); cf. the thanksgiving of Phil. i. 6. τωι τέλοιι (see parls.) points to a consummation, not a mere termination of the present order; cf. Rom. vi. 21 f. δι᾽ θελήματος Θεού (I, see note), and δι᾽ου . . . το πάντα (of God, Rom. xi. 36); similarly in Gal. iv. 7: God had manifestly interposed to bring the Cor. into the communion of Christ (see, further, 26-28); His voice sounded in the ears of the Cor. when the Gospel summons reached them (cf. 1 Thess. ii. 13). Christ (8) and God are both therefore security for the perfecting of their Christian life. 

—God's accepted call has brought the readers εις κοινωνίαν του ιδίου αυτού Ιησού Χριστού του Κυρίου ἡμῶν—i.e., not "into a communion (or partnership) with His Son Jesus Christ our Lord" (nowhere else has this noun an objective
The κοινωνία τ. υιού is the same, both in content and constituency, as the κοινωνία τ. πνεύματος (see xii. 13, 2 Cor. xiii. 13, Phil. ii. 1, Eph. iv. 4-6). Its content—that which the Cor. share in—is ηζονσία to God, since it is “a communion of His Son,” with Christ for “first-born among many brethren” (Rom. viii. 29 f.; cf. Heb. ii. 10-16), and consequent ήζονσία to God (Rom. viii. 17, Gal. iii. 26-iv. 7). The title “our Lord,” added to “His Son Jesus Christ,” invests the Christian communion with present grandeur and certifies its hope of glory; Christ’s glory lies in His full manifestation as Lord (κν. 25, Phil. ii. 11), and its glorification is wrapped up in His (2 Thess. i. 12, ii. 14; also 1 Thess. ii. 12). Ver. 9 sustains and crowns the hope expressed in ver. 8. For κοινωνία, see further the notes on x. 16 f.

DIVISION I. THE CORINTHIAN PARTIES AND THE GOSPEL MINISTRY, i. 10-iv. 21. Paul could not honestly give thanks for the actual condition of the Cor. Church. The reason for this omission at once appears. The Church is rent with factions, which ranged themselves under the names of the leading Christian teachers. On the causes of these divisions see Introduction, Chap. i. Out of their crude and childish experience (iii. 1-4) the Cor. are constructing prematurely a γνώσις of their own (viii. 1, see note), a σοφία resembling that “wisdom of the world” which is “foolishness with God” (18 ff., 30, iii. 18 f., iv. 9 f.); they think themselves already above the mere λόγος του σταυροῦ brought by the Ap., wherein, simple as it appeared, there lay the wisdom and the power of God. This conceit had been stimulated, unwittingly on his part, by the preaching of Apollos. Ch. iii. 3-7 shows that it is the Apollonian faction which most exercises Paul’s thoughts at present; the irony of i. 18-31 and iv. 6-13 is aimed at the partisans of Ap., who exalted his υπεροχή λόγου κ. σοφίας in disparage-ment of Paul’s unadorned πάραγμα τοῦ σταυροῦ. Mistrusting the nature of the Gospel, the Cor. mistook the office of its ministers: on the former subject they are corrected in i. 18-ii. 5 showing in what sense and why the Gospel is not, and in ii. 6-iii. 2 showing in what sense and to whom the Gospel is a σοφία; the latter misconception is rectified in iii. 3-iv. 21, where, with express reference to Ap. and P., Christian teachers are shown to be no competing leaders of human schools but “fellow-workers of God” and “servants of Christ,” co-operative and complementary instruments of His sovereign work in the building of the Church. The four chapters constitute an apologia for the Apostle’s teaching and office, paral. to those of 2 Cor. x.-xiii. and Gal. i.-iii.: but the line of defence adopted here is suited distinct. Here Paul pleads against Hellenising lovers of wisdom, there against Judaising lovers of tradition. Both parties stumbled at the cross; both judged of the Ap. κατά σάρκα, and fastened upon his defects in visible prestige and presence. The existence of the legalist party at Cor. is intimated by the cry, “I am of Cephas,” and by Paul’s words of self-vindication in ix. 1 f.; but this faction had as yet reached no considerable head; it developed rapidly in the interval between i and 2 Cor. § 3. THE REPORT ABOUT THE PARTIES, AND PAUL’S EXPOSTULATION, i. 1-17. Without further notice, the Apostle warns the Cor. solemnly against their schisms (το), stating the testimony on which his admonition is based (ττ). The four parties are defined out of the mouths of the Cor. (τ2); and the Ap. protests esp. against the use of Christ’s name and of his own in this connexion (τ3). In founding the Church he had avoided all self-exaltation, bent only on fulfilling his mission of preaching the good news (π4-τ7a).

Ver. το. “But I exhort (appeal to) you, brothers:” the reproof to be given stands in painful contrast (§8) with the Thanksgiving. It is administered “through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,” which the Ap. has invoked so often (see note on 8); all the authority and grace of the Name reinforce his appeal, “that you say the same thing,
ματα, ητε δε ι κατηρτισμον διεν τα αυτην νοτ και δε τα αυτη
γνωμη. Προσ Κορινθιους αν τω αυτω νοια επ τη αυτη
χλης διεν εριδες εν ομιν ειρι. 12. λεγεν δε τουτο δι εκατος
ομιν λεγει, "Εγει μεν ειμι Παυλου," "Εγει δε ι Απολλωνας," "Εγει δε

In the first instance, Paul is saying, "I am of Paul," instead of "say each of you, I am of Paul," etc. (12). The use of the term "κατηρτισμόν," a strictly classical expression used of political communities which are free from factions, or of different states which entertain friendly relations with each other (Lt.). The appeal made implies a serious charge; now the authority for it: "For it has been signified to me about you, my brothers, by the (people) of Chloe." — Εδηλωθη (see par.). implies definite information, the disclosure of facts. — Οι Χλόης, "persons of Chloe's household"—children, companions, or possibly slaves (cf. Rom. xvi. 10): there is nothing further to identify them. "Chloe is usually considered a Cor. Christian, whose people had come to Eph.; but it is more in harmony with St. Paul's discretion to suppose that she was an Ephesian known to the Cor., whose people had been at Cor. and returned to Eph." (En., Ηf.). "Chloe's people" are distinct from the Cor. deputies of xvi. 17, or Paul would have named the latter here; besides, Stephanas was himself the head of a household. — Χλόη (Verdure) was an epithet of the goddess Demeter, as Φοίβη of Artemis (Rom. xvi. 1): such names were often given to slaves, and C. may have been a freedwoman of property (Lt.). "That strifes exist amongst you" was the information given: these έριδες, the next ver. explains, were generating the σχίσματα (see note on 10).

Ver. 12. "But I mean this (τουτο δε λγω), that each one of you is saying (instead of your all saying the same thing, το) but I of Paul's man,'—'But I of Apollos,'—'But I of Cephas,'—'But I of Christ!'—κατηρτισμον, distributive, as in xiv. 26: each is saying one or other of these things; the party cries are quoted as from successive speakers challenging each other.

The question of the FOUR COR. PARTIES is one of the standing pro-

Ver. 11. The appeal made implies a serious charge; now the authority for it: "For it has been signified to me about you, my brothers, by the (people) of Chloe." — Εδηλωθη (see par.) implies definite information, the disclosure of facts. — Οι Χλόης, "persons of Chloe's household"—children, companions, or possibly slaves (cf. Rom. xvi. 10): there is nothing further to identify them. "Chloe is usually considered a Cor. Christian, whose people had come to Eph.; but it is more in harmony with St. Paul's discretion to suppose that she was an Ephesian known to the Cor., whose people had been at Cor. and returned to Eph." (En., Ηf.). "Chloe's people" are distinct from the Cor. deputies of xvi. 17, or Paul would have named the latter here; besides, Stephanas was himself the head of a household. — Χλόη (Verdure) was an epithet of the goddess Demeter, as Φοίβη of Artemis (Rom. xvi. 1): such names were often given to slaves, and C. may have been a freedwoman of property (Lt.). "That strifes exist amongst you" was the information given: these έριδες, the next ver. explains, were generating the σχίσματα (see note on 10).

Ver. 12. "But I mean this (το� δε λγω), that each one of you is saying (instead of your all saying the same thing, το) but I of Paul's man,'—'But I of Apollos,'—'But I of Cephas,'—'But I of Christ!'—κατηρτισμον, distributive, as in xiv. 26: each is saying one or other of these things; the party cries are quoted as from successive speakers challenging each other.

The question of the FOUR COR. PARTIES is one of the standing pro-
In this sense, vii. 34; Mt. xvii. 25 f.; 3 Kings xvi. 21. r x. 2; Gal. iii. 57; Mt. xviii. 19; Acts viii. 16, xix. 3 f.

I Thd. 168, ad loc.: τούτο τίνες αποφαντικός έκερακατέργησαν, εγώ δὲ αυτὸ κατ’ ερμηνείαν προσάλεις. Αμβρστ. interprets affirmatively; so Lachm. and W. H. text, R.V. marg. See note below.

*τεμπε* in BD* (hence W. H. marg.); all other Codd. *τεμπ*.

blems of N.T. criticism. It is fully examined, and the judgments of different critics are digested, by Gd. *ad loc.*; see also Mr.-Hn., *Einleitung*, § 3; Weiss' *Manual of Introd. to the N.T.*, § 19. After all, this was only a brief phase of Church life at Cor.; P. had just heard of it when he wrote, by the time of 2 Cor. a new situation has arisen. The three first parties are easy to account for: (1) The body of the Ch., converted under P.'s ministry, adhered to its own apostle; P. valued this loyalty and appeals to it, while he condemns its combative expression,—the disposition of men "more Pauline than Paul himself" (Dods) to exalt him to the disparagement of other leaders, and even to the detriment of Christ's glory. (2) Apollos (cf. Acts xviii. 24 ff.) had preached at Cor., in the interval since P.'s first departure, with brilliant effect. He possessed Alexandrian culture and a graceful style, whereas P. was deemed at Cor. ἵππος τοῦ λόγου (2 Cor. xi. 6). Some personal converts Ap. had made; others were taken with his genial method, and welcomed his teaching as more advanced than P.'s plain gospel-message. Beside the more cultured Greeks, there would be a sprinkling of liberally-minded Jews, men of speculative bias imbued with Greek letters, who might prefer to say *Εγώ Ἀπολλώ* (Acts xxviii. 19). The Christ-party of this place plumed themselves, at most, on being *His* disciples (rather than P.'s, etc.): the coincidence is verbal rather than real. Upon Baur's theory, there were *two* parties at Cor., as everywhere else in the Church, diametrically opposed—a Gentile-Christian party, divided here into Pauline and Apollonian sections, and a Jewish-Christian party naming itself from Κηφάς or Christ as occasion served. Later scholars following Baur's line of interpretation, distinguish variously the Petrine and Christine Judaists: (a) Weizsäcker associates the latter with *James*; (b) Reuss and Bayschlag see in them strict followers of *the example and maxims* of *Jesus* as the *διὰ κανών περιτομής*, from which Peter in certain respects deviated; (γ) Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Haurath, Sm., think they had been in *personal relations* with *Jesus* (it is quite possible that amongst the "five hundred" of xv. 5 some had wandered to Cor.); (δ) Gd. strangely conjectures that
13-16.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

14. εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι οὐδένα ὠμῶν εὐβαπτίσα, εἰ μὴ Κρίσπον καὶ Γάιον. 15. Ἰνα μὴ τις εἰπῇ ὅτι 'εις τὸ ὄμων ὄνομα ἐν εὐβαπτίσα. 16. ἐν εὐβαπτίσαι δὲ καὶ τὸν Στεφάνον ὁ Λουκᾶς.

1 Νοβ. 67**, with Chr. and Dam. (in comment.), om. τῷ Θεῷ. A strong group of witnesses; paras. suggested to copyists the inserted words.

2 ABC*, 67**, and several good minusc., read εὐβαπτίσαθε; instead of εὐβαπτίσα, as in C-DGLP, etc.,—Western and Syrian reading, conformed to context.

3 εὐβαπτίσα replaces first εὐβαπτίσει in D*G, and second also in D*.

"they were Gnostics before Gnosticism, who formulated their title οἱ Χριστοῦ, after the fashion of Cerinthus, in opp. not merely to the names of the apostles, but even to that of "Jesus is anathema". He identifies them with the men who cried "Jesus is anathema" (xiv. 2: see note). This notion is an anachronism, and has no real basis in the Epp.

(b) Ι Cor. iii. 22 f. supplies a nearer and safer clue to the interpretation; this is the Apostle's decisive correction of the rivalries of i. 12. The human leaders pitted against each other all belong to the Church (not this teacher or that to this section or that), while it belongs without distinction to Christ, and Christ, with all that is His, to God. The catholic ήμεῖς Χριστοῦ swallows up the self-assertive and sectarian Εγώ δὲ Χριστοῦ. Those who used this cry arrogated the common watchword as their peculiarity; they erred by despising, as others by glorying in men. "Εγώ Χριστοῦ ad eos pertinet qui in contrarium partem peccabant; i.e., qui sese unius Christi ita dicebant, ut interim is per quos quos Deus loquitur nihil tribuerent" (Bz.).

(c) The Gr. Ff., followed by Cν., Bleek, Pfeiderer, Räbiger, and others, saw in the Εγώ δὲ Χριστοῦ the true formula which P. approves, or even which he utters proprίa persona. But the context subjects all four classes to the same reproach. It is a sufficient condemnation for the fourth party that they said "I am of Christ," in rejoinder to the partisans of Paul and the rest, lowering His name to this competition.

(d) Ηn., finding the riddle of the "Christus-partēi" insoluble, eliminates it from the text; "we are driven," he says, "to explain the Εγώ δὲ Χριστοῦ as a gloss, which some reader of the original codex inscribed in the margin, borrowing it from iii. 23 as a counter-confession to the Εγώ μὴ Πάυλου κ.τ.λ.".

Ver. 13. In his expostulation P. uses, with telling contrast, the first and last only of the party names: "Is the Christ divided? Was Paul crucified on your behalf? or into the name of Paul were you baptised?" Lachmann, W.Η., Μr., Bt., read μεμέρισται ο Χ. as an exclamation: "The Christ (then) has been divided!"—torn in pieces by your strife. But μερίζω (here in pf. of resultful fact) denotes distribution, not dismemberment (see paras.); the Christian who asserts "I am Christ's" in distinction from others, claims an exclusive part in Him, whereas the one and whole Christ belongs to every limb of His manifold body (see xii. 12; also xi. 3, Rom. xii. 12, etc.; Eph. iv. 3 f.; Col. ii. 19). A divided Church means a Christ parcelled out, appropriated κατά μέρος. ο Χριστὸς is the Christ, in the fulness of all that His title signifies (see xii. 12, etc.).—While μεμέρισται ο Χ.; is Paul's abrupt and indignant question to himself, μή Παύλος εσταυρώθη; (aor. of historical event) interrogates the readers—"Is it Paul that was crucified for you?" From the cross the Ap. draws his first reproof, the point of which vi. 20 makes clear, "You were bought at a price."

The cross was the ground of κοινωνία Χριστοῦ (9, x. 16); baptism, signifying personal union with Him by faith, its attestation (Rom. vi. 3); to this P. appeals asking, ή εἰς τὸ δομα Πάυλου εὐβαπτίσητε; His converts will remember how Christ's name was then sealed upon them, and Paul's ignored. What was true of his practice, he tacitly assumes for the other chiefs. The readers had been baptised as Christians, not Pauline, Apollonian, or Petrine Christians. Paul's horror at the thought of baptising in his name shows how truly Christ's was to him "the name above every name" (Phil. ii. 9; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 5).
In fact, P. had himself baptised very few of the Cor. He sees a providence in this; otherwise he might have seemed wishful to stamp his own name upon his converts, and some colour would have been lent to the action of the Paulinists—"lest any one should say that you were baptised into my name". For βαπτίζω εις το όνομα, cf. Matt. xxviii.19 and other parts.; also βαπτίζω εις, x. 2; it corresponds to πιστεύω εις, and has the like pregnant force. "The name" connotes the nature and authority of the bearer, and His relationship to those who speak of Him by it. Crispus and Gaius: both Roman names (see Introd., p. 723); the former a cognomen (Curly), the latter an exceedingly common praenomen. These two were amongst Paul's earliest converts (Acts xvii.8, Rom. xvi.23), the former a Synagogue ruler. On second thoughts ("he was reminded by his amanuensis," Lt.; or by Steph. himself), P. remembers that he had "baptised the house of Stephanas" (see xvi. 15, and note), the first family here won to Christ. Στεφανάς (perhaps short for Στεφανηφόρος), like Κηφάς, takes the Doric gen. in -ά usual with proper names in -άς, whether of native or foreign origin (see Bm., p. 20).—λοιπόν ούκ οίδα ει τινα κ.τ.λ.: P. cannot recall any other instance of baptism by his own hands at Cor.; this was a slight matter, which left no clear mark in his memory. λοιπόν (more regularly, το λοιπόν), "for the rest"—in point of time (vii. 29), or number—a somewhat frequent idiom with Paul (cf. iv. 2). In oυκ οίδα ει (hand scio an), the conjunction is indir. interr., as in vii. 16.

Ver. 17a justifies Paul's thanking God that he had baptised so few: "For Christ did not send me to baptise, but to evangelise". The insfs. (cf. ii. 1 f., ix. 16, xv. 11; Rom. xv. 17-21) are epechegetical (of purpose); and pres., of continued action (function). ουκ . . . ἀλλὰ —no qualified, but an absolute denial that Baptism was the Apostle's proper work. For the terms of Paul's commission see Gal. i. 15 f., Eph. iii. 7-9, i Tim. ii. 7; also Acts ix. 15, and pars. Baptism was the necessary sequel of preaching, and P. did not suppose his commission narrower than that of the Twelve (Matt. xxviii. 19 f.); but baptising might be performed vicariously, not so preaching. "To evangelise is to cast the net—the true apostolic work; to baptise is to gather the fish already caught and to put them into vessels" (Gd.). It never occurred to P. that a Christian minister's essential function was to administer sacraments. The Ap. dwells on this matter so much as to suggest (Cv.) that he tacitly contrasts himself with some preachers who made a point of baptising their own converts, as though to vindicate a special interest in them; cf. the action of Peter (Acts x. 48), and of Jesus (John iv. 1 f.).
asserted that Christ sent him not to *baptise*, but to *preach*; further, what he has to preach is not a *philosophy* to be *discussed*, but a *message* of *God* to be *believed*: “L’évangile n’est pas une *sagesse*, c’est un *salut*” (Gd.). In this transition the Αp. silently directs his reproof from the Pauline to the Αpol·lian party.—Ιn σοφία λόγου (see ii. 1-4, 13; cf. the opp. combination in xii. 8) the stress lies on τε *wisdom* (called in vv. 19 f. “the wisdom of the world”)—sc. “wisdom” in the common acceptance, as the world understood it and as the Cor. expected it from public teachers: “in wisdom of word” = in *philosophical* style. “To tell good *news* in wisdom of word” is an implicit contradiction; “news” only needs and admits of plain, straightforward *telling*. To dress out the story of Calvary in specious rhetoric, or wrap it up in fine-spun theorems, would have been to “empty (κενώθη) the cross of Christ,” to *eviscerate* the *Gospel*. The “*power* of *God*” lies in the *facts* and not in any man’s present *ment* of them: “to substitute a system of notions, however true and ennobling, for the fact of Christ’s death, is like confounding the theory of gravitation with gravitation itself” (Ed.).—For κενώθη, factitive of κενός (cf. χν. 14), see pars.; the commoner syn., καταργέω (28, etc.), means to deprive of activity, make impotent (in effect), κενώθη to *defy* of content, make unreal (in fact).

Ver. 18. What P. asserted in ver. 17 as intrinsically true, he supports by experience (τό) and by Scripture (19), combining their testimony in ver. 20.—ό λόγος γάρ, δ τοῦ σταύρου. “For the word, namely that of the cross,” to *eviscerate* the *Gospel*. The “*power* of *God*” lies in the facts and not in any man’s present *ment* of them: “to substitute a system of notions, however true and ennobling, for the fact of Christ’s death, is like confounding the theory of gravitation with gravitation itself” (Ed.).—For κενώθη, factitive of κενός (cf. χν. 14), see pars.; the commoner syn., καταργέω (28, etc.), means to deprive of activity, make impotent (in effect), κενώθη to *defy* of content, make unreal (in fact).

Ver. 18. What P. asserted in ver. 17 as intrinsically true, he supports by experience (18) and by Scripture (19), combining their testimony in ver. 20.—ό λόγος γάρ, δ τοῦ σταύρου. “For the word, namely that of the cross,” to *eviscerate* the *Gospel*. The “*power* of *God*” lies in the facts and not in any man’s present *ment* of them: “to substitute a system of notions, however true and ennobling, for the fact of Christ’s death, is like confounding the theory of gravitation with gravitation itself” (Ed.).—For κενώθη, factitive of κενός (cf. χν. 14), see pars.; the commoner syn., καταργέω (28, etc.), means to deprive of activity, make impotent (in effect), κενώθη to *defy* of content, make unreal (in fact).

Ver. 19. As concerns “the perishing,” the above sentence agrees with God’s ways of judgment as revealed in Scripture: γέγραπται γάρ κ.τ.λ. The quotation Ἀπολώ κ.τ.λ. (suggested by τ. ἀπολλυμένους) belongs to the cycle of Isaiah’s prophecies against the worldly-wise politicians of Jerusalem. Yet because it is δύναμις, the word of the cross is, after all, the truest σοφία (see 3ο, ii. 6 ff.). The double ἐστίν emphasises the actuality of the contrasted results.

Ver. 19. As concerns “the perishing,” the above sentence agrees with God’s ways of judgment as revealed in Scripture: γέγραπται γάρ κ.τ.λ. The quotation Ἀπολώ κ.τ.λ. (suggested by τ. ἀπολλυμένους) belongs to the cycle of Isaiah’s prophecies against the worldly-wise politicians of Jerusalem. Yet because it is δύναμις, the word of the cross is, after all, the truest σοφία (see 3ο, ii. 6 ff.). The double ἐστίν emphasises the actuality of the contrasted results.
\[\text{768 ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α} \]

1. Acts xii. 

"ο που σοφός, τον καλεί σοφόν τον Ελληνική στωμύλια κοσμούμενον (Thd.; cf. Rom. i. 23).—τον σοφόν (not δ σοφός); κ.τ.λ.: "Where is a wise man? where a scribe? where a disputater of this age?" These orders of men are swept from the field; all such pretensions disappear (cf. 29)—"Did not God make foolish the wisdom of the world?" The world and God are at issue; each counts the other's wisdom folly (cf. 28, 25, 30). But God actually turned to foolishness (infatuation, Bz.: cf. Rom. i. 21 f., for μωράνω; also Isa. xxxiii. 25) the world's imagined wisdom: how, vv. 21-25 proceed to show. On αιών see parl., and Ed.'s note; also Trench's Synon., lix., and Gm., for the distinction between αιών and κόσμος, "αιών, like sacculum, refers to the prevailing ideas and feelings of the present life, κόσμος to its gross, material character" (Lt.)

Ver. 21. Πριν γάρ (quoniam enim, Cv.) introduces the when and how of God's stultifying the world's wisdom by the λόγος του σταύρου: "For since, in the wisdom of God, the world through its wisdom did not know God, God was pleased," etc.—οί γάρ . . . δι' την σοφίαν του Θεού records Paul's experience, e.g., at Athens, in disclosing the γνώσις του Θεού to philosophers. Of the emphatic adjunct, εν τη σοφία του Θεού,
there are two explanations, following the line of Rom. i. 19 f. or Rom. xi. 32 f.: on the former view, the clause qualifies ἔγνω—"the world did not come to know God in His wisdom," evidenced in creation and Providence—so most interpreters ("amid the wisdom of God," Bt.; in media luce, Cv.; in nature and Scripture, addressed to Gentile and Jew, Bg.; Mr.); on the other hand, Rückert, Reuss, Al., Lt., Ev. attach the clause to ὑπὸ ὑπὸ—"in God's wise plan of the world's government, the world's wisdom failed to win the knowledge of Him. The latter is the sounder explanation, being (a) in accord with Paul's ref. elsewhere to σοφία Θεοῦ, (b) presenting a pointed antithesis to σοφία κόσμου, and (c) harmonising with Paul's theory of the education of mankind for Christ, expounded in Gal. iii.10-iv.5 and Rom. ν. 20 f.,vii.7-25,xi. "Through its (Greek) wisdom the world knew not God," as through its (Jewish) righteousness it pleased not God; both results were brought about "in the wisdom of God"—according to that "plan of the ages," leading up to "the fulness of the seasons," which embraced the Gentile "times of ignorance" (Acts xvii.26-31) no less than the Jewish dispensations of covenant and law. "It is part of God's wise providence that He will not be apprehended by intellectual speculation, by dry light" (Ev.). The intellectual was as signal as the moral defeat, the followers of Platowere "shut up," along with those of Moses, εἰς τ. μέλλουσαν πίστιν (Gal. iii. 22 f.).

Now that God's wisdom has reduced the self-wise world to ignorance, εὐδοκεῖσθαι: man's extremity, God's opportunity. "It was God's good will" ( plagiarit Deo: see parls. for the vb.); εὐδοκεῖ. P. associates with δέησα, βούλῃ on the one hand, and with χάρις, ἀναθηματίζῃ on the other: God's sovereign grace rescues man's bankrupt wisdom. διὰ τ. μισθοῦ: εἰς τ. πρόγνωσιν states the means, τοὺς πιστεύοντας defines the qualified objects of this deliverance. "Through the folly (as the wise world calls it, 18) of the κήρυγμα "—which last term signifies not the act of proclamation (κήρυξις), but the message: proclaimed by God's herald (κήρυξ, see parls.: the heralding suggests thoughts of the kingdom: cf. Acts xx. 25, Luke viii. 1, etc.). P. designates Christians by the act which makes them such—"those that believe" (see parls.). God saves by faith. Faith here stands opposed to Greek knowledge, as in Rom. to Jewish law-works.

Vv. 22-25 open out the thought of ver. 21: "the world" is parted into "Jews" and "Greeks"; μωρία becomes σκάνδαλον and μωρία; the κήρυγμα is defined as that of Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος; and the πιστεύοντες reappear as the κλητοί. Both Mr. and Al. make this a new sentence, detached from vv. 20 f., and complete in itself, with ἐπειδή καί κ.τ.λ. for protasis, and ἡμεῖς δὲ κ.τ.λ. for apodosis,—as though the mistaken aims of the world supplied Paul's motive for preaching Christ, the point is rather (in accordance with 2ο) that his "foolish" message, in contrast with (8δ, 23) the desiderated "signs" and "wisdom," convictsthe world of folly (2ο); thus the whole of vv. 22-24 falls under the regimen of the 2ο ἐπειδή, which with its καί, emphatically resumes the first ἐπειδή (21)—"since indeed". God turned the world's wise men into fools (2ο) by bestowing salvation through faith on a ground that they deem folly (21)—in other words, by revealing His power and wisdom in the person of a crucified Messiah, whom Jews and Greeks unite to despise (22-24).

Ver. 22. Ιουδαίοι... "Ελλήνες—anarthrous; "Jews" qua Jews, etc.: in this "asking" and "seeking" the characteristics of each race are "hit off to perfection" (Ed.: see his interesting note); αἰτεῖν expresses "the importunity of the Jews," ἰθεῖν "the curious, speculative turn of the Greeks" (Lt.). For the Jewish requirement, cf. parls. in the case of Jesus; the app., doubtless, were challenged in the same way—P. perhaps publicly at Cor.: "non reperias Corinthi signum editum esse per Paulum, Acta xviii." (Bg.). Respecting this demand, see Lt., Biblical Essays, pp. 150 ff. Such dictation Christ never allowed;
His miracles were expressions of pity, not concessions to unbelief, a part of the Gospel and not external buttresses to it. Of the Hellenic σοφίαν ζητείν Ἡρίλος wisdom is itself a monument; cf., amongst many cl. parl., Herod., iv., 77, "Ελλήνης πάντας ασχόλους είναι πρὸς πάναν σοφίαν; also Αέlian, Var. Hist., xii., 25; Juvenal, Sat., I., ii., 58 f.

Ver. 23. Instead of working miracles to satisfy the Jews, or propounding a philosophy to entertain the Greeks, "we, on the other hand, proclaim a crucified Christ"—Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, i.e., Christ as crucified (predicative adjunct), not "Christ the crucified," nor, strictly, "Christ crucified"; cf., for the construction, 2 Cor. iv. 5, κηρύσσομεν Χ. Ι. "We preach (not ourselves but) Christ Jesus as Lord." Not a warrior Messiah, flashing His signs from the sky, breaking the heathen yoke, but a Messiah dying in impotence and shame (see 2 Cor. iv. το, xiii. 4: hattality, Deut. χxi. 23—the hung—He is styled in the Talmud) is what the app. preach for their good news! "Τοίς δὲ εθνεσιν μωρίαν: for the "folly" of offering the infelix lignum to cultured Gentiles, see Cicero, pro Rabirio, v.: "Nomen ipsum crucis abit non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, osculis, auribus"; and Lucian, De morte Peregrini, 13, who mocks at those who worship τὸν ἄνω, but not at σοφίαν, "that gibbeted sophist!"

For reff. in the early Apologists see Justin M., Tryph., lxix., and Ἀπόλ., i, 13; Tertull., adv. Jud., § 10; Aristo of Pella, in Routh's Rel. Sacr., i., 95; and the graffito of the gibbeted ass discovered on the wall of the Pedagogium in the Palatine. To Jews the Αὔγος τοῦ σταυροῦ announced the shameful reversal of their most cherished hopes; to Greeks and Romans it offered for Saviour and Lord a man branded throughout the Empire as amongst the basest of criminals; it was "outrageous," and "absurd".

Ver. 24. αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, ἕπειτα autem vocatis (Vg.): for the emphatic prefixed αὐτοῖς, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 14, 1 Thess. 16, etc., it; "marks off those alluded to from the classes to which they nationally belonged" (ΕΙ.)—"to the called however upon their part, both Jews and Greeks"—cf. the ou . . . διαστολή of Rom. iii. 9, 22 ff. "(We proclaim) a Christ (to these) God's power and God's wisdom." Of God reiterated four times, with triumphant emphasis, in the stately march of νν. 24 f. Θεού δύν., Θεού σοφ. are predicative, in antithesis to ἐσταυρωμένον (23): the app. "preach as power and wisdom" Ονε who wears to the world the aspect of utter powerlessness and Ε and Σοφία Θεού were synonyms of the Λόγος in the Alexandrian-Jewish speculations, in which Apollos was probably versed; these surpassing titles Paul appropriates for the Crucified.—Θεοῦ δύναμιν reaffirms, after explanation, the δύναμιν Θεοῦ of ver. 18; now Θεοῦ σοφίαν is added to it, for "power" proves "wisdom" here (see note on 30); the universal efficacy of the Gospel demonstrates its inner truth, and faith is finally justified by reason.—δύναμις Θεοῦ of ver. 22 (see, e.g., 2 Thess. ii. 9); believing Jews found, after all, in the cross the mightiest miracle, while Greeks found the deepest wisdom. The "wisdom of God," secretly
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26. Βλέπετε γάρ τὴν κλησίν ὑμῶν, ἄδελφοί, ὅτι οὗ ἐὰν τολμῇ, ἄρα καὶ ὑπομένει ἄνευ λόγου; ἤμεν δὲ τοῦτον ἐκ τῆς ὁλιγοσοφίας, ἐκ τῆς ἀδόξου, ἐκ τῆς ἄκοςτος ἀληθείας. Οὔτε ἐὰν τολμῇ, ἀλλά πάντως ὑπομένει ἐκ τῆς ἀδόξου, ἐκ τῆς ἄκοςτος ἀληθείας. Μόνον τὸν Ἀπόστολον ἔστη ὑπερασπίζεται ἐκ τῆς ἀδόξου, ἐκ τῆς ἄκοςτος ἀληθείας.

etc. g vii. 20; Rom. xi. 29; Eph. iv. 1, 4; Ph. iii. 14; 2 Th. i. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9; Heb. iii. 1; 2 Pet. i. 10. h iv. 13; Acts i. 5, xxvii. 14. i x. 18; 17 times besides in P.; cf. Jo. viii. 15. k Acts xxv. 1. Lk xii. 12; Acts xvii. 11 (another sense) only; Job i. 3; 3 Macc. x. 13.

working in the times of preparation (20), is thus at length brought to human recognition in Christ. On κλήσις see note to ver. 2: this term is preferable to οἱ σωζόμενοι, οἵ τοις σωζόμενοι, where the stress rests upon God’s initiative in the work of individual salvation; cf. νν. 9, 26, Rom. viii. 28 ff.

Ver. 25. What has been proved in point of fact, viz., the stultification by the cross of man’s wisdom, the Αρ. (as in Rom. iii. 30, xi. 29, Gal. ii. 6) grounds upon an axiomatic religious principle, that of the absolute superiority of the Divine to the human. Τhat God should thus confound the world one might expect: “because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men”. Granted that the λόγος τ. σταυροῦ is folly and weakness, it is God’s folly, God’s weakness: will men dare to match themselves with that! (cf. Rom. ix. 20).—τὸ μωρόν (not μωρία as before), τὸ ἐσεί: concrete terms—the foolish, ἀθανασία policy of God (cf. τὸ χρηστόν, Rom. ii. 4), the folly and weakness embodied in the cross.—ἰσχυρός (ἰσχύς) implies intrinsic strength, δύναμις is ability, as relative to the task in view.

§ 5. THE OBJECTS OF THE GOSPEL CALL, i. 26-31. § 4 has shown that the Gospel does not come εν σοφία λόγου (17b) by the method of its operation: this will further be evidenced by the status of its recipients. If it were, humanly speaking, a σοφία, it would have addressed itself to σοφοί, and won their adherence; but the case is far otherwise.

Ver. 26. Βλέπετε γάρ τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν, ἄδελφοί,—“For look at your calling, brothers”: God has called you into the fellowship of His Son (9); if His Gospel had been a grand philosophy, would He have addressed it to fools, weaklings, base-born, like most of you? P.’s experience in this respect resembled his Master’s (Matt. xi. 25, John vii. 47-49, Acts iv. 13). This argument cuts two ways: it lowers the conceit of the readers (cf. vi. 9-11, and the scathing irony of iv. 7-13), while it discloses the true mission of the Gospel. On κλήσις see the note to κλητοὶς (2), also on vii. 20: it signifies not one’s temporal voca-
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1. "εξελέξατο ο Θεός, ίνα τα μωρά και τα ασθενή του κόσμου καταισχύνητα και τα εξουθενημένα εξελέξατο ο Θεός, και τα μη όντα, ίνα τα όντα καταργήση.

2. τοις σοφοῖς και τα ασθενή του κόσμου εξελέξατο ο Θεός. 28. και τα αγενή του κόσμου και τα αγενή του κόσμου εξελέξατο ο Θεός, και τα μη όντα, ίνα τα όντα καταργήση.

The ellipse of predicate to ο υμείς σοφοὶ καταίσχυνητα is commonly filled up by understanding εκλήθησαν, as implied in εκλήθησαν (2, 9, 26), ευδόκησεν...σώσαι (21), την χάρινέδωκενεν Χ. Ι.(4); this word indicates the relation in which the saved are put both to God and to the world, out of (εξ) which they were taken (see parls.); nothing here suggests, as in Eph. i. 4, the idea of eternal election. —εξελέξατο ο Θεός: the astonishing fact thrice repeated, with solemn emphasis of assurance. The objects of God's saving choice and the means of their salvation match each other; by His το μωρόν and το ασθενές (25) He saves τα μωρά and τα ασθενή: "the world laughs at our beggarly selves, as it laughs at our beggarly Gospel!" The neut. adj. of vv. 27 f. mark the category to which the selected belong; their very foolishness, weakness, ignobility determine God's choice (cf. Matt. ix. 13, Luke x. 21, etc.).—τοῦ κόσμου is partitive gen.: out of all the world, God chose its (actually) foolish, weak, base things—making "faux urbs lux orbis!" In this God acted deliberately, pursuing the course maintained through previous ages. In τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ (see note, 21): He "selected the foolish things of the world, that He might shame its wise men (τοις σοφοῖς) ... the weak things of the world, that He might shame its strong things (τα ισχυρά), and the base-born things of the world and the things made absolutely nothing of... the things non-existent, that He might bring the things existent to naught". In the first instance a class of persons, immediately present to Paul's mind (cf. 20), is to be "put to shame"; in the two latter P. thinks, more at large, of worldly forces and institutions (cf. vii. 31, 2 Cor. x. 4-6). The pride of the cultured and ruling classes of paganism was to be confounded by the powers which Christianity conferred upon its social outcasts; as, e.g., Hindoo Brahmism is shamed by the moral and intellectual superiority acquired by Christian Parias.—τα αγενή του κόσμου, third of the categories of disparagement, is reinforced by τα εξουθενημένα (from εξ and οὐδέν, pf. pass.: things set down as of no account whatever), then capped by the abruptly apposed τα μη όντα, to which is attached the crowning final clause, ίνα τα όντα καταργήση. For καταργέω (ut cneraret, Bz.), see note on κενόω (17), and parls.: the scornful world-powers are not merely to be robbed of their glory (as in the two former predictions), but of their power and being, as indeed befell in the end the existing social and political fabric. In τα μη όντα, "μη implies that the non-existence is not absolute but estimative" (Al.); the classes to which Christianity appealed were non-entities for philosophers and statesmen, cyphers in their reckoning: contrast οὐκ ὄν, of objective matter of fact, in John x. 12, Acts vii. 5; also Eurip., Troad., 600. —τα δότα connotes more than bare ex-
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καταργήσατε 29, όπως "μή καυχήσηται" πάσα σάρξ ενώπιον Θεού: αυτού.

3ο, εξ αυτού, "εξαυτού δέ υμείς εστε" εν Χριστώ Ιησού, δς εγενήθη ημίν: 2 σοφία, αυτο Θεού, διακοσμησθε τε και "άγιασμε και ψαλύτωσιν".

31, "καθος γέγραπται, "Ο Καυχώμενος, εν Κυρίω καυχάσθω".

iv, 21, 23, 3, 5, vi, 8. i lli, 21, iv, 7, xiii, 3. 2 Cor., passim; nine times elsewhere in P.; only Jas. i 9, iv, 18 besides. Rare and poetical in cl. Gr. Hebraistic (or αυτον ... εις) ... χιλιον. Rom. lii, 20. Epbr. iv, 29, v, 3. 2 Pet. i, 20: frequent in App. of Jo. and Rev.; Mt. xiv, 22. v Frequent in P., Lk, and Rev.; never in Mt. or Mk. 

w viii, 6. 2 Cor. v, 18; Rom. viii, 23, 43, etc. x 2 Cor. v, 17, xii, 2; Rom. viii, 1, xvi, 7, 11; Gal. i, 23, 28, etc. y Ver. 3, iv, 5, vi, 19, etc. z Rom. vi, 19, 21, 25; 2 Cor. v, 21. a Rom. vii, 1, xvi, 7, 29; Th. iv, 4, 7; 2 Th. ii, 13.

Ver. 29. God's purposes in choosing the refuse of society are gathered up into the general and salutary design, revealed in Scripture (see parls.), "that so no flesh may glory in God's presence" (a condensed quotation = πάντα εις δόξαν Θεού (x. 31). For οπως, which carries to larger issue the intentions stated in the previous clauses, cf. 2 Cor. viii, 14, 2 Thess. i. 12. Two Hebrewisms, characteristic of the LXX, here: μή ... τοαμ (χαι ... ιο), for 

σεβασμός; and αυτο (βασιλεύσα), for humanity in its mortality or sinfulness. Cf., for this rule of Divine action, 2 Cor. xii, 9. Also, Plato, Ιησούς 534 Ε, 19, δια τοκον εν χρήστες εστι τα καλα τοτε τομάματα σθεν ανθρώπων, ἀλλά θεία καὶ θεῖο ... ἢ θεία ἐξεισε 

τινά διὰ τούτοις πνεύματι τοῦ καλλίστος μέλος ὑπόν. Ver. 3o. Ιησούς εστιν εν Χριστῷ Ιησους: είναι εν Χ. Ιησού or Ιησού εστιν (εν τού Θεού) the predicate to ὑμεῖς. Does Ρ. mean, "It comes of Him (God) that you are in Christ Jesus" —i.e., "Your Christian status is due to God" (so Mr., Hn., Bt., Ed., Gd., El.)? or, "It is in Christ Jesus that you are of Him"—"Your new life derived from God is grounded in Christ" (Gr. Ff., Cv., Bz., Ruckert, Hf., Lt.)? The latter interpretation suits the order of words and the trend of thought (see Lt.): "You, whom the world counts as nothing (26 ff.: note the contrastive δέ), are of Him before whom all human glory vanishes (29); in Christ this Divine standing is yours". Thus Paul exalts those whom he had abused. The conception of the Christian estate as "of God," if Johannine, is Pauline too (cf. viii, 6, x. 12, xii, 6, 2 Cor. iv, 6, v. 18, etc.), and lies in Paul's fundamental appropriation, after Jesus, of God as πατήρ ημών (i.4, and passim), and in the correlative doctrine of the ζητοεις; the whole passage (18-29) is dominated by the thought of the Divine initiative in salvation. This derivation from God is not further defined, as in Gal. iii, 26; enough to state the grand fact, and to ground it "in Christ Jesus" (see note, 4).

The relative clause, "who was made wisdom," etc., unfolds the content of the life communicated "to us from God" in Christ. Of the four defining complements to ἡμῖν εστιν, σοφία stands by itself, with the other three attached by way of definition—"wisdom from God, και θεία, both righteousness, etc."; Mr., Al., Gd., however, read the four as co-ordinate. On σοφία the whole debate, from ver. 17 onwards, hinges: we have seen how God turned the world's wisdom to folly (20-25); now He did this not for the pleasure of it, but for our salvation—to establish His own wisdom (24), and to bestow it upon us in Christ ("us" means Christians collectively—cf. 17—while "you" meant the despised Cor. Christians, 26). This wisdom (how diff. from the other! see 17, 19; Jas. iii, 15 ff.) comes as sent "from God" (κεινον of ultimate source: δι of direct derivation). It is a vitalising moral force—
ΕΕ ΙΙ. ΙΙ. ΙΙ. καγώ ελθών προς σοφία, αδελφοί, ήλθον ή καθ’ *υπεροχήν ή λόγου ή σοφίας, καταγγέλλων ή σοφίας το μαρτύριον του Θεού.

δύναμις και σοφία (24) — taking the shape of δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός, and signally contrasted in its spiritual reality and regenerating energy with the σοφία λόγου and σοφία τ. κόσμου, after which the Cor. hankered. Righteousness and Sanctification are alluded “by their theological affinity” (El.): cf. note on vi. II, and Rom. vi. passim—hence the double copula τε . . . καί; καὶ ἀπό-λύτρωσις follows at a little distance (so Lt., Hn., Ed.; who adduce numerous cl. pars. to this use of the Gr. conjunctions): “who was made wisdom to us from God—viz., both righteousness and sanctification, and redemption”—δικαιοσύνη καὶ αγιασμός carries with it, implicitly, the Pauline doctrine of Justification by faith in the dying, risen Christ (see vi. 11, and other pars.; esp., for Paul’s teaching at Cor., 2 Cor. v. 21). With the righteousness of the believer justified in Christ sanctification (or consecration) is concomitant (see note on the kindred terms in 2); the connexion of chh. v. and vi. in Rom. expounds this τε . . . καί; all δικαιοσύνη ἐν Χριστῷ is ἐκ ἁγιασμοῦ. (Vbl. nouns in -μός denote primarily a process, then the resulting state.)—Από-λύτρωσις (based on the λύτρον of Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6, with ἀπό of separation, release), deliverance by ransom, is the widest term of the three—“primum Christi donum quod inchoatur in nobis, et ultimum quod perficitur” (Cv.). It looks backward to the cross (18), by whose blood we “were bought” for God (vi. 19), so furnishing the ground both of justification (Rom. iii. 24) and sanctification (Heb. x. 10), and forward to the resurrection and glorification of the saints, whereby Christ secures His full purchased rights in them (Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14, iv. 30); thus Redemption covers the entire work of salvation, indicating the essential and just means of its accomplishment (see Cr. on λύτρον and derivatives).

Ver. 31. “In order that, as it stands written, he who glories, in the Lord let him glory;” by “the Lord” the readers could only understand Christ, already five times thus titled; so, manifestly, in 2 Cor. x. 17 f., where the citation reappears. Paul quotes the passage as a general Scriptural principle, which ultimately applies to the relations of Christians to Christ; ἐν Κυρίῳ belongs to his adaptation of the original: God will have no flesh (see note, 29) exult in his wisdom, strength, high birth (cf. the objects of false glorying in Jer.) before Him; He will have men exult in “the Lord of glory” (ii. 8; cf. Phil. ii. 9 ff.), whom He sent as His own “wisdom” and “power unto salvation” (24, 30). What grieves the Ap. most and appears most fatal in the party strifes of Cor., is the extolling of human names by the side of Christ’s and at his expense (see notes on 12-15; also iii. 5, 21-23, and 2 Cor. iv. 5, Gal. vi. 14). Christians are specifically οἱ καυχώμενοι εν Χριστῷ, Phil. iii. 3. The irregularity of mood after ἵνα—καυχᾶται is accounted for in two ways: either as an anacoluthon, the imp. of the original being transplanted in lively quotation (cf. Rom. xii. 3, 2τ.); or as an ellipsis, with γένηται or πληρωθή mentally supplied (cf. Rom. iv. 26, Gal. ii. 9, 2 Cor. viii. 13)—explanations not materially different. Clem. Rom. (§ 13) quotes the text with the same peculiarity.

§ 6. Paul’s CORINTHIAN Mission, ii. 1-5. Paul has justified his refusing to preach ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου on two grounds: (1) the nature of the Gospel, (2) the constituency of the Church of Cor.; it was no philosophy, and they were no philosophers. This refusal he continues to make, in pursuance of the course adopted from the outset. So he returns to his starting-point, viz., that “Christ sent” him “to bring good tidings,” such as neither required nor admitted of “wisdom of word” (i. 17).

Ver. 1. Καγώ ελθών . . . φλοιον:
"And I at my coming . . . came" : the repeated vb. draws attention to Paul's arrival,—to the circumstances and character of his original work at Cor. The emphasis of ἐγὼ—" And I " —may lie in the correspondence between the message and the messenger—both " foolish " and " weak " (i. 25 : so Ed.) ; but the form of the sentence rather suggests allusion to the nearer i. 26—" As it was with you, brothers, to whom I conveyed God's call, so with myself who conveyed it; you were not wise nor mighty according to flesh, and I came to you as one without wisdom or strength " . Message, hearers, preacher matched each other for folly and feebleness! " I came not in the way of excellence—καθ'ὑπεροχήν, cum eminentia (Bz.)—of word or wisdom,''-not with the bearing of a man distinguished for these accomplishments, and relying upon them for his success: this clause is best attached to the emphatic ἐλήλθον, which requires a descriptive ad- junct (so Or., Cv., Bz., Hf. : cf. 3) ; others make it a qualification of καταγγέλλων. Paul's humble mien and plain address presented a striking contrast to the pretensions usual in itinerant professors of wisdom, such as he was taken for at Athens.—ὑπεροχή, from ὑπερέχω (Phil. ii. 3, iii. 8, iv. 7), to overtop, outdo. For λόγον ἦ σοφίας, see note on σοφία λόγου (i. 17).

The manner of Paul's preaching was determined by its matter ; with such a commission he could not adopt the arts of a rhetorician nor the airs of a philosopher: " I came not like a man eminent in speech or wisdom," but with the bearing of a man distinguished for these accomplishments, and relying upon them for his success: this clause is best attached to the emphatic ἐλήλθον, which requires a descriptive adjunct (so Or., Cv., Bz., Hf. : cf. 3) ; others make it a qualification of καταγγέλλων. Paul's humble mien and plain address presented a striking contrast to the pretensions usual in itinerant professors of wisdom, such as he was taken for at Athens.—ὑπεροχή, from ὑπερέχω (Phil. ii. 3, iii. 8, iv. 7), to overtop, outdo. For λόγον ἦ σοφίας, see note on σοφία λόγου (i. 17).

The manner of Paul's preaching was determined by its matter ; with such a commission he could not adopt the arts of a rhetorician nor the airs of a philosopher: " I came not like a man eminent in speech or wisdom," but with the bearing of a man distinguished for these accomplishments, and relying upon them for his success: this clause is best attached to the emphatic ἐλήλθον, which requires a descriptive adjunct (so Or., Cv., Bz., Hf. : cf. 3) ; others make it a qualification of καταγγέλλων. Paul's humble mien and plain address presented a striking contrast to the pretensions usual in itinerant professors of wisdom, such as he was taken for at Athens.—ὑπεροχή, from ὑπερέχω (Phil. ii. 3, iii. 8, iv. 7), to overtop, outdo. For λόγον ἦ σοφίας, see note on σοφία λόγου (i. 17).
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Και τὸ κήρυγμά μου ὅπως ἐν πειθοίς 1 ἀποδείξεως 2 σοφίας λόγους,

1 πειθοί ... λόγων, or ... λόγων, in several minusc., latt. am. (persuasiones sapientiae verbi), sah.: a translator's error due to the adj. being h.l. W. H. follow AD*Ρ, and analogy, in spelling πιθανος.

2 Om. αὐθωνίας ὉBDG 17, latt. am. syr.ch. Borrowed from ver 13.

Ver. 3. "In weakness": cf. i. 25, 27; also 2 Cor. x. 10, and xiii. 3 f. This condition was bodily—the Cor. had received an impression of Paul's physical feebleness; but the phrase expresses, more broadly, his conscious want of resources for the task before him (cf. 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 5). Hence he continues, "and in fear and in much trembling"—the inward emotion and its visible expression (see parls.). P. stood before the Cor. at first a timid, shaken man: on the causes see Introd., ch. i.

For γίνομαι ἐν (versari in), to be in a state of, cf. parls.—πειθοί ὄμωs qualifies the whole foregoing sentence: "I was weak, timid, trembling before you (when I addressed you)"; ἐγενόμην ... πρὸς ὑμᾶς might be construed together, ἐγενόμην becoming a vb. of motion—"I came to (and was amongst) you in weakness," etc. (Ed., as in xvi. 10); this would, however, needlessly repeat ver. 1.

Ver. 4. "And my word and my message:" λόγος recalls i. 18; κήρυγμα, i. 21, 23 (see notes). The former includes all that Paul says in proclaiming the Gospel, the latter the specific announcement of God's will and call therein.

οὐκ ἐν πειθοίς σοφίας λόγοις, "not in persuasive words of wisdom": the adj. πειθός (= πιθανός, see txtl. note), from πείθω, analogous to φίλος from φιλέωμαι. "Words of wisdom," substantially = "words of word." (i. 17); that expression accentuating the matter, this the manner of teaching—"exquisita eloquio, quae artificio magis quam veritate nitatur et pugnet" (Cv.). For the unfavourable nuance of πειθός, see Col. ii. 4 (πιθανολογία), also Gal. i. 10, Matt. xxviii. 14. Eusebius excellently paraphrases (Præf. Ev., i., 3), τὰς μὲν ἀπαρτιλάς κ. σοφιστικάς πιθανολογίας παρατομομένων. "With a contemptuous touch of irony that reminds one of Socrates in the Gorgias and Apology [cf. Ev., as previously cited, on τὸ ἐθνεῖν], he disclaims all skill in rhetoric, the spurious art of persuading without in-

structing, held nevertheless in high repute in Cor. But when the Ap. speaks of the demonstration of the Spirit, he soars into a region of which Socrates knew nothing. Soc. sets σοφία against πειθοί; the Ap. regards both as being on well-nigh a common level, from the higher altitude of the Spirit." (Ed.); since the time of Socrates, however, Philosophy had sunk into a πιθανολογία. —ἀποδείξεις, "the technical term for a proof drawn from facts or documents, as opposed to theoretical reasoning; in common use with the Stoics in this sense" (Hn.).—see Plato, Theaet., 162 E, and Arist., Eth. Nic., i., 1; ii., 4, for the like antithesis (Ed.).

Ἀποδεικτικός πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας gathers up the force of the δύναμιν Θεοῦ of i. 24, and ἐνέπνευτο σοφία κ.τ.λ. of i. 30 (see notes); the proof of the Gospel at Cor. was experimental and ethical, found in the new consciousness and changed lives that attended its proclamation: cf. vi. 11, ix. 1, 2 Cor. iii. 1 ff., 1 Thess. ii. 13 (λόγος Θεοῦ, δε κ. ἐνέργειται ἐν ὑμῖν τ. πνεύμων).—πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως are not objective gen. (πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως) of δυνάμεως and πνεύματος in i. 30, 7 ff., but subjective: the Spirit, with His power, gives the demonstration (similarly in xii. 7, see note); cf. vv. 10, 12, 2 Cor. iii. 3-18, Rom. viii. 16, xv. 19, for Paul's thoughts on the testimonium Spiritus sancti; also John xv. 26, i John v. 6.—Δύναμις, specially associated with ἐνέπνευσα after Luke xxiv. 49 (see ref. for P.), is certainly the spiritual power that operates as implied in i. 30, vi. 11, but not to the exclusion of the supernatural physical "powers" which accompanied Apostolic preaching (see note on ἐβεβαιώθη, i. 6; also xii. 7, 11, and the combination of Rom. xv. 17 ff.): "latius accipio, nempe pro manu Dei potente omnibus modis per apostolum se exserente" (Cv.). The art. is wanting with πνεύματος, though personal, after the anakrinos ἀποδείξεις, according to "the law of correlation" (Wr., p. 175): contrast this with xii. 7, also the double
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4-6.

ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΟΦΙΑΝ δε λαλοῦν ἐν τοῖς "τελείοις" σοφίαν δε ὁ τοῦ "αἷμος τοῦ τούτου, οδὸν τῶν "ἀρχόντων τοῦ "αἷμος τοῦ τούτου τῶν" Προς Κορινθίους Α

6. Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς "τελείοις" σοφίαν δὲ ὁ τοῦ "αἷμος τοῦ τούτου, οδὸ δὲ τῶν "ἀρχόντων τοῦ "αἷμος τοῦ τούτου τῶν":

often in P., σοφίαν is anarthrous in like connexion. o in combination with νως, xii. 10; Rom. i. 4, xv. 13, 19; Tii. 5; 2 Tim. i. 7; Heb. ii. 4; I K. i. 17, iv. 14, xxiv. 49; Acts ii. 8, x. 38. See L. in x. 18. q xii. 10, xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 13; Ph. iii. 15; Col. i. 28, iv. 18; Heb. v. 14; Jas. i. 4; Mt. vi. 48, xii. 21. See L. x. 8 Jo. xili. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, with σοφίαν; in pl. ἀλ.; cf. Eph. ii. 4, vi. 12. αἱ ἀρχόντες, Rom. xii. 3; Mt. xx. 25; Lk. xxiii. 13, 35, xiv. 20; Acts i. 17, and six other places; Jo. vii. 26, 48, xii. 48.

art. of P. with the anarthrous phrase of i. 18). The pl. clause affirms not the agency by which, but the sphere of action in which, Paul's word operated.

Supply to this verse ἐγένετο from the ἐγενόμην of ver. 3.

Ver. 5. The Apostle's purpose in discarding the orator's and the sophist's arts was this: "that your faith might not rest in wisdom of men, but in (the) power of God". The καγώ ἠλθον of ver. I dominates the paragraph; P. lives over again the experience of his early days in Cor.; this purpose then filled his breast: so Ἰη., Gd., with the older interpreters; most moderns read into the ινα the Divine purposes suggested by i. 27-31. Paul was God's mouthpiece in declaring the Gospel: he therefore sought the very end of God Himself, viz., that God alone should be glorified in the faith of his hearers (i. 3; cf. i. 5). Had he persuaded the Cor. by clever reasonings and grounded Christianity upon their Greek philosophy, his work would have perished with the wisdom of the age (see 6, also i. 18). Paul was God's mouthpiece in declaring the Gospel; he therefore sought the very end of God Himself, viz., that God alone should be glorified in the faith of his hearers (i. 31; cf. i. 15). He had persuaded the Cor. by clever reasonings and grounded Christianity upon their Greek philosophy, his work would have perished with the wisdom of the age (see 6, also i. 19, iii. 19 f.).

The disowned σοφία ανθρώπων is the σοφ. τ. κόσμου of i. 10 (see note) in its moral character, a σοφ. σαρκική (2 Cor. i. 12)—"wisdom of men" as opposed to that of God,—ἀνθρωπίνη, ver. 13. Yet not God's wisdom, but primarily His power (see notes on i. 18, 24, 30) supplied the ground on which P. planted his hearers' faith. All through, he opposes the practical to the speculative, the reality of God's work to the speciousness of men's talk. The last ινα clause of this long passage corresponds to the first, ἵνα ἡ κενωθή ἡ σταυρός τ. Χριστοῦ (i. 17). ἵνα should be construed with ἵνα (consistat in, Bz.) rather than τινις, pointing not to the object of faith but to its substratum: for this predicative ἵνα—"should be (a faith) in," etc.—cf. iv. 20, Eph. v. 18, Acts iv. 12.

Summary. Thus the Apostle's first ministry at Cor., in respect of his bearing (ver. 1), theme (2), temper (3), method (4), governing aim (5), illustrated and accorded with the Gospel, as that is a message from God through which His power works to the confounding of human wisdom by the seeming impotence of a crucified Messiah (i. 17 b-31).

§ 7. ΤΗΕ GosΡΕL coΝsΙDΕRΕd Αs wΙsDoΜ, ii. 6-9. So far Paul has been maintaining that his message is a "folly," with which "wisdom of word" is out of keeping; yet all the while he makes it felt that it is wisdom in the truest sense —"God's wisdom," convicting in its turn the world of folly. If relatively the Gospel is not wisdom, absolutely it is ἵνα—to persons qualified to understand it. This P. now proceeds to show (ii. 6-iii. 2: cf. Introd. to Div. II.). The message of the cross is wisdom to the right people (§ 7), qualified to comprehend it (§ 8).

Ver. 6. Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.: "(there is) a wisdom, however, (that) we speak amongst the full-grown." The anarthrous, predicative σοφίαν asserts that to be "wisdom" which in ironical deference to the world has been styled "folly" (i. 27 ff.). ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, the mature, the initiates (opp. to νηπίοι, παιδια, iii. 1, xiv. 20; see parls.) = νεανικοι in contrast with the relatively σάρκινοι (iii. 1; cf. note on μυστήριον, ver. 7). "The curtain must be lifted with a caution measured by the spiritual intelligence of the spectators, ἐπόπται" (Ev.). This τελείωτης the Cor. had by no means reached; hence they failed to see where the real wisdom of the Gospel lay, and estimated its ministers by worldly standards. ἵνα signifies not to, nor in relation to, but amongst the qualified hearers—in such a circle P. freely expanded deeper truths. λαλῶν (cf. 7, 13), to utter, speak out: P. uses the pl. not thinking of Sosthenes in particular (i. 1), but of his fellow-preachers generally, including Apollos (i. 23, and xv. 11, etc.; iii. 6, iv. 6).

The "wisdom" uttered in such company is defined first negatively: "but a
wisdom not of this age, nor of the rulers of this age, that are being brought to nought." For αἰῶν, see note to i. 20; it connotes the transitory nature of the world-powers (i. 19, 28; cf. vii. 31, 2 Cor. iv. 18; also i John ii. 17; 1 Peter i. 24 ff.). The άρχοντες τ. αἰῶνος τοῦτον were taken by Marcion, Or., and other ancients, to be the angelic, or demonic (Satanic), rulers of the nations—sc. the "princes" of Dan. xii., and Jewish angelology, the κοσμοκράτορες τ. κόσμου τούτου of Eph. vi. 12 (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11—where άρχον is applied to Satan; also Gal. iii. 15, Acts vii. 53, touching the office of angels in the Lawgiving): so Sm., after F. C. Baur—"the angels who preside over the various departments of the world, the Law in particular, but possess no perfect insight into the counsels of God, and lose their dominion—from which they take their name of άρχαι (= άρχοντες)—with the end of the world (xv. 24)"; see also, at length, Everling, Die Paulin. Angelologie u. Dämonologie, pp. 11 ff. But these super-terrestrial potentates could not, without explanation, be charged with the crucifixion of Christ (8); on the other hand, i. 27 ff. shows P. to be thinking in this connexion of human powers. Unless otherwise defined, οἱ άρχοντες denotes "the rulers" of common speech, those, e.g., of Rom. xiii. 3, Luke xxiii. 35. Ον τῶν καταργούμενων, see note to i. 17 (καταργ.), 28, xv. 24, and other parts. The Jewish rulers, whose overthrow is certain and near (1 Thess. ii. 16, Rom. ix. 22, xi.), are aimed at, as being primarily answerable for the death of Jesus (cf. Acts xiii. 27 f.); but P. foresaw the supersession of all existing world-powers by the Messianic kingdom (xv. 24; cf. Rom. xi. 15, Acts xvii. 7); the pr. ptp., perhaps, implies a "gradual nullification of their potency brought about by the Gospel" (El.). P. cannot have meant by οἱ άρχοντες the leaders of thought (as Thd., Thp., Neander suppose, because of the association with σοφία); he held a broad, practical conception of wisdom (sagacity) as shown in power; the secular rulers, wise in their own way but not in God's, must come to nought. Statecraft, equally with philosophy, failed when tested by the cross.

Ver. 7. "(We speak . . . a wisdom not of this world . . .) but (αλλά, of diametrical opposition) a wisdom of God, in (shape of) a mystery."—ινή θετυπήρει . . . λαλάθει, rather than σοφίαν (as Hn., En., Lt. read it—"couched in mystery"), indicating how it is that the App. do not speak in terms of worldly wisdom, and express themselves fully to the τέλειοι alone: their message is a Divine secret, that the Spirit of God reveals (το f.), while "the age" possesses only "the spirit of the world" (12). Hence to the age God's wisdom is uttered "in a mystery" and remains "the hidden (wisdom)"; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4; also Matt. xiii. 13 ff. (ἐν παραβολαίς . . . λαλώ, Luke x. 21 f.: λαλώ έν μυστηρίῳ = αποκρύπτω. —μυστήριον (cf. xv. 51) has its usual meaning in St. Paul's Epp.,—something not comprehensible by unassisted human reason" (El.; for a full account see Ed., or Bt., on the term). The Hellenic "mysteries," which flourished at this time, were practised at night in an imposing dramatic form, and peculiar doctrines were taught in them, which the initiated were sworn to keep secret. This popular notion of "mystery," as a sacred knowledge disclosed to fit persons, on their subjecting themselves to prescribed conditions, is appropriated and adapted in Bibl. Gr. to Divine revelation. The world at large does not perceive God's wisdom in the cross, being wholly disqualified; the Cor. believers apprehend it but partially, since they have imperfectly received the revealing Spirit and are "babes in Christ" (iii. 1 ff.); to the App., and those like them (10 ff.), a full disclosure is made. When he "speaks wisdom among the ripe," P. is not setting forth esoteric doctrines diff. from those preached to beginners, but the same "word of the cross"—for he knows nothing greater or higher (Gal.
7-8.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

"εις δόξαν ἡμῶν. 7. δόξαι τῶν ἀρχόντων τού ἀιώνος τοῦ τῶν Κύριων τῆς δόξης δεσποτῶν..."

Επεκτείνεται η ιδέα της ἐν μυστηρίῳ (σε παράλληλα): Ρ. Μπότε, πιστεύεις, από δόξης εις δόξαν, τα πιστήτα του "κύριον" της δόξης έσταυρώει, εί δόξαν, ούδεν τον Κύριον της δόξης έσταυρώει, ημών. 8. έγνωκεν, εί δόξαν, εφέδρα των αρχόντων του "αιώνος τοῦ αἰώνος τοῦ τῆς δόξης δεσποτῶν..."

Ver. 8. ήν ουδείς κ.τ.λ.: "which (wisdom) none of the rulers of this age has perceived"—all blind to the significance of the rise of Christianity.—

Ver. 9. cf. Heb. ii. 10; Pet. v. 1, 4, 10; Jo. xvi. 22. a Jas. ii. 1; similarly, Acts vii. 2 (Ps. xxviii. 9, xxi. 7, 9); Eph. i. 17; cf. Heb. ix. 5. b See i. 23; cf. Mt. xxix. 19, xvi. 2; Lk. xxiii. 33; Jo. ix. 18; Acts ii. 36, iv. 10.

Paul's view of Christ always shone with "the glory of that light" in which he first saw Him on the road to Damascus (Acts xxi. 11). Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin, Pilate and the Roman court (cf. Acts xiii. 27 f., 1 Tim. vi. 13) saw nothing of the splendid clothing the Lord Jesus as Ηεις stood before them; so knowing, they could not have crucified Ηεις. The expression κύριος τῆς δόξης is no synonym for Christ's Godhead, its signifiesthe entire grandeur of the incarnate Lord, whom the world's wise and great sentenced to the cross.

Ver. 9 confirms by the language of Scripture (καθώς γέγραπται) what has just been said. The verse is open to three different constructions: (1) It seems best to treat the relatives, ά, όσα, as in apposition to the foregoing ήν clauses of vv. 7, 8 (the form of the pro-
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c See i.31.

d Isa. lxxv. 4 and lxxv. 16 (see note below).

Rom. xi.

8 (Deut. xxvi. 3 3 f., after the Hebrew text; the 3rd occurs in a similar strain in Isai. lxxv. 17 (LXX, 16); see other parls.

In thought, as Hf. and Bt. point out, this passage corresponds to Isai. lxxiv.: in P. God does, as in Isaiah He is besought to do, things unlooked for by the world, to the confusion of its unbelief; in each case these things are done for fit persons—Isaiah’s “him that waiteth for Him,” etc., being translated into Paul’s “those that love Him”; προώρισεν is changed to ἠτοίμασεν, in conformity with προώρισεν (7). A further analogy appears between the “terrible things in righteousness” which the prophet foresees in the coming theophany, and the καταργείν that P. announces for “the rulers of this world”. Clement of Rome (ad Cor., xxxiv. 8) cites the text briefly as a Christian saying, but reverses from Paul’s “them that love Him”—τιμήσων εἰς τὴν αἰώναν, manifestly identifying the O. and N.T. sayings.

Or. wrote (on Matt. xxvii. 9), “In nullo regulari libro hoc positum invenitur, nisi in Secretis Eliae prophetæ”—a lost Apocalypse; Jerome found the words both in the Ascension of Isaiah and the Apocalypse of Elias, but denies Paul’s indebtedness to these sources; and Lt. makes out (see note, ad loc.) that these books were later than Paul. Origen’s suggestion has been adopted by many expositors, but is really needless; this is only an extreme example of the Apostle’s freedom in adopting and combining O.T. sayings whose substance he desires to use. The Gnostics quoted the passage in favour of their method of esoteric teaching.

δος, of the last clause, is a climax to 5 of the first—“so many things as God prepared for those that love Him”: cf. 2 Cor. i. 20, Phil. iv. 8, for the pronomi-
For amongst men, who knows (οίδεν) the things of the man, except the spirit of the man that is within him? So also the things of God none has perceived (ἐγνώκεν), except the Spirit of God. Far from being otiose, ἀνθρώπων is emphatic: R. argues from human to Divine personality, each heart of man has its secrets (τά του ανθρώπου) : nor even the dearest soul, and next our own, knows half the reasons why we smile or sigh; there is a corresponding region of inner personal consciousness with God (τά του Θεοῦ). As the man's own spirit lifts the veil and lights the

the complementary truth concerning the relation of Father and Spirit, see Rom. viii. 27. The Spirit is the organ of mutual understanding between man and God. P. conceives of Him as internal to the inspired man, working with and through, though immeasurably above his faculties (see iii. 16, Rom. viii. 16, 26, etc.). τα βάθη (pl. of noun βάθος) are those inscrutable regions, below all that "the eye sees" and that "comes up into the heart of a man" (9), where God's plans for mankind are developed: cf. Rom. xi. 33 ff., Eph. i. 23 ff., iii. 18, and by contrast Rev. ii. 24. These deep-laid counsels centre in Christ, and are shared by Him (Matt. xxi. 27, John iv. 20, xvii. 25); so that it is one thing to have the Spirit who "sounds the deeps of God" and to "have the mind of Christ" (16). The like profound insight is claimed, in virtue of his possessing the Holy Spirit, by the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon (vii.), but in a υπεροχή λόγου και σοφίας that goes to discredit the assumption; cf. also Sirach xlii. 8. The attributes there assigned to the half-personified "Wisdom," N.T. theology divides between Christ and the Spirit in their several offices towards man. The "Spirit" is apprehended in Wisdom under physical rather than, as by Paul, under psychological analogies.

Ver. 11. "For amongst men, who knows (οἴδεν) the things of the man, except the spirit of the man that is within him? So also the things of God none has perceived (ἐγνώκεν), except the Spirit of God." Far from being otiose, ἀνθρώπων is emphatic: P. argues from human to Divine personality; each heart of man has its secrets (τα του Θεου); "not even the dearest soul, and next our own, knows half the reasons why we smile or sigh"; there is a corresponding region of inner personal consciousness with God (τα του Θεου). As the man's own spirit lifts the veil and lights the
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o Rom. viii.
 x. 47, xix.
2: Jos. xx. 3.
χαριστώμεν ἡμῖν. 13. 4 καὶ λαλοῦμεν, όποι ἐν 'ιδιακοῖς ἀθρο- 

1 See ver. 4. u iii. 1, xiv. 37; Gal. vi. 1.

recesses penetrable by no reasoning from without, so God's Spirit must communicate His thoughts,—or we shall never know them. This reserve belongs to the rights of self-hood. Paul's axiomatic saying assumes the personality of God, and man's affinity to God grounded therein. P. does not in this analogy limit the Ἀγίον Πνεύμα by human conditions, nor reduce Him to a mere Divine self-consciousness (το ἐκ του Θεού, το, guards us against this); the argument is a minori ad majus (as in Gal. iii. 15, Rom. v. 7, Luke xi. 13), and valid for the point in question. The Ap. ascribes to a man a natural πνεύμα (cf. v. 5, 1 Thess. v. 23), which manifests itself in νούς and συνείδησις (Rom. ii. 15, vii. 25, etc.; see Cr. on these terms), akin to and receptive of the Πνεύμα Θεού; but not till quickened by the latter is the πνεύμα ἀνθρώπου regnant in him, so that the man can be called πνευματικός (see note on 15).—Οn οίδα, as diff. from εὑρισκεν, see note to ver. 8: "while οίδα is simple and absolute, γινώσκω is relative, involving more or less the idea of a process of examination" (Lt.): "no one has got to know τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ"—has by searching (10) found Him out (Job xi. 7, xxiii. 9, etc.; John xviii. 25)—only His own Spirit knows, and therefore reveals Him.

Ver. 12. ἡμῖς δὲ, "But we": cf. the emphatic ἡμῖν of ver. 10 (see note), and the ἡμῖς δὲ of i. 23, standing in contrast with the σοφόλης and ἄνυστοι of the world. The κόσμος whose "spirit" the App. "did not receive," is that whose "wisdom God has reduced to folly" (i. 20 f.), whose "rulers crucified the Lord" (8); its spirit is broadly conceived as the power animating the world in its antipathy to God (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, John xii. 32, etc., 1 John iv. 2 ff.—for τοῦ κοσμοῦ, Bz., Hn., Sm.) read the phrase in a more abstract—perhaps too modern—sense, "sapientia mundana et secularis," or "the world-consciousness" (Hf.), or "l'esprit de l'humanité... ce que les Païens appellent la muse et qui se concentre dans les génies" (Gd.).—"(Not the spirit of the world we received), but the Spirit which was from (issues from: ως εκ Θεοῦ, Bg.) God" (compare ως εκ Θεοῦ, 2 Cor. ii. 17); the phrase recalls the teaching of Jesus in John xiv. 26, xv. 26; see also Rom. v. 5, Gal. iv. 6. "The spirit of the world" breathes in men who are a part of the world; "the Spirit that is from God" νisits us from anothersphere, bringing knowledge of things removed from natural apprehension (see Isa. ix. 9). ελάβομεν implies actual, objective receiving (taking), as in iii. 8, xi. 23, etc.—ἐλάβομεν κ.τ.λ. (see note on οίδα, 15; and cf. the emphatic οίδα of 2 Cor. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 12)—a bold word here—"that we may know (certo scire, Cn.) the things that by God were bestowed in Ηis grace upon us," τα χαρισθέντα, aor. ptp., points to the historic gifts of God to men which would have been idle boons without the Spirit enabling us to "know" them: cf. Εph. i. 17 ff., ἣν διὸ... πνεῦμα... ἐλάβομεν. χαρίζω (to deal in χάρις: see note on χάρισμα, i. 7), to grant by way of grace, in unmerited favour (cf. esp. Rom. viii. 32, Gal. iii. 18).

Ver. 13. καὶ λαλοῦμεν—the vb. of 6, 7 (see note): there opposed to μυστήριον, here to εἰδοῦμεν (cf. John iii. 11)—"which things indeed we speak out"; knowing these great things of God, we tell them (cf. John xviii. 20; also 2 Cor. iv. 2 ff., Luke xii. 2 ff., Acts xxvi. 16). P. has no esoteric doctrines, to be whispered to a select circle; if the τέλειοι and πνευματικοί alone comprehend his Gospel, that is not due to reserve on his part. "The καὶ λαλοῦμεν makes it clear that P. does not mean (in 6 and iii. 1 ff.) to distinguish two sorts of Gospel; his preaching has always the entire truth for its content, but expressed suitably to the growth of his hearers" (Hn.).
The mode of utterance agrees with the character of the revealing Spirit: 'οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοι, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς κ.τ.λ. ' (which things we speak out), not in human-wisdom-taught words, but in (words) Spirit-taught"—verba rem sequuntur (Wetstein). The opposed gens. depend ΟΠκτοίς, denoting agent with νbl. adj.—a construction somewhat rare, but cl. (so in John vi. 45, Isa. liv. 13; diff. in 1 Macc. iv. 7, διδακτοὶ τολόμου;) they are anarthrous, signifying opposite kinds of wisdom.—διδακτοὶ in earlier Gr. meant what can or ought to be taught; later, what is taught (cf. γνωστός, Rom. i. 19). Paul affirms that his words in matters of revelation, as well as thoughts, were taught him by the Spirit; he claims, in some sense, verbal inspiration. In an honest mind thought and language are one, and whatever determines the former must mould the latter. Cor. critics complained both of the imperfection of Paul's dialect (2 Cor. χ. το: see 1 above) and of the poverty of his ideas; here is his rejoinder. We arrive thus at the explanation of the obscure clause, πνευματικοίς πνευματικά συνκρίνοντες,—combining spiritual things with spiritual, welding kindred speech to thought (for the ptp. qualifies λαλοῦμεν): so Εr., Cν., Βz., D.W., Μr., Ηn., Lt., Ε1., Βt.: "with spiritual phrase watching spiritual truth" (Εν.). Ver. 13 asserts the correspondence of Apostolic utterance and thought; in ver. 14 P. passes to the correspondence of men and things. Other meanings are found for συνκρίνω, and πνευματικοίς may be masc. as well as neut.; thus the following variant renderings are deduced: (1) comparing sp. things with sp. (Vg., E.V., Ed.)—forming them into a correlated system; (2) interpreting, or proving, sp. things by sp.—sc. O.T. types by N.T. fulfils (Cm. and Ff); (3) adapting, or appropriating, sp. things to sp. men (Est., Olshausen, Gd.), with some strain upon the vb.: (4) interpreting sp. things to sp. men (Bc., Buckert, Hf., Stanley, Al., Sm.). The last explanation is plausible, in view of the sequel; but it misses the real point of ver. 13, and is not clearly supported by the usage of συνκρίνω, which "means properly to combine, as διακρίνω to separate" (Lt.).

Ver. 14. With the App. all is spiritual—words and thoughts; for this very reason men of the world reject their teaching: "But a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God" (cf. Rom. viii. 5: John xv. 18-21, i John iv. 5).—Of the vbs. for receiving, λαμβάνω (12) regards the object, δέχομαι the manner and spirit of the act—to welcome (see par.;) there is no receptivity—"non vult admirere" (Bg.). Ψυχικός, in all N.T. instances, has a disparaging sense, being opposed to πνευματικός (as ψυχή is not to πνεύμα), and almost syn. with σαρκικός or σαρκικός (iii. 1 f). The term is in effect privative—ο μόνην τ. ήματου καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην σύνεσιν έχων (Cm.), "quemlibet hominem solis naturae facultatibus praeditum" (Cν.),—positive evil being implied by consequence. Adam's body was ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ, as not yet charged, like that of Christ, with the Divine ΠΝΕΥΜΑ (νν. 44-49: syn. with χοιρίκος, and contrasted with ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ). "The word was coined by Aristotle (Eth. Nic., III., x., 2) to distinguish the pleasures of the soul, such as ambition and the ptp. qualities λαλοῦμεν; so Er., Cv., Bz., D.W., Mr., Hn., Lt., El., Bt.; "with spiritual phrase matching spiritual truth" (Ev.). Ver. 13 asserts the correspondence of Apostolic utterance and thought; in ver. 14 P. passes to the correspondence of men and things. Other meanings are found for συνκρίνω, and πνευματικοίς may be masc. as well as neut.; thus the following variant renderings are deduced: (1) comparing sp. things with sp. (Vg., E.V., Ed.)—forming them into a correlated system; (2) interpreting, or proving, sp. things by sp.—sc. O.T. types by N.T. fulfils (Cm. and Ff); (3) adapting, or appropriating, sp. things to sp. men (Est., Olshausen, Gd.), with some strain upon the vb.: (4) interpreting sp. things to sp. men (Bc., Buckert, Hf., Stanley, Al., Sm.). The last explanation is plausible, in view of the sequel; but it misses the real point of ver. 13, and is not clearly supported by the usage of συνκρίνω, which "means properly to combine, as διακρίνω to separate" (Lt.).

Ver. 14. With the App. all is spiritual—words and thoughts; for this very reason men of the world reject their teaching: "But a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God" (cf. Rom. viii. 5: John xv. 18-21, i John iv. 5).—Of the vbs. for receiving, λαμβάνω (12) regards the object, δέχομαι the manner and spirit of the act—to welcome (see par.;) there is no receptivity—"non vult admirere" (Bg.). ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ, in all N.T. instances, has a disparaging sense, being opposed to πνευματικός (as ψυχή is not to πνεύμα), and almost syn. with σαρκικός or σαρκικός (iii. 1 f). The term is in effect privative—ο μόνην τ. ήματου καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην σύνεσιν έχων (Cm.), "quemlibet hominem solis naturae facultatibus praeditum" (Cν.),—positive evil being implied by consequence. Adam's body was ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ, as not yet charged, like that of Christ, with the Divine ΠΝΕΥΜΑ (νν. 44-49: syn. with χοιρίκος, and contrasted with ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ). "The word was coined by Aristotle (Eth. Nic., III., x., 2) to distinguish the pleasures of the soul, such as ambition and the ptp. qualities λαλοῦμεν; so Er., Cv., Bz., D.W., Mr., Hn., Lt., El., Bt.; "with spiritual phrase matching spiritual truth" (Ev.). Ver. 13 asserts the correspondence of Apostolic utterance and thought; in ver. 14 P. passes to the correspondence of men and things. Other meanings are found for συνκρίνω, and πνευματικοίς may be masc. as well as neut.; thus the following variant renderings are deduced: (1) comparing sp. things with sp. (Vg., E.V., Ed.)—forming them into a correlated system; (2) interpreting, or proving, sp. things by sp.—sc. O.T. types by N.T. fulfils (Cm. and Ff); (3) adapting, or appropriating, sp. things to sp. men (Est., Olshausen, Gd.), with some strain upon the vb.: (4) interpreting sp. things to sp. men (Bc., Buckert, Hf., Stanley, Al., Sm.). The last explanation is plausible, in view of the sequel; but it misses the real point of ver. 13, and is not clearly supported by the usage of συνκρίνω, which "means properly to combine, as διακρίνω to separate" (Lt.).

Ver. 14. With the App. all is spiritual—words and thoughts; for this very reason men of the world reject their teaching: "But a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God" (cf. Rom. viii. 5: John xv. 18-21, i John iv. 5).—Of the vbs. for receiving, λαμβάνω (12) regards the object, δέχομαι the manner and spirit of the act—to welcome (see par.;) there is no receptivity—"non vult admirere" (Bg.). ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ, in all N.T. instances, has a disparaging sense, being opposed to πνευματικός (as ψυχή is not to πνεύμα), and almost syn. with σαρκικός or σαρκικός (iii. 1 f). The term is in effect privative—ο μόνην τ. ήματου καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην σύνεσιν έχων (Cm.), "quemlibet hominem solis naturae facultatibus praeditum" (Cν.),—positive evil being implied by consequence. Adam's body was ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ, as not yet charged, like that of Christ, with the Divine ΠΝΕΥΜΑ (νν. 44-49: syn. with χοιρίκος, and contrasted with ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ). "The word was coined by Aristotle (Eth. Nic., III., x., 2) to distinguish the pleasures of the soul, such as ambition and the ptp. qualities λαλοῦμεν; so Er., Cv., Bz., D.W., Mr., Hn., Lt., El., Bt.; "with spiritual phrase matching spiritual truth" (Ev.). Ver. 13 asserts the correspondence of Apostolic utterance and thought; in ver. 14 P. passes to the correspondence of men and things. Other meanings are found for συνκρίνω, and πνευματικοίς may be masc. as well as neut.; thus the following variant renderings are deduced: (1) comparing sp. things with sp. (Vg., E.V., Ed.)—forming them into a correlated system; (2) interpreting, or proving, sp. things by sp.—sc. O.T. types by N.T. fulfils (Cm. and Ff); (3) adapting, or appropriating, sp. things to sp. men (Est., Olshausen, Gd.), with some strain upon the vb.: (4) interpreting sp. things to sp. men (Bc., Buckert, Hf., Stanley, Al., Sm.). The last explanation is plausible, in view of the sequel; but it misses the real point of ver. 13, and is not clearly supported by the usage of συνκρίνω, which "means properly to combine, as διακρίνω to separate" (Lt.).
II. 15—16.
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ναι καιου δύναται γνωναι, ὅτι "πνευματικῶς" ανακρίνεται πάντα, αὐτὸς δὲ ὅπερ οὖθεν "ἀνα-
κρίνεται. Τις γὰρ ἐγὼν τοὺς Κυρίου, δὲ συμβιβάσει αὐτῶν;

ο Κύριος, διὰ οὗ φθάσει συναι ὁ ἀνακρινητὴς, ἀνακρίνεται πάντα," ἀνακρίνεται ὁ δὲ ὅπερ οὖθεν "ἀνα-
κρίνεται. Τις γάρ ἐγὼν τοὺς Κυρίου, δὲ συμβιβάσει αὐτῶν; 3. α.35 ἀνακρίνεται πάντα, αὐτὸς δὲ ὅπερ υπ' οὐδὲνος ανακρίνεται. 16.

Lk, κρίνεται.

14, and five times in Acts. c Is. xii. 13; Rom. xi. 34; cf. Wisd. ix. 13. d Eph. iv. 16; Col. ii. 19; Acts ix. 22, xvi. Io, xix. 33.

1 Ver. 15 om in NEC and harl., by homoteleuton, ανακρινεται being repeated in vv. 14 and 15 (cf. text note on i. 27).

2 Om. μεν ΑCDG; NECBLP, etc., insert it. The foregoing & would condemn it with stylists.

3 τα πάντα: ΑCD*P, 17; W.H. mg. (bracketed). πάντα, δSaBGL, etc. The chief copies that omit μεν, substitute for it τα before πάντα.

folio belongs (cleaves) to him, and he cannot perceive that he is spiritually searched" (cf. xiv. 24 ff., ἀνακρινεται)—an ingenious and grammatically possible translation, but not consistent with the emphatic ref. of μορία in ch. i. to the world's judgment on the Gospel, nor with the fact that "the things of God" (σοφία Θεού, πνευματικά) are the all-commanding topic of this paragraph. We adhere therefore to the common rendering: "For to him they are folly; and he cannot perceive (them), for (it is) spiritually (that) they are tried"—and he is unspiritual. For γνώναι, see note on ἔγνωκεν (8).—Ἀνακρίνω must be distinguished from κρίνω, to judge, deliver a verdict; and from διακρίνω, to discern, distinguish diff. things; it signifies to examine, inquire into, being syn. on the one side with ἔραυναν of ver. 10, and on the other with δοκιμάζων of 1 Thess. v. 21 (see I. ad loc., and in his Fresh Revision, pp. 69 ff.): ἀνακρίτης was an Athenian law-term for a preliminary investigation—corresponding mutatis mutandis to the part taken in English law-proceedings by the Grand Jury" (cf. Acts xxv. 26). The Gospel appears on its trial before the ψυχικός; like the Athenian philosophers, τ.γ. give it a first hearing, but they have no organon to test it by. The inquiry is stultified, ab initio, by the incompetence of the jury. The unspiritual are out of court as religious critics; they are deaf men judging music.

Ver. 15. "But the spiritual man tries (tests) everything"—a maxim resembling, perhaps designedly, the Stoic dicta concerning "the wise man". Paul sees "in the Πνεύμα, the Divine power creatively working in the man and imparted to him, the κριτήριον for the right estimate of persons and things, Divine and human. The Stoai on its part was intently concerned 'to know the standard according to which man is judged by man' (Arrian-Epictetus, II., xiii., 16) . . . it found this criterion in the moral use of Reason . . . The Christian believer and the Stoic philosopher both practise an ἀνακρίνειν; both are conscious of standing superior to all judgment from without; but the ground of this superiority, and the inferences drawn from it, are equally opposed in the two cases. The Stoic's judgment on the world leads him, under given conditions, to suicide ('The door stands open,' Epict.): the Christian's judgment on the world leads to the realisation of the victory of the children of God" (Hn.).—πάντα (not every one, but neut. pl.) is quite general—everything; cf., for the scope of this faculty, vi. 2 f., x. 15, i Thess. v. 21, i John ii. 20 f., iv. 1, Rev. ii. 2. Aristotle (Eth. Nic., III., iv.) says of ὁ στοιχειοθες (the man of character), ἡ αρετή κρίνει ἄρδες, καὶ ἐν ἐκατότετοι πάντα κρίνει οὕτως . . . δοτερ καὶ κρίνει οὕτως ἄρδες; Plato, De Rep., iii., 409 D (quoted by Ed.), ascribes the same universally critical power to ἥ ἀριτή. Paul's πνευματικὸς judges in virtue of a Divine, all-searching Presence within him; Aristotle's στοιχειοθες, in virtue of his personal qualities and attainments. Paul admirably displays in this Ep. the powers of the πνευματικὸς as ἐν ἀνακρίνει αὐτῶν πάντα. There are, of course, limits to the exercise of the ανακρίνειν, in the position and opportunities of the individual.

αὐτὸς δὲ ὅπερ υπ' οὐδένος ἀνακρίνεται, "while he himself is put on trial by none,"—since none other possesses the probe of truth furnished by the Πνεύμα τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ; the πνευματικὸς stands on a height from which he overlooks the world, and is overlooked only by God. The statement is ideal, holding good of "the spiritual man" as, and so far as, he
Και ο Άγιος, αδελφοί, ούκ α σαρκινοίς, ούκ α νοστιμίαις (vi.17, 2 Cor. viii. 5, etc.; John xv. 1-8); the union mystica is the heart of Paul's experience.

Chapter III.—Ver. i. Καγώ, αδελφοί: The Ap. returns to the strain of ii. 1-5, speaking now not in general terms of ημείς, οἱ τέλειοι, etc., but definitely of the Cor. and himself. They demonstrate, unhappily, the incapacity of the unspiritual for spiritual things. The και carries us back to ii. 14: "A natural man does not receive the things of God... and I (accordingly) could not utter (them) to you as to spiritual (men), but as to men of flesh". Yet the Cor. were ποτ ψυχικοί (see note, ii. 14). For λαλήσαι, see ii. 6; and on the receptivity of the πνευματικός, ii. 13 ft. Cf. Rom. viii. 5-9: οἱ κατὰ πνεύμα όντες τα του Πνεύματος φρονούσιν. (ουκ... ώς πνευματικοίς), αλλ' ώς σαρκίνοις: "on the contrary, (I was obliged to speak to you) as to men of flesh"—grammatical zeugma, as well as breviloquence: the affirmative "I was able," carried over from the negative clause οὐκ ἦδυνήθην, passes into the kindred "I was obligated," that is necessarily understood (cf. Eph. iv. 29); ver. 7, vii. 19, x. 24, are similarly expressed, without the zeugma.—Σάρκινος (see parls.) differs from σαρκικός (3, ix. 11, etc.) as carnisus from carnis, fleischern from fleischlich (as leathern from leathery)—ους implying nature and constitution (ἐν σαρκί εἶναι, -ικής tendency or character (κατὰ σέρικα εἶναι).

So σάρκινος is associated with νηπιάτης, σαρκικός with ξέλος καὶ κεφαλή: see Trench, Syn., § lxx. The distinction
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II.

b xiii. 11, xiv. 20; (ἡπιάτω)
Rom. ii. 20; Gal. iv. 1, 3; Eph. iv. 11. Th. ii. 7; Heb. v. 13; Mt. xvi. 25, xxi. 16; Lk. x. 21; Ps. xvii. 8. c ix. 7; Heb. v. 12 f; 1 Pet. ii. 2. d xii. 3, 20; Rev. xiv. 8; Mt. x. 42. e In sing., viii. 13, 3; Rom. xiv. 15, 20; Jo. iv. 14. f In all, iv. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 12; Gal. ii. 3; Acts xix. 2; Lk. xxiii. 15. g In this sense, 2 Cor. i. 2, x. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 11. h In the like sense, Col. iii. 17; Heb. iv. 16, x. 18; Ja. iii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 11. i Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Sir. ix. 5. ζηλος alone, in this use, Acts v. 17, xiii. 45; Ja. iii. 14, 16. εποτίσα, see i. 11.

ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Rom. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Gal. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

3ο. Eph. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Lk. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Mt. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Sir. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

3ο. Acts ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Lk. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Mt. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

2ο. Sir. ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

3ο. Acts ούπω γάρ ήδύνασθε.

ούκ ήδυνήθην in ver. 1.

εποτίσα . . . βρώμα is natural in Paul's conversational style; see ix. 7, per contra. —ούσα γρά

δύνασθε: "for not yet (while I was with you) were you equal to it". This absolute use of δύνασθε (= δύνασθε εἰμι) is cl., but a.l. for the N.T.; the tense impf., of continued state.

§ 9. God's Rights in the Church, iii. 3-9. One idea runs through this chapter and into the next,—that of God's Church, God's temple at Corinth, in whose construction so many various builders are engaged (5-17). For this building's sake, and because it is His, God beats down the pride of human craft, making all things, persons, times, serve His people, while they serve Christ, as Christ serves God (18-23). To God His servants are responsible; it is His to judge and commend them (i. 1-5). Thus the thought that the Gospel is "God's power, God's wisdom," pursued since i. 18, is brought to bear upon the situation in Corinth. God who sends the message of the cross, admitting in its communication no mixture of human wisdom (ch. i.), chose and inspired His own instruments for its impartation (ch. ii.). What presumption in the Cor. parties to appropriate the diff. Christian leaders, and inscribe their names upon rival banners!

Ver. 3. 'Αλλ' ουδέ έτι νύν δύνασθε: "Nay, but not even yet (after this further interval), at the present time, are you strong enough (immo ne nunc quidem adhuc potessis, Bz.), for you are yet carnal!" For έτι, cf. xv. 17, Gal. i. 10, v. 11; for σαρκικοί, see note on σάρκινος (1). The Cor. are weak (otherwise than in x. 28) just where they think themselves strong (viii. 1), viz., in spiritual apprehension; their gifts of "word and knowledge" are a source of weakness, through the conceit and strife they engender. The άλλ' ουδέ clause, with its strong disjunctives, is better joined to ver. 3 (A., W. H., Sm.) than to ver. 2. The foregoing ούσα γρά δύνασθε sufficiently explained the ούδε of Paul's previous ministry (1); ούδε έτι νύν δύνασθε describes the present condition of the Cor. (3 f.). It is reluctantly and with misgiving that the
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καὶ ἐστὲ καὶ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε; 4. ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ εἴη

“Ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμὶ "Παύλος,“ ἢ "Ἐγὼ "Ἀπολλῶς," ὃν ἂν ἠσπάζωσα ὁ ἀνθρώπος καὶ ἠσπάζωσά τις ἐστε; 5. τίς εὖ ἐστὶν Παύλος; τίς ἀλλ’ ἡ ἐὰν ἀπεστείλατε, καὶ ἐκάστῳ τίς;

Rom. iii. 5, vii. 22. m Lk. ix. 57, 59, 61; xi. 15 f. n See i. 12. ο ἀνθρωποι, ver. 21. l. 25, etc.; frequent in P. in such disparaging use, Heb. vii. 28; Acts xiv. 11; Jo. iii. 19; Mt. x. 17, xv. 9 (Isa. xix.; 13); Gen. vi. 5 f.; Isa. ii. 22, etc. p In this sense, 2 Cor. iii. 6, vi. 4, xi. 23; Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 7, 23, 25; i Tim. iv. 6. q See l. 21; also, in absolute use, s Cor. iv. 13; Acts viii. 13, xiii. 12, 48, xiv. 1, xv. 7, xvi. 12, 34, xviii. 8.

1 D*G read σαρκινοί (twice), in conformity with ver. 1; G reads, perversely, σαρκικοί there: instances of Western license.

ὁ θρόνος (before ανθρ.,) Ν*ABC, τ7. οὐκ (before ανθρ.), ΝΑΒC, τ7. οὐχι, DLp, Western and Syrian: parl. to ver. 3.

σαρκικοί all uncc. but Νεκρό (Syrian) with συντρ., which carry over σαρκικοί from νέρ. 3.

τίς τις, Ν*ΑΒC, τ7. ουκ (before ανθρ.), ΝΑΒC, τ7. οὐκ, DLP, Western and Syrian: parl. to ver. 3.

Ἀπολλώς . . . Παύλος, in this order, all uncc. but Dfl, which are followed by the bulk of minuscc. and συντρ., reversing the order to guard Π.'s dignity.

τις, CDGLP, συντρ., Lnt., etc., seemingly a Western emendation, but not followed by Lat. cdd.

Ἀπολλώς . . . Παύλος, in this order, all uncc. but DbL, which are followed by the bulk of minuscc. and συντρ., reversing the order to guard Π.'s dignity.

全线, but ΔεβLp, om. αλλ’ η...ο a Syrian insertion.

Apostle later in the Ep. enters into deep doctrine (μονάχος, cf. note on ii. 6).—διὸν γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ., “for where (not when, nor thither—as Βg. cum, Mr. quæquam) amongst you there is jealousy and strife”: this seems to limit the censure (cf. v11. 12, 34); the use of party-names was universal (i. 12), but not due in all cases to ἔχλος και ἐρις. Otherwise the διὸν clause must be read as a general principle applied to the Cor. = διὸν γὰρ ἔχλος και ἐρις, ὡς ἐν ὑμν. a construction inconsistent with the position of ἐν ὑμῖν. So far as these evils exist, the readers are σαρκικοί, not πνευματικοί. For ἐρις, see note to i. 11; ἔχλος is the emulation, then ἐννυ, which is a chief cause of ἐρις. These are companion “works of the flesh” in Gal. v. 20: for the honourable sense of ἔχλος, prevailing in cl. Gr., see 2 Cor. vii. 7, etc.; also Trench, Syn., § xxvi.; zealous and jealous reproduce the diff.

Paul seems to call the Cor. denying the allegation made in 3a, "Ετέρος δέ, Εγώ ἀλλ’ ἂν διάκονοι διάκονοι, καὶ οὐκ ἂν . . . κατά θεόν γε for its tacit anti-
quarrelling over the claims of their teachers, as though the Church were the creature of men: "What therefore (I am compelled to ask) is Apollos? what, on the other side (δέ), is Paul?" —τί is more emphatic than τίς; it breathes disdain; "as though Apollos or Paul were anything!" (Lt.). Apollos precedes, in continuation of ver. 4. For both, the question is answered in one word—διάκονοι, "non autores fidei vtræ, sed ministri duntaxat" (Er.); cf. 2 Cor. i.24, iv. 5.: ο Κύριος in the next clause is its antithesis. Paul calls himself διάκονος in view of specific service rendered (2 Cor. iii.6, vi.4, etc.), but δούλος in his personal relation to Christ (Gal. i.10, etc.). "Through whose ministration you believed:" βεν quos, non in quos (Bg.: cf. i.15). Το "believe" is the decisive act which makes a Christian (see i.21); for the relation of saving faith to the Apostolic testimony, cf. ch. i.-iii.; 2 Cor. i.18-22, etc. Some Cor. had been converted through Apollos. The above-named are servants, each with his specific gift: και εκάστω ώς ο Κύριος κ.τ.λ., "and in each case, (servants in such sort) as the Lord bestowed (on him)." —ἐκάστω is emphatically projected before the ὃς: cf. vii.17, Rom. xii. 3. The various disposition of Divine gifts in and for the Church is the topic of ch. xii. "The Lord" is surely Christ, as regularly in Paul's dialect, "through whom are all things" (viii. 6, xii. 5; Eph. iv. 7-12, etc.)—the sovereign Dispenser in the House of God; from "Jesus our Lord" (ix. 1) P. received his own commission; the Apostolic preachers are alike "ministers of Christ" (iv. 1): so Thp., Rückert, Bt., Gd. However, Cm., and most modern exegetes, see God in ὁ Κύριος on account of vv. 6-9; but the relation of this ver. to the sequel is just that of the δι' αὐτοῦ to the ὃ ἀυτῷ τὰ πνεύματος of viii. 6; cf. note on ἦς αὐτοῦ, i. 30; and for the general principle, Matt. xxv. 44 ff.

Vv. 6, 7. The grammatical obj. of this sentence has been given by the foregoing context, viz., the Cor. Church of believers (cf. iv. 15).—ποτίζειν Paul uses besides only in ix.7; his regular metaphor in this connexion is that of ver. 10. "Planting" and "watering" happily picture the relative services of P. and Ap. Ποτίζειν, to give drink, to irrigate, may have for obj. men (2, xii. 13, etc.), animals (Luke xiii. 15), or plants. In ver. 2, Paul was the ποτίζων γάλα. The vb. takes a double acc., of person and thing (Wr., p. 284).—The ἀλλὰ of the last clause goes beyond a mere contrast (δέ) between God and men in their several parts, excluding the latter from the essential part: "but God—He only, and no other—made it to grow". The planting and watering of Christ's servants were occasions for the exercise of God's vitalising energy. While the former vba. are aor., gathering up the work of the two ministers into single successive acts, ποτίζειν is impf. of continued activity: "God was (all the while) making it to grow." Several of the Ff.—Aug. e.g.—saw in ποτίζειν the baptism, in φυτεύειν the instruction of catechumens,—illustrating a general fault of patristic exegesis, the endeavour to attach a technical sense to words in the N.T. which had not yet acquired this meaning" (Lt.).—στένει, itaque (and so, so then), with ind. (cf. vii. 38, xi. 27, xiv. 22), points out a result immediately flowing from what has been said: "the planter" and "the waterer," in comparison with "the Lord" who dispensed their powers and "God" who makes their plants to grow, are reduced to nothing; "God who gives the growth" (quidat υπο ενεσκείον, Bz.) alone remains. To the subject, ὁ αὐξάνων Θεός, the predicate τὰ πάντα εστίν is tacitly supplied from the negative clauses foregoing.—For εστίν τι (anything of moment), cf. Gal. ii.6, vi.3, Acts v.36, and note on τι εἰδέναι, ii.2. The pr. ptp. with ὃ becomes, virtually a (timeless) substantive—the planter waterer, Increaser (Wr., p. 444).
9. *Θεον γὰρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί. Θεον γεωργιον, Θεον οἰκοδομη έστε.*

10. Κατά τὴν χάριν τού θεον τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι, ὡς σοφὸς ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τῆς ἀρχιτέκτων, έστε. Κατά την χάριν του Θεού την δοθείσαν μοι, ὡς σοφὸς, Θεον γεώργιον, Θεον οἰκοδομη έστε.

Ver. 8. In comparison with God, Ap. and P. are simply nothing (7): in relation to each other they are not rivals, as their Cor. favourers would make them (4): “But the planter and the waterer are one” (ἐν, one thing)—with one interest and aim. τεις., the growth of the Church; cf. xii. 12, 20; also John x. 30. Their functions are complementary, not competitive: a further answer to the question, τί οὖν είναι Απόλλως κ.τ.λ.; The servants of God are nothing before Him, “one thing” before His Church: vanity and variance are alike impossible.

While one in aim, they are distinct in responsibility and reward: “But each will get his own proper wage, according to his own toil”. ἰδιός, appropriate, specific (cf. vii. 7, xv. 23, 28): “congruent iteration, antitheton ad unum” (Bg.). ἐργον (13-15) denotes the work achieved, κόσμος the exertion put forth (see parts., and κόσμιον. 10, etc.): τί γὰρ ἐργον τοικ ἄρτλεν; —κοπίασεν άλλος άλλος (Thp.). The contrast ἐργαλεῖα. ἐξαρτήσει, between collective and individual relationships, is characteristic of Paul: cf. xii. 5-11, 27. xv. 10 f., Gal. vi. 2-5, Rom. xiv. 7-10. He forbids the man either to assert himself against the community or to merge himself in it. The fixed ratio between present labour in Christ’s service and final reward is set forth, diff. but consistently, in the two parables of the Talents and Pounds, Matt. xxv. 14-30, Luke x. 11-28.

Ver. 9. Θεον . . . συνεργοι sums up in two words, and grounds upon a broad principle (γάρ), what vv. 6 ff. have set out in detail: “we are God’s fellow-workers”—employed upon His field, His building; and “we are God’s fellow-workers”—labouring jointly at the same task. The συν- of συνεργοι takes up the ἐργαλεια of ver. 8; the context (cf. xii. 6) forbids our referring it to the dependent gen. (cf also 2 Cor. 1. 24. vi. 1. Phil. iii. 17, 3 John 8), as though P. meant “fellow-workers with God”: “the work (Arbeit) of the διάκονος would be improperly conceived as a Mit-arbeit in relation to God; moreover the metaphors which follow exclude the thought of such a fellow-working” (Hn.); also Bg., “operarii Dei, et co-operarii invicem”.

As in regard to the labourers, so with the objects of their toil, God is all and in all: Θεον γεωργιον, Θεον οἰκοδομη έστε, “God’s tillth (arvum, land for tillage, Ed.), God’s building you are”. For God as γεωργιον, cf. John xv. 1; as οἰκοδομην, Heb. iii. 4. xi. 10. “Of the two images, γεωργιον implies the organic growth of the Church, οἰκοδομη the mutual adaptation of its parts” (Lt.); the one looks backward to vv. 6 ff., the other forward to vv. 10 ff.—Οἰκοδομη displaces οἰκοδομήμα in later Gr.—Θεον, anarthrous by correlation (see note on ἀπεστ. Πν., ii. 4): the three gens. are alike gens. of possession—“God’s workmen, employed on God’s field-tillage and God’s house-building”. Realising God’s all-comprehending rights in His Church, the too human Cor. (3 f.) will come to think justly of His ministers.

§ 10. The Responsibility of the Human Builders, iii. 10-17. After the long digression on Wisdom (i. 17-iii. 2), occasioned by the Hellenic misconception of the Gospel underlying the Cor. divisions, the Ap. returned in vv. 3 ff. to the divisions themselves, dealing particularly with the rent between Apollonians and Paulinists. His first business was to reduce the Church leaders to their subordinate place, as fellow-servants of the one Divine cause (§ 9). They are temple-workmen—not himself and Apollonios alone, but all who are labouring on the foundation which he has laid down—and must therefore take heed to the quality of their individual work, which will undergo a searching and fiery test.

Ver. 10. Κατά τὴν χάριν κ.τ.λ.: while “the grace of God” has been
ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

1 Ιησ. Χρ., ΝABLPC, above fifty mm., syr.ch. sah. cop. Χρ. Ιησ., CD, some

II.

59ο

11. \( \theta ρ η ρ \) δέ βλεπω (Pχ). Ι2. ει δέ τις εποικοδομείπι τον θεμέλιοντούτον γράφων,

1. εί "βλεπετός "εποικοδομεί τον θεμέλιον "θείναι τον Καιρός.1 Ιησούς ο Χριστός.

δέ, Luke ix. 19, John iv. 37, xiv. 16, xxi. 18. For the compound vb., see parls.; εκ- points to the basis, which gives the standard and measure to all subsequent work.
ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

11—13.

αργυρον, ἠλίθους κτιμίους—ξύλα, ἔχορτον, "καλάμην—13. ἐκάστος το ἔργον χαλάζεται· ή γάρ ἡμέρα δειλαίοις, δει ἐν τ' ἀποκαλύπτεται· καὶ έκάστον το ἔργον ὁ πυρός ἔστιν το

1 ΧΡΟΣΙΟΙ, ΑΡΓΥΡΟΙ: ΝΒ (C in latter inst., defective in former), 73, Clem., Or., Bas. B, ath. ins. και 50 W. H. mg.

name; and for this, with Paul the rarer, order, cf. ii. 2, Rom. v. 15. xvi. 25, etc.—also Heb. xiii. 8; in each instance Ἰεσοῦς Χριστός connotes the recognised facts as to His life, death, etc. (cf. note on i. 2).

Ver. 12. After the interjected caution to let the foundation alone, P. turns to the superstructure, to which the work of his coadjutors belongs; δε indicates this transition.—ειδέτις εποικοδομεῖ, εἰ with ind. (as in 14 f, etc.)—a supposition in matter of fact, while ἐὰς with sbj. (as in iv. 15) denotes a likely contingency. The doubled prp. ἔτι (with acc.)—an idiom characterising later Gr., which loves emphasis—implies growth by way of accession: "if any one is building-on,—onto the foundation"; contrast ἔτι with dat. in Eph. ii. 20. The material superimposed by the present Cor. builders is of two opposite kinds, rich and durable or paltry and perishing: "gold, silver, costly stones—wood, hay, straw,"—thrown together "in lively ἄσυνδετον" (Μπ.);

The latter might serve for poor frail huts, but not for the temple of God (17).—Κῆλος τῆς, the marbles, etc., used in rearing noble houses; but possibly Isa. liv. 11 f. (cf. Rev. xxi. 18-21) is in the writer's mind. The figure has been interpreted as relating (a) to the different sorts of persons brought into the Church (Pelagius, Bg., Hf.), since the Cor. believers constitute the θεοῦ ἐκκοσμή (9), the νόες θεοῦ (16)—"my work are you in the Lord" (ix. i.; cf. Eph. ii. 20 f., 2 Tim. ii. 19 ff., 1 Peter ii. 4 f.; also the striking parl. in Mal. iii. 1 ff., iv. 1); (b) to the moral fruits resulting from the labours of various teachers, the character of Church members, this being the specific object of the final judgment (2 Cor. v. 10, Rom. ii. 5-11; cf. i. Cor. xiii. 13) and that which measures the work of their ministers (1 Thess. ii. 19 ff., etc.)—so Or., Cm., Aug., lately Osianer and Gd. G. (20) to the ἐργασίαις of the different teachers, since for this they are primarily answerable and here lay the point of present divergence (cf. viii. 10 f., Rom. xiv. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 1 ff., 13 ff., Gal. i. 7, etc.)—so Clem. Al., and most moderns. The three views are not really discrepant: teaching shapes character, works express faith; unsound preaching attracts the bad hearer and makes him worse, sound preaching wins and improves the good (see i. 18, 24; 2 Tim. iv. 3; John iii. 18 ff., x. 26 f.). "The materials of this house may denote doctrines moulding persons," or "even persons moulded by doctrines" (Ev.),—"the doctrine exhibited in a concrete form" (Ltt.).

Ver. 13. "The work of each (ἐκάστου) will become manifest:" while the Wheat and Tares are in early growth (Matt. xiii. 24 ff.), they are indistinguishable; one man's work is mixed up with another's—"for the Day will disclose it".—Η ημέρα can only mean Christ's judgment γι-see parls., esp. i. 8, iv. 3 ff., and notes; also Rom. ii. 26, Acts xvii. 31. Matt. xxv. 19. "The day" suggests (cf. i. Thess. v. 2 ff., Rom. xiii. 11 ff.) the hope of daylight upon dark problems of human responsibility. But this searching is figured as the scrutiny of fire, which at once detects and destroys useless matter: ότι εν πυρί αποκαλύπτεται, "because it (the Day) is revealed in fire". For αποκαλύπται (pr., implying certainty, perhaps nearness), see notes on i. 7, ii. 10—a supernatural, unprecedented "day," dawning not like our mild familiar sunrise, but "in" splendour of judgment "fire": cf. 2 Thess. i. 8. This image comes from the O.T. pictures of a Theophany: Dan. vii. 9 f., Mal. iv. 1, Isa. xxx. 27, lxiv. 1 ff., etc.—καὶ εκάστου το ἔργον ὁ πυρός ἔστιν κ.τ.λ.: "and each man's work, of what kind it is,—the fire will prove it". The pleonastic αὐτὸ is due to a slight anacoluthon: the sentence begins as though it were to end, "the fire will show"; φασινέρωσι is, however, replaced by the stronger δηλαίοις suitable to πυρ, and this
altered vb. requires with it αὐτὸς, to recall the object ὁ ἑργον. Mr. and El. attach the pronoun to ὁ πῦρ, “the fire itself,” but with pointless emphasis. Others avoid the pleonasm by construing ἐκάστος τὸ ἑργον at the beginning as a πιομινετοςpendens (“as to each man’s work”), resembling that of John καν. 2; but the qualification that follows, ὁποῖον ἐστιν, makes this unlikely: cf. Gal. ii. 6, for the interpolated interr. clause. —δοκιμάζω is to assay (see LXX parls.), suggested by the “gold, silver” above: “πνεῖν, non purgabit... Ηic locus ignem purgatorium non modo non fovet, sed plane extinguit” (Bt.).—“Εκαστος, thrice repeated in vv. 10-13, with solemn individualising emphasis.

Vv. 14, 15. The opp. issues of the fiery assay are stated under parl. hypotheses: ὁ πῦρ τὸ ἑργον... μενεὶ... ὁ πῦρ τὸ ἑργον κατακαθίσταται, “If any one’s work shall abide... shall be burned up.” The double ind. with ὁ πῦρ balances the contrasted suppositions, without signifying likelihood either way: for the opposed vbs., cf. xiii. 8, 13; μενεὶ recalls υπομενεὶ of Mal. iii. 2.—δοκιμάζωσιν (wanting augment: usage varies in this vb.; Wr., p. 83) reminds us that the work examined was built on the one foundation (10 ff.).—μισθὸν λήμψεται and ζημιωθήσεται are the corresponding apodoses,—μισθὸν being carried over to the second of the parl. clauses (Mr., Gd., Lt., Ed.): “He will get a reward... will be mulcted (of it).”—ζημιόω retains in pass. its acc. of thing, as a vb. taking double acc.; derived from ζήμια (opp. of κέρδος: cf. Phil. iii. 7), it signifies to fine, inflict forfeit (in pass., suffer forfeit) of what one possessed, or might have possessed. “αὐτὸς —opposed to μισθὸς: his reward shall be lost, but his person saved” (Lt.); αὐτός is nearly syn. with the ψυχή of Matt. xvi. 25 f., etc. The man built on the foundation, though his work proves culpably defective: σωθήσεται promises him the σωτηρία of Christ’s heavenly kingdom (see i. 18, and other parl.s.). Such a minister saves himself, but not his hearers: the opp. result to that of ix. 27, etc. αὐτός δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὁ διὰ τοῦτο ἐργον (δὲ correcting δό, as in ii. 6)—“yet so (saved) as through fire”—like Lot fleeing from Sodom; his salvation is reduced to a minimum: “He rushes out through the flame, leaving behind the ruin of his work... for which, proved to be worthless, he receives no pay” (Bt.), getting through “scorched and with the marks of the flame” upon him (Lt.); “s’ilest sauvé, ce ne peut être qu’en έchappant a travers les flammes, et grâce a la solidité du fondement” (Gd.); to change the figure, “ut naufragus mercator, amissa merce et lucro, servatus per undas” (Bg.). For the prp., in local sense, see Gm., and Wr., p. 473; διὰ τωρεσ, proverbial for a hairbreadth escape (see Lt. ad loc.: Eurip., Andr., 487; Elec., 1182, and LXX parls.). The διὰ has been read instrumentally, “by means of fire,”—sc. the fire of purgatory (see Lt.); an idea foreign to this scene. Cm., by a dreadful inversion of the meaning, reads the διὰ as ἐν πυρί—“will be preserved in fire!” (σωθῶ nowhere has this sense of τηρέω): εἶταν Σωθήσεται, σιδῶν ἔτερον ὧν τὴν άπιστον τῆς τιμιρας ἴππεστο. For other interpretations, see Mr. Vv. 16, 17. However poor his work,
If any one destroys the temple of God, God will destroy him.” — *talonem justissimam* (Bk.). On the form of hypothesis, see ver. 14. — *φθείρω* signifies *to corrupt morally, deprave* (injure in character), *xxxv. 32* *Cor. xi. 3*, as well as *to waste, damage* (injure in being); see parls.—mutually implied in a spiritual building. This Church was menaced with destruction from the immoralities exposed in chh. v., vi., and from its party schisms (i.—iii.), both evils fostered by corrupt teaching. The figure is not that of Levitical defilement (*φθείρω* nowhere means to pollute a holy place); this *φθορά* is a structural injury, to be requited in kind. — ο Ἡθός closes the warning, with awful emphasis (cf. *I Thess. iv. 6*, *Rom. xii. 19*); God is bound to protect His temple (cf. Ps. xivi., *lxlviii., 1xx1n., Isa.xxv.3, lxiv. 10 ff.).—The injury is a *desecration*: “for the temple of God is holy,—which (is what) you are.” The added clause οἵτινες εστίν υμεῖς reminds the Cor. at once of the obligations their sanctity imposes (see notes on ἡγιασμένοις, κλητοίς, ἁγίοις, i. 2, cf. *I Peter i. 5*), and of the protection it guarantees (*Cor. vi. 14* ft., *2 Thess. ii. 13*; *John x. 29*; *Isa. xliii. 1-4*, etc., *Zech. ii. 8*).—οἵτινες, the qualitative relative, refers to ἁγίος more than to ναὸς, and is predicate (see Wr., pp. 206 f.) with *ψις* for subject.

§ 11. THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD, iii. 18-23. Affectation of philosophy, —“the wisdom of the world,” which P. has repudiated on behalf of the Gospel (i., ii.)—was at the bottom of the Cor. troubles. Those who follow human wisdom exalt human masters at the expense of God’s glory, and there are teachers who lend themselves to this error and thus build unworthily on the Christian foundation — some who are even destroying, under a show of building, the temple of God (iii. 3-17). That the warnings P. has given to his fellow-labourers bear on the popular *μάθημα* is apparent from the manner in which he reverts to the topic at this
προς κορινθιους α

ἐν τῷ ή αἰώνι τούτῳ μωρὸς γενέσθω, ἵνα γένηται σοφὸς. 19. ἐγάρ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου μωρία "παρά τῷ "θεοσερτος" γέγραπται γὰρ, "ο "δρασάσθομεν τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν": 20. καὶ πάλιν, "Κύριος γνώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν, ὅτι εἰς τῷ μάταιον." 21. ὅτε μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν ἄνθρωποις ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τοῦτος εἰς θεον εστὶ γέγραπται γὰρ, "ὁ "καταλαμβάνων τοὺς ἀρχοντές, ο "δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς εὔποροι εἰς τῷ πανουργίαν αὐτῶν." 22. ὅτε μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν ἄνθρωποις ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τοῦτος παρὰ θεῷ εστὶ γέγραπται γὰρ, "ὁ "δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς εὔποροι εἰς τῷ πανουργίαν αὐτῶν." Αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἐκ τῆς λαοῦ ἐς τὸν θεον ἑλθεν, ἵνα ταύτα ταῦτα σημείωσην. 23. ὅτε μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν ἄνθρωποις ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τοῦτος παρὰ θεῷ εστὶ γέγραπται γὰρ, "ὁ "δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς εὔποροι εἰς τῷ πανουργίαν αὐτῶν."
22. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

22. πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν, εἴτε Παύλος εἴτε Ἀπολλὼς εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε Ἰωάννης εἴτε θάνατος, εἴτε μέλλοντα πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν 1. 23. οὐκ εἴπομεν Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ.

19. πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν, εἴτε Παύλος εἴτε Ἀπολλὼς εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε Ἰωάννης εἴτε θάνατος, εἴτε μέλλοντα πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν 1. 23. οὐκ εἴπομεν Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ.

1 Om. 2nd ε σ τ ι ν all uncc. but DbcL.
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22. πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν, εἴτε Παύλος εἴτε Ἀπολλὼς εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε Ἰωάννης εἴτε θάνατος, εἴτε μέλλοντα πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν 1. 23. οὐκ εἴπομεν Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ.

19. πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν, εἴτε Παύλος εἴτε Ἀπολλὼς εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε Ἰωάννης εἴτε θάνατος, εἴτε μέλλοντα πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν 1. 23. οὐκ εἴπομεν Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ.
IV. 1. *Οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθω ἀνθρώπως ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ, καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων Θεοῦ. 2. *ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ κ. τ. λ. ὡς οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων Θεοῦ.

1 ως, all uncc. but δΞΕΛ.; also oldest verss. ος, however, in Chr. and Gr. Comm. Lachm., following the bulk of minusc., placed the full stop after ος.

πάντα ἡμῶν, having gathered into it the totality of finite existence, "to reverse it by the words ὡς διὰ Χριστοῦ, "but (not and) you are Christ's!" (cf. vi. 20, Rom. xii. 1 ff., 2 Cor. v. 15). The Cor. readers, exalted to a height outsoaring Stoic pride, are in a moment laid low at the feet of Christ: "Lords of the universe—you are His bondmen, your vast heritage in the present and future you gather " (cf. vi. 20, Rom. xii. 1 ff., 2 Cor. v. 15), "but," he reminds him, "his wealth is that of a steward. Our property is immense, but we are Another's; we rule, to be ruled. A man cannot own too much, provided that he recognises his Owner.

Finally, Christ who demands our subordination, supplies in Himself its grand example: Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ, "but Christ is God's". We are masters of everything, but Christ's servants; He Master of us, but God's Servant (cf. Acts iii. 13, etc.). For His filial submission, see xi. 3, xv. 22 ff., Rom. vi. 12, and notes; also John viii. 29, x. 29, etc. We cannot accept Cν.'s dilution of the sense, "He accepts the Christian leaders, whose names are so much abused at Cor. If the Church is to understand its proper character, it must reverence theirs. They are its servants; it is not their master. They are its property, because they are Christ's property; and His instruments first of all. P. thus resumes the train of thought opened in § 10, where the work of Church-builders was discriminated in relation to the building; now it is viewed in its relation to God the Householder. Here lies another and the final ground of accusation against the Cor. parties: those who maintained them, in applauding this chief and censuring that, were putting themselves into Christ's judgment-seat, from which the Apostle thrusts them down.

Ver. 1. "In this way let a man take account of us, etc." Οὕτως draws attention to the coming ὡς: the vb. λογιζέσθω implies a reasonable estimate, drawn from admitted principles (cf. Rom. vi. 11; xii. 1, λογικὴν), the pr. impv. an habitual estimate. The use of ἄνθρωπος for τις (xi. 28, etc.), occasional in cl. Gr., occurs "where a gravior dicendi formula is required" (El.). Υπηρέτης (only here in Epp.; see parls.) agrees with οἰκέτης (Rom. xiv. 4, domestic) in associating servant and master, whereas διάκονος rather contrasts them (iii. 5, see note; Mark ix. 35): see Trench, Syn., § 9.—ὡς ὑπήρ. Χριστοῦ κ. οἰκονόμου κ. τ. λ., "as Christ's assistants, and stewards of God's mysteries"—in these relations Jesus set the Ap. to Himself and God: see Matt. xiii. 11, 52. With P. the Church is the οἶκος (1 Tim. iii. 15), God the οἰκοδεσπότης, its members the οἶκοι (Gal. vi. 10, Eph. ii. 19), and its ministers—the Ap. in chief—the οἶκονόμοι (ix. 17, Col. i. 25, etc.). The figure of iii. 9 ff. is kept up: those who were ἀρχιτέκτοναι and οἰκοδομοῦντες in the rearing of the house, become ὑπηρέται and οἰκονόμοι in its internal economy. The οἰκονόμοι was a confidential housekeeper or overseer, commonly a slave, charged with pro-
viewing the establishment. Responsible not to his fellows, but to “the Lord,”
his high trust demands a strict account
(Luke xii. 41-48).—On μυστ. Θεοῦ, see
notes to ii. 7, 9 f.: the phrase implies
not secrets of the master kept from other
servants, but secrets revealed to them
through God’s dispensers, to whose judg-
ment and fidelity the disclosure is com-
pmitted (cf. ii. 14, iii. 1).

Ver. 2. Ὡδὲ λαοῦτον (proindeigitur)
ζητεῖται, ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις κ.τ.λ.: “In
such case, it is further sought in stewards
(to be sure) that one be found faithful”.
ﻫ εἶναι gathers up the position given to
“us” in ver. 1; ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις is
therefore pleonastic, but repeated for
distinctness and by reference to the well-
understood rule for stewards (Luke xii.
48). λαοῦτον brings in the supplement
to an imperfect representation: it is not
enough to be a faithful steward is looked for
(an echo of Luke xii. 42 f.). ζητεῖται . . . ἵνα resembles παρακαλεῖ
τούτο, i. 10 (see note): the telic force
of the conj. has not disappeared; one “seeks”
a thing in order to “find” it.

Ver. 3. ἢμοι δὲ εἰς ἅλαχιστον ἵνα ἰνα
κ.τ.λ.: “For myself however it amounts
to a very small thing that by you I should
be put to trial, or by a human day (of
judgment).” Fidelity is required of
stewards: yes, but δὲ who is the judge
of that fidelity? Not you Cor., nor even
my own good conscience, but the Lord
only (4: cf. Rom. xiv. 4); P. corrects
the false inference that might be drawn from
iii. 22. ἢμοι δὲ takes up the general
truth just stated, to apply it as a matter
between me and you. P. is being put on
his trial at Cor.—his talents appraised,
his motives scrutinised, his administration
canvased with unbecoming pre-
sumption. For εἰς in this somewhat

rare, but not necessarily Hebraistic sense,
cf. vi. 16, Acts xix. 27; see Wr., p. 229.

ίνα . . . ἀνακριθή (construction more
unclassical than in 1) equals τὸ ἀνακρι-
θῆναι—unless the clause should be ren-
dered, “that I should have myself tried
by you,”—as though P. might have
challenged the judgment of the Cor. (see
ix. 2, 2 Cor. iii. 1, xi. 11) but dismissed
the thought. ἀνακρίνω (see note, ii. 15)
speaks not of the final judgment (κρίνω,
v. 12, etc.), but of an examination,
investigation preliminary to it. The
“human (ἄνθρωπινς, cf. ii. 3) day,” of
which P. thinks lightly, is man’s judg-
ment—that of any man, or all men
together; he reserves his case for “the
day (of the Lord”’’: see i. 8).—ἀλλ’ ὄδε
 ἐμαυτόν ἀνακρίνω: “nay, I do not even
try myself!” The ἀλλ’ ὄδε (cf. iii. 3)
brings forward another suggestion, con-
trary to that just rejected (ίνα ὑμών,
ἀνακ.), to be rejected in its turn. In
another sense P. enjoins self-judgment,
in xi. 28-32; and in ii. 16 he credited
the “spiritual man” with power “to try all
things”. Ο ἐαυτόν ἀνακρίνων, the self-
trier, is one who knows no higher or
surer tribunal than his own conscience;
Christ’s Απ. stands in a very diff. position
from this. This transition from Cor.
judgment to self-judgment shows that no
formal trial was in question, such as
Weizsacker supposes had been mooted
at Cor.; arraigned before the bar of
public opinion, P. wishes to say that he
rates its estimate ἐς ἅλαχιστον in com-
parison with that of his heavenly Master.

Ver. 4. The negative clauses, οὐδὲν
γάρ . . . ἄλλ’ οὐκ, together explain,
parenthetically, Paul’s meaning in ver. 3:
“ For I am conscious of nothing against
myself” (in my conduct as Christ’s
minister to you: cf. 10, 18; 2 Cor. i. 12-
IV.
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Κύριος ἐστίν. ΙV. 5. ὦτε μὴ πρὸ καὶ κρίνετε, ἦς ἐν ἐλθῇ ὁ Κύριος γὰρ ἐστιν. ἐν τού τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἐπιθυμεῖ ταῦτα οὖν, καὶ ἐφανερώσει τὰς βουλές τῶν καρδιῶν. Κύριος δὲς καὶ φωτίσει ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἑλθεῖν τῶν ἐπαινών γενήσεται εἰς ἐκάστῳ τῷ ἑλθεῖν τῶν ἐπαινῶν γενήσεται εἰς ἐκάστῳ.

In this passage, Paul is urging the Corinthians to avoid premature judgment (προ καιροῦ) until the Lord has revealed the hidden things of darkness (τὰ κρυπτὰ). He stresses the importance of waiting for the Lord’s revelation, as His presence will illuminate these matters (φωτίσεται). The Lord’s coming (κρίσις) will be the finaljudgment, and Paul urges the Corinthians to be patient and not to pass premature judgment (κρίνετε) on one another.

Ver. 5. The practical conclusion of the statement respecting Christ’s servants (see note on ὦτε, iii. 21). "So then do not before the time be passing any judgment. τι, the cognate acc. = κρίσιν τινά, as in John vii. 24. προ καιροῦ (the fit time, not the set time) signifies prematurely (so ἸΕσχ., Εὐμεν., 367), as εν καιρώ seasonably (Luke xii. 42). Our Lord gives another reason for not judging, in Matt. vii. 1 ff.; this prohibition, like that, points to His tribunal, bidding men hold back their verdicts on each other in deference to His (cf. Rom. xiv. 1 ff.; etc.)."
Τοῦ ὑκότου, "the secrets hidden in the darkness" (res tenebris occultatae, Bz.) — not necessarily evil things (see Rom. ii. 16 Cor. iv. 6), but things impenetrable to present light.—Chief amongst these, "the Lord will make manifest (φανερώσει) the counsel of the hearts". These God (and with Him Christ, ὁ ἄναξριψων: 4) already searches out (Rom. viii. 27; Ps. cxxix., etc.); then He will make plain to men, about themselves and each other, what was dark before. The καρδία is the real self, the "hidden," "inward man" (Eph. iii. 16 f., 1 Pet. iii. 4, and other pars.), known absolutely to God alone (corhominiscryptaεστ, Bz.); its "counsels" are those self-communings and purposings which determine action and belong to the essence of character.— "And then (not before) the (due) praise will come (ὁ ἐπαινὸς γενήσεται) to each from God (not from human lips)." ἀνέδω τ. Θεοῦ for it is on God's behalf that Christ will judge; His commendation is alone of value (Rom. ii. 29; John v. 44). The Church is God's field and temple (iii. 9 Η.); all work wrought in it awaits His approval. ἐκάστω recallsthe lesson of iii. 8, 11-13, respecting the discriminating and individual character of Divine rewards. "Praise" ambitious Gr. teachers coveted: let them seek it from God. "Praise" the Cor. partisans lavished on their admired leaders: this is God's prerogative, let them check their impertinent eulogies. Enough was said in iii. 15, 17, of condemned work; P. is thinking here of his true συνεργοῖ (1 f.), who with himself labour and hope for approval at the Day of Christ; little need they reek of the criticisms of the hour. §13. Disciples above their Master, iv. 6-13. What the Ap. has written, from iii. 3 onwards, turns on the relations between himself and Apollos; but it has a wide application to the state of feeling within the Church (6 f.). To such extravagance of self-satisfaction and conceit in their new teachers have the Cor. been carried, that one would think they had dispensed with the App., and entered already on the Messianic reign (8). In comparison with them, P. and his comrades present a sorry figure, as victims marked for the world's sport—famished, beaten, loaded with disgrace, while their disciples flourish! (9-13.)

Ver. 6. Ταύτα δε κ.τ.λ. (δε meta batikon, of transition): "Now these things I have adapted (in the way I have put them) to myself and Apollos".—μετα-σχηματίζω (see parls.), to change the dress, or form of present(σχήμα), of anything. P. has put in a specific personal way—speaking in concreto, ἐνβίi grafia—what he might have expressed more generally; he has done this δι' ὑμᾶς, "for your better instruction,"—not because he and Ap. needed the admonition. The rendering "I have in a figure transferred" (E.V.), suggests that the argument of iii. 3-11 had no real connexion with P. and A., and was aimed at others than their partisans—an erroneous implication: see Introd. to Div. I. P. writes in the σχήμα κατ' ἐξοχήν, aiming through the Apollonian party at all the warring factions, and at the factious spirit in the Church: his reproaches fall on the "puffed up" followers, not upon their unconsenting chiefs (4). We found certain other teachers, active at Cor. in the absence of P. and A., rebuked in iii. 11-17; the Cor. will easily read between the lines. This μετασχηματισμός is "id genus in quo per quandam suspicacionem quod non dictum accipi volumus" (Quintilian, Instit., ix., 2).—Ἀπολλὼν, the preferable reading here and in Tit. iii. 13, like the gen. of i. 12, iii. 4, is acc. of Attic 2nd decl.; Ἀπολλώ (3rd) is attested in Acts xix. 1.


2 (νταρ) a, ΝABCP 17, 31, 73. Referring to Scripture at large.

3 Οτι. φρονεῦν Ν*ABDG*, latt. νg., Ορ., Αμφ., Αμβρ. δScCDcLΡ cop.syrr., Cyr. insert (? Alexandrian) ; Ath., φυσιουσθαι.

10 της ουκοτους, "the secrets hidden in the darkness" (res tenebris occultatae, Bz.) — not necessarily evil things (see Rom. ii. 16 Cor. iv. 6), but things impenetrable to present light.—Chief amongst these, "the Lord will make manifest (φανερώσει) the counsel of the hearts". These God (and with Him Christ, ὁ ἄναξριψων: 4) already searches out (Rom. viii. 27; Ps. cxxix., etc.); then He will make plain to men, about themselves and each other, what was dark before. The καρδία is the real self, the "hidden," "inward man" (Eph. iii. 16 f., 1 Pet. iii. 4, and other pars.), known absolutely to God alone (cornhominiscryptaεστ, Bz.); its "counsels" are those self-communings and purposings which determine action and belong to the essence of character.— "And then (not before) the (due) praise will come (ὁ ἐπαινὸς γενήσεται) to each from God (not from human lips)." ἀνέδω τ. Θεοῦ for it is on God's behalf that Christ will judge; His commendation is alone of value (Rom. ii. 29; John v. 44). The Church is God's field and temple (iii. 9 Η.); all work wrought in it awaits His approval. ἐκάστω recallsthe lesson of iii. 8, 11-13, respecting the discriminating and individual character of Divine rewards. "Praise" ambitious Gr. teachers coveted: let them seek it from God. "Praise" the Cor. partisans lavished on their admired leaders: this is God's prerogative, let them check their impertinent eulogies. Enough was said in iii. 15, 17, of condemned work; P. is thinking here of his true συνεργοῖ (1 f.), who with himself labour and hope for approval at the Day of Christ; little need they reek of the criticisms of the hour. §13. Disciples above their Master, iv. 6-13. What the Ap. has written, from iii. 3 onwards, turns on the relations between himself and Apollos; but it has a wide application to the state of feeling within the Church (6 f.). To such extravagance of self-satisfaction and conceit in their new teachers have the Cor. been carried, that one would think they had dispensed with the App., and entered already on the Messianic reign (8). In comparison with them, P. and his comrades present a sorry figure, as victims marked for the world's sport—famished, beaten, loaded with disgrace, while their disciples flourish! (9-13.)
that are written" : cf. the cl. ἢδειν ἄγαν.

The art. τὸ seizes the Μὴ ὑπέρ clause for the obj. of μάθητε; for the construction, cf. Gal. v. 14, Luke xxii. 37, and see Wr., pp. 135, 644; the elliptical form ("Not for" or "Do not go," or the like) marks the saying as proverbial, though only here extant. Ewald suggests that it was a Rabbinical adage—as much as to say, Κεκορεσμένοι έστε, ηδέ επλουτήσατε; those that follow, ήδέ, είδε και ελα... marks it as ungrateful; both ways it is egotistic.—τί δε έχεις κ.τ.λ.: "what moreover hast thou that thou didst not receive!"—i.e., from God (i. 4 f., 3ο, iii. 5, 1ο, xii. 6, etc.). For this pregnant sense of λαμβάνω, cf. Acts xx. 35.—"But if indeed thou didst receive (it), why glory as one that had not received?" The receiver may boast of the Giver (i. 31), not of anything καλ.;" καλοί lends actuality to the vb.; "εἰκάι, de re quam ita esse ut dicitur significamus" (Herrmann) at cf. 2 Cor. iv. 3. καυχάσαι, a rare form of 2nd sing. mid.; Wr., p. 90. For ὡς with ptp., of point of view (perinde ac), see Bm., p. 307; cf. ver. 3.

Ver. 8 depicts the unjustifiable "glorying" of the readers with an abruptness due to excited feeling (cf. the asyndeton of iii. 16): "How much you have received, and how you boast of it!—So soon you are satiated!" etc. The three first clauses—ἡδέ, ήδέ, χωρίς κ.τ.λ.—are exclamations rather than questions (W.H.). Distinguish ἡδέ, jam, by this time: νῦν, at this time (iii. 2, etc.); ἀρτι, in presenti, modo, just now or then, at the moment (xiii. 12, etc.). κεκορεσμένοι ἐστί (κορέννυμι, to glut, feed full;) in cl. Gr. poetical, becoming prose in κοινή; for tense-form, cf. i. 10, ἤτε κατηρτ.: "So soon you have had your fill (are quite satisfied)!" The Cor. reported themselves, in the Church Letter (?), so well fed by Paul's successors, so furnished in talent and grace, that they desired nothing more. —ἡδέ επλουτήσατε (aor., not pf. as before): "So soon you grew rich!" The Thanksgiving (i. 5) and the list of
charisms in xii. appear to justify this consciousness of wealth, but ostentation corrupted Cor. riches; spiritual satiety is a sign of arrested growth: contrast Phil. iii. 10-14, and cf. Rev. iii. 17, "Thou sayest, ‘Thou hast made us last’"—at the end of the show, in the meanest place (for the use of έσχατος, cf. Mark ix. 35; for the sentiment, xv. 19 below)—"as (men) doomed to death". One imagines a grand procession, on some day of public festival; in its rear march the criminals on their way to the arena, where the populace will be regaled with their sufferings. Paul's experience in Ephesus suggests the picture (cf. xvi. 32); that of 2 Cor. ii. 14 is not dissimilar. "The app." (cf. ix. 1, xv. 5 ff.), not P. alone, are set in this disgrace: Acts i.-xii. illustrates what is said; possibly recent (unrecorded) sufferings of prominent missionaries gave added point to the comparison. "Αποδείκνυμι (to show off)" takes its disparaging sense from the connexion, like δειγματίζω in Col. ii. 15 επιθανατίους (later Gr.) = επί τ. θάνατον ένότας.—οτι θέατρον εγενήθημεν τω κόσμω does not give the reason for the above απόδειξις, but re-affirms the fact with a view to bring forward the spectators; this clause apposed to the foregoing, in which οτι was implicit: "Methinks God has set for thus the app. last, as sentenced to death", etc. Ηf would read οτι θέατρον, "which spectacle," etc.—a tempting constr., taking the lively style of the passage; but δοτις occurs as adj. nowhere in the N.T. (unless, possibly, in Heb. ix. 9), and rarely at all in Gr. θέατρον "may mean the place, spectators, actors, or spectacle: the last meaning is the one used here, and the rarest" (Lt.). "To the world:" so Peter, e.g., at Jerus., Paul in the great Gentile capitals. "Both to angels and men" extends the ring to include those invisible watchers—"καλ singles them out for special attention" (Lt.)—of whose presence the Ap. was aware (see xi. 10, and other pars.); angels, as such, in contrast with men,—not the good or bad
angels specifically (cf. note on vi. 3). Eph. iii. 10 intimates that the heavenly Intelligences learn while they watch.

Ver. 10 represents the contrasted case of the App. and the Cor. Christians, as they appear in the estimate of the two parties. "We" are ωροι, ἀθέναι, ἀτιμοὶ (cf. i. 18-27, iii. 18, and notes; with ii. 3, for ἀθέτω); "you," φρόνιμοι, ἄγενη — the last adj. in heightened contrast to ἀτιμοὶ; not merely honoured (ὕτως, Phil. ii. 29), but gloriously-P. reflects on the relatively "splendid" (Luke vii. 25) worldly condition of the Cor. as compared with his own. μωροὶ διὰ Χριστοῦ, "fools because of Christ" (cf. Matt. v. 21) — who makes us so, sends us with a "foolish" message (i. 23).

Distinguish διὰ (ix. 23, 2 Cor. iv. 11, etc.) from υπέρ Χριστοῦ, which means on Christ's behalf, "as representing Him" (2 Cor. vi. 23, etc.). The Ap. does not call the Cor. υπεροι (see iii. 18), but, with a fine discrimination, φρόνιμοι εἰς Χριστοῦ — he appeals to them as in such x. 15, 2 Cor. xi. 19 — the epithet was one they affected; writing at Cor., he is perhaps thinking of them in Rom. xi. 25, xii. 16. The φρόνιμος is the man of sense — no fanatic, rushing to extremes and affronting the world needlessly: this Church is on dangerously good terms with the world (viii. 10, x. 14-33, cf. 2 Cor. vi. 14-17); see Introduct., pp. 731 f.; "Christum et prudentiam carnis miscere vellent" (Cv.). They deem themselves "strong" in contrast with the "feeble in faith" (Rom. xiv. 1), with whom P. associates himself (ix. 22, etc.), able to "use the world" (viii. 31) and not hampered by weak-minded scruples (vi. 12, x. 23, viii. ; see note on iii. 22). In the third clause P. reverses the order of prons. (γενεῖς, τυφλοὶ), returning to the description of his own mode of life. The ἀγενής (i. 28) is without the birth qualifying for public respect, the ἀτιμοὶ (see para.) is one actually deprived of respect — in cl. Gr., disfranchised.
II—IV.
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γούμεν, ἰψωρόγομενοι ἐνεχόμεθα, ἵτι διωκόμενοι ἐνεχόμεθα, ὑπερκαθαρματά ἐνεχόμεθα. οὐκ ἤνεμον ὡς ἐνέργημεν, τῶν κύριον κάθαρμα, τῶν κύριον περίψημα, ὡς ἄρτι. 13.

14. Οὐκ ἐντρέπων ὡς γράφω ταῦτα, ἀλλ’ ὡς τέκνα μου ἐντρέπων καθάριστα, ὡς παρακαθαρίστα, ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου εγενήθημεν, πάντων Εἰς περίψημα, ἐως ἀρτι. ἐπὶ κόσμου ἐγενήθησαν, πάντων Εἰς περίψημα, ἐως ἀρτι. 13. Οὐκ εντρέπων ὡς γράφω ταῦτα, ἀλλ’ ὡς τέκνα μου Τιμιώτα. 12: Rev. xii. 13; Αbsol., 2 Cor. xi. 4, 2ο. m δυσφ., Ν.Τ. h.l., Μυκ. v. 4π. δυσφημια, 2 Cor. vi. 8. n Αbsol., 2 Cor. ν. 2ο: Rom. xii. 8: 2 Τιμ, ν. 2ο; Τίτ. i. 9; Ρρον. xxi. 18. p Η.Ι.; Ρρον. xxi. 18. p Η.Ι.; Tobit ν. 19; Ignatius ad Eph. viii. 1, xviii. 1. q viii. 7, ν. 6. Mt. xi. 12; four times in John. τινις, τινις, εφ. 1 f., cf. 2 Τhess. iii. 14; Τίτ. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 9, etc. ερωταν, έπικαθαρματα, τον κόσμον... τῶν περίψημα (from περι-καθαίρω, -ψάω respectively, to cleanse, τυιπε all round, with -μα of result): the ne plus ultra of degradation; they became "as rinsings of the world," "a scraping of all things" (purgamenta et ramentum, Βz.), the filth that one gets rid of through the sink and the gutter.

The above terms may have a further significance: "the Αp. is carrying on the metaphor of επιθανατίους above. Βoth περικαθ. and περίψ. were used esp. of those condemned criminals of the lowest class who were sacrificed as expiatory αφέρρασμα, as scapegoats in effect, because of their degraded life. It was the custom at Athens to reserve certain worthless persons who in case of plague, famine, or other visitations from heaven, might be thrown into the sea, in the belief that they would cleanse away, or wipe off the guilt of the nation." περικαθαρματα (for the earlier κάθαρμα) occurs in this sense in Arr.-Εpict., ΙΙΙ., xxii., 78; also in Prov. xxiv. 15 (LXX). This view is supported by Hesychius, Luther, Bg., Hn., Ed.; rejected, as inappropriate, by Er., Est., Cv., Bz., Mr., Gd., El. Certainly P. does not look on his sufferings as a piaculum, but he is expressing the estimate of the world, which seemed its vilest fitures to devote to the anger of the Gods. Possibly some cry of this sort, anticipating the "Christiani ad leones" of the martyrdoms, had been raised against P. by the Ephesian populace (cf. xv. 32; also Acts xxii. 21) — ὡς ἄρτι, repeated with emphasis from ver. 11, shows P. to be writing under the smart of recent outrage. With his temper, Paul keenly felt personal indignities.

§ IV. PAUL's FATHERLY DISCIPLINE, iv. 14-21. All has now been said that can be concerning the Divisions at Cor.—the causes underlying them, and the spirit they manifest and foster in the Church. In their self-complacent, ungrateful thoughts, the Cor. have raised themselves quite above the despised and painful condition of the App. of Christ; "imitabantur filios qui illustratiparum curant humiles parentes—ex saturitate fastidium habebant, ex opulentia in solentiam, ex regno superbiam" (Βg.). The delineation of Paul's state and theirs in the last Section is, in truth, a bitter sarcasm upon the behaviour of the readers; yet P. wishes to admonish, not to rebuke them (14). He states, in a softened tone, the measures he is taking to rectify the evils complained of. His severity springs from the anxious heart of a father (14 f.). Yet in the father's hand, before the paragraph ends, we see again the rod (21).

Ver. 14. Οὐκ εντρέπων κ.τ.λ.: "Not (by way of) shaming you do I write this, but admonishing (you) as my children beloved." It is in chiding that the Αp. addresses both the Cor. and Gal. as his "children" (2 Cor. vi. 13, xii. 14, Gal. iv. 19); τέκνον ἄγαθόν he applies besides only to Timothy (ver. 17 and 2 Tim. i. 2). Not intentionally here, but in vi. 5 and xv. 34 he does speak πρὸς ἄντροπον—πάντων νοῦτετῶν (πάντων νικῶν) is the part of a father (Εph. vi. 4), or brother (2 Τhess. iii. 15): "the vb. has a lighter meaning than ἄντροπον or ἄντιτομον, and implies...
15. If you have so many tutors, you have not many fathers! The relation of the εποικοδομοῦτες to the θεμέλιον τιθέται (iii.10) is exchanged for that of the παιδαγωγοί to the πατήρ. The παιδαγωγός (boy-leader) was not the schoolmaster, but the home-tutor—a kind of nursery-governor—who had charge of the child from tender years, looking after his food and dress, speech and manners, and when he was old enough taking him to and from school (see Lk. on Gal. iii.24). This epithet has a touch of disparagement for the readers (cf. Gal. iii.25); as Or. says (Catena), referring to iii.1, ὄντες ἀνήρ παιδαγωγεῖται, ἀλλ' εἰ τις γενίως καὶ ἐτέλης—μυρίους (xiv.19) indicates the very many—probably too many—teachers busy in this Church (cf. Jas. iii.1, and iii.18 above), in whose guidance the Cor. felt themselves “rich” and Apostolic direction superfluous. This relationship “non solum Apollos excluditur, successor, sed etiam comites, Silas et Timotheus” (Bp.): εγὼ (1 and no other) γέννησα ὑμᾶς (cf. Philem. 10; Gal. iv.19); in the Rabbinical treatise Sanhedrin, f., xix. 2, the like sentiment occurs, “Whoever teachest the son of his friend the law, it is as if he had begotten him”; similarly Philo, de Virtute, p. 1000.—διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου: cf. 1 Peter i.23; also i.18 above, 1 Thess. i.5, ii.19; John vi.63, etc. Ver. 16. “I beseech you therefore (as your father), be imitators of me.” μιμηταί γίνεσθε (pr. impr.) signifies, in moral exhortations, be in effect, show yourselves (cf. Eph. iv.32, v.17). μιμηταί γίνεσθαι demands, beyond μιμείσθε, a character formed on the given model. Imitation is the law of the child’s life; cf. Eph. v.1; and for the highest illustration, John v.17-20. It is one thing to say “I am of Paul” (i.12), another to tread in Paul’s steps. The imitation would embrace, in effect, much of what was described in v.9 ff.

Ver. 17. “For this reason”—viz., to help you to imitate me as your father—“I sent to you Timothy, who is a beloved child of mine, and faithful in the Lord.” Timothy had left P. before this letter was written, having been sent forward along with Erastus (possibly a Cor., Rom. xvi.23) to Macedonia (Acts xix.22), but with instructions, as it now appears, to go forward to Cor.; respecting his

a monitory appeal to the νοῦς rather than a direct rebuke or censure” (El.).

Ver. 15. Reason for this lighter reproof, where stern censure was due—“For if you should have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet (you have) not many fathers!” The relation of the εποικοδομοῦτες to the θεμέλιον τιθέται (iii.10) is exchanged for that of the παιδαγωγοί to the πατήρ. The παιδαγωγός (boy-leader) was not the schoolmaster, but the home-tutor—a kind of nursery-governor—who had charge of the child from tender years, looking after his food and dress, speech and manners, and when he was old enough taking him to and from school (see Lk. on Gal. iii.24). This epithet has a touch of disparagement for the readers (cf. Gal. iii.25); as Or. says (Catena), referring to iii.1, ὄντες ἀνήρ παιδαγωγεῖται, ἀλλ’ εἰ τις γενίως καὶ ἐτέλης—μυρίους (xiv.19) indicates the very many—probably too many—teachers busy in this Church (cf. Jas. iii.1, and iii.18 above), in whose guidance the Cor. felt themselves “rich” and Apostolic direction superfluous. (8)—Διὰ (at certe) introduces an apodosis in salient contrast with its protasis: “You may have ever so many nurses, but only one father!” From this relationship “non solum Apollos excluditur, successor, sed etiam comites, Silas et Timotheus” (Bp.): εγὼ (1 and no other) γέννησα ὑμᾶς (cf. Philem. 10; Gal. iv.19); in the Rabbinical treatise Sanhedrin, f., xix. 2, the like sentiment occurs, “Whoever teachest the son of his friend the law, it is as if he had begotten him”; similarly Philo, de Virtute, p. 1000.—διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου: cf. 1 Peter i.23; also i.18 above, 1 Thess. i.5, ii.19; John vi.63, etc. Ver. 16. “I beseech you therefore (as your father), be imitators of me.” μιμηταί γίνεσθε (pr. impr.) signifies, in moral exhortations, be in effect, show yourselves (cf. Eph. iv.32, v.17). μιμηταί γίνεσθαι demands, beyond μιμείσθε, a character formed on the given model. Imitation is the law of the child’s life; cf. Eph. v.1; and for the highest illustration, John v.17-20. It is one thing to say “I am of Paul” (i.12), another to tread in Paul’s steps. The imitation would embrace, in effect, much of what was described in v.9 ff.

Ver. 17. “For this reason”—viz., to help you to imitate me as your father—“I sent to you Timothy, who is a beloved child of mine, and faithful in the Lord.” Timothy had left P. before this letter was written, having been sent forward along with Erastus (possibly a Cor., Rom. xvi.23) to Macedonia (Acts xix.22), but with instructions, as it now appears, to go forward to Cor.; respecting his
visit, see notes to xvi. 10 f. The Cor. had heard already (through Erastus?) of Timothy's coming; P. does not announce the fact, he explains it: "This is why I have sent T. to you"; to the τέκνα αγαπητά (14) P. sends a τέκνον αγαπητόν (see Phil. ii.19-22), adding και πιστον εν Κυρ., since it was a trusty agent, one "faithful in the Lord"—in the sphere of Christian duty—that the commission required. For εν Κυρίω, see parls., esp. Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7; πιστός τῷ Κυρίῳ (Acts xvi. 15) denotes a right relationship to Christ, πιστός εν Κυρίω includes responsibility for others.—"Who will remind you of my ways, that are in Christ" (tάς άδοξις μου τάς εν Χριστῷ); the adjunct is made a definition by the repeated art. αναμιμνήσκω with double acc., like υπομιμν. in John xi. 26, combines our remind (a person) and recall (a thing). Paul's "ways" had been familiar in Cor. (cf. Acts xx. 31-35; also 2 Cor. i.12 ft.), but seemed forgotten, the παιδαγωγοί had crowded out of mind the πατήρ. He means by οδοί μου habits of life to be copied (16)—the αγωγή of 2 Tim. iii. 10 f.—not doctrines to be learnt; see further ix. 19-27, x. 3-33. xi, 2 Cor. vi. 4-10, x. 1. For εν Χριστῷ, see note on εν Χ. Ι., x. 2. In Paul's gentler qualities Tim. would strongly recall him to the Cor., by conduct even more than words.—"According as" (not how) "I teach,"—in accordance with my teaching. Paul's "ways and teaching" are not the same thing; but the former are regulated by the latter; they will find the same consistency in Tim. "(As I teach) everywhere, in every Church;" the "ways" of P. and Tim. observe, and to which the Cor. must be recalle, are those inculcated uniformly in the Gentile mission; see i. 2 (συν πάσι... εν παντί τόπω, and notes), also xi. 16, xiv. 33.

Vv. 18, 19. οὐ μὴ ερχομένου δὲ μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνυψιωθησάντες: "Some however have been puffed up, under the idea that I am not coming to (visit) you." The contrastive δὲ points to a group of inflated persons (cf. 6, v. 2, viii. 2) hostile to Paul's "ways." The wish was father to the thought, which was suggested to "some" by the fact of Timothy's coming. They bore themselves more insolently as ποι fearing correction;—or did they imagine that Paul is afraid of them! Amongst these, presumably, were mischiefous teachers (iii. 11-17) who had swollen into importance in Paul's absence, partisans who magnified others to his damage and talked as though the Church could now fairly dispense with him (3, 6, 8, 15). On ώς with ptp., see Ben. S.440 f. or Goodwin's Syntax, or Grammar, ad rem; cf. note on ώς μὴ λαβὼν, ver. 7, also 2 Cor. v. 20, 2 Pet. i. 3: "because (as they suppose) I am not coming." The aor. ἐνυψιωθησάν points to the moment when they heard, to their relief, of Timothy's coming. δὲ is postponed in the order of the sentence to avoid separating the closely linked opening words (Wr., pp. 608 f.)—"But (despite their presumption) I shall come speedily, if the Lord will." They say, "He is not coming; he sends Tim. instead!" he replies, "Come I will, and that soon" (see xvi. 8, and note).—ἐάν ο Κύριος θελήσῃ (see parls.), varied to έστυρψή in xvi. 7; the aor. sbj. refers the "willing" to the (indeterminate) time of the visit. "The Lord" is Christ; that θέλω and θελήσῃ (see note
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V. I. "Ολος βάδθεται ἐν ὑμῖν τορνεία, καὶ τοιαύτη τορνεία
4 ητις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐννοοῦν ὑμᾶς ταῦτα; 1 οτε τὰ γυναικά τινά τοῦ

1 Om. ὑμᾶς all unce. but NAMESPACE, and all oldest verss. but synr.—

Added by Syrian emendation.

on xii. 11) are elsewhere referred by P. to God (Mr.) is no sufficient reason for
noting Κύρ. from its distinctive sense
(cf. 17 above, and note on i. 31). Christ
determines the movements of His servants
(cf. i Thess. iii. 11, Acts xvi. 7, xviii.
9, etc.).

"And I shall know (take cognizance of)
not the word of those that are puffed up
(εἰνχρ. ptp., of settled state), but their
power." "γνώσομαι: νερβάμα judiciale;
πατεράν οστητήρ φοτεστατο" (Βg.).
High-flown pretensions P. ignores; he
will test their "power," and estimate
each-man (he is thinking mainly of the
εποικοδομούντες of chap. iii.) by what
he can do, not say. The "power" in
question is that belonging to "the
kingdom of God" (i. 18, 24, ii. 4).

Ver. 20. "For not in word (lies) the
kingdom of God, but in power:" another
of Paul's religious maxims (seenote on i.
29), repeated in many forms: cf. 2 Cor.
χ. ΙΙ, xiii. 3 f., etc. The βασιλεία τοῦ
Θεοῦ always (even in Rom. xiv. 17) bears
ref. to the final Messianic rule (see vi. 9 f.,
χv. 24, 50); the "power of God" called
it into being and operates in every man
who trulyservesit. That Divine realm
is not built up by windy words. To the
same test P. offers himself in 2 Cor.
χι. ΙΙΙΘοι (understood) ἐν, see
ii. 5 and note.

Ver. 21. Τί ἔθετε; "What is your
will?"—what would you have? Τί a
sharper πόντερον; the latter only once
(John vii. 17) in N.T.—"With a rod am
I to come to you? or in love and a spirit
of meekness?" ἐν ἑβαθοῷ (= ἐν κολάσει,
ἐν τρομίᾳ, Cm.) is sound Gr. for "armed
with a rod" (cf. Sir. xiv. 4, ἐν λίθῳ;
Lucian, Dial. Mort., xxiii. 3, καθηκόμενος
ἐν π. ἑβαθοῷ; add Heb. ii. 25, i John v. 6)—the implement of paternal discipline (14)
called for by the behaviour of "some" (18).

There is reason, however, in the stern
note of this question, for connecting it
with ch. v. i (so Oec., Cv., Bz., Hf.).
P. is approaching the subject of the
following Section, which already stirs his
wrath. For the subj. of the dubitative
question, ἐθετόν, see Wr., p. 356: ἐν ὑμῖν
τὰ πράγμα κατανάλωσα (Cm.).—ἐν Δυστ.
κ. Θ.Ι. (ἲβων); cf. 2 Cor. ii. 1; the
constr. of ii. 3 above is somewhat diff.
(see note). ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

DIVISION II. QUESTIONS OF SOCIAL
MORALS, v.-viii. The Ap. has done
with the subject of the Parties, which
had claimed attention first because they
sprung from a radical misconception of
Christianity. But in this typical Hellenic
community, social corruptiions had arisen
which, if not so universal, were still more
malignant in their effect. The heathen
converts of Cor., but lately washed from
the foulest vice (vi. 9 ff.), were some of
them slipping back into the mire (2 Cor.
dii. 21). An offence of incredible turpi-
tude had just come to the Apostle's
ears: he takes it to the Divine realm
is not built up by windy words. To the
same test P. offers himself in 2 Cor.
χι. ΙΙΟΘοι (understood) ἐν, see
ii. 5 and note.
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with a rod" (cf. Sir. xiv. 4, ἐν λίθῳ;
Lucian, Dial. Mort., xxiii. 3, καθηκόμενος
ἐν π. ἑβαθοῷ; add Heb. ii. 25, i John v. 6)—the implement of paternal discipline (14)
called for by the behaviour of "some" (18).

There is reason, however, in the stern
note of this question, for connecting it
with ch. v. i (so Oec., Cv., Bz., Hf.).
P. is approaching the subject of the
following Section, which already stirs his
wrath. For the subj. of the dubitative
question, ἐθετόν, see Wr., p. 356: ἐν ὑμῖν
τὰ πράγμα κατανάλωσα (Cm.).—ἐν Δυστ.
κ. Θ.Ι. (ἲβων); cf. 2 Cor. ii. 1; the
constr. of ii. 3 above is somewhat diff.
(see note). ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

DIVISION II. QUESTIONS OF SOCIAL
MORALS, v.-viii. The Ap. has done
with the subject of the Parties, which
had claimed attention first because they
sprung from a radical misconception of
Christianity. But in this typical Hellenic
community, social corruptiions had arisen
which, if not so universal, were still more
malignant in their effect. The heathen
converts of Cor., but lately washed from
the foulest vice (vi. 9 ff.), were some of
them slipping back into the mire (2 Cor.
dii. 21). An offence of incredible turpi-
tude had just come to the Apostle's
ears: he takes it to the Divine realm
is not built up by windy words. To the
same test P. offers himself in 2 Cor.
χι. ΙΙΟΘοι (understood) ἐν, see
ii. 5 and note.

Ver. 21. Τί ἔθετε; "What is your
will?"—what would you have? Τί a
sharper πόντερον; the latter only once
(John vii. 17) in N.T.—"With a rod am
I to come to you? or in love and a spirit
of meekness?" ἐν ἑβαθοῷ (= ἐν κολάσει,
ἐν τρομίᾳ, Cm.) is sound Gr. for "armed
with a rod" (cf. Sir. xiv. 4, ἐν λίθῳ;
Lucian, Dial. Mort., xxiii. 3, καθηκόμενος
ἐν π. ἑβαθοῷ; add Heb. ii. 25, i John v. 6)—the implement of paternal discipline (14)
called for by the behaviour of "some" (18).

There is reason, however, in the stern
note of this question, for connecting it
with ch. v. i (so Oec., Cv., Bz., Hf.).
P. is approaching the subject of the
following Section, which already stirs his
wrath. For the subj. of the dubitative
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πατρὸς ἐχειν· 2. καὶ ὁμείσ· πεφυσισμένοι εστε· καὶ οὐδὲ μᾶλλον επενθήσατε, ἵνα εξαρθή· εκ μέσου ὑμῶν ὅ το εργον τούτο ποιήσας; 3. ἐγώ μὲν γάρ ώστε ἀπον τού δούλου τούτου ὑμῶν ζωμάς, παρέω διέ πνεύματι, ἤδη κέκρικα· Lk. vi. 25. 2. Thess. ii. 7; Acts xvii. 33, xxiii. το; ν111. 4. Ἰ. m See xi. 18. νίιι. το: Eph. iv. 4; 1 Thess. ν. 23. νιι. 8 Η. allunc. but L.
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formula Περὶ δὲ ἐν ἐγγάται μοι, must not be allowed to break the strong links of subject-matter and thought binding it to chn. v. and vi. Its connexion with the foregoing context is essential, with the following comparatively accidental. § 15. The Case of Incest, v. 1-8. About the party-strifes at Cor. Ρ. has been informed by the members of a particular family (i. ΙΙ): the monstrous case of incest, to which he turns abruptly and without any preface (cf. i. το), is ΠΟΤΟΓΙΟΙΣ.

Ver. 1. "Ολως ακούεται κ.τ.λ.: "Τhere is actually fornication heard of amongst you!" Νο wonder that the father of the Church is compelled to show the " rod " (iν.21). Νot ακούω, as in xi. τ8, but the impersonal ακούεται (cf. ηκούσθη, Mark ii. Ι), indicating common νεφοτιν in the Church (ενυμίν), - and (όλως: see parl.) τινδεδεμένη. Τhe sin is branded as of unparalleled blackness by the description, και τοιαύτη πορνεία ήτις· "Τes, and a fornication of such sort - the καί climactic " as (there is) not even among the Gentiles!" While mere πορνεία was excused—not to say approved—in heathen society, even by strict moralists, such foulness was abominated. Οf this crime the loose Catullus says (76.4): " Νam nihil est quidquam sceleris quo prodeat ultra "; and Cicero, pro Cluent., 6, 15: " scelus incredibile, et præter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum "; Euripides' Hippolytus speaks for Gr. sentiment. Greek and Roman law both stamped it with infamy; for Jewish law, see Lev. xviii. 7 f., Deut. xxii. 30, also Gen. xlix. 4. — ήτις, of quality (as in iii. 17), in place of the regular correlative ota (xv. 48). Neither οὐκαμετατέω (T.R.) nor άκούεται is understood in the ellipsis, simply λοιπών — "such as does not exist" ; the exceptional heathen instances are such as to prove the rule. The actual sin is finally stated: στετε γυναίκα τινα κλαμάν, "as that one (or a certain one) should have a wife of his father".— ήτις defines the quality, στετε (with inf.) the content and extent of the πορνεία.— γυν, του πατρός (instead of μητρόν) is the term of Lev. xviii. 8. ἐχειν indicates a continued association, whether in the way of formal marriage or not; nor does ἐργον (2), nor κατεργασάμενον (3), make clear this latter point. That "the father" was living is not proved by the αδικηθείς of 2 Cor. vii. 12; Ρ. can hardly have referred to this foul immorality in the language of 2 Cor. iii. 5-11, vii. 8-12; the "grief" and "wrong" of those passages are probably quite diff. The woman was not a Christian, for Paul passes no sentence upon her; see ver. 13.

Ver. 2. What are the Cor. doing under this deep disgrace? Not even grieving. Και υμείς πεφυσισμένοι εστε· κ.τ.λ.: "Ανδ are you (still) puffed up! and did you not rather mourn!" For the grammatical force of πεφυ. έστε, see parl. in i. 10, iv. 8: and for the vb., note to iv. 6. Ρ. confronts the pride of the Cor. Church with this crushing fact; no intellectual brilliance, no religious enthusiasm, can cover this heinous blot: "argumentatur a contrario, ubi enim luctu est, cessit gloria" (Cv.). The ver. is best read interrogatively, in view of the έστε in 2nd clause (cf. i. 2ο), and in Paul's expository style (cf. iv. 7 f.) — στετε (see parl.) connotes funeral
mourning—over “a brother dead to God, by sin, alas! undone;” the sense signifies “going into mourning”—“breaking out in grief” (Ev.) when you heard of it. Of such grief the fit sequel is expressed by ίνα ἀρθῇ εκ μέσου ὑμῶν, “that he should be removed from your midst, who so perpetrated this deed”. This is the later Gr. “sub-final” ίνα, of the desired result: see Wr., p. 420; Bm., p. 237; cf. κίν. 12 f.—πράξας, as distinguished from ποιήσας (Τ.Κ.), implies quality in the action (see pars.).

Vv. 3-5. The removal of the culprit is, in any case, a settled matter: εγώ μέν γάρ, “For at least” ... ἡ δε κτέρικε, “have already decided”—“without waiting till you should act or till I could come. For ἡ δε see note, iv. 8; κτέρικε, pl. of judgment that has determinate effect.—μὲν σολιταρίου—“I indeed (whatever you may do)”—ἀπὸ τῶν συμπαθῶν παρών δὲ τῆς πνευμάτως, “while absent in the body yet present in the spirit” : by absence the culprit is disqualified for judging (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 20-22); he declares that he is spiritually present, so present to his inmost consciousness are the facts of the case; cf. Col. ii. 5. “St. Paul’s spirit, illumined and vivified, as it unquestionably was, by the Divine Spirit, must have been endowed on certain occasions with a more than ordinary insight into the state of a Church at a distance” (Ev.; cf. John i. 48; 2 Kings v. 26): “I have already passed sentence, as one present, on him that has so wrought this thing”, ὃς παρὼν means “as being present,” not “as though present”—which rendering virtually surrenders the previous ἀπὸ τῶν ... παρὼν δὲ.—κατεργάζομαι, to work out, consummate (see pars.); the qualifying φόνος probably refers to the man’s being a Chris-

tian (cf. 12 f.)—“under these conditions” (cf. iii. 16 f., vi. 15).

The judgment already determined in the Apostle’s mind is delivered in ver. 5, supplying a further obj. (of the thing: cf. for the construction, Acts xv. 38) to κτέρικε: “I have already judged him ... (have given sentence), in the name of our Lord Jesus, to deliver him that is such (τὸν τοιοῦτον) to Satan for destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” The clauses of ver. 4, with their solemn, rounded terms, make fit way for this awful sentence; “graviter suspensa manet et vibrat oratio usque ad ver. 5” (Bg.). The prp. phrases εν τῷ ὑμῶν, τ. κυρ. ἕναν τ. δυνάμει τ. κυρ. ημῶν ἑνα, may be connected, either of them or both, with τιμῆσαι or with the subordinate συναχθέντων; and the four combinations thus grammatically possible have each found advocates. The order of words and balance of clauses, as well as intrinsic fitness of connexion, speak for the attachment of the former adjunct to τιμῆσαι, the latter to συναχθέντων: so Luther, Bg., Mr., Al., Ev., Bt., El. “In the name of the Lord Jesus” every Church act is done, every word of blessing or banning uttered; that Name must be formally used when doom is pronounced in the assembly (see pars.). The gen. abs. clause is parenthetic, supplying the occasion and condition precedent (aor. ptp.) of the public sentence; all the responsible parties must be concurrent: “when you have assembled together, and my spirit, along with the power of our Lord Jesus”. Along with the gathered assembly, under Paul’s unseen directing influence, a third Supreme Presence is necessary to make the sentence valid; the Church associates itself
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"Ημέρα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 6. Οὐκ οἴδατε θάνατον. Εὐριμήματα ἡμῶν; Ἐπεὶ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι μικρὰ "ζύμη ἀναστάτε ῥημαὶ ἡμῶν, καθὼς ἀρξέται ἢ ἡμῶν. Εἰς τὴν παλαιὰν "ζύμην, ἵνα ἅπαν νέον "φύραμα "ζυμοι; καθὼς ἔφτε "ζυμοι καὶ γάρ τὸ πάσχα ἦμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκτυθὲν

7. "Εκκαθάραστε ὑμνὸν "τὴν "ζύμην, ὅπερ τὸ πάσχα "ζυμοι ἡμῶν ὑπέρ "ημῶν ὑπέρ ἡμῶν "ετύθη εἰς τὰ τμήματα, οἰνῷ τὴν παλαιὰν "ζύμην, ἵνα ἅπαν νέον "φύραμα "ζυμοι; γάρ τὸ πάσχα "ζυμοι κατὰ ὑμᾶς ἐπέτυχε, καὶ γάρ τὸ τμήμα τοῦ "πάσχα "ζυμοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ "φυραμας, ἐπὶ τὸν "τμήματος. Εἰς "οὐκ οἴδατε οὐκ "οἴδατε ὅτι μικρὰ "ζύμη ἀναστάτε ῥημαὶ ἡμῶν, καθὼς ἀρξέται ἢ ἡμῶν. Εἰς τὴν παλαιὰν "ζύμην, ἵνα ἅπαν νέον "φύραμα "ζυμοι; καθὼς ἔφτε "ζυμοι καὶ γάρ τὸ πάσχα ἦμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκτυθὲν

κ. τ. λ. is a h.l., ενδυνάμει (ii. 5, etc.) is frequent in P. " "Our Lord Jesus" is Christ the Judge (see i. 8). " "Delivering to Satan" in the view of many (including Aug., Cv., Bz., and latterly Hn.), is a synonym for excommunication,—a thrusting out of the condemned into "the kingdom of darkness," where "the god of this world" holds sway (2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12, Col. i. 13, etc.); similarly in i Tim. i. 20. But there is no proof that such a formula of excommunication existed either in the Synagogue or the early Church; and the added words, ἔλεγεν δληθὼν τὴς σαρκός κ. τ. λ., point to some physically punitive and spiritually remedial visitation of the sinner. The σάρξ to be destroyed, it is replied, lies in the man's sinful passions; but these would, presumably, be strengthened rather than destroyed by sending him back to the world. " The flesh," as antithetical to "the spirit" (see parls.), is rather the man's bodily nature; and physical maladies, even death, are ascribed in the N. T. to Satan (2 Cor. xii. 7, Luke xiii. 16, John viii. 44, Heb. ii. 14), while on the other hand affliction is made an instrument of spiritual benefit (ix. 27, xi. 30 ff., 2 Cor. iv. 16 f., xv. 1, Peter iv. 1 f.); moreover, the App. did occasionally, as in the cases of Ananias and Elymas (Acts v., xiii.), pronounce penal sentences in the physical sphere, which took immediate effect on the condemned. It appears certain that P. imposed in this case a severe physical infliction—indeed, if διέθεσα is to be pressed (see parls.), a mortal stroke—as the only means of marking the gravity of the crime and saving the criminal. " Il ne faut pas en
douter, c'est une condamnation à mort que Paul prononce" (Renan); not however a sudden death, rather "a slow consumption, giving the sinner time to repent" (Gd.). The ejection of the culprit the Church of itself could and must effect (2, 13); for the aggravated chastisement the presence of the Apostle's "spirit," allied "with the power of the Lord Jesus," was necessary.—ὁ Σατανᾶς (Heb. ἡσσατάν, Aram. şātanâ: see parls.), " the Adversary," sc. of God and man, to whom every such opportunity is welcome (John viii. 44). That Satan's malignity should be (as one may say) overreached by God's wisdom and mercy (cf. iii. 19) is nothing very wonderful (see 2 Cor. xii. 7, Luke xxii. 31 f., also the temptation of our Lord, and of Job); hate is proverbially blind. "The day of the Lord," when the ultimate salvation or perdition of each is fixed, see i. 8, Rom. ii. 15-16. That some Cor. afterwards sought proof of Paul's supernatural power goes to show, not that this sentence proved abortive, but rather that the offender averted it by prompt repentance.

Ver. 6. "Your vaunt is not good: " καύχημα, materies gloriandi (cf. αἰσχρόν κλέος, Eurip., Helena, τ. 35: Μr.), found in the state of the Church, of which the Cor. were proud (iν. 6 ff.) when they ought to have been ashamed.—καλὸν, good in the sense of seemly, of fine quality; cf. 2 Cor. viii. 21, John x. 32, etc. For οὐκ οἴδατε . . . ; see i. 16. —The Cor. might reply that the offence, however shameful, was the sin of one man and therefore a little thing; P. retorts, that it is "a little leaven," enough to "leaven the whole kneading": cf. the Parables of Matt. xiii. 33 and Luke xii. 1. A sin so virulent held an indefinite power of corruption; it tainted the entire community. The φύραμα (φυραμα,
8 Ιο
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1. Η. l. for νb. Χριστός — εορτή, Col. ii. 16; Προς κορινθίους. 1. P. νb. Rom. i. 29.

2ο: ΕΡh. iv. 3τ; Col. iii. 8; Τit. iii. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 1; 15; Acts viii. 22; Mt. vi. 34. ποκ. v. 17, 22, Lk. xi. 39.

8. ώστε"εορτάζωμεν,μη εν ζύμηπαλαιάμηδε εν ζύμηκακίαςκαιπονηρίας,αλλ'εν'αζύμοις ειλικρινείας και ρία,

to mix) is the lump of dough kneaded for a single batch of bread: see parls.

Ver. 7. ἐκκαθάρατε, "Cleanse out" —the aor. implying a summary, and εκ a complete removal (see parls.; for simple καθαίρω, John xν. 2), leaving the Church "clean"; an allusion to the pre-Paschal removal of leaven (Exod. xii. Ι5 ff., xiii. 7). For τ. παλαιάν ζύμην, cf. Ignatius, ad Μagn., το, τ. κακήν Εν τ. παλαιωθείσαν, applying, however, to Judaism what here relates to Gentile vice. The "old leaven" (denoting not persons—the incestuous and his like—but influences: see 8) must be cleansed away, "in order that you may be a fresh kneading". νεών, new in point of time (see parls.)—the mass of dough, with the evil ferment removed, kneaded over again.

The Cor. are to be clear of the παλαιά ζύμη "in accordance with the fact that" (καθώς) they "are άζυμοι," a term not used literally—as though the Church was at this (sc. Paschal) season eating unleavened bread: such a παρετήρησις of Jewish law by Gentiles P. would hardly have encouraged (see Gal. iv. 9 ff.)—but morally, in consistency with the allegorical strain of the passage; "in the purpose and command of God, and in their own profession, they are separated from all sin, which is to them what, during the passover week, leaven was to the Jews. This objective use of unleavened corresponds to that of sanctified in i. 2" (Bt.). Cf. the ζηθι καθαροί άστι of John xv. 3; and for the general principle, i. 30, vi. 11, Rom. vi. 1-11, etc.

Ver. 8 explains the symbolical ἄζυμοι. Participation in the sacrifice of Christ presumes unleavenedness in the participants; the unleavened bread and the passover are related (objectively) as repentance and faith (subjectively): "For indeed our passover has been slain, even Christ". ἔκπασχε ... εντιθή (aor., of historical fact)—the Passover Lamb killed, and leaven not yet cast out: what a contradiction! The Law prescribed no exact time, but usage required every scrap of leaven to be got rid of from the house at the beginning (eye) of the day, Nisan 14, on which the Lamb was slain. τάσαχα stands for the Paschal Lamb, the sacrifice of which legally constituted the Passover (Mark xiv. 12, cf. John i. 29).

"Our (Christian) passover," cf. Heb. xiii. 10; for Paul's appropriation of the Church of the things of the Old Covenant, Rom. xi. 17, Gal. iv. 26, vi. 16, Phil. iii. 3. This identification of Christ crucified with the Paschal Lamb lends some support to the view that Jesus died, as the Fourth Gospel appears to represent, on the 14th Nisan; but the precise coincidence is not essential to his interpretation. The Pascha (Aram. pascha = Heb. pesach)—in O.T. "Jehovah's Passover"—was the sacrificial covenant-feast of the kingdom of God in Israel. It contained three essential elements: (1) the blood of the victim, sprinkled at the exodus on each house-door, afterwards on the national altar, as an expiation to God (cf. Rom. iii. 25), who "passes over" when He "sees the blood"; (2) the flesh of the lamb, supplying the food of redeemed Israel as it sets out to the Holy Mount and the Promised Land (see x. 16 f., John vi. 32, 51); (3) the continued feast, an act of fellowship, grounded on redemption, between Jehovah and Israel and amongst the Israelites; cf. x. 16-22, xi. 20, and notes.

With the leaven removed and the Passover Lamb slain, "let us keep the feast (εορτάζωμεν, pr. sbj. of continued action)—this term again allegorical not literal (see ἄζυμοι, 7), "a figurative characterisation of the whole Christian conduct of life" (Mr.). ἄτας δ ἔδωκε αὐτοὺς παραγίνεται ἁγία (Clem. Al., Strom., viii., quoted by Ed.); to the same effect Cm., διεκνέσαν δή τις δ θρόνος πορτίς ἡντὶ καιρὸς τ. Χριστιανοῦ δακ τ. υπέρβολην τ. ἁγίαν αὐτοὺς διδάσκων. δια τοῦτο γάρ ὁ ἄνω τ. θεοῦ ἐδώκε τούτῃ γένος καὶ ἐντήθη ὑπ' αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ δικαίου πολίτη; cf. earlier than P., Philo's interpretation of
9. "I wrote you in the (my) letter"—the last the Cor. had received from P., which is recalled by the matter just discussed. The Ff., except Ambrosiaster (? Hilary of Rome, prob. Isaac, a converted Jew), referred the ἐγράψα to this Ep., taking the vb. as epistolaris orist (as in II, see Bn. S 44); but there is nothing in I Cor. to sustain the ref., and ἐν τῇ επιστολῇ seems "added expressly to guard against this interpretation" (Ed.). Modern expositors, from Cn. downwards, find the traces here of a lost Ep. antecedent to our First; 2 Cor. χ. το f. intimates that the Cor. had received several letters from P. before the canonical Second. Some have found in 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii.1 a stray leaf of the missing document; that par. is certainly germane to its purpose (see Hilgenfeld, Einleit. in das N.T., p. 287; Whitelaw, in Classical Review, 1890, pp. 12, 317 f.). The ambiguity lay in the word συναναμίγνυσθαι (to mix oneself up with), which forbids social intimacy, while those who wished to misunderstand took it as a prohibition of all intercourse!—What applies to one sort of immorality applies to others: ή τ. πλεονέκταις καὶ ἀρπαξινή ειδωλολατραίς, "or with the covetous and rapacious, or with idolaters". The πλεονέκται (from πλέον and έχω; see pars.) are the self-aggrandising in general;

Ver. 9. "I wrote to you in the (my) letter"—the last the Cor. had received from P., which is recalled by the matter just discussed. The Ff., except Ambrosiaster (? Hilary of Rome, prob. Isaac, a converted Jew), referred the ἐγράψα to this Ep., taking the vb. as epistolaris orist (as in II, see Bn. S 44); but there is nothing in I Cor. to sustain the ref., and ἐν τῇ επιστολῇ seems "added expressly to guard against this interpretation" (Ed.). Modern expositors, from Cn. downwards, find the traces here of a lost Ep. antecedent to our First; 2 Cor. χ. το f. intimates that the Cor. had received several letters from P. before the canonical Second. Some have found in 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii.1 a stray leaf of the missing document; that par. is certainly germane to its purpose (see Hilgenfeld, Einleit. in das N.T., p. 287; Whitelaw, in Classical Review, 1890, pp. 12, 317 f.). The ambiguity lay in the word συναναμίγνυσθαι (to mix oneself up with), which forbids social intimacy, while those who wished to misunderstand took it as a prohibition of all intercourse!—What applies to one sort of immorality applies to others: ή τ. πλεονέκταις καὶ ἀρπαξινή ειδωλολατραίς, "or with the covetous and rapacious, or with idolaters". The πλεονέκται (from πλέον and έχω; see pars.) are the self-aggrandising in general;
...
VI. 1-2.

1. Τολμᾶ τις υμῶν β' πράγμα β' έχων β' προς τόν 'έτερον Ρομ. v. 7; a Cor. x. 4. 

2. κρίνεσθαι επί των 'αδικών, και ουδέ επί των 'εγίων; b ουδ 12; Acts v. 13.

3. Κρίνεσθαι επί των αδίκων και ουδέ επί των αγίων; d This sense, ver. 9; cf. άσφαλειά, Gal. ii. 15, etc.; ασφαλη, ver. 6 below.

4. Κρίνεσθαι επί των αδίκων και ουδέ επί των αγίων; d In this comprehensive use, xiii. 34; xiv. 24, 25; Acts xxiii. 30, xxiv. 19, 21-9; Mt. xxviii. 15; Esth. vii. 12.

5. Οι άδικοι -the term applied by the Jews (cf. Gal. ii. 15), and then by Christians, to the heathen—marks the action censured as self-stultifying—to seek for right from "the unrighteous"! P. himself appealed to Roman justice, but never in matters "between brother and brother," nor in the way of accusing his injurers (Acts xxviii. 19); only in defence of his work.

6. Οι άγιοι indicates by contrast the moral dignity of Christians (see i. 2, and note), a judicial attribute; cf. sanctitas

7. In this passage technical legal expressions.

8. Τολμᾶ τις υμῶν κ.τ.λ.: “Does any one of you dare!” etc.—“notatur laesa majestas Christianorum” (Bz.): τολμάν, sustinere, non crubescere.

9. Also was matter of common knowledge, like the crime of τον πονηρόν in v. 1. The abrupt interrog. marks the outburst of indignant feeling. You treat the Church, the seat of the Holy Spirit (iii. 16 ff.), as though it were without authority or wisdom; you take your case from the highest court to the lowest! So the affeλλατ is first censured; in ver. 4 the whole Church comes in for blame.

10. Πράγμα (res, negotium), κρίνεσθαι (mid.: see parl.), επί with gen., κριτήριον (2), καθίζω (4), and perhaps κρίνη (E) are all in this passage technical legal expressions.

11. Ol ἔδικατ—...ονuous and extreme guilt which gave rise to the whole discussion. Τόδε έρατη (cf. ἐκκαθάρισθε, 7) takes up again the τον ἀρνηθος of ver. 2, with the added thought (ἐδικασαν αὐτον) of the riddance effected by his removal. The terrible sentence of vv. 3 ff. had not, in so many words, prescribed ejection, though implying it; and P. needed to be very explicit: see note on ver. 9. The formal expulsion must proceed from the Cor. άδικα κρίνεται; the Church is a self-governing body.
fori (Quintilian, xi, 3, 58). There exists a similar Rabbinical inhibition: "It is forbidden to bring a matter of right before idolatrous judges. . . . Whosoever goeth before them with a law-suit is impious, and does the same as though he blasphemed and cursed; and hath lifted his hand against the law of Moses our Teacher,—blessed be he!" (Shulchan aruch, Choshen hammishpat, 29). The Roman Government allowed the Jews liberty of internal jurisdiction; the Beth din (house of judgment) was as regular a part of the Israelite economy as the Beth-keneseth (synagogue). In Rom. xiii. 1 ff. P. regards the power of the State from a different point of view.

Ver. 2. ή ουκ οίδατε κ.τ.λ.; "Or (is it that) you do not know?" etc. If the appeal to non-Christian tribunals is not made in insolence (τολμά) towards the Church, it must be made in ignorance of its matchless prerogative. That "the saints will judge the world" is involved in the conception of the Messianic kingdom (Dan. vii. 22; cf. Matt. xxi. 21); Israel, with its Christ, is to rule, and therefore judge, the nations (Acts i. 6, etc.: cf. Gal. vi. 16). See Wisd. iii. 7 f., where participation in this Messianic power is asserted for "the souls of the righteous" in their future state. After the manner of Jesus, the Ap. carried over to the new Israel of God the promises of dominion claimed under the Old Covenant, transforming in transferring them (2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. xx. 4, xxii. 5, etc.). Paul reminds his readers of a truth they should have known, since it belongs to the nature of "the kingdom of God" (g) and to the glory they look for at "the unveiling of Christ" (i. 7 ff.; cf. iv. 8, Rom. viii. 17, etc.).

Ver. 3. The question of ver. 2 urged to its climax: "Know you not that we shall judge angels?" Paul already does this, hypothetically, in Gal. i. 8. Instructed through the Church (Eph. iii. 10), the heavenly powers will be subject to final correction from the same quarter. The angels were identified, in later Jewish thought, with the forces of nature and the destiny of nations (Ps. civ. 4; Dan. x. 13, xii. 1); they must be affected by any judgment embracing the κόσμος. "There is, it seems, a solidarity between the Princes of the nations (cf. Paul's αρχαι κ. εξουσίαι, χν. 24, etc.) and the nations directed by them; according to Shir rabba, 27 b, God does not punish a people until He has first humbled its Angel-prince in the higher world, and according to Tanchuma, Beshallich, 13, He will hereafter judge the nations only when He has first judged their Angel-princes" (Weber, Alltsynag. palist. Theologie, p. 165); Satan is κατ’ ἐξοχήν "the god of this world" (2 Cor. iv. 4; cf. John xiv. 30, Luke iv. 6), and has his "angels" whom P. styles "world-rulers" (Eph. vi. 12, Matt. xxv. 41). On the throne of world-judgment Christ will sit (Acts xvii. 31, Matt. xxv. 31 f.), and "the saints"—sc. after their own acquittal—as His assessors. —κρινοῦσιν in this context
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oíde te óti ággelous kriçoymen; mèti ge biwthiká. 4. biwthiká a In like
µèn ouv mé kntría, òan ékçi toú de éxoutheýmenous én tì ekklêsìa,
toutous kathiçte. 5. práde éntropth òan lègu. toutous ouv éçin
èc in ouv sofos 2 ouv 3 èc, 2 de dívugetai "biwthiçta" av.

p Lk. xxi. 34; Aristot., Polyb., Philo. Al. q See i. 28. r Transit. Eph. i. 20; Acts ii. 30.
xxv. 34; Job xi. 8; Ps. xxxiv. 26. etc. Cф. iv. 14. t Gal. iii. 3; Mt. xxvi. 40; Mk. vii. 18; Jn.
xxviii. 22. u N.T. h.l., in this sense. Cф. iv. 7; xi. 29. v Mt. xiii. 23; Mk. vii. 31; Rev. vii.
17; Ex. xi. 7; Is. livil. 5.

1 evâ, ΝΒCLP, minn. 78 or more (cf. Gal. iii. 28, Col. iii. 11).
estin, DG 37, etc.: Western correction.
2 oudeis sofos, ΝBC 17, 46, 73; so crit. edd.
oudei eis sofo, GP 37, Aug., Ambrst. (quisquam sapiens).—later Western; sofos
simply, D', earlier Western (2), so crit. edd.
2 p. Lk. xxi. 34; Aristot., Polyb., Philo. Al.
mèn ou v σοφός, διάβασα ὡς ΣΒCL 7, 46, 73, so crit. edd.
oudei eis sofo, GR 37, Aug., Ambrst. (quisquam sapiens),—later Western; σοφος
simply, D', earlier Western (2), so crit. edd.

qualifies its objects as culpable; cf. ινα καταργήση in xv. 24; also v. 12 above,
and other parts. The anarthrous ággel-
ous signifies beings of this order, in con-
trast with men (cf. iv. 9; also Jude 6);
" P. does not wish to mark out this or that
class of angels, but to awaken in the
Church the sense of its competence and
dignity by reminding it that beings of this
lofty nature will one day be subject to its
jurisdiction" (Gd.; also El.).—µήτι
βιωτικά (necum quidem: not surely a
continued interrog., as W. H. punctuate)
in sharp contrast to "angels"—" (to
say) nothing verily of secular matters!".

—µήτιν (sc. λέγωμεν) is a Ν.Τ. h.l.,
a sound cl. idiom (see Lidd. on µήτις,
also El. ad. loc.),—negative syn. for
τον µάλλον (Rom. xi. 12, 24); for the
γε, cf. iv. 8.—βιωτικός, of later Gr. (after
Aristotle), denotes matters relating to
ίος (one's "living"), which differs from
ωή as υίταquam from υίταqua υίνimus
—" guae ad hujus vitaeusum pertinent"
(Βz.), or "ad victum pertinentia" (Cν.);
see Lt. ad loc., and Trench, Syn., § 27.

Vv. 4, 5a. Ver. 4 is rendered in three
diff. ways, as (a) τ. éxoutheýmenous én tı
ékklêsia is taken to mean the heathen
judges, the édikoi of ver. 1 whom the
Church could not respect (ἐν, in the eyes
of; cf. xiv. 11); then toutous kathiçte
becomes an indignant question—" Do
you set up these (as your judges)?" so
Mr., Hn., Tisch., W. H., R.V. text.
The position of kathiçte and the strain
put upon its meaning speak against this
view—the Cor. Christians did not apoint
the city magistrates; also the unlikeli-
hood of Paul's using language calculated
to excite contempt toward heathen rulers.
(b) The prevalent construction (Vg., Syr.,
Bz., Cv., Bg., Ed., El., Lt., A.V., R.V.
margin) understands τ. έξου. ἐν τ. έκκλ.
as the despised of the Church itself
(κανάκαθα ἐν ἀνθ., iii. 21, iv. 6 ff.,
implies such a counterpart); then kathiçte
is read as impv., and P. says in sarcasm,
"If you have lawsuits in secular affairs,
set up the lowest amongst you (for judges
of these low matters)!" κριτήρια how-
ever (see note on 2, and R. V. marg.) sig-
nifies not trials, nor matters of trial, but
tribunals, and is therefore an unsuit-
able obj. to εάνέχητε: βιωτικά κριτ. are the things τε "anting to the Church,
which P. is advising them to set on foot.
Moreover, Paul would hardly speak of
Christians as "despised" among their
fellows, without some touch of blame for
their despisers. (c) For these reasons,
it is better, as Hf. suggests, to put the
comma before, instead of after, εάνéxoutheý-
menous. (d) The position of καθίζετε
speaks against this view—the Cor. Chris-
tians did not appoint the city magis-
trates; also the unlikelihood of Paul's
using language calculated to excite contempt
among heathen rulers. (e) For these reasons,
it is better, as Hf. suggests, to put the
comma before, instead of after, εάν éxout-
heýmenous. "Unto your shame (lit. for a shame to you) I say (it)": this
relates to the foregoing sentence (cf. xv.
34); it is a shame the Cor. Church
should have members looked on with
utter contempt (cf. xii. 21-25); but since
it has, it is fitting that they should be its
judges in things contemptible! P. writes
with anger, whereas he did not, though
he might seem to do, in iv. 14.

Ver. 5b. Laying aside sarcasm, the Ap.
asks most gravely: "(Is it) so (that)
there is no wise man found amongst you,
who will be able to decide between his
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VI.

7. "Ηδη μεν ουν, δοκεῖ (αυτοῖς) τοσαύτη σπάνις αμόινον αμόινον" (Cm.)—"so utter a lack of men of sense amongst you Cor., with all your talent and pretensions?" (i. 5, iii. 18, iv. 10). 

6. "ούτως intensifies the question (cf. Gal. iii. 3)—τοσαύτη σταυρός: (Cm.)—"so utterly a failure on your part"—not a mere defeat, nor a loss (sc. of the Messianic glory: so Mr., in view of 9), but a moral defeat (so parls.). "Ηττάομαι (see Lidd., s. v., i. 3) signifies to be υποκειόμεθα, be beaten in a suit (Lat. causa cadere); this sense excellently suits the context and Paul's epigrammatic style: "Indeed then it is already an unmistakable defeat for you that you have law-suits"—you are beaten before you enter court, by the mere fact that such quarrels arise and reach this pitch."κρίμα is the πράγμα (τ)ripened into an actual case at law. μεθ' αυτών, for μετ' αλλήλων, implies intestine strife; the 3rd pl. reflexive pron. frequently serves all three persons (Jelf's Gr. Gram., § 654, 2 b).—αδικείσθε, αποστερείσθε, mid. voice: "injuriam accipitis, fraudem patimini" (Vg.)—"Why do you not rather submit to wrong, to robbery!" (see Wr., p. 218). Paul reproduces the teaching of Jesus in Luke vi. 27 ff., etc., which applies more strictly as the relationships of life are closer; cf. His own example (1 Pet. ii. 23), and that of the Ap. (iv. 12 f., 16). οδοχί μᾶλλον, as in v. 2.

Ver. 8. "Ναι, but you commit wrong and robbery this too (cf. 6) upon your brothers!" Mr. readsthis, like the parl. αλλά clause of ver. 6, as a further question; it is the answer to the question of ver. 7—the sad fact contrasted with the duty of the Christian. The spiritual kinship which heightens the duty of submission to wrong, aggravates its commission.

Vv. 9, 10. On οὐδέν ὡθήσατε; see note to ver. 2. The wrongers of their brethren are surely unaware of the fact that "wrong-doers (δικεῖοι) will not inherit...
God's kingdom" (which nevertheless they profess to seek, i. 7 ff.)—an axiom of revelation, indeed of conscience, but the over-clever sometimes forget ele- 

moral principles; hence the μή 

πλανάσθε. Their conduct puts them on a level with the heathen (οι άδικοι, 1). 

Θεού βασιλείαν (doubly anarthrous, see ποτε on ii. 5), "God's kingdom"—the expression indicating the region and nature of the realm from which unrighteousness excludes; "the kingdom of God is righteousness" (Rom. χίν. τ7; cf. Matt. ν. το, xiii.43, Luke xiv. 14, 

Rev. i. 18, ii. 8 f., etc.). The deception taking place on this fundamental point springs from the frivolity of the Hellenic nature; it had a specific cause in the libertinism deduced from the gospel of Free Grace and the abrogation of the Μosaic Law (12 f., see notes; cf. Rom. i. 24 ff., written from Cor. The three detached classes appended by ού to the ούτε list were specified in ν. 1τ: see 

ΠΟtes. Ver. 1τ. και ταύτα τινες ήτε : "And these things you were, some (of you) 

τοντα, all uncc. but L. 

Θεονικειαν (in this order: cf. ver. 10): all uncc. but L. 

ούτε seven times (πορνοί . . . πλεονεκται), then ου (μεθυσοι), ου, ουχ: ΝΑCP. BL, and Syrian text, read ουτε eight times, then ου, ουχ. 

D*, ουτε seven times, ουτε twice, then ουν. 

Ομ. ου all uncc. but LP (Syrian); cf. ver. 9. 

and by the use of molles in Latin. For 

άρσενοκοίται (cl. παιδερασταί), whose sin of Sodom was widely and shame- 

lessly practised by the Greeks; cf. Rom. i. 24 ff., written from Cor. The three detached classes appended by ου to the ούτε list were specified in v. 11; see notes. 

Ver. 11. και ταύτα τινες ήτε : "And these things you were, some (of you) 

The neuter τοντα is contemptuous— "such abominations!" τοντα softens the aspersions; the majority of Cor. Christians had not been guilty of extreme vice. The stress lies on the tense of ήτε; "you were"—a thing of the past, cf. Rom. vi. 19, Eph. ii. 11 f. —But you washed yourselves! but you were sanc- 

tified; but you were justified!"—αλλά 
thrice repeated, with joyful emphasis, as in 2 Cor. ii. 17, vii. 11. The first of the three vbs. is mid., the other two pass. in 

voice. άπελουσατε refers to baptism (cf. Acts xxii. 16, Col. ii. 11 f., Eph. ν. 26 f., 1 Pet. iii. 21; see i. 13 for its signal importance), in its spiritual meaning; the form of the vb. calls attention to the initiative of the Cor. in getting rid, at the call of God, of the filth of their old life; in baptism their penitent faith took deliberate and formal expression, with this effect. But behind their action in submitting to baptism, there was the action of God, operating to the effect described by the terms ήγιάσθητε, έδι- 

καιθεσθητε. These twin conceptions of the Christian state in its beginning appear commonly in the reverse order (see i. 30, Rom. vi. 19, etc.); in Rom. v.,
vi. they are seen to be related as the resurrection and death of Christ, and in Rom. vi. to be figured respectively in the ἀνάδυσις and κατάδυσις which formed the two movements of baptism; see notes ad locc., also Tit. iii. 5 ff. The order of the words does not justify Calovius, Lipsius, and Mr., with Romanist interpreters, in finding here "the ethical continuatio justificationis,"—an explanation contrary to the uniform Pauline signification of δικαιοῖται; the Ap. is thinking (in contrast with vv. 9 f.) of the status attained by his readers as ἁγίοι (i. 2, iii. 17, vi. 1), behind which lay the fundamental fact of their δικαίωσις. The qualifying prpl. phrases both belong to the three closely linked vs. Baptism is received "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (quoted with formal solemnity: cf. note on i. 2): "in the Spirit of our God" it is validated and brings its appropriate blessings (cf. John iii. 5-8: water is the formal, the Sp. the essential source of the new birth).

Baptize in ἡγίω was the distinctive work of Jesus Christ (Matt. iii. 11, etc.); to be ἐν πνεύματι (Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ) is the distinctive state of a Christian, including every element of the new life (19, ii. 12, iii. 16, 2 Cor. i. 21 f., Rom. v. 5, viii. 2, 9, etc.). Sanctification esp. is grounded in the Holy Spirit; but He is an agent in justification too, for His witness to sonship implies the assurance of forgiveness (Rom. viii. 15 ff). The name of our Lord Jesus Christ sums up the baptismal confession (cf. Rom. x. 8 ff.); the Spirit of our God constitutes the power by which that confession is inspired, and the regeneration effected which makes it good: the two factors are identified in xii. 3 (see note). "Our God," in emphatic distinction from the gods in whose service the Cor. had been defiled (see vii. 4 ff., 2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2; cf. Ps. xxix. 9).

§ 19. The Sanctity of the Body, vi. 12-20. The laxity of morals distinguishing the Cor. Church was in some instances defended, or half-excused, by appealing to the principle of Christian liberty, which P. had himself enunciated in asserting the freedom of Gentile Christians from the Mosaic ceremonial restrictions. From his lips the libertarians took their motto, Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν. The Ap. does not retract this sentence, but he guards it from abuse: (1) by setting over against it the balancing principle of expediency, ού πάντα συμφέρει; (2) by defining, in the twofold example of ver. 13, the sphere within which it applies, distinguishing liberty from licence. This leads up to a reiterated prohibition of fornication, grounded on its nature as a sin against the body itself, and an act which flagrantly contradicts the sanctity of its limbs, as they belong to Christ, being purchased by Him for the service of God (15-20).

Ver. 12. Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν stands twice here, and twice in x. 23; P. harps on the saying in a way to indicate that it was a watchword with some Cor. party—perhaps amongst both Paulinists and Apollonians; his μοι endorses the declaration (cf. vii. 8 f., x. 23 ff., Rom. xiv. 14, 20). Very likely it had been quoted in the Church Letter. This sentence, like those of i. 14, iii. 21, iv. 1 (see notes), recalls the attributes of the Stoic ideal σοφός, to whom it belongs ἐξείναι ὡς βουλόμεθα διεξάγειν (Arr.-Epict., ii., i., 21-28; see Hn. ad loc.).—αλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει: "Yes, but not all things are advantageous."—Συμφέρει (conducunt) signifies contributing to some one's benefit—here one's own, in x. 24 one's neighbour's.—Parl. to the former ἀλλ' οὐ, is ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ ἑξωσμοσίαν κ.τ.λ.: "All things are in my domain; yes, but I will not be dominated by anything." That is "unprofitable" to a man which "gets the mastery" over him. "Such and such a thing is in my power; I will take care that it does not get me into its power. I will never by abuse of my liberty forfeit that liberty in its noblest part." This gives the self-regarding, as x. 23 f. the other-regarding rule of Christian temperance in the use of things lawful. Cf. the instructive chapter Πεπ.
VI.

The prefix in εξ-εγερεί is local—out of (sc. the grave; cf. ἐξ-ἀνάστασις, Phil. iii. 11); not de massa dormientium (Bp.). The raising of Christ (cf. Eph. i. 19 ff.), then of Christians, from the dead is the supreme exhibition of God's supernatural "power" (see Rom. iv. 17-24, Matt. xxii. 29, Acts xxvi. 8, etc.). Christ is raised as "Lord," and will rule our life yon side of death more completely than on this (Acts ii. 36, Col. i. 18, Phil. iii. 20 f.).

Vv. 15-17 unfold in its repulsiveness, by vivid concrete presentation, the opposition between the two claimants for bodily service already contrasted: the rival of Christ is ἡ πόρνη! "Or (if what I have said is not sufficient) do you not know that your bodies are Christ's limbs? Should I then take away the limbs of Christ and make them a harlot's limbs? Far be it!"—Αἴρω is to remove, carry off, as in v. 2 (see parls.), Vg. tollens, implying "a voluntary and determined act" (Ed.); for the introductory aor. ptp., see Bn., §§ 132, 138. ποιήσω, either (de liberative) aor. subj. or fut. ind.—"Am I to make, etc.?" or, "Am I going to make?" The former idiom suits an act of choice; this question the tempted Cor. Christian must put to himself: cf. the interrog. form of Rom. vi. 1, 15 (-ομεν).

What is true of Christian men individually, that they are μέλη Χριστοῦ and parts of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ, is true specifically of the physical frame of each; similarly in vv. 19 f. Paul applies to the Christian man's body the glorious truth stated respecting the Christian society in iii. 16 f. In the Hellenic view, the body was the perishing envelope of the man; in the Scriptural view, it is the abiding vehicle of his spirit. To devote the body to a harlot, one must first withdraw it from Christ's possession: to do that, and for such a purpose—the bare statement shows the infamy of the proposal. The Biblical formula of depreciation, μὴ γένοσθαι, is frequent also in Epictetus; cf. Odyssey, vii., 316, μὴ τύπτω φίλον Δι' οὐδεὶς γένοσθαι.

Ver. 16 justifies the strong expression πόρνης μέλη (15), implying that the alliance is a kind of incorporation: "Or (if you object to my putting it in this way), do you not know that he who cleaves to the harlot is one body (with her)?" ο κολλώμενος (see parls.), qui agglutinantur scorto (Bz.), indicates that sexual union constitutes a permanent bond between the parties. What has been done lives, morally, in both; neither is henceforth free of the other. The Divine sentence (uttered prophetically by Adam) which the Ap. quotes to this effect was pronounced upon the first wedded pair, and holds of every such union, whether lawful or unlawful—honourably true (vii. 4, Heb. xiii. 4), or shamefully. In Eph. v. 31 the same Scripture is cited at length, where the Ap. is making out the correspondence between wedlock and Christ's union with the Church: in that place the spiritual union is treated as parli. to the natural union, where this follows the Divine order; here, it stands out as prohibitory to a natural union which violates that order. Here only Paul uses the parenthetical φησίν ("says He," sc. God) in citing Scripture; it is common in Philo, and in the Ep. of Barnabas.—ἐσονται . . . εις (Hebraism) = γενήσονται.

Ver. 17. ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ Κυρίῳ κ.τ.λ.: "But he who cleaves to the Lord is one spirit (with Him)". Adhesion by the act of faith (i. 21, etc.) to Christ (as Lord, cf. xii. 3, etc.) establishes a spiritual communion of the man with Him as real and close as the other, bodily communion ("tam arcte quam conjuges sunt unum corpus," Bg.), and as much more influential and enduring as the spirit is above the flesh. "The Spirit" is the uniting bond (iii. 16, Rom. viii. 8 f., etc.), but the Ap. is thinking of the nature and sphere of this union; hence the anarthrous, generic πνεύμα, contrasted with σάρξ (16). In 2 Cor. iii. 17 "the Lord" is identified with "the Spirit," and believers are repeatedly said
to be in the body; so that between them and Christ there exists a κοινωνία Πνεύματος (i. 9, 2 Cor. xiii. 13; John xvi. 14, etc.). For the intimacy of this association of members with the Head, see Gal. ii. 20, Eph. ii. 5 f., iii. 16 f., Col. ii. 10, iii. 1 ff., John xx. 1 ff., xvii. 23 ff., etc.

Ver. 18. With vehement abruptness P. turns from exposition to exhortation. "Flee fornication"—other sins may be combated; this must be fled, as by Joseph in Potiphar's house. θεία το από το ειδωλολατρείας του 16 shows "the connexion in Cor. between impurity and idolatry" (Ed.: cf. the lists of sins in 9 and ν. 1 τ.)—"ι exacerbis" contradicts Christ's rights in the body (13-17) and severs the commuter from Him; P. has now to say that this is a sin against the nature of the human body: "Every act of sin (αμαρτήματα) which a man may possibly do, is outside of the body; but the fornicator (πορνεύων) sins against his own body". The point of this saying lies in the contrasted prepositions εκτός and εις: all bodily sins "defile the flesh" (2 Cor. vii. 1), but other vices—those of the κοιλία, e.g.—look outside the body; this in its whole essence lies within our physical nature, so that, while it appropriates the person of another (16), it is a self-violation. Hence transgressions of the Seventh Commandment are "sins of the flesh" and "of the passions" παρ' εἰκόνιστος. They engage and debauch the whole person; they "enter into the heart," for "they proceed out of the heart" and touch the springs of being; in the highest degree they "defile the man" (Mark vii. 20 ff.). That fornication is extreme disowning is realised in the one sex; Christianity makes it equally so in the other.

Vv. 19, 20. What a deadly sin, an act of high treason, this is for the Christian, Paul's final appeal shows: "Or (if you do not yet realise the heinousness of fornication), do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have (οὐ εἴχες, gen. by attraction to Πνεύματος) from God! " The Holy Spirit dwells in the readers: "οὐχ ὑμεῖς, but in their body, since they are in the body! (iii. 16, cf. Rom. viii. 11: also John ii. 21): there is the same tacit inference from whole to part as in ver. 15; the same assumption that the body is essential to the man, which underlies the doctrine of the Resurrection (χρ.): The Christian estimate of πορνεία is thus categorically opposed to the heathen estimate. In the temple of Aphrodité prostitutes were priestesses, and commerce with them was counted a consecration; it is an absolute desecration of God's true temple in the man himself. And (that) you are not your own!" This too P. asks his readers if they "do not know?" The possessor is God, who has occupied them by His Spirit, having first purchased them with His Son's blood: cf. i. 30, iii. 23; Rom. viii. 32, 2 Cor. v. 18 ff., Acts xx. 28. "For you were bought at a price!"
VII. 1. \( \text{Περί δὲ ἐν ἐγράφατε μοι} \) 1. \( \text{Kalóν} \) 2. \( \text{ἄνθρωπόν γυναῖκας} \)

1 In this connection, Mt. xix. 5, 10 (Gen. ii. 24). c In this sense, N.T. A.G.; Gen. xx. 6; Prov. vi. 29. d See v. 17; Mt. xv. 19; Mk. vii. 21.

P. does not need to state; it was \( \text{τίμιον αἷμα} \) (1 Pet. i. 18 f.; Eph. i. 7, Matt. xx. 28, Rev. v. 9). \( \text{Ἀγοράζω} \), to purchase, syn. with \( \text{(ἀντ)αντρόμω, to ransom} \) (i. 30, Tit. ii. 14): the latter points to the means of redemption, the former to the proprietorship which it creates (cf. \( \text{περίπτευσάτο} \), Acts xx. 28); both ideas meet in Eph. i. 14. The gen. of price, \( \text{τιμής} \), indicates the value at which God rates His purchase.—\( \text{διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας} \), to ransom;

Ver. 1. \( \text{Περί δὲ ἐν ἐγράφατε:} \) "Now about the things on which you wrote (to me)".—\( \text{Περί δὲ = περί τοῦτον περὶ} \) (not \( \text{ἡ} \); cf. the constructions of rel. pron. in ver. 39, x. 30; see Wr., p. 198. —\( \text{διὰ} \) \( \text{metabatikon} \) leads to a new topic, in orderly transition from the last: "Now I proceed to deal with the matters of your letter to me"; the questions proposed about marriage are discussed on the ground prepared by the teaching of chh. v. and vi. They form a part of the wide social conflict between Christian and Pagan life at Corinth: see Intro. to Div. II. P. answers at once, affirmatively, the question of principle put to him: "It is right (\( \text{καλόν, honourable, morally befitting} \)—\( \text{pulchrum, conveniens, Bg.} \); see note on v. 6) for one (\( \text{ἄνθρωπον} \), homin); not \( \text{ἄνδρα, man distinctively, spond} \) not to touch a woman" (to live in strict celibacy).—\( \text{καλόν} \) contradicts the \( \text{οὐ καλόν} \) present in the minds of some of the questioners, influenced by the sensuous atmosphere of Cor. Paul is not disparaging marriage, as though he meant \( \text{καλλίον μὴ ἄπτ.} \) but defending celibacy against those who thought it inhuman.

Ver. 2: a single life is good in itself, "but" is not generally expedient at Cor. —\( \text{διὰ τὰς πορνείας,} \) "because of the (prevailing) fornications" (the unusual pl. indicating the variety and extent of profligacy: cf. 2 Cor. xii. 21); for this reason marriage, as a rule, is advisable here.—It must be Christian marriage, as opposed to heathen libertinism and Jewish polygamy: "let each (man) have his own wife, and each (woman) her proper husband". The pr. impv., \( \text{ἐκατός} \) (ec. directive, not permissive), signifies "have and keep to" (cf. 2 Tim. i. 13).
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3. Τῇ γυναικὶ ἐχέτω, καὶ ἵκατῃ τὸν ἰδιὸν ἄνδρα ἐχέτω. 4. Τῇ γυνῇ τὸν ἰδιὸν σῶματος ἔχωσι, ἀλλ' ὁ ἄνδρας. 5. Μή αποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, εἰ μὴ τῇ ἡμερίᾳ πρὸς καίρον, ἵνα σχολάζητε τῇ εἰσαγωγῇ, καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ, καὶ πάλιν επὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέρχηθεν, ἵνα μὴ ἁκρασία ἄβεθεν.
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VΙΙ.
Γ.
Ε;
"πειράζηυμαςο "Σατανάς διά την"ακρασίανυμών. 6. τούτο δὲ πειράζημα εἰναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκαστὸς θεὸν "χάρισμα. Δ. «γ' Κ» - 2
Άλεγω κατά"συγγνώμην,ου κατ' επιταγήν. 7. θέλω γάρ πάντα "αργυρίαν "κρείσσον ἐκ γαμήσαι καὶ ταῖς χήρας, "καλὸν ἀδώτες ἐστιν" ἕως ἐκαστὸς τοῖς ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς "χήραις, "Καλὸν ἀδώτες ἐστιν εἰ ἐκ μείνων ὁς καὶ τοίς "χήραις. 9. εἰ «δε» «οὐκ» "εγκρατεύονται, "γαμησάτωσαν "κρείσσον "κρείσσον; 25; freq. γὰρ ἐστὶ "γαμησάτωσαν τῇ προσευχῇ (Rom. xii.12, Col. v. 2).  

1. Τh. iii. 5 the leading direction given in ver. 2, from which vv. 3-5 digressed: “I advise you to be married (though I think celibacy good), κατά συγγνώμην,” sec μν. 2. Therefore δὲ (2): Ντ ΑCD*G τ 7, 46, latt. am. fu. cop., Οr., Cyπ. (Western and Alexandrian). So Τisch., Τr., W.Η., R.V., Ε1., Nestle. 

κρατεύονται, "γαμησάτωσαν "κρείσσον, ΑCGLP, etc.  

ο δε οὐτώς does not refer to the married Christian, as though his state were in itself a charism, but to any special endowment for service in Christ's kingdom other than that stated. Ον "χάρισμα see i.7 ; and cf. xii.4-1τ.  

Vv. 6, 7. τούτο δὲ λέγω points to the leading direction given in ver. 2, from which vv. 3-5 digressed: “I advise you to be married (though I think celibacy good), κατά συγγνώμης,” secundum indulgentiam (Vg.). The rendering “permission” is somewhat misleading; συγγνώμη is quite distinct from the γνώμη opposed to επιταγή in ver. 25; it signifies either pardon (venia, excuse for a fault), or, as here, allowance, regard for circumstances and temperament. In δὲ λέγω κατ' επιταγήν the Ap. states his personal bent, which he had set aside in the recommendation just given: “But I would have all men to be as indeed myself,” sc. cancel—and contentedly so (cf. Acts xxvi. 29). ὁς καὶ ἐμαυτῶν, paratactic acc. (attached to πάντας διὰ θρόσπουν) = ὁς καὶ ἐμαυτὸς εἶμι; καὶ εἴπομαι the emphasis that the writer is what he would like others to be. It is manifest (see also ix. 5) that the Ap. was unmarried, although Clem. Alex. and some moderns have inferred otherwise from Phil. iv. 3. That he had never been married is by no means certain. Two things, however, are clear: that if P. had known the married state, it was before his apostleship—“wife and children are never hinted at, he goes about entirely free from such ties” (Lt.); further, that if in early life he had entered this state, it was not δι' ακρασίαν; he possessed the “grace-gift” (χάρισμα) of undisquieted continence (opposed to πυροῦσθαι, 9; cf. Matt. xix. 12), which was in his case an adjunct of his χάρις αποστολῆς. — "However (= I cannot have every one like myself, but) each has a charism of his own from God, the one in this shape and the other in that." δὲ οὖν does not refer to the "married Christian, as though his state were in itself a charism, but to any special endowment for service in Christ's kingdom other than that stated. On "χάρισμα see i.7 ; and cf. xii. 4-11. 

Vv. 6, 9 re-state the answer given in vv. 1, 2 to the question concerning celibacy v. marriage. “But I say to the unmarried and the widows, it is right (καλόν; cf. 1) for them if they remain as indeed I (am).” The Ap. extends the
6—11.  
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10. Τοις δὲ γυναικοῖς ἐπαιραγγέλεω, οὐκ ἔγνω ἄλλ' ὁ Κύριος, γυναίκα ἄπο ἄνδρος μή χωρισθῇ. 1  

11. εὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ, μενεῖ ἄγαμος τῷ ἄνδρι καταλλαγὴν καὶ ἄνδρα γυναίκα μή χωρισθῇ.  

χωρισθῇ, ADG (Western).

reassurance given in ver. 1, and fortifies it by his own example, so that those out of wedlock who were under no constraint to enter its bonds might be free from misgiving and reproach. τοῖς ἁγάμοις, in contrast to τοῖς γεγαμηκόσιν, ver. 10: the term is masc.—" to unmarried men"; the case of "maidens" is discussed later (25 ff.). The widows, who would frequently have the disposal of themselves, are included here—they are advised again to the like effect in vv. 39 ff. Holsten omits καὶ τοῖς χήραις as out of place; Bovis ingeniously suggests that this may be a primitive corruption for καὶ τοῖς χήραις, "the widowers". As the τορνία without (2), so δαισία within (5) might make abstention from marriage pernicious; hence the qualification added in ver. 9: "But if they have not self-control, let them marry; for better it is to marry than to burn on (with desire)".—τυρσοῦσθαι, pr. of continued state—"occulta flamma concupiscentiae vastari" (Aug.); the vb. is used of any consuming passion, as in 2 Cor. xi. 29. Not "better in so far as marriage is sinless, burning is sinful (Matt. v. 28),"—so Mr.; if marriage and parenthood are holy (14), the fire which burns toward the end may be less—"the sacred love of well-placed love"; but "better" as the unsatisfied craving is a continual temptation, and according to the rule of ver. 35. Better to marry than to burn; but if marriage is impossible, better infinitely to burn than to sin.  

§ 21. Prohibition of Divorce, vii. 10-16. Pagan sentiment and law, while condoning fornication, were exceedingly lax in permitting divorce (see Hermann-Stark, Griech. Privat-alterthumer, §§ 30, 15, 17), as Jewish practice was on the side of the husband (Matt. v. 31 f., xix. 7 ff.); and marriages were often contracted without affection. Unfit unions became irksome in the extreme, with the stricter ethics and high ideal of the new faith; in many cases one of the partners remained a heathen (12 f.). It was asked whether Christians were really "bound" (καταλλαγήν, 15) by the ties of the old life formed under unholy conditions, and whether it was right for man and wife to live together while one was in the kingdom of God and the other in that of Satan. These questions, propounded in the letter from Cor., Paul has now to answer—(a) as respects Christian couples (10 f.), (b) as respects married pairs divided in religion (12-16).  

Vv. 10, 11. "But in the case of those that have married (τ. γεγαμηκόσιν, pf. of settled fact), I charge . . . wife not to separate from husband . . . and husband not to send away (or let go) wife." The parenthesis, "not I but the Lord" (it is His command, not mine), refers the indissolubility of marriage to the authority of Christ. The exceptional cause of divorce allowed by Jesus, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9; also unmentioned in Mark x. 11, Luke xvi. 18), is not contemplated in the instance of wedded Christians (Paul is addressing both partners at once). The Apostle's tone is changed (cf. 6 ff.); he is laying down the law, and on Supreme Authority. He cites Christ's words in distinction from his own (2), not as though his word was insufficient (see, to the contrary, 40, ii. 16, v. 3 f., xiv. 37, etc.), but inasmuch as this was a principle upon which "the Lord" had pronounced categorically.—It is noticeable that the case of the τυαί woman seeking separation comes first and is dwelt upon, Christianity had powerfully stirred the feminine mind at Cor. (see xi. 5 ff., xiv. 34 f.). In some cases, not so much incompatibility as ascetic aversion (cf. 3 f.) caused the wish to separate.—The γυναῖκα μὴ χωρισθῇ is qualified by the parenthesis εὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ: "but if indeed she have separated, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband". P. is not allowing exceptions from the rule of Christ, but advising in cases where the mischief was done; the aor. sbj., χωρισθῇ, is timeless, taking its occasion from the context: see Bn., § 98. Her remaining unmarried is virtually included in the law of Christ (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9). καταλλαγὴν, pass., "let
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12. τοις δὲ ’λαοίτοις ἐγὼ λέγω, οὐδὲ ὁ Κύριος, εἰ τις ἀφίηναι. Κ ἐν ουτοις, Φοίνιξ τις ἐκεῖνος εἰς τις ἀδελφὸς γυναῖκα ἐχεῖ = ἀπίστου καὶ αὕτη ἐκεῖνης ἀπίστως καὶ αὐτός. 13. καὶ γυνὴ ἢτις ἐχεῖ ἁνδρα = ἀπίστου καὶ αὐτός. 14. ἡ γάφη ἤγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἄνδρ καὶ αὐτὴς ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρα ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἀπίστου ἐν τῷ ἄνδρε. 15. ἡ γάφη ἤγίασται γὰρ κ.τ.λ. 

1 λέγω εἰμί: Νικαίος (pre-Syrian and non-Western).

2 αὐτή, latt. vg., Tert.; crit. edd.: see οὐτός, ver. 13. In uncc. no distinction.

3 οὐ τις: ΝΙΗΓΡ, latt. vg., Chr., Αμβρ., Aug., Dam. (Western).

4 οὐτός, all uncc. but DeKL.

5 αὐτός, B.

6 DG add τῇ πιστῇ.

7 αὐτῆς, all pre-Syrian uncc.; vg. and syr., αὐτῆς.

her get herself reconciled”: the vb. indicates the fact of alienation or dis- sension, but not the side on which it exists (cf. the theological use of καταλάσσω in Rom. v. 10 f.); if the husband disallows her return, she must remain ἄγαμος.—Romanists have inferred from the text, after Aug., and notwithstanding Matt. v. 32, that even adultery leaves the marriage-vow binding on the wronged partner; but this question is not in view here (see Ed. in loc.).

Ver. 12, 13. “But to the rest”—as distinguished from Christian couples (10)—“say I, not the Lord”: this is my word, not His. On the problem of mixed marriages, which Jesus had no occasion to regulate, the Ap. delivers his own sentence. Not that he exhorts, whereas the Lord commands (Cm.)—λέγω is a word of authority (virtually repeating παραγγέλλω, το), as in xiv. 34, 37, xv. 51, 2 Cor. vii. 13, Rom. xii. 3; much less, that he disclaims inspiration upon this point (Or., Tert., Milton), or betrays a doubt of his competence (Baur): he quoted the dictum of Jesus where it was available, and on the fundamental matter, and indicates frankly that in this further case he is proceeding on his personal judgment. The Christian spouse is forbidden to cast off the non-Christian in terms identical for husband and wife, only γυνή ἢτις (or εἰς τις: 13) standing over against εἰς ἀδελφὸς (12). Ἀφίημι, used of the ἄνδρ specifically in ver. 11, is now applied to both parties: cf. Gr. uses ἀποτιθήματι or ἀπολάλω (Matt. v. 31) of the husband as dismissing the wife, ἀποτιθήματι of the wife as deserting the husband; “in the structure of the two verses, with their solemn repetition, the equal footing of man and wife is indicated” (Hn.; cf. notes on 2-4 above). ἃ πιστοῖς “is jointly well-pleased,”—implying that the ἄπιστος agrees with the Christian spouse in deprecating separation, which the latter (after το f.) must needs desire to avoid; cf., for the force of συν-, Luke xi. 48, Acts viii. 1.

Ver. 14 obviates the objection which the Christian wife or husband (for the order, see note on το f.) might feel to continued union with an unbeliever (cf. Paul’s own warning in 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff.): “Will not the saint,” some one asks, “be defiled, and the ‘limbs of Christ’ (vi. 15) be desecrated by intercourse with a heathen?” To such a protest ἡγίασται γὰρ κ.τ.λ. replies: “For the husband that is an unbeliever, has been sanctified in his wife,” and vice versa. ἡγίασται... ἄπιστος is a paradox: it does not affirm a conversion in the unbeliever remaining such,—whether incipient or prospective (D.W., and some others)—the pf. tense signifies a relationship established for the non-Christian in the past,—sc. at the conversion of the believing spouse; but man and wife are part of each other, in such a sense (cf. vi. 16 f., by contrast) that the sanctification of the one includes the other so far as their wedlock is concerned. The married believer in offering her- (or him-) self to God could not but present hus-
12—16.
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band (or wife) in the same act—"sanctified in the wife, brother," respectively—and treats him (or her) henceforth as sacred. "Whatever the husband may be in himself, in the wife's thought and feeling he is a holy object. . . . Similarly the Christian's friends, abilities, wealth, time, are, or should be, holy" (Bt.).

Marriage with an unbeliever after conversion is barred in 2 Cor. vi. 14.

The (relative) sanctity of the unconverted spouse is made more evident by the analogous case of children: "Else one must suppose that your children are unclean; but as it is, they are holy!" P. appeals to the instinct of the religious parent; the Christian father or mother cannot look on children, given by God through marriage, as things unclean. Offspring are holy as bound up with the holy parent; and this principle of family solidarity holds good of the conjugal tie no less than of the filial derived therefrom. See the full discussion of this text in Ed. : it has played no small part in Christian jurisprudence, and in the doctrine of Infant Baptism; it "enunciates the principle which leads to Infant Baptism, viz. that the child of Christian parents shall be treated as a Christian" (Ltr.).—On έπει άρα, alioquícerte, si res se alter habet, see v. 10 and paral.; νυμ βι, as in v. 11, is both temporal and logical (cf. xv. 20, Rom. vi. 22).

Ver. 15a. The Christian wife or husband is not to seek divorce from the non-Christian (12-14); but if the latter insists on separation, it is not to be refused: "But if the unbeliever separates, he may separate"—let the separation take its course (χωριζέσθω, pr. impv.): for this impv. of consent, cf. ver. 36, xiv. 38.—ου δεδούλωται (pf. of fixed condition), "the brother or the sister in such circumstances is not kept in bondage"; cf. ver. 39—the stronger vb. of this passage implies that for the repudiated party to continue bound to the repudiator would be slavery. Christ's law forbids putting away (10 ff.), but does not forbid the one put away to accept dismissal.

Whether the freedom of the innocent divorced extends to remarriage, does not appear: the Roman Church takes the negative view—though contrary to the Canon Law (see Wordsworth, in loc.); the Lutheran Church the affirmative, allowing remarriage on desertion of ιναχιστοια; "in view of ver. 11, the inference that the divorced should remain unmarried is the safer" (so Hn., against Mr.). If, however, the repudiator forms a new union, cutting off the hope of restoration, the case appears then to come under the exception made in Matt. v. 31. With ἡπτούτοις, neut., cf. ηπτούτοις, Rom. viii. 37; and ηποζη, Phil. iv. 11.

Vv. 15b, 16. ἡπηρην ὁ Θεος . . . . σωτερ; The Christian spouse forsaken by the heathen is free from the former yoke; but such freedom is undesirable. Two considerations make against it: Peace is better for a Christian than disruption (15b); and there is the possibility of saving the unbeliever by remaining with him, or her (16). Thus P. reverts, by the contrastive δέ, to his prevailing thought, that the marriage tie, once formed, should in every way possible be maintained. On this view of the connexion, the full stop should be set at ηπτούτοις, and the colon at ο Θεος. "In peace," etc.—opposed to χωριζέσθω, like καταλλαγή in ver. 11—appeals to the ruling temper of the Christian life, determined once for all by God's call in the Gospel, "ex quo consequitur retenendum esse nobis infidelem, ac omnibus officiis demerenendum; nedum ut vel eum ipsi deseramus, vel ad nos deserendos provocemos" (Bz.); cf. Rom. xii. 18, for the general thought. For the construction of ἡπηρην, cf. 1 Thess. iv. 7, Gal. i. 6, Eph. iv. 4.—Ver. 16 follows up the
17. "Only, in each case as the Lord has apportioned to him, in each case as God has called him, so let him (the believer) walk." Under this general rule the exceptional and guarded permission of divorce in v. 15 was to be understood. For έλ η in this exceptive sense (= τάξις), cf. Rom. xiv. 14, Gal. i. 7, 19; see Bm., p. 359. The repeated distributive έκαστον extends the principle pointedly to every situation in life; cf. vv. 20, 24, iii. 5, 8-13. On μεμέρικεν,
17-19. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

οὕτως εν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις διατάσσομαι. 18. ἐπειτεμπῆμένος τις ἐκλήθη; μὴ ἐπιτομῶθω· ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ τις ἐκλήθη; μὴ ἐπειτεμπῆμένος. 19. ἐπειτομή ἢ οὐδέν ἐστιν, καὶ Ρ.; Re ν. i. 4 Η., xxii. 16; Αcts xν. 4τ, ανιμ. 5.

In this connexion, xvi. τ. - ἡ ἘΗ., Ἰσαι. ν. 18. See note below. 18; Jo. νiii.54.

διδασκω, D*G, latt. νg.(docco).

κ κεκληται: ΝΑΒΡ 17, 37, 46.

τις εκληθη (asin parl.clause), DcΚL, etc. see ver. 33 and i. τ2 : the Christian's secular status is a μέρος which " the Lord," the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). ὦς κεκληκεν, on the other hand, refers not to the secular " νοον " but, as always (see15,18,21 f.,i.9,26,etc.), to the " call"of God's grace in the Gospel, which came to the individual readers under these circumstances or those. οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). ὦς κεκληκεν, on the other hand, refers not to the secular " νοον " but, as always (see15,18,21 f.,i.9,26,etc.), to the " call"of God's grace in the Gospel, which came to the individual readers under these circumstances or those. οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; cf. i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between Ἰ. ord., "the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (cf.Μatt. xxν. 14 f.). οὔτως περιπατείτω enjoins the pursuance of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. Ρ. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.
The Gentile who embraced circumcision in order to fulfill the law of God was severing himself from Christ and falling from grace. The "abide" of 1 Cor. is paralleled to the "stand fast" of Gal.

Ver. 21. From the chief religious, the Ap. passes to the chief social distinction of the times: cf. Gal. iii. 28, Col. iii. 11. This contrast is developed only on one side—no freeman wished to become a slave, as Gentiles wished to be Jews; but the slaves, numerous in this Church (i. 26 ff.), sighed for liberty; their conversion stimulated this longing. The advice to the slave is read in two opposite ways: (a) "In slavery wast thou called? never mind (μή σοι μελέτω)! But still if thou canst also become free, rather make use of it (than not)—so Ev. excellently renders, with Cv., Bz., Gr., Hf., Bt., Gd., Lt., supplying τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ for complement to μᾶλλον χρήσια; while (b) Est., Bg., D.W., Mr., Hn., Weiss, Weizsäcker, Al., El., Sm. supply τῇ δολαιᾳ, and suppose P. to recommend the slave, with liberty offered, to "make use rather" of his servile condition. εἰ καὶ may either mean (α) "if verily" (Luke xi. 18; so δὲ εἰ καὶ in xi. 28, Gal. vi. 1), or (b) "although" (Phil. ii. 17, Luke xi. 8, etc.). The ancient commentators differed on this text, with a leaning to (b). The advocates of (b) exaggerate the sense of vv. 20, 24, which condemns change not per se but, as in the case of circumcision, because it compromises Christian faith and standing. "Freedom" is the object proximately suggested to "rather use" by "free" just above; and the sense of χράομαι in ver. 31, ix. 12, 15—to "avail oneself of an opportunity of good" (Lk.)—speaks in favour of the. The ou δολαιὼν of ver. 15 and the μὴ γίνεσθε δολοὶ ἀνθρώπων of ver. 23 indicate Paul's feeling for freedom; and the δολοῖς ἐλευθέροις γένεσθαι was to the Christian slave a precious item in his providential μέρος (17).

Ver. 22. The two sentences, balanced by ομοίως (cf. 3 f.), do not precisely match: ο εν Κυρίω κληθείς δούλος is "the slave that was called in the Lord" (under Christ's authority), but ο ελεύθερος κληθείς is rather "the freeman, in that he was called," his call has made the latter Christ's slave, while the former, though a slave, is the Lord's freedman. —ἀπελεύθερος, libertus (the prep. implying severance as in ἀπολύτρωσις, i. 30)—freedman of a Lord; "Christ buys us from our old master, sin, and then sets us free; but a service is still due from the libertus to the patronus" (Lt.); cf. Rom. vi. 17 f.; also ἀνθρώπων Χριστοῦ, ix. 21, with the same gen. of possession. Ignatius makes a touching allusion to this passage, ad Rom., 4: "I am till the present time a slave; but if I suffer I shall be Jesus Christ's freedman, and I shall rise up [in the resurrection] free!"

Ver. 23. τιμής ηγοράσθητε (see note on vi. 20) explains the position both of the δούλοι ἀπελευθέρως and the ελεύθερος δούλοι by the same act of purchase: the slave has been liberated from sin, and the freeman bound to a new Lord. The point of the appended exhortation μὴ γίνεσθε δολοὶ ἀνθρώπων is not obvious: we can scarcely imagine free Christians selling
20—26.
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των. 24. ἐκαστὸς ἐν δὲ "ἐκλήθη, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τούτῳ μεντὶ "παρὰ τῇ ᾧ 1 Θεῷ.

25. Περὶ δὲ τῶν "παρθένων ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίων ὁδὸν ἔχω: γνωρίζω δὲ τὴν ἡμερήσιον ὧν ἐπὶ "Κυρίων πιστῶς εἰσι. 26. νομίζω οὖν τούτῳ "καλὸν ὑπάρχειν διὰ τὴν "ἐνεστώσαν "ἀνάγκην, ὅτι

Lk. i. 27; Acts xxii. 9; Rev. xiv. 4. u See ver. 6. v See i. 10; yr. & xii. 4. Cor. viii. 10. w 2 Cor. iv. 1; Ph. ii. 27; i Tim. i. 13, 16. The vb. Rom. ix. 15 ff.; xi. 30 ff.; Mt. v. 7; x See iv. a. y See ver. 1. z See iii. 22. a 2 Cor. vi. 4, xii. 1ο, 1 Τh. iii. 7; Lk. xxi. 23; 1 Kings xxii. 2.

1 Om. τῷ all uncc. but A, which is followed by a considerable minority of minn.

give, whether proceeding immediately (10, ix. 14) or mediately (xiv. 37) from "the Lord," he "gives" his γνώμη, his settled and responsible "opinion." He pronounces "as (i.e., feeling myself to be; cf. 29 ff., iv. 7, 18) one ἡμερήσιον ὧν ἐπὶ "Κυρίων πιστῶς εἰσι. "Conscious that he is "faithful through the mercy effectually shown" him (pf. pass. ptp.; cf. i Tim. i. 13, 16) "by the Lord," faithful in this pronouncement to his stewardship under Christ (see iv. i f., and ii. 16). His advice is therefore to be trusted. The distinction made is not between higher and lower grades of inspiration or authority (cf. note on 12); but between peremptory rule, and conditional advice requiring the concurrence of those advised. Paul's opinion, qua opinion, as much as his injunction, is that of the Lord's steward and mouthpiece.

Ver. 25. νομίζω οὖν τούτῳ ε.τ.λ.: "I consider therefore"—the formula by which one gives a γνώμη (contrast the παραγγέλλω, διατάσσομαι of το, τ7) "this to be good because of the present straits": καλὸν ὑπάρχειν, "good in principle" or "in nature" (cf. xi. 7, xii. 22); the existing situation is such as to make the course recommended entirely right and honourable (see note on καλὸν, I, also 8, 38).—The ανάγκη—narrowness, "pinching stress" (Ee.)—belongs to the καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος (29), the brief earthly continuance visible for the Church, a period exposed to persecution (28) with its hardships and perils; this "might or might not be the beginning of the ανάγκη μεγάλη predicted by Jesus" in Luke xxii. 23 (L.). ἐνεστώσαν signifies "present" rather than "impending" (see iii. 22, Gal. i. 4); the distress of the time, which P. was feeling keenly at Ephesus (iv. 9 ff., xv. 32), portended a speedy crisis.—ὅτι καλὸν ἄνθρωπος τὸ στρώμα εἶναι is open to three constructions, as δείκτις is rendered that, because, or which (6,74): (a) makes
the instructions of vv. 10-16 and 8 respectively. - ἔλυσαι, as opp. of δέδεσαι, applies either to bachelor or widower.

In ver. 28 the general advice of 27 is guarded from being overpressed; cf. the relation of ver. 2 to 1 and ver. 9 to 8. The punctuation of El. and Nestle best marks the connexion of thought, closing ver. 27 with a full stop, each of the parl. εάν . . . ήμαρτες (-εν) clauses with a colon, and separating θλίψιν δε and εγώ δε by a comma. In the second supposition (both with εάν and subj. of probable contingency) P. reverts to the case of "the maiden," from which he was diverted in ver. 26; he makes her, by implication, responsible for her marriage, although in 36 ff., later, the action of the father is alone considered. - γαμέω is used in the act. here, and in ver. 39, both of man and woman; cf. Gr. applies it to the latter in pass.; cf. note on the double αφιέτω in vns. τ2f. έγημα and εγάμησα are the older and later aors. - The aor. in the apodosis - ήμαρτες, ήμαρτεν - is proleptic (Bn. § 50 ; Bm., pp. 198 f., 202), rather than gnomic (Mr., Hn., Ed.), as though by way of general reflexion: the Ap. addresses specific instances—"thou didst not . . . she did not sin"; cf., for tense, John xv. 11, Rev. v. 7.

The marriage Paul discourages is no sin, but will bring suffering from which he would fain save his friends. - But affliction for the flesh such (as may marry) will have, but I am seeking to spare you. - With ήμαρτες cf. σκόλοπ τη σαρκί (2 Cor. xii. 7; also v. 5 above); there is some thought, possibly, of recompense to "the flesh" which has had its way against advice. The affliction that Paul foresees is aptly indicated by Photius: "More easily and with small distress shall we endure if we have no wives and children to carry along with us in persecutions and countless miseries". At such times, for those who have domestic cares, there arises "the terrible
833
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δὲ ὑμῶν ἐφιδομαί. 29. Τοῦτο δὲ φημὶ, ἀδελφοί, ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες ὡσιν, καὶ οἱ κλαίοντες ὡς μὴ κλαίοντες, καὶ οἱ χαίροντες ὡς μὴ χαίροντες, καὶ οἱ 'χρώμενοι τῶν κόσμων καταχρώμενοι, κατέχοντες, καὶ οἱ 'κατέχοντες καταχρώμενοι τῶν 'κατέχοντων τούτων, τον κόσμον (om. τον), καὶ οἱ 'εχοντες θητην, παράγει γάρ το καθαρρίζει. 2:Rom. xiii. τι: Eph. ν.τ6, Col. iv. 5; 2 Τim. ίν.6; Reν. xii.12; Lk.xix.44; Jo.vii.8.

p See i. τ6, το λ.,Ρh. iii.Ι,ίν.8; 2 Τh. iii.1: Ηeb. x.13; Μk. 2 Cor.vi.1ο; Rom. xii.15, Jo.ανi.2ρ.

u See νεr. 21.

A.Ι.(ε/.Αcts ν.6);Sir.iv.31. Νεr.4Ι. q See ν. 1.

sense, 2 Cor. vi.τo, Josh. i.11. See xi.2.

1 Jo. ii.8, 17. x Ph. ii.8; Ιsa.iii.17.

alternative, between duty to God and affection to wife and children" (Lt.).—φημι appears to be a conative present (see Bn. ΙΙ; cf. Ro. ii.4, Gal. v. 4).

Vv. 29-31. τοῦτο δὲ φημὶ, ἀδελφοί, κ.τ.λ.: "This moreover I assert, brethren: The time is cut short".—φημι, as distinguished from λέγω, " marks the gravity and importance of the statement" (Εl.).—Συνστέλλω (to contract, shorten sail) acquired the meaning to depress, defeat (Ι Μacc. iii.6, 2 Μacc. vi.12); hence some render συνεσταλμένος by " calamitous," but without lexical warrant.—ο καιρός (see parls.) is " the season," the epoch of suspense in which the Church was then placed, looking for Christ's coming (i.7) and uncertain of its date. The prospect is " contracted"; short views must be taken of life.

The connexion of το λοιπόν and Ἴνα . . . οὖν with the foregoing affords a signal example of the grammatical looseness which mars Paul's style. (a) As to το λοιπόν: (1) Cm., the Gr. Ff., Bz., Al. Ex., Hn., Gd., Ed., R.V. mg. attach it to συνστ. οὐσία, in a manner " contrary to its usual position in Paul's epp. and diluting the force of the solemn ὁ καιρὸς . . . οὐσία " (Εl.). (2) The Vg. and Lat. Ff., Est., Cv., A.V. read το λοιπόν as predicate to οὐσία understood, thus commencing a new sentence,—" reliquum est ut," etc.; this is well enough in Latin, but scarcely tolerable Greek. (3) Mr., Hf., Bt., El., Lt., W.H., R.V. txt. subordinate το λοιπόν, thrown forward with emphasis, to the ίνα clause (cf. Gal. ii.10, Rom. xi.31)—" so that henceforth indeed those that have wives may be as without them," etc.; this gives compactness to the whole sentence, and proper relevance to the adv. Those who realise the import of the pending crisis will from this time sit loose to mundane interests. (b) As to the connexion of ίνα . . . οὖν: this clause may define either the Apostle's purpose, as attached to φημι (so Βz., Ηf., Εd.), or the Divine purpose implied in συνεστ. οὐσία (so most interpreters). Both explanations give a fitting sense: the Ap. urges, or God has determined, the limitation of the temporal horizon, in order to call off Christians from secular absorption. In this solemn connexion the latter is, presumably, Paul's uppermost thought.

Vv. 29b, 30 are "the picture of spiritual detachment in the various situations in life" (Gd.). Home with its joys and griefs, business, the use of the world, must be carried on as under notice to quit, by men prepared to cast loose from the shores of time (cf. Luke xii.29-36; by contrast, Luke xiv. 18 ff.). From wedlock the Ap. turns, as in vv. 17-24, to other earthly conditions—there considered as stations not to be wilfully changed, here as engagements not to be allowed to cumber the soul. Ed. observes that the Stoic condemned the interaction, here recognised, between " the
VII.

προς κορίνθιούς

32. θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους εἶναι. ὁ ἀγάμος μεριμνά τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, τῶς ἀρέσεις τῷ κυρίῳ. 33. οἶ μεριμνᾶ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, τῶς ἀρέσεις τῇ γυναικὶ. 34. μεριμνᾶτα ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος. ἡ ἀγάμος μεριμνᾶ τὸν κύριον, ἵνα ἀγία σώματι καὶ πνεύματι. ἡ δὲ γυμνάσεσα μεριμνᾶ τὸν κύριον, καὶ ἡ παρθένος καὶ ἡ ἀγαμή τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἀγία σώματι καὶ πνεύματι.

1. ἀμερίμνος (thrice): all pre-Syrian uncc.

2. A perplexed varia lectio:—

(1) καὶ (μεμερισται), NA, BD, P 17, vg. syr. sch. cop. Om. καὶ DcKL, etc. (later Western and Syrian).

(2) καὶ (ἡ γυνῆ): all uncc. but D*E, and most minn. Om. καὶ D*, etc., codd. mentioned by Hier., syr. sch. cop.


3. See ver. 9, and note on ver. 28.

4. See ver. 25.

5. ὁμ. καὶ AD1E 17, 37, syr. sch. cop.

6. ὁμ. καὶ AD1E 17, 37, 46.

Vv. 32-34. θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους εἶναι (cf. 7): "But I want you to be unanxious (αμερίμνους):" cf. σιθομονα, ver. 28. This is the reason why P. labours the advice of this section; see our Lord's dehortations from η μέριμνα του αἰῶνος in Matt. vi. 25-34 and xiii. 22.—Vv. 32b-34 describe, not without a touch of humour, the exemption in this respect of the unmarried: he "is anxious in respect of the things of the Lord"—not "of the world, as to how he should please his wife!" After bidding the readers to be ἀμερίμνους, P. writes μεριμνᾶ τοῦ κυρίου, with a
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κόσμου, πώς ἀρέσει τῷ ανδρί. 35. τούτο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ὄμον αὐτῶν. 
εὐφρέον 2 λέγω νῦν ἀνδρόν ὄμων ἐπιβάλω, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ 
εὐσχέμον καὶ εὐπρόσεδρον τῷ Κύριῳ ἀπερισκέπαστος.

vii. 21, xxii. 25. xvii. 12, Μκ. ν. 43. C/.xi. 23, xίν. 4ο. 
m. Η αρεσθ (thrice): allpre-Syrian uncc. 
ευπαρεδρον: alluncc., but ΚL.

certain catechresis in the vb., for the 
sake of the antithesis. The accs. are of 
limitation rather than of transitive obj. 
πώς ἀρέσει is indirect question, retaining 
the deliberate sbj.—"is anxious ... 
(asking) how he should please," etc. 
For the supreme motive, " pleasingthe 
Lord," cf.iv. Ι-5, 2 Cor. ν. 9, etc. ο 
γαμήσας, aor. of the event (pf. in το: 
cf. note), which brought a new care.
Accepting the reading και μεμέρισται. και ή γυνη ή ἄγαμος, with the stop at μεμέρ. (the only possible punctuation 
with ή άγαμος in thisposition: see txtl. 
note), then it is added about the married 
Christian, that " he has been (sincehis 
marriage) divided,"-parcelled out (see 
note on i. 12): part of him is assigned 
to the Lord, part to the world. Lt.says 
that this rendering (R.V. mg.) " throws 
sense and parallelism into confusion, for 
και μεμέρισται is not wanted with ver. 
33, which is complete in itself": nay, 
the addition is made just because the 
parl. would be untrue if not so qualified; 
the married Christian does not care 
simply for the thingsof the world" as 
the unmarried for " the things of the Lord," he cares for both " and is divided,'' 
giving but half his mind to Christ (so 
Ενwald, Ηf., Ηn., Εd.). The attachment 
of και μεμέρισται to ver. 34, with the 
Western reading (see txtl. note), retained 
by Mr., Βt., El., Lt., Sm., Α.V., and 
R.V. ext., in accordance with most of 
the older commentt., gives to μεμέρισται 
a meaning doubtful in itself and without 
N.T. parl.: "And there is a distinction 
between the wife and the maiden". Μδ. 
escapes this objection by reading μεμέρισται κ. ή γυνη as a sentence by itself, 
"the wife also is divided": then con- 
tinuing, "And the unwedded maiden 
cares for," etc.; an awkward and im-
probable construction as the text stands 
(see Hn. below). Txtl. criticism and 
exegetis concur in making και μεμέρισται 
a further assertion about δό 
γαμήσοιη, 
revealing his full disadvantage.

Hn., by a very tempting conjecture, 
proposes to insert a second μεμέρισται 
after the first: τοὺς ἀρέσθης τ. γυναικι, και 
μεμέρισται: μεμέρισται και ή γυνη. η 
ἄγαμος καλ η παρθένος μεριμνά κ.τ.λ.—
"He that has married is anxious in regard to the things of the world, how he may 
please his wife, and is divided; divided 
also is the wife. The unmarried (woman), with the maiden, is anxious as to the 
things of the Lord." This would account 
for the double καλ, which embarrasses the 
critical text; it gives a fuller and more 
balanced sense, in harmony moreover 
with Paul's principle of putting husband 
and wife on equal terms (2 ff.,1Ι-16); 
and nothing was easier than for a doubled 
word, in the unpunctuated and unspaced 
early copies, to fall out in transcription. 
Placing the full stop at μεμέρισται, 
without the aid of Hn.'s emendation, η 
γυνη ή άγαμος και η παρθένος are made 
the combined subject of μεριμνά (34), "the 
unmarried woman" being the general 
category, within which " the maiden," 
whose case raised this discussion (25), is 
specially noted; the two subjects forming 
one idea, take a sing. verb.

The purpose ίνα ἡ ἡγία κ.τ.λ. is the 
subjective counterpart of the question 
τοὺς ἀρέσθης of ver. 32; note the similar 
combination in Rom. xii. 1, also 1 Τhess. 
v. 3; and see notes on ἡγία, ἡγια-
μένοις. i. 2. Holiness τω σώματι (dat. 
of sphere: see Wr., p. 270) comes first 
in this connexion (cf. 4; vi. 20), and τω 
πνεύματι is added to make up the entire 
person and to mark the inner region of 
sanctification; " the spirit" which ani-
mates the body, being akin to God (John 
v. 24) and communicating with His 
Spirit (Rom. ν. 16), is the basis and 
organ of our sanctification (cf. 1 Τhess. 
v. 23, 2 Τhess. ii. 13).—Of ἡ γαμήσοιη, 
"she that has married," on the contrary, 
the same must be said as of δό 
γαμήσοιη (33): she studies to " please her hus-
band" as well as "the Lord".

Ver. 35. A third time P. declares that
he is consulting for the welfare of his readers (cf. 28b, 32a), not insisting on
his own preference nor laying down an
absolute rule: “looking to (πρός) your
advantage I say (it)”. το σύμφορον is
the abstract of συμφέρει (vi.12, x.23).—
The βρόχος is the noose or lasso by which
a wild creature is snared : Ρ. does not
wish by what he says to deprive the Cor.
of any liberty,—to capture his readers
and shut them up to celibacy—“not that
Ι may throw a snare over you ''. He
aims at what is socially εύσχημον,”of
honourable guise,” as belonging to the
Christian decorum of life (see pars.); and at what is religiously ευπάρεδρον τώ
Κυρίω, “ promotive-of-fit-waiting on the
Lord”.—απερισπάστως recallsthe περιε
σπάτο used of Μartha in Luke x.38-42,
and suggeststhatthe Αp. had this story
in his mind, esp. as μεριμνάω, his leading
expression in this Section, isthe word of
reproof used by Jesus there. Εpictetus’
dissuasive from marriage, in his Dissert.,
III., xxii., 67 ff., curiously resembles
Paul’s: τοιαύτης ούσης καταστάσεως
οί τών ἄστιν, ὡς εἰ παρατάξει, μὴν
ἀπέρητιστατον εἶναι δεί τ. Κυρίων ἄρον
πρὸς τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀποφυγόν
ἀνθρώπων δυνάμενον, σφ τροφοδοτοῦν
καθήκοντι δια δικαιοσύνης ποιέων
(cf. 2 Tim. ii. 4) σχέσιν, δε
παραβαίνων οὐκ εἴπεται σώσει τοῦ καλοῦ
καὶ ἀγαθοῦ πρὸς τῶν θεῶν; (69).

§ 24. FREEDOM TO MARRY, vii. 36-40.
The question of the marriage of Cor.
Christian maidens Paul has discussed on
grounds of expediency. The narrow
earthly horizon, the perils of the Christian
lot, the division between religious and
domestic duty esp. probable under these
conditions, render the married state un-
desirable (28-34). The Αp. does not on
these grounds forbid marriage,—to do so
would entangle some of his readers perilously; he recommends what appears
to him the course generally fitting, and
advantageous for their spiritual interests
(35 f.). If the parent’s judgment points
the other way, or if circumstances are
such as to enforce consent, then so let it
be (36). But where the father can thus
decide without misgiving, he will do well
to keep his daughter at home (37 f.).
Similarly in the case of the Christian
widow: she is free to marry “in the Lord’';
but, in Paul’s decided opinion, she will be
happier to refrain (39 f.). Τhe Αp. gives
inspired advice, and the bias of his own
mind is clearly seen, but he finds no sin
in marriage; he guards sensitively the
rights of individual feeling and con-
science, and leaves the decision in each
case to the responsible parties.

Ver. 36. By a contrastive δι Ρ. passes
from the εύσχημον at which his dissuasive
was aimed, to the ασχημονείν that
might be thought to result in some cases
from following it.—The vb. (= ασχήμων
eίναι) signifies either to act unbecomingly
(xiii. 5), or to suffer disgrace, turpem
videri (Vg.); the antithesis, and the ad-
junct επί την παρθένον, dictate the former
sense, which is post-classical.—On νομίζει
(is of opinion), see ver. 26. It was socially
discreditable, both amongst Greeks and
Jews (cf. Sirach xlii. 9), to keep one’s
daughter at home, without obvious rea-
son, for any long period beyond adult
age; a Christian father might feel this
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τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον, γάλας τοιεί. 38. δοτε καὶ ἐκ γνώμης ἐκγαμίζω τοιεί. 39. γνώμη δὲ δεῖται νόμῳ ἡ ἐκγαμίζω τοιεί. 40. μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν ἐν ἐν Κυρίω. 41. ποιεῖν.
words, mastery of the situation.—The obj., τ. παρθένου, suggests the tacit complement to τηρείν (see parls.) : “to keep intact, in what he believes to be the best state” for the Lord’s service (Ed.). “The will of the maiden is left wholly out of court” (Hn.) ; social custom ignored this factor in marriage; for all that, it might constitute the opposed ἀνάγκη, and might, in some circumstances, practically limit the paternal ἔτοιμον; see ver. 28b, and note.

Ver. 38, the sum of the matter: either to marry one’s daughter or refuse her in marriage is, abstractly viewed, an honourable course; the latter, in Paul’s judgment, and for Christians in the present posture of things, is better. “Ceci et mieux ressume tout le chapitre” (Gd.).

Ver. 39, 40 dispose, by way of appendix to the case of the maiden and to the like effect, of the question of the remarriage of Christian widows. Ver. 39 is repeated in almost identical terms, for another purpose, in Rom. vii. 2.—On δικαίως and γαμηθήναι (cl. γαμήσῃ), see vv. 27 f.; κοιμηθή, the term for Christian death (see parls.).—“She is free to be married to whom she will,” while the maiden is disposed of by her father’s will (36 f.); μόνον εν Κυρίω (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 14 f., 1 Τhess. iv. 3 ff.) forbids union with a heathen; it also forbids any union formed with un-Christian motives and otherwise than under Christ’s sanction (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 4 f.).—“But more blessed she is” (μακαριώτέρα δέ: see parls.)—not merely happier by exemption from trouble (26 ff.), but religiously happier in her undivided devotion to the Lord (32 ff.)—“if she abide as she is.” This advice was largely followed in the Pauline Churches, so that before long widows came to be regularly enrolled for Church service (1 Τim. v. 3-16)—κατὰ τὴν ἴδιν γνώμην (see note on 26) : Paul’s advice, not command.—Βοκά δέ κάγιο κ.τ.λ.: “However I think, for my own part (however others may deem of me), that I have (an inspiration of) God’s Spirit” (the anarthrous πνεῦμα Θεού: cf. xii. 3, etc.); see for Paul’s claim to Divine guidance, extending to his opinions as well as commands, ver. 25, ii. 10-16, iv. 1, ix. 2, xiv. 37.—On δοκώ, see note to iv. 9; it is the language of modesty, not misgiving. The Ap. commends his advice in all these matters, conscious that it proceeds from the highest source and is not the outcome of mere human prudence or personal inclination.

DIVISION III. CONTACT WITH IDOLATRY, viii.-x. We have traced in the previous chapters the disastrous reaction of the old leaven upon the new Christian kneading at Cor. But Christian society had its external as well as its internal problems—a fact already evident in the discussion of ch. vi. respecting the carrying of disputes to the heathen law-courts. A much larger difficulty, involving the whole problem of social intercourse between Christians and their heathen neighbours, had been raised by the Church Letter—the question περί τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (viii. 1). Was it lawful for a Christian to eat flesh that had been offered in sacrifice to an idol? Social festivities commonly partook of a religious character, being conducted under the auspices of some deity, to whom libations were poured or to whom the dedicated animal was sacrificed. “The idol’s house” (viii. 10) was a rendezvous for banquets. Much of the meat on sale in the markets and found on ordinary tables came from the temples; and without inquiry it was impossible to discriminate (x. 25-28). Jewish rule was uncompromisingly strict upon this point; and the letter of the Jerusalem Council, addressed to the Churches of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, had directed “the brethren from among the Gentiles” to “abstain from idololathy” (Acts xv. 29). The Cor. Church, in consulting Paul, had expressed its own leaning towards liberty in this matter (viii.); what will the Ap. say? It is a real dilemma for him. He has to vindicate the broad principles of spiritual religion; at the same time he must avoid wounding Jewish feeling, and must guard Gentile weakness against the seductions of heathen feasts and against the peril of relapsing into idolatry through inter-
course with unconverted kindred and neighbours. In theory Paul is for freedom, but in practice for great restrictions upon the use of idolatry. (1) He admits that the question is decided in principle by the fundamental truth of religion, viz., that God is one, from which it follows that the sacrifice to the idol is an invalid transaction (viii. 1 ff.; x. 19, 26). But (2) many have not grasped this inference, being still in some sense under the spell of the idol; for them to eat would be sin, and for their sake stronger-minded ones should abstain (viii. 7-13; x. 23-30). To this effect (3) P. sets forth his own example, (a) in the abridgment of his personal liberty for the good of others (ix. 1-22; x. 33-xi. 1), and (b) in the jealous discipline of bodily appetite (ix. 23 ff.). The last consideration leads (4) to a solemn warning against contamination by idolatry, drawn (a) from the early history of Israel, and further (b) from the communion of the Lord's Table, which utterly forbids participation in "the table of demons" (x. 1-22). These instances show in a manner evident to the good sense of the readers (x. 15), that to take part in a heathen sacrificial feast is in effect a recognition of idolatry and an apostasy from Christ.

§ 25. Knowledge of the One God and One Lord, viii. 1-6. In inquiring from their Ap. "about the εἰδωλόθυτα," the Cor. had intimated their "knowledge" of the falsity of the entire system of idolatry. Here Paul checks them at the outset. The pretension betrays their one-sided intellectualism. Such matters are never settled by knowledge; love is the true arbiter (2 f.). After this caution, he takes up the statement of the Cor. creed made in the Church Letter, with its implications respecting idolatry (4 ff.).

Ver. 16. Περί δὲ τῶν εἰδωλόθυτων: another topic of the Church Letter, to which the Apostle continues his reply (see a doubling of vii. 1; also Introd., chap. ii.). The word εἰδωλόθυτον (see parls.), "the idol-sacrifice," substituted for the ιερόθυτον (x. 28) of the heathen vocabulary, conveys an implicit judgment on the question in hand; see note on εἰδωλον, ver. 4, and on x. 19 f.; also Acts xv. 20, τὰ ἐλεγμάτα τῶν εἰδώλων. — δει πάντες γνωσθείν εχομεν: the common rendering, "We know that we all have knowledge" yields a weak tautology, and misses the irony of the passage; otherwise than in οἴδαμεν δι' of ver. 4, this is the causal δι' (so Bg., Hn., Ed.). The Cor. in making their inquiry virtually answered it themselves; they wrote Οίδαμεν δι' οίδαμεν οίδαμεν ς τῷ κόσμῳ (4); and P. takes them up at the first word with his arresting comment: "'We know (say you!) because we all have knowledge'! - Knowledge puffs up," etc. — For γνώσις, see note on iν. 6. The appeal of the Church to knowledge as decisive in the controversy about "meats" disclosed the great flaw in its character—its poverty of love (xiii. 1 ff.). The tacit obj. of ἀγάπης is the Church, the Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή (iii. 9, 16); Eph. iv. 15 f. describes the edifying power of love; see also Matt. xxii. 37-40, 1 John iv. 16-21. For the Biblical use of ἀγάπη, see note to xiii. 1. The divisive question at issue Love would turn into a means of strengthening the bonds of Church life; Knowledge operating alone makes it an engine of destruction (11 f.).

Vv. 2, 3. Loveless knowledge is ρίουνος
(1b); more than that, it is self-stultifying. The contrasted hypotheses—εἰ τις
δοκεῖ εγνώσκει τι (= δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι, iii. 18) and εἰ τις ἁγιάζει τὸν Θεόν—define
the position of men who build upon their own mental acquisitions, or who make
love to God the basis of life. For emphatic δοκεῖ, cf. iii. τς, vi. 40; it implies an
opinion, well- or ill-founded, and confidence in that opinion. The pf. δοκεῖ, εγνώ
σκείν (= δοκεῖσοφός είναι, iii. τς) and δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι denote the
acquisition of (right) knowledge, rendered impossible by self-conceit—"he has
never yet learnt as he ought to do". For τι—probably τί in this connexion, some-
thing emphatically, something great—cf. note on τι εἶδεν, ii. 2. The Enchiridion
of Epictetus supplies a parl. to ver. 2: "Prefer to seem to know nothing; and if
to any thou shouldst seem to be somebody, distrust thyself"; similarly So-
crates, in Plato's Apology, 23.

Ver. 3 is one of Paul's John-like sayings. In the apodosis he substitutes,
by an adroit turn, "is known (εγνώσκει) by God" for "hath come to know God," the expected consequence—see the like
correction in Gal. iv. 9; cf. Phil. ii. 12 f., iii. 12; John xv. 16; 1 John iv. 10. Paul
would ascribe nothing to human acqui-
sition; religion is a bestowment, not an
achievement; our love or knowledge is
the reflex of the divine love and know-
ledge directed toward us. Philo, quoted by
Ed., has the same thought: γνωρίζομεν
μόνον ὥς γνωρίζομεν (De Cherub., 8 32).

οὐδεν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ δέ (sc. τοῦ Θεοῦ),
"he (and not the other) is known by Him"
Ev. reverses the ref. of the pronas.: "He
(God) hath been known by him (the man
loving Him)"—an unlikely use of οὕτως.

Ver. 4. After his thrust at Cor. γνώσεσ, P. resumes, with ὅν (cf. xi. 17-20), from
ver. 1 the question "About the eating of
idolothya," repeating the "we know"
at which he had interrupted his corre-
spondents. For οὕτως in a confessio
fidei, cf. 1 John v. 18 ff. That the theo-
logical statement given in vv. 4 ff. comes
from the mouth of the Corinthians seems
probable from the following considera-
tions: (a) the repeated οὕτως (h. l. in
this Ep.; cf. the frequent interrog. οὐχ
οἴδατε; of chh. iii., vi., vii.: also xii. 2),
by which P. associates himself with the
readers, who are men of knowledge (i. 5,
x. 15, etc.); (b) the solemn rhythm of vv.
4b and 6, resembling a confessional for-
mula (cf. Eph. iv. 4 f., i. Tim. iii. 16)—
ver. 5 may be an interjected comment of
the Church Letter upon its creed; (c) the
expression "gods many and lords many"
applied to heathen divinities, which is
foreign to Pauline as to Jewish phrase-
ology, but natural on the lips of old
polytheists; (d) the aptness with which
ἄλλοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς ὑμεῖς γνωρίζομεν (7) fits in
with this explanation, being understood as
Paul's νεφλαι to his readers' declaration of
their enlightened faith. See, on this ques-
The articles of belief cited from the Cor.
in vv. 4b and 6 had probably been for-
mulated first by P., like the Πάντα μοι ἐξεστίν of vi. 12, and so would be fitly
quoted to him.—οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ
(cf. x. 19), being parl. to οὐδὲς Θεός
κ.τ.λ., should be rendered not "An idol
is nothing," etc., but "There is no idol in
the world" (so R.V. virtually, Mr., Hf.,
Bt., Ed., Sm.). Existence is denied to the
idol not absolutely (see 5, χ. τς f.), but
relatively; it has no real place ἐν κόσμῳ,
no power over the elements of nature;
"the earth is the Lord's," etc. (x. 26);
there is no Zeus in the sky, nor Poseidon
ruling the sea, but "one God and Father"
everywhere,—a faith emancipating en-
lightened Christians from every heathen-
ish superstition.—οὐδὲν εἴδωλον κ.τ.λ.a
forms the polemic counterpart to οὐδὲς
Θεός ἐλ. εἰς (see parl.),—the corner-
stone of Jehovism, which Christ has
made the world's creed.—εἴδωλον (sc. a
thing possessing εἶδος, form only), sem-
bliance, phantom, renders in the LXX
several Hebrew words for false gods—
el: 5. Καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἠλεγόμενοι Θεοὶ, ἐμεῖς ἐν ὑμῖν ἦμεν. 6. Ὄπι τῆς γῆς, διὸν ἐστὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ.

εἰς ἐν αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ ἐστιν ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰ πάντα καὶ τιμῆσι τιμήν ἐν αὐτοῖς.
7. "All'' o'd in 'vui' 'vuiwes, 'nies do 'vuiwes 1 tov 2

8. "All'' o'd in 'vui' 'vuiwes, 'nies do 'vuiwes 1 tov 2

9. "All'' o'd in 'vui' 'vuiwes, 'nies do 'vuiwes 1 tov 2

10. "All'' o'd in 'vui' 'vuiwes, 'nies do 'vuiwes 1 tov 2

1. συνήθεια, Ν*AB 17, 46, 67**, cop., Euthal., Dam. συνήθησις, DGL, etc.

2. συνήθεια εμς αρπα ιων 1 tov ειδωλου (in this order): all uncc. but ALP.

3. παραστήσει, Ν*AB 17, 46, 67**, cop. basm.

4. Om. γαρ ΝαΒ, am. tol. cop. basm.

Ins. γαρ DGLP, etc.—Western and Syrian.


The order of T. R. is that of Western and Syrian uncc., the minn., latt. and syrr.; Ν and A** read ειν εις φαγετομεθα . . . ειν εις πειρασινομεν: so Lachm. Tr. further follows B in reading πειρασινομεν for πειρασιν.

reading διε διε (for διε: see txtl. note), "because of whom are all things," would consist with a lower doctrine of Christ's Person, representing Him as preconceived object, while with διε διε He is preexistent medium of creation. The full Christology of the 3rd group of the Eph. is latent here. The faith which refers all things to the one God our Father as their spring, and subordinates all things to the one Lord our Redeemer, leaves no smallest spot in the universe for other deities; intelligent Christians justly inferred that the material of the idolotry was unaffected by the hollow rites of heathen sacrifice.

§ 26. THE WEAK CONSCIENCE OF THE OLD IDOLATER, viii. 7-13. "The knowledge of the one Father and Lord upon which the Cor. Church prided itself, had not released all its members from fears respecting the idolotry; in some the intellect outran the heart, in others it lagged behind. With the latter, through weakness of understanding or force of habit, the influence of the heathen god still attached to objects associated with his worship (7). For a man in this state of mind to partake of the consecrated flesh would be an act of compliance with heathenism; and if the example of some less scrupulous brother should lead him thus to violate his conscience and to fall into idolatry, heavy blame will lie at the door of his virtual tempter (10-12). Such blame P. declares that he will himself on no account incur (13)."

Ver. 7. "But not in all is there the knowledge (χ γνώσεως) which you and I claim to have (1, 10), expressed just now in the terms of the Church confession (4 ff.).—τη συνήθεια εως άρτι του ειδωλου, "by reason of their habituation up till now to the idol": for this dat. of defining cause, cf. Eph. ii. 1.—έως άρτι (cf. iv. 8, 11) qualifies the quasi-vbl. noun συνήθεια, actively used, which, as in 4 Macc. xiii. 21 and cl. Gr., signifies with the objective gen. (= συνήθεια πρός or μετά intercourse, familiarity with; the other, passive sense is seen in xi. 16. The Western reading, συνήθησις, preferred by some critics as the lectio ardua, gives the sense, "through relation of conscience to the idol" (Hf., Hn.).—έως ειδωλοθυτον εσθιουν, "as an idol-sacrifice eat (the meat in question)"—under the consciousness that it is such, with the sense haunting them that what they eat belongs to the idol and associates them with it; cf. x. 18 ff. and notes. "And their conscience, since it is weak (unable to get rid of this feeling), is soiled" (opp. of the καθαρς συνήθεις of 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3). The consciousness of sharing in idol-worship is defiling to the spirit of a Christian; to taste knowingly of idolotry, under any circumstances, thus affects converts from heathenism who have not the full faith that the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; now, "whatever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. xiv. 23).

Ver. 8. βρώμα δι κ.τ.λ.: "But food will not present us to God," non exhibebit nos Deo (Mr.): that on the ground of
ούτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα. 9. *βλέπετε δὲ μὴ μίμησις ἡ ἑξουσία ἦν ὧν ἄυτη πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσιν. 10. εἰδός τις ἑξῆς τοῦ ἔχομα γνῶσιν, ἐν ἑιδωλείαι κατα-κείμενοι, οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος ὀικοδομηθή-

35: Acts xiii. 40; Lk. xxi. 8. C. f. iii. 10, and ref. f See vii. 37; also vi. 12. g Rom. 12.
32 f. (Rom. vili. 14), xiv. 13, 20; 1 Pet. ii. 8; cf. -κοιτη, Rom. xiv. 21; ἐγκοπη, ix. 12 below.
1 N.K. H; 1 Esdr. ii. 9; 1 Marc. i. 47, x. 83. i In this sense, Mk. ii. 15, xiv. 3; Lk. vii. 37.
= αὐτήμη. k See ver. 1; here only ironical. See note below.

1 εἰ μὴ φαγ. υστερούμεθα... εἰ μὴ περισσεύομεν (in this order): Α"Β τη 46, oldest νg. cop. basm. so ΤR., Αl., W.Η., Nestle, Εl., R.V. The order of Τ.R. is that of Western and Syrian uncc., the minn., latt. and syr.; Ν and Α read εἰ μὴ φαγ. περισσεύομεν... εἰ μὴ υστερούμεθα: so Lachm. Tr. further follows Β in reading περισσεύομεν for-ομεν.

2 "ἀσθενεῖσιν, all uncc. but L.
3 BG, vg., Aug., Ambrost. om. σε; bracketed by Lachm. and W.H.
4 Many Latin interp., including vg., read cum sit infirma, as if for ἀσθενεῖς οὐα.
The foods offered to idols?"—not because he is weak (as though overpowered by a stronger mind), but while he is still weak, as under the lingering belief that the idol is "something in the world" (7): "his verbis exprimitur horror infirmi, tamen edentis" (Bg.).—Thus eating unpersuaded "in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5), he sins (Rom. xiv. 23), and therefore "is perishing" (11). The vb. "edified"—instead of "persuaded" or the like—is used in sad irony (cf. Tert., "aedificatur ad ruinam," De Prascr., Haretic., 3); P. probably takes up the word in this connexion from the Church Letter: the eaters of idolothytathought their practice "edifying" to less advanced brethren—"edifying, forsooth!—to what end!"—Ver. 11. "For the weak man [whom you talk of building up I] is being destroyed through thy knowledge—the brother, on whose account Christ died!" (Rom. xiv. 15). This affirms, with terrible emphasis, the issue implied by ver. 10: "est aedificatio ruinosa" (Cv.).—δ διενενεν means (more than δ διενενης) the man in a continued state of weakness.—ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει, "on the ground (or in the sphere) of thy knowledge"; in this atmosphere the weak faith of the other cannot live (cf. ἐν in ii. 4; Eph. iv. 16, ἐν αὐτῇ). His "knowledge" leaves the tempter inexusable. "Notice the threefold darkness of the picture: there perishes, thy brother, for whom Christ died" (Bt.). Paul appeals to the strongest feelings of a Christian—brotherly love and loyalty to Christ. For the prospective δι' ὅ, cf. Rom. iv. 25; Christ's death is thus frustrated of its dear object (cf. Gal. ii. 21) by thy heartless folly!—Ver. 12. In such case, not only the weak brother sins by yielding, but the strong who tempted him; and the latter sins directly "against Christ" (for the construction, cf. vi. 18): "But sinning in this way against the brethren, and inflicting a blow on their conscience while it is weak, you sin against Christ!"—την συνείδησιν ασθενούσαν, not "their weak conscience" (την ασθεν.), but "their conscience weak as it is": how base to strike the weak!—τύπτω describes as the violent wrong of the injurer, what is a μόλυσμα and πρόκομμα (7, 9) in its effect upon the injured. A blow on the conscience shocks and deranges it.—For the bearing of such an act on Christ, see Matt. xviii. 6 ff., xix. 40, 45; also Zech. ii. 8, etc. The principle of union with Christ, which forbids sin against oneself (vi. 15), forbids sin against one's brother.—Ver. 13 sums up the debate in the language of personal conviction: "Wherefore verily—"for this last reason above all—"if (a matter of) food (βρώμα, indef.) is stumbling my brother, I will eat no flesh-meats for evermore, that I may not stumble my brother".—κρέα (pl. of κρέας) signifies the kinds of βρώμα in question, including probably beside the idolothytathis kind of foods which scandalise men of narrow views, such as the vegetarians of Rom. xiv. 13-21 (see notes ad loc.).—Four times in vv. 11-13 P. repeats the word ἀδελφός, seeking to elicit the love which was needed to control Cor. knowledge (cf. 2 f.).—For "σκανδαλίζω,
IX. 1. Oὐκ εἰμι ἀπόστολος; Οὐκ εἰμι ἤλευθερος; Οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν ἀπόστολος, εἰ δὲ εἰμι ἐλεύθερος, ὑμῖν οὐκ ἐρωτάω τιμήν. 1. cf. Phil. iii. 8; cf. Rom. ii. 29; xvi. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 5; Acts xiii. 26. d Lk. xxiv. 21; cf. Phil. iii. 8. For ἀλλά after hypoth., see iv. 15, viii. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 6, xiii. 4; Rom. vi. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Rev. v. 1, etc. τίς ἀπόστολος, οὗτοί εἰμι, ἢ γὰρ ἡ σφραγίς τῆς ἀποστολῆς ὑμῶν ἐστε ἐν Κυρίῳ. 

Acts vii, 55, ix, 5, 17, xxii, 8, xxvi, 15 is a unique expression with P.; it describes not a spiritual apprehension, the γνώναι of the believer, nor the ecstatic visions which he had sometimes enjoyed in a state of trance (2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.), but that actual beholding of the human and glorified Redeemer which befell him on the way to Damascus; from this dated both his faith and his mission (Acts ix. 1-32, Gal. i. 10-17). Paul seldom uses “Jesus” as the name of our Lord distinctively, always with specific ref. to the historical Person (cf. xii. 3, 1, 3 Thess. iv. 14; Eph. iv. 21; Phil. ii. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 10-14). The visible and glorious man who then appeared, declared Himself as “Jesus”; from that instant Saul knew that he had seen the crucified Jesus risen and reigning. Asking of his new-found Lord, “What wilt Thou have me to do?” he received the command out of which his commission unfolded itself. Personal knowledge of the Lord and a “word from His mouth” (Acts xxii. 14) were necessary to constitute an Apostle in the primary sense, the immediate “emissary” of Jesus (cf. Mark iii. 13, Acts i. 21 f.); in virtue of this experience, P. classes himself with “the other App.” (xv. 7 ff., Gal. i. 16 f.); his right to do so was in due time acknowledged by them (Gal. ii. 6-9). The great interview, in its full import, was Paul’s own secret; his Apostolic power, derived therefrom, was manifest to the whole world (2 Cor. iii. 1 ff., xii. 12), the Cor. Church supplying a conspicuous proof.

Vv. 2, 3. If not at Corinth amongst those who cried “I am of Cephas,” elsewhere Paul’s apostleship was denied by the Judaistic party, against whom he
had afterwards to write 2 Cor. x. ff. In this trial he counts on the Cor. standing by him: "If to others I am no apostle, at any rate (ἀλλὰ γε, at certe, Bz.) I am to you". He does not say "of others," as though distinguishing two fields of jurisdiction in the sense of Gal. ii. 8, rather "in the eyes of others"; cf. the dat. of viii. 6. For ἀλλὰ γε, cf. Plato, Gorg., 470 D., εἰ σοι μὴ (ἕρω), ἄλλ' ακούω γε;—γε throws its emphasis on ὑμίν, so P. continues: "The seal of my apostleship you are, in the Lord"; cf. Rom. iv. ii, 2 Cor. i. 22. This seal came from the hand of the Lord, affixed by the Μaster to His servant's work (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1 ff.). Despite its imperfections, the Cor. Church was a shining evidence of Paul's commission; it was probably the largest Church as yet raised in his independent ministry. For ἐν Κυρίω, see note on iν. 15, and vii. 22.—"This"—referring to v. 1, "an answer to those that put me on my defence"; I point them to you!—ἀναπολογία (see pars.) is a self-exculpation. For ἀνακρίνω, cf. notes on ii. 14 f., iv. 4.—It is Paul's ἀποστολή, not the ἀναπολογία of vv. 4 ff., that is called in question; hence the vein of self-defence pervading the Epp. of this period. Granted the apostleship (and this the readers cannot deny), the right followed as a matter of course: this needed no "apology".

Vv. 4-6. The rights P. vindicates for himself and his fellow-labourers in the Gospel, are (a) the right to maintenance; (b) to marriage; (c) to release from manual labour.—(a) μὴ οὖν ἐξομν.: "Is it that we have not?"—ironical question, as in xi. 22—"Of course we have". P. writes in pl. collegas includens (Bg.), the ἀποστολὴ suggesting οἱ λοιποί mentioned in the next ver.—ἐξομνίαν φαγεῖν καὶ πίειν (later Gr. for πιεῖν), "right to eat and drink,"—sc. as guests of the Church: see Mark vi. 10, Luke x. 7, xxii. 30. The added καὶ πίειν, and the illustrations of vv. 7 and 13, show that the obj. of the two vbs. is not the idolothya, but the material provision for Christ's apostles, supplied by those they serve (iι); this ἐξουσία is analogous to, not parl. with, that of viii. 9, belonging not to the ἀποστολὴ as such, but to the ἀποστολη; cf. the Didaché, 13, "Every true prophet is worthy of his food". George Fox characteristically notes the moderation of the demand: "The Ap. said 'I have not power to eat and to drink?' But he did not say, 'to take tithes, Easter reckonings, Midsummer dues, augmentations, and great sums of money.'" ἐξουσίαν, as a verbal noun, governs the bare inf., like ἐξεστίν. —(b) Paul claims, in order to renounce, the ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφῆς γυναικας τεραγνως—the "right to take about (with us) a sister as wife"—i.e., a Christian wife: brachyology for "to have a Christian sister to wife, and take her about with us".—ἀδελφῆς is obj., γυναικας objective complement to τεραγνως, on which the stress lies; "non ex habendo, sed ex circumducendo sumtus afferebatur ecclesiis" (Bg.). The Clementine Vg. rendering, μυλησατο τεραγνως circumducendi (as though from γυν. ἀδελφ.), gives a sense at variance both with grammar and decorum, not to be justified by Luke viii. 2 f. This misinterpreted text was used in defence of the scandalous practice of priests and monks keeping as "sisters" γυναῖκες συνεισακτοῖς, which was condemned by the Nicene Council, and often subsequently; so Jerome (Ep. 23, ad Eustoch.), "Agapetarum pestis . . . sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum . . . novum concubinarum genus" (see Suicer's Τheirōs, s. uν. 'Αγαπητή, 'Αδελφή).—From the ἐς καλ clause it appears that "the rest of the App.," generally speaking, were married, and their wives often travelled
3-7.
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στολα και οι * αδελφοι του * Κυριου και * Κηφας; 6. η μονος εγ\(\text{N})\)
και Βαρνάβας, ουκ * έξομεν * εξουσιαν του 1 μη * εργάζεσθαι;

7. Τις στρατεύεται ἰδίους * ὄψωνις * ποτε; τις * φυτεύει * ἀμπε-

λώνα και έκ 2 τοις 2 καρπως 3 αυτοί ουκ έσθιει; η 3 Τις * ποιμάνει

with them; the “forsaking” of Luke xviii. 28-30 was not final (in the parl. Matt. xix. 28 f., Mark x. 28 ff., ηνη does not appear); according to tradition, John however was celibate. “The brothers of the Lord” were also orthodox Jews in this respect (on their relationship to Jesus, see Lt., Essay in Comm. on Galatians); indeed, they came near to founding a kind of Christian dynasty in Jerus. “And Cephas,” separately mentioned as the most eminent instance of the married Christian missionary. The association of the αδελφοι τ. Κυρ. with the απόστολοι does not prove that they were counted amongst these, or bore this title of office: while distinguished from the latter by their specific name (cf. Gal. i.19), they are linked with them as persons of like eminence; see the position of James in Acts.-(c) The third εξουσία, μη εργάζεσθαι, Paul and his old comrade Barnabas had laid aside. Barnabas had stripped himself of property at Jerus. in the early days (Acts iv. 36 f.); and he and P. together, in the pioneer mission of Acts xii. 1, worked their way as handi-
craftsmen. Now separated, they both continued this practice, which was ex-
ceptional—μόνος εγ\(\text{N})\) και Βαρνάβας. The allusion implies wide-spread knowledge of the career of Barn., which ends for us at Acts xv. 30. Notwithstanding the παροξυσμός in which they parted, the two great missionaries remained in friendly alliance; cf. Paul’s ref. to Mark, Barnabas’ cousin, in Col. iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 11. For εργάζεσθαι, as denoting manual labour, see parls.; a cl. usage, like that of Eng. workmen. This third εξουσία was the negative side of the first (cf. 1 Thess. ii. 9, also 2 Cor. xi. 9, and διά-

τανον ένσων of 18 below).—The three

rights in fact amount to the one which Paul argues for in the sequel: he might justly have imposed his personal support, and that in the more expensive character of a married man, upon the Christian communities for which he laboured, thus sparing himself the dis-
advantages and hardships of manual toil.

§ 28. The Claim of Ministers to Public Maintenance, ix. 7-15a. Paul asserts his right to live at the charge of the Christian community, in order to show the Cor. how he has waived this prerogative (15b, etc.). But before doing this, he will further vindicate the right; for it was sure to be disputed, and his renunciation might be used to the dis-
advantage of other servants of Christ. He therefore formally establishes the claim: (a) on grounds of natural analogy (7); (b) by proof from Scripture (8-10); (c) by the intrinsic justice of the case (11); (d) by comparison with O.T. prac-
tice (13); finally (e) by ref. to the express commandment of the Lord (14). In ver. 12 he indicates, by the way, that “others” of inferior standing are mak-
ing themselves chargeable on the Cor. Church.

Ver. 7 puts the question under three figures—virtual arguments from nature—drawn from the camp, the vineyard, the flock. These figures had been similarly used by our Lord: (1) in Luke xi. 21 f., xiv. 31; (2) in Matt. xx. 1 ff., xxi. 28 ff.; (3) in Luke xii. 32, John x., and xxi. 15 ff. Cf. in Paul for (1) xiv. 8, Eph. vi. 10 ff.; (2) i Thess. v. 8; (2) iii. 6 ff.; (3) Acts xx. 28, Eph. iv. 11. On διανωσος, see Gr.: it denotes primarily “rations” served out in lieu of pay; then military “stipends” of any kind; then “wages” generally; see parls.—ιδίους διως, not
"at his proper pay," but "at his private (as distinguished from public) charges": cf. xi. 21, Gal. ii. 2. The use of τοῦ to widen negative, interr. (virtually negative), and hypothetical propositions, common in cl. Greek, is infrequent in N. T. —In the third question, a partitive εκ with gen. replaces the acc., the image suggesting a share: "the shepherd is still remunerated in the East by a share of the milk" (Mr.); or is P. thinking of the solid food (εδοξάσθη) which comes "out of the milk"? For the cognate acc., ποιμάνει ποιμήν, cf. 1 Peter v. 2, also John x. 16.

Vv. 8-100. μη κατά ἄνθρωπον κ.τ.λ.; "Am I saying these things as any man might do?"—in accordance with human practice (as just seen in 7)?—κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, in contrast with what ο νόμος λέγει; cf. Gal. iii. 15 ff. This dialectic use of μη, ἢ or ἦ καί, in a train of questions, is very Pauline; καί recommends the second alternative; cf. Rom. iv. 9, Luke xii. 41. —"The law" is abolished as a means of obtaining salvation (Rom iii. 19 ff., etc.); it remains a revelation of truth and right (Rom. vii. 12 ff.), and P. draws from it guidance for Christian conduct; cf. xiv. 34, Rom. xiii. 8 ff., and (comprehensively) Rom. viii. 4. The ethics of the N. T. are those of the Old, enhanced by Christ (see Matt. v. 17 ff.). Paul speaks however here, somewhat distantly, of the "law of Moses" (cf. vv. 20 f., x. 2); but of the "law of Christ" in Gal. vi. 2 (cf. John i. 17, viii. 17, x. 34, xv. 25).—Οὐ φιμώσεις κ.τ.λ., "Thou shalt not muzzle a threshing-
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8. See iii. τ 6

1. See ii. τ 6


νι. 7, 2

Macc. v.

16, etc.

Vb., in

ti, use,

35 Η.Ι.

ν With dat., xvi., z;

With inf., Lk. viii. 55; Αcts xviii. 2, xxiv. 23. With dat. and inf., thus, H.L. cf.Μt. iv. 4 (Deut. xvii. 3).

1. Τυγκοτητην (in this order): ΝΑΒC 17, 46.

εκκοπην, δςL; Tisch. εκκοτην, BG; W.H., Nestle.

2. Τα εκ: ΝΜΒD*G 46. Om. τα ACDbcKLP (Alex. and Syrian).

3. παρεδρευσουτε: all uncc. but ΝΚL.

4. Ου κεφρημαι ουδει: all uncc. but K.

(military term of later Gr., from ενκοπτω, to cut into, break up, a road, so to hinder a march) lay (a) in the reproach of venality, as old as Socrates and the Sophists, attaching to the acceptance of remuneration by a wandering teacher, which his enemies desired to fasten on Paul (1 Thess. ii. 3 ff., 2 Cor. xi. 7 ff., xii. 13 ff.); and (b) in the fact that P. would have shackled his movements by taking wages from particular Churches (19), so giving them a lien upon his ministrations. For the Hebraistic phrase ενκοπην δίδωμι (= ενκόπτω), cf. xiv. 7, 2 Τhess. i. 8.-τον Χριστον is always obj. gen. after ευαγγελιου; see Rom. i. 2 f., also μαρτυρείον τ. Χριστον, i. 6 above.

Vv. 13, 14. After the personal "aside" of vv. 11 f., Paul returns to his main proof, deriving a further reason for the disputed διωκσια from the Temple service. "Do you not know "—you men of knowledge (cf. iii. 16)—"οι οι τα ιερα εργαζομενοι εκ του ιερου εσθιουσιν, " that those employed in the sacred offices eat what comes from the sacred place (the Temple) "—"qui sacris operantur, ex sacrario edunt." (Gv.): see the rules ad hoc in Lev. vi. 8-vii. 38 and Num. xviii. 8-19. For εργαζομαι (of business, employment), cf. iv. 12, Acts xviii. 3, etc.,

"Those that are assiduous at the altar," qui altari assident (Bz.)—i.e., the priests engaged in the higher ritual functions—are distinguished from other Temple ministers; the position of Paul and his colleagues is analogous to that of these chief dignitaries.—παρεδρευω, to have one's seat beside; cf. ευπαρεδρον, vii. 35.

P. argues by analogy from the Jewish priest to the Christian minister in respect of the claim to maintenance; we cannot infer from this an identity of function, any more than in the previous comparison with "the threshing ox" —τ. θυσιαστηριον συμμεριζονται, "have their portion with the altar," i.e., share with it in the sacrifices—"altaris esse socios in dividend victimas" (Bz.); parts of these were consumed in the altar-fire, and parts reserved for the priests (Lev. x. 12-15). Some refer the first half of ver. 13 to Gentile and the last to Israelite practice; but "with the Ap., το ιερον is only the sanctuary of the God of Israel, το θυσιαστηριον only the altar on which sacrifice is made to Him" (Hf.): cf. Acts xxii. 17, etc., and the Gospels passim, as to ιερον, χ. τ8, as to θυσιαστηριον: cf. χ. τ -τ2, for the use in this Ep. of O.T. analogies.—"So also (in accordance with this precedent) did the Lord appoint for those that preach the good tidings to live of the good tidings."—εκ τ. ευαγγ. in ver. 14 matches εκ τ. ιερου, ver. 13; τοις ... καταγγελουσιν, τοις. . . εργαζομενοι: cf. ειραγωνιστα οι τ. ευαγγ. τ. Θεου, Rom. χν. 16.—For the "ordination" of the Lord" (sc. Jesus), see parls.; the allusion speaks for detailed knowledge of the sayings of Jesus, on the part of writer and readers; cf. vii. 10, xi. 23 ff., and notes.—διαταγην, act., as in vii. 17, xi. 34; mid. in xvi. 1. — Τδν δκ., of source of livelihood (ex quo quod evangelium pradicant, Bz.), in cl. Gr. often Εν άτο (see parls.). For καταγγελλω, see note on ii. 1.

Ver. 15a. "But for my part, I have used none of these things:" does Paul mean "none of the privileges" included in the above διωκσια? or "none of the
156. Où dò ἐγράψα δὲ ταῦτα ἵνα ὀστὺ γίνηται ἐν ἐμὸι· "καλὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ῥώμας ἡμῖν ἔργα μοι ἀλλὸν ἀποθεαῖν ἢ τὸ "καύχημα μου ἵνα τις κενώσῃ."

15ό. Οὕτως γενήται· ἐν ἐμοί, γάρ μοι "μάλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἢ τὸ καύχημά μου. Ἰνα τις κενώσῃ."

16. ἐὰν γὰρ ἐναγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστιν μοι "ἐπίκειται, ὡδή δέ μοι ἐστίν ἐὰν μὴ "ἐναγγελίζωμαι."

Acts xx. 35; cf. Phil. i. 23. b See ν. 6.

1τ. τὸ "πρῶτον οὐκ ἐγράψα ταῦτα ἐν ἐμοί, γάρ μοι "μάλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἢ τὸ καύχημά μου ἵνα τις κενώσῃ."

τέλειος εάν γὰρ "ευαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστιν μοι "ἐπίκειται, οὐαί δέ μοι "εστίν εάν μὴ "ευαγγελίζωμαι."

Τὴν έποτίζω μοι "καύχημα ἀνάγκη γάρ "ευαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστι "ἐπίκειται, οὐαί "εστίν εάν μὴ "ευαγγελίζωμαι."

The Westerns (DG, etc.) have ἐνεμοί twice in this ver. reasons" by which they have been enforced (so Ἔηhooks, the former with exclusive ref. to 13 f.)? The parl. sentence of ver. 12, and the οὐκ ἐγράψα ταῦτα of the next clause, are decisive for the former view. "The authority" included a number of rights (συν. Gospp., Rev., passim; with στις, N. T.).—εγώ emphasises, in preparation for the sequel, and in distinction from the broader statement of νερ. 12, etc., Paul's individual position in the matter, and the pf. κέχρημαι (replacing the historical aor. of 12) affirms a settled position; the refusal has become a rule. From this point to the end of the ch. the Ap. writes in the 1st sing., revealing his inner thoughts respecting the conduct of his own ministry.

§ 30. Paul's Renunciation of Right for the Gospel's Sake, ix. 15b-23. The Ap. has been insisting all this time on the right of Christ's ministers to material support from those they serve, in order that for his own part he may explicitly renounce it. This renunciation is his "boast," and his "reward"; of his office he cannot boast, nor seek reward for it, since it was imposed upon him (15-18). In this abnegation P. finds his freedom, which he uses to make himself impartially the slave of all; untrammelled by any particular ties, he is able to adapt himself to every condition and class of men, and thus to win for the Gospel larger gains (19-22). For himself, his best hope is to partake in its salvation with those he strives to save (23).
852  ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

h Rom. vii. 20, xxi. 13.

1 οίκονομίας = πεπιστευμαι. 18. τις ουν μισθόν εί δύναται μισθός;

With ν. επικείμαι.ν. επιτίθημι (separate pars.), "to lay" a task, by authority, "upon" some one: in this sense, Gals. iii. 12. in the Apostolic ranks, a pressed man, not a volunteer, "laid hold of" (Phil. iii. 12) against his previous will; he entered Christ's service as a captive enemy (cf. xν. 8, 2 Cor. ii. 14). 

Ver. 16. The fact of his preaching supplies in itself no καύχημα: "For if I be preaching the good news (ευαγγελίζωμαι), it is no matter of boasting to me; for necessity is imposed on me". 

For ανάγκη, see notes on vii. 26, 37; also Phil. i. 14, where it contrasts with κατά έκούσιον.as with έκών here. - Επίκειμαι is virtually pass. to επιτίθημι, "to lay" a task, by authority, "upon" some one: in this sense, Phil. iii. 12, against his previous will; he entered Christ's service as a captive enemy (cf. xν. 8, 2 Cor. ii. 14). While a gift of Divine mercy (vii. 25, 2 Cor. iv. 1, etc.), his commission was a determination of the Divine sovereignty (i. 1., etc.). For service rendered upon this footing there can never be any boasting; cf. Luke xvii. 10. -That all glorying in this direction was excluded, is sustained by the exclamation, "For woe is to me if I should not preach the Gospel!" (cf. Luke xvi. 22). 

The εκονομίαν πεπιστευμαι of comprehensive fut. ref., from the standpoint of the original "necessity imposed"; cf., for the construction, viii. 8, xv. 36. The intersection εκαλ here is a quasi-substantive, as in Rev. ix. 12. Had P. disobeyed the call of God, his course from that time onwards must have been one of condemnation and misery. To fight against "Necessity" the Greeks conceived as ruin; their Ανάγκη was a blind, cruel Fate, Paul's Ανάγκη is the compulsion of Sovereign Grace.

Ver. 17 completes a chain of four explanatory γάρs (cf. i. 17-21). To make his position clearer, P. puts two further contrasted hypotheses, the former imaginary, the latter suggesting the fact: (a) "For if I am engaged on this (work) of my own freewill (έκών), I have reward (μισθόν)"—sc. the supposed καύχημα of ver. 16, the right to credit his work to himself (cf. Rom. iv. 2, 4); not the future Messianic reward (so Mr. and others), for έχω implies attained possession (see pars.), much as απέχω in Matt. vi. 2, etc. For πράσσω, see note on ν. 2. (b) "But"—the contrasted matter of fact—"if against my will (άκων = ανάγκη, 16), with a stewardship I have been trusted"; cf. iv. 1, i Tim. i. 22, etc.—The εκονομίαν (see note, iv. 1), however highly placed, is a slave whose work is chosen for him and whose one merit is faithful obedience. In Paul's consciousness of stewardship there mingled submission to God, gratitude for the trust bestowed, and independence of human control (cf. iv. 1, etc.). The use of πιστεύω in pass. with personal subject and acc. of thing (imitating νbs. of double acc.), is confined to Paul in N.T.; see Wr., pp. 287, 326. The εκονομίαν πεπιστευμαι of comprehensive fut. ref., from the standpoint of the original "necessity imposed"; cf., for the construction, viii. 8, xv. 36. The intersection εκαλ here is a quasi-substantive, as in Rev. ix. 12. Had P. disobeyed the call of God, his course from that time onwards must have been one of condemnation and misery. To fight against "Necessity" the Greeks conceived as ruin; their Ανάγκη was a blind, cruel Fate, Paul's Ανάγκη is the compulsion of Sovereign Grace.

Ver. 18. Yet, after all, Paul has his reward: "What then (ούν, things being so) is my reward?"—δ μισθός, "the
reward "proper to such a case, is simply to take no pay; "that, while I preach the good news, I may make the good news free of charge" (αδάπανον θήσω, gratui-éum constituam, Βz.). No thought of uire (deferred) pay, nor of suφerorogatory τυorkbeyond the strict duty of the οικονόμος, but only of the satisfaction felt by a generous mind in rendering unpaid service (cf. Acts xx. 33 ff.). The Ap. plays on the word μισθός-first denied, then asserted, much as on σοφία in ii. 18; he repudiates "reward " in the mercenary sense, to claim it in the larger ethical sense. He "boasts" that the Cor. spend nothing on him, while he spends himself on them (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 9-12, xii. 14 f.).—Ista replaces the inf. in apposition to μισθός, "marking the pur-
pose, but only of the satisfaction felt
by a generous mind in rendering unpaid
service (cf. Аctс xx. 33 ff.). То the word μισθός-first denied, then asserted, much as on σοφία in ii.
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In this exact meaning.

Acts ii. 23, xvii. 2.

Also

Wisd.

xviii. 2.

v


In this

νόμον enlarges the category τ. Ιουδαίοις by including circumcised proselytes (see Gal. v. 1-3); and ώς υπό νόμον defines Paul's Judaism as subjection, by way of accommodation, to legal observance, to which the ptpl. phrase (wanting in the T.R.), μη ών αίτε: υπό νόμον, intimates that he is no longer bound in principle —μή with ptpl. implying subjective standpoint ("not being in my view"), and αίτε denoting on my part, of and for myself (cf. Rom. vii. 25). P.'s self-denying conformity to legal environment brought on him the reproach of "still preaching circumcision" (Gal. v. 11).—In relation to Gentiles also he takes an attitude open to misunderstanding and which he wishes to guard: "to those out-of-law (τ. ανόμοις) as out-of-law—though I am not out of-law in respect of God, but in-law (έννομος) in respect of Christ". άνομος was the Jewish designation for all beyond the pale of Μosaism (see Rom. ii. 9-16, etc.): Ρaul became this to Gentiles (Gal. iv. 12), abandoning his natural position, in that he did not practise the law of Moses amongst them nor make it the basis or aim of his preaching to them; see Acts xiv. 15 ff., xvii. 22 ff. He was άνομος therefore, in the narrow Jewish sense; not so in the true religious sense—"in relation to God"; indeed P. is now more than υπό νόμον, he is έννομος Χριστού (= εν νόμῳ Χριστοῦ; cf. Gal. vi. 2, Rom. iii. 27, 31, viii. 2)—non existens ex lex Deo, sed in lex Christo (Est.).

The Christian stands within the law as entering into its spirit and becoming one with it in nature; he is "in the law of Christ" as he is "in Christ" (cf. Gal. ii. 20, 2 Cor. v. 17). This νόμος Χριστοῦ P. expounds in Rom. xii., xiii. (esp. 10), Col. iii., Eph. iv. 20-25, after John xiii. 34, Matt. v.-vii., etc. Its fulfilment is guaranteed by the fact that it is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 2 ff.), who "dwells in" the Christian (iii. 16), operating not as an outward yoke but an implanted life.—Τοις ανόμοις follows τ. ανόμοις ώς άνομος, after the μη ών parenthesis, in the manner of the two ίνα clauses of ver. 20 (κερδάνω and κερδήσω are the Αttic and non-Αttic forms of the Ιst aor. sbj.).—Describing the third of his self-adaptations, P. resumes the εγενόμην of the first, coming home to the situation of his readers: "I became to the weak (not as των ασθενών, but actually) τυφλάντες (see text note), that I might gain the weak". So well did he enter into the scruples of the timid and half-enlightened (see e.g. vii. 7, το άνομος of abiding fact replacing the historical εγενόμην, and with the subjective σώσω, cf. John vi. 29, τοις ασθενείς, ώς φίλοι ασθενείς). Ver. 22b sums up (in the pf. γέγονα of abiding fact replacing the historical εγενόμην, and with the objective σώσω) the Apostle's conduct in the various relations of his ministry: "To all men I have become all things, that by all means I might save some".—Ον πάντως, which varies in sense according to its position and context, see ver. 10, v. 10; here it is adv. of manner to σώσω, omni quovis modo.

"That in all this description of his οἰκονομία or συγκατάβασις P. sets forth no unchristian compliance with men, but
the practical wisdom of true Christian love and self-denial in the exercise of his office, this he expects will be self-evident to his readers, so well acquainted with his character (2 Cor. i. 12 ft., vii. 11). This kind of wisdom is so much more manifestly the fruit in P. of experience under the discipline of the Spirit, as his temper was the more fiery and uncompromising (Mr.); "non mentientisactus, sed compatientiaffectus" (Aug.). This behaviour appeared to his enemies timeserving and duplicity (2 Cor. i. 12, iv. 2, xii. 16, Gal. i. 10).

Ver. 23. Paul's course in its chameleon-like changes is governed by a simple practical aim: "but all things I do for the gospel's sake". His one purpose is to fulfill his Gospel stewardship (17, iv. 1 ff., etc., Acts xx. 24); Phil. iii. 7-14 presents the inner side of the "one thing" he pursues. The intensity with which this end is sought accounts for the variety of means; the most resolute, in a complicated situation, becomes the most versatile of men. ἵνα πάντες τρέχουσιν, εἰς δὲ κ.τ.λ.: "Those that run in the stadium, run all (of them), but one receivesthe prize". As much as to say,"Entering the race is not winning it; do not be satisfied with running, but make sure of winning—So run that you may secure (the prize)". The art. is wanting with σταδίω, as often after prps., esp. when the noun is quasi-proper; cf. our "at court," "in church." The stadion was the race-course, always a fixed length of 6oo Gr., or 6oo Eng. ft.; hence a measure of distance, as in Matt. xiv. 24—a furlong.—For the antithesis of πάντες and εἰς, conveying the point of the warning, cf. the emphatic πάντες of x. 1-4 (see note); also vii. 12, x. 23.—οὕτως may point backward to εἰς ("run like that one": cf. 14, ii. 11), or forward to ίνα (καταλάβετε)—a particle substituted for the regular correlative, δόται (cf. Acts xiv. 1, John iii. 16), where the result is an aim to be achieved; the latter connexion is more probable, since the following vv. dilate on the conditions of success.

Ver. 25. πάς δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος κ.τ.λ.: "But every combatant is temperate in everything—they, to be sure, that they may win a perishable garland, but we an imperishable." The stress in the first clause lies on πάντες, πάντα—no competitor can afford to be self-indulgent in anything; in the second on ἐκεῖνοι, ἐκεῖνοι—if they are so abstinent for so poor a prize, what should we be? For ten months before the contest in the Great Games, the athletes were required, under
k xv. 53 f.; Rom. i. 18, 23. 1 Tim. iv. 8; Jas. i. 12. 2 Pet. v. 4.; Rev. ii. 10, iii. 11, etc.; Mt. xxvii. 29, etc. — to ιν. 2 Tim. ii. 5; Rom. i. 53 f.; Heb. xii. 13. Lk. xx. 13, Jas. iii. 10, v. 13. c Cf. ill. 15, p. H. l.; — Aes, xiv. 8; — —, i. 1 Tim. vi. 17. — q xiv. 9; Eph. ii. 1.; i Th. iv. 17; Acts xxii. 23; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17. Wisd. v. 11 f. r 2 Cor. xi. 20; Acts v. 40, vi. 37, xiii. 19; Mt. xxii. 33, etc. a Lk. xviii. 5.; — —, Prov. xx. 30. f N. H. d.; Diodorus, and Longinus. v Sea viii. 9. v Sea ii. 28. — 2 Cor. xiii. 5 f.; Rom. i. 28; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 16; Heb. vi. 8.

oath, to follow a prescribed diet (αναγκαφαγία) and regimen (άσκησις): Pau-
sianas V. 24. 9; Philostratus De Gymn., p. 4; Arrian-Epict., iii. xv. 23. 2; Xenoph. Symp. viii. 37; Horace, Ars Poet. 422 f.; "Qui studet optatam cursu con-
tingeremetam, Μulta tulit fecitque puero, sudavit et alsit, Αβστινuit venere et vino."

εγκρατεύεται(see vii. 9) impliestemper-
ance in a positive degree—not mere ab-
stinence, but vigorous controlof appetite
and passion, πάντα is acc. of specifica-
tion. Τhe " garland''of the victor in
the Ιsthmian Games was of pine-leaves,
at an earliertime of parsley, in the
Οlympian Games of τυιλαί-olive,yet these
were the most coveted honours in the
whole Greek world.—φθαρτον andάφθαρ-
tον are again contrastedin xν. 53.

Vν. 26, 27. "Τherefore I so run, in
no uncertainfashion; so I ply my fists,
not like one that beats the air.'' " So
as the context describes, and as you see
me (cf. χιν. 32) "; the Αp. feelshimself,
while he writes, to be strainingevery
nerve like the racer, strikinghome like
the trained pugilist: for this graphic
ούτως, cf. χιν. ΙΙ, Gal. ι. 6, 2 Τhess. iii.
17; the adv. would be otiote as mere antec-
cedent to άτρομον (similarly τρομον
in 1 Τhess. iv. 8) brings in the prompt,
emphasizing the inference drawn from the last
clause: "We are fighting for the im-
mortal crown— I as a leader and exem-
plar; surely then I make no false step
in the course, I strike no random blows."

άδήλως is susceptible both of the objec-
tive sense prevailing in cl. Gr., obscure,
inconspicuous (preferred by Mr. and Gd.
here, as though P. meant, "not keeping
out of sight, in the ruck"); cf. xiv. 8; and
(preferably) of the subjective sense, un-
sure, without certain aim (Thuc., i. 2. 1;
Plato, Symp. 181 D; Polybius)—" ut non
in incertum " (Bez.). " έκειo quod petam et
quondam " (Bg.); άηνος σκοτόν τον
πλακών, άει εκείν καλά μάτην (Cm.): cf.
Phil. iii. 14. The image of the race
suggests that of pugilism (τρομον),

another exercise of the Pentathlon of the
arena: the former a familiar N. T. meta-
phor, the latter h. I.— δείξειτε άφθαρτον, " ut non aerem caedens" (Bez.), " smit-
ing something more solid than air"
(Εν negatives αέρα, not δέρων),—esp.my
own body (27); cf. Virgil's " verberat
ictibus auras" (ΑΕπ. ν. 377). P.'s are
no blows of a clumsy fighter that fail to
land—struck in's Βlauc hinein. Βg.,
Ηf., Εd. suppose him to be thinking of
the σκιομαχία, sham-fight, practised in
training or by way of prelude, without
an antagonist. άφθαρτον means to play,
then beat severely; smile; cf. our vulgar
hiding.

Ver. 27. The fully-attested reading
τρομον (from τρόω and τρό, to hit
under the eye) continues the pugilistic
metaphor and suits Paul's vehemence;
" contudo corpus meum "(Bez.), " livi-
dum facio" (Cod. Claromontanus), "I
beat my body black and blue": a vivid
picture of the corporeal discipline to which
P. subjects himself in the prosecution of
his work (cf. iv. 11—esp. κολαφίζομεθα;
2 Cor. xi. 23 f.; Gal. vi. 17, 2 Τim. ii.
4). τρομον (τρόω + πέμπω; cf. 2 Cor.
xi. 32, etc.)—preferred by Hf. and Hn.,
after Clem. Alex.—giving the milder
sense, to force under, subdue, subigo
(Cν.), is almost syn. with δουλαγωγώ.
P.'s severe bodily suffering, entailed by
the circumstances of his ministry, he
accepts as needful for his own sanctifi-
cation (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 7),—a physical
castigation which tames the flesh for the
uses of the spirit (cf. 1 Pet. iv. 1 f.; also,
for the principle involved, Rom. viii. 13,
Col. iii. 5). The practices of the Middle-
Age Flagellants and similar self-torturers
have been justified by this text, but
Paul's discipline was not arbitrary and self-inflicted, it was dictated by his call-
ing (12b, 23)—a cross laid on him by the
hand of God, and borne for the Gospel's
and the Church's sake (cf. Col. i. 24).
In Col. ii. 23 he guards against the
ascetic extravagances which this passage,
perhaps even in his life-time, was used
Χ. Ι-2. 857
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Χ. Ι.*ου "θέλω δε' υμάς" αγνοείν, αδελφοί, ὅτι "πατέρες" εξ ί.

Rom. i. 13; 1 Th. iv. 13.

εβαπτίσαντο, mid. voice (see pars.), implies consent of the subjects—"had themselves baptised" (cf. εὐαναγγελισθείς, vi. 11) aggravating their apostasy.

Vv. 3, 4. After deliverance came the question of sustenance. This was effected by the "buffeting" of his physical frame enabled P. to "lead (his body) about as a slave,"—as one might a bullying antagonist after a sound beating. Paul's physical temperament, it appears, had stood in the way of his success as a minister of Christ; and the hindrance was providentially overcome by the terrible hardships through which he passed in pursuit of his ministry. This experience he commends to the Cor. He had felt the fear, from which the above course of rigorous self-abnegation in the interest of others has saved him, "lest haply, after preaching to others, I myself should prove reprobate" (αδόκιμος γένωμαι): the opp. result to that of ver. 23. —For κηρύσσω, see i. 23; the κήρυξ at the Games summoned the competitors and announced the rules of the contest. With αδόκιμος, νε' eject an us, cf. δοκιμάζω, iii. 13, and note; see 2 Cor. xiii. 5 ff., and other pars.—On the Gr. Games, see the Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq. (Isthmia, Stadium); Hermann, Lehrbuch d. gottesdienstl. Alterthümer, § 50; also the supplementary Note on Greek Athletic Festivals in Bt.

§ 31. The Backsliding of Ancient Israel, x. 1-5. The Apostle has just confessed, in warning others, his own fear of reprobation. That this is no idle fear the history of the O.T. Church plainly proves. All the Israelite fathers were rescued from Egypt, and sealed with the ancient sacraments, and virtually partook of Christ in the wilderness; but, alas, how few of those first redeemed entered the Promised Land!

Vv. 1, 2. The phrase οὖν θέλω υμᾶς ἄγνοειν (see pars.) calls attention to something not altogether within the range of the reader's knowledge (contrast ἀπελούσασθε; ix. 24, etc.) γάρ attaches the paragraph, by way of enforcement, to the foregoing ἄδοξον. "Our fathers" is not written inadver-
in the desert by means no less miraculous and symbolic: "and they all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink"—the manna of Exod. xvi. 13 ff., etc., and the stream drawn from the rocks of Rephidim (Exod. xix.) and Kadesh (Num. xx.).—The epithet πνευματικὸς does not negative the materiality of the βρώμα and πόμα, any more than the corporeality of the ripe Christian man described in ii. 15; it ascribes to these nutriments a higher virtue—such as, e.g., the bread of Christ's miracles had for intelligent partakers—a spiritual meaning and influence: for the bread, see Deut. viii. 2 f. (cf. Matt. iv. 3 f., John vi. 31 ff., Ps. cxlviii. 23 ff.); for the water, Exod. xvii. 7, Num. xx. 13, Ps. cv. 41, Isa. xxxv. 6.—In drinking from the smitten rock the Israelites "were drinking" at the same time "of a spiritual rock"—and that not supplying them once alone, but "following" them throughout their history. Ver. 4b explains 4a (γάρ): P. justifies his calling the miraculous water "spiritual," not by saying that the rock from which it issued was a spiritual (and no material) rock, but that there was "a spiritual rock accompanying" God's people; from this they drank in spirit, while their bodies drank from the water flowing at their feet. The lesson is strictly paral. to that of Deut. viii. 3 f. respecting the manna. In truth, another rock was there beside the visible cliff of Rephidim: "Now this rock (ἡ λίθος 84) was the Christ!" The "meat" and "drink" are the actual desert food—"the same" for "all," but endowed for all with a "spiritual" grace; the "spiritual rock" which imparted this virtue is distinguished as "following" the people, being superior to local limitations—a rock not symbolic of Christ, but identical with Him. This identification our Lord virtually made in the words of John vii. 37. The impf. εἰπεν (4b), exchanged for εἶπον (4a), indicates the continuous aid drawn from this "following rock".

Baur, Al., and others suppose P. to be adopting the Rabbinical legend that the water-bearing Rephidim rock journeyed onwards with the Israelites (see Bammid-" Rabba, s. 1; Eisenmenger, Entd. Judenthum, I. 312, 457, II. 876 f.). Philo allegorized this fable in application to the Logos (Leg. alleg. II. §§ 21 f.; Quod det. pot. insid. solet, § 30). This may have suggested Paul's conception, but the pre-dicate πνευματικῆς emphatically discards the prodigy; "we must not disgrace P. by making him say that the pre-incarnate Christ followed the march of Israel in the shape of a lump of rock!" (Hf.). ο Χριστός—not the doctrine, nor the λίοφος of the Christ, but Ηim himself—assumes that Christ existed in Israelite times and was spiritually present with the O.T. Church, and that the grace attending its ordinances was mediated by Him. "The spiritual homogeneity of the two covenants"—which gives to the Apostle's warning its real cogency—"rests on the identity of the Divine Head of both. The practical consequence saute aux yeux: Christ lived already in the midst of the ancient people, and that people has perished! How can you suppose, you Christians, that you are secured from the same fate!" (Gd.). Holsten rejects the parenthetical η πέτρα δέ clause as a theological gloss; but it is necessary to explain the previous η πεπονθήμ, ἀπολύμ. πέτρας, and is covered doctrinally by the δι' οὗ τα πάντα of viii. 6 (see note). Already Jewish theol. had referred to the hypothesized "Wisdom" (see Wisd. x.), or "the Logos" (Philo passim), the protection and sustenance of ancient Israel. The O.T. saw the spiritual "rock of Israel" in Jehovah (Deut. xxxii., 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, Isa. xvii. 10, xxvi. 4, etc.), whose offices
of grace, in the N.T. view of things, devolve on Christ.—The Ap. does not in so many words associate the "spiritual food" and "drink" of vv. 3 f. with the Lord's Supper, as he did the crossing of the Red Sea with Baptism; but the second analogy is suggested by the first, and by the reference to the Eucharist in vv. 15 ff. In no other place in the N. T. are the two Sacraments collocated.

Ver. 5. "But not with the greater part (of them)"—a "tragic litotes: only Joshua and Caleb reached the Promised Land" (Num. xiv. 30: Mr.). The result negatives what one expects from the antecedents; hence the strong adversative ἄλλα οὐκ.—τοῖς πλείοσιν—"the majority" of the πάντες so highly favoured, cf. xν. 6. ηὐδόκησεν ἐν (after the LXX), Heb. chapbets δἰ; the ἐν resembles that of ix. 15; see Wr., p. 292. —κατεστρώθησαν γάρ κ.τ.λ. "For they (their bodies) were laid prostrate in the wilderness," gives graphic proof, in words borrowed from the O.T. narrative, of God's displeasure; sooner or later this doom overtook nearly all the witnesses of the Exodus (cf. Heb. iii. 17). "What a spectacle for the eyes of the self-satisfied Cor.: all these bodies, full-fed with miraculous nourishment, strewing the soil of the desert!" (Gd.).

§ 32. The Moral Contagion of Idolatry, x. 6-14. The fall of the Israel of the Exodus was due to the very temptations now surrounding the Cor. Church—to the allurements of idolatry and its attendant impurity (6 ff.), and to the cherishing of discontent and presumption (9 ff.). Their fate may prove our salvation, if we lay it to heart; the present trial, manifestly, is nothing new; and God who appoints it will keep it within our strength, and will provide us with means of escape (11 ff.). The whole is summed up in one word, "Flee from idolatry!" (14).

Ver. 6. ταῦτα τῶποι ήμῶν ἐγενήθησαν may mean (α) "These things have been made our examples," typi nobis (Cv.)—sc. exx. for our use; (b) "In these things (acc. of specification) they proved types of us"—figura nostri (Vg., Bz., Mt., Mt., R.V. marg.); or (c) "As types of us they became such" (so Ηf.: cf. ταύτα . . . ήτε, vi. 11)—a construction clashing with that of the parl. ver. 11. (a) best suits the application of ταῦτα in the sequel (cf. 1 Pet. v. 3); to make the fallen Israelites prophetic "types" of the Cor. would be to presume the ruin of the latter!—ἐγενήθησαν is pl. despite the neut. pl. subject ταύτα, through the attraction of the predicate; so πάντα ταύτα κακουργίαι ἦσαν in Xenophon; the incidents included are distinctly viewed. For the deterrent "example," cf. Heb. iv. 11.—With ἐπιθυμ. κακών cf. ἐφευρετάς κακών, Rom. i. 30: the double ἐπιθυμητάς . . . ἐπεθύμησαν recalls Num. xi. 4 (LXX); in alluding to the old "lusting" for the diet of Egypt, the Ap. hints at the attraction of the Cor. idol-feasts, but his dehortation applies to all κακά (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 7, Ἡ Θεσσ. v. 15, etc.). The general admonition is specialised in four particulars, with repeated μηδε—idolatry, fornication, tempting of the Lord, murmuring—based on the analogy furnished by vv. 1-5.

Ver. 7. μηδε εἰδωλολάτραι γίνεσθε, "And do not become idolaters" in apposition to the εἰς τὸ μή clause of ver. 6. The dependent sentence of purpose passing into a direct impv.; for the like conversational freedom, cf. i. 31, iv. 16, vii. 37, ix. 15, and notes. The repetition of this warning in ver. 14 shows its urgency. Even where eating of the εἰδωλοθυτα was innocent, it might be a stepping-stone to εἰδωλολατρεία.—Enforcing his appeal by ref. to the calf-worship at Sinai, the Ap. dwells on the accompaniments of this apostasy; here
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"Εκάθισεν ο λαός φαγείν και πιήν καὶ ανέστησαν παίζειν. Καθὼς τινες αυτῶν επόρνεσαν καὶ ἐπέσον εν Ε ὁ λαός φαγείν και πιήν. Ἐκάθισεν ο λαός εἰκοσιτρείς χιλιάδες έν μία ἡμέρᾳ. Μηδε πορνεύωμεν, καθὼς τινες αυτῶν επόρνεσαν καὶ ἐπέσον εν Ε ὁ λαός ἔπειραν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τινες αύτων εί. Τον ΛΌγο το μηδέ γογγύζετο, καθώς και τινες αύτων εί. Μείζονα, ΝΑΒDL, many minn.: unusual in this connexion. "See, CD*KL, etc.

Ver. 8. μηδε πορνεύωμεν: here P. comes closer to his readers, adopting the communicative 1st pl. For the prevalence of this vice at Cor. and its connexion with Cor. idolatry, see vii. 2, vi. 11, and Intro'd., p. 734 (cf. Num. xxxv., 1 f. also Rev. ii. 14); for its existence in the Cor. Church, ch. v. above, and 2 Cor. xii. 21. Wisd. xiv. 12 affirms, of idolatry at large, ἀρχὴ τιραγνίας ἐνίοτε εἰδολῶν; see the connexion of Rom. i. 24 with the foregoing context.—"23,000" is a curious variation from the figure given in Num. xxv. 9 for the slain of Baal-Peor, which is followed by other Jewish authorities, viii., 24,000. It is more respectful to credit the Ap. with a trifling inadvertence than to suppose, with Gd., that he makes a deliberate understatement to be within the mark. Ev. gives no evidence for his alleged "Jewish tradition" in support of the reduced estimate. Possibly, a primitive error of the copyist, substituting γ' for θ' (Hn.).

Vv. 9, 10. The sins condemned in vv. 7, 8 are sins of sensuality; these, of unbelief (Ed.)—which takes two forms: of presumption, daring God's judgments; or of despair, doubting His goodness. The whole wilderness history, with its crucial events of Massah and Meribah, is represented as a "trying of the Lord" in Ps. xcv. 8 ff. (cf. Num. xiv. 22), a δοκιμασία (Heb. iii. 7-12); this process culminated in the insolence of Num. xxvi. 4 f., which was punished by the infliction of the "fiery serpents." The like sin, of presuming on the Divine forbearance, the Cor. would commit if they trifled with idolatry (cf. 22) and "sinned wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth" (Heb. x. 26; Rom. vi. 1); cf. Deut. vi. 16 (Matt. iv. 7), Ps. lxviii. 17 ff., for this trait of the Israelite character. ἐν-νείρησις is to try thoroughly, to the utmost—as though one would see how far God's indulgence will go. The graphic
1. Η τάσει έλθεν απὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τάξιν τοῦ αὐτοῦ: 2 οὐκέτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐνημερωμένος, ἀλλὰ ἐξ οὗ ἐκεῖνος ἔφερεν ὅτι πάντα τῆς τύπου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐφόρασεν.

2. Τίνι, πρὸς τὸν νοοθετή τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔγραψεν ὅτι τῶν Τύπων τῆς εἰρήμενος, ἐκείνων, ὡς εὐδοκήσαι ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις.

3. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

4. τοῦ δὲ μεταλαμβάνειν την θυσίαν τινών, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις, Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

5. ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

6. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

7. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

8. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

9. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

10. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

11. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

12. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.

13. Ταῦτα δεινοτέρα ἐποιήσεις καὶ ἀπώλεσθι τοῦ ὅλοθρευτοῦ. Πάντα τῶν τύπων συνέβαινεν εκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τάξιν, κατηντήσεις.
aspect of (b) encouragement besides. (a)
“So then”—εκείνη with impv., as in iii.
21 (see note)—“he that thinks (ἐμοί καὶ
see note, iii. 18) that he stands, let him
take heed (βλέπει) lest he fall!” For
“such thinking, as it leads to trust in one-
self, is the beginning of a perilous se-
curity” (Hf.); this vanity was precisely the
danger of the Cor. (see iv. 6 ff., v. 2,
etc.). For the pf. ειλθήσατέ, in this em-
phatic sense (to stand fast), see parl.
A moral “fall” is apprehended, involving
personal ruin (5, 8; Rom. xi. 11, 22).—
(b) The example which alarms the self-
confident, may give hope to the despon-
dent, it shows that the present trials are
not unprecedented: πειρασμός υμάς οὐκ
είληφεν εἰ μὴ ἀνθρώπινος, “It is only
human temptation that has come upon
you”—such as men have been through
before. Ver. 13 follows sharply on ver.
12, δινάθεντος, correcting a depressing
fear that would arise in some minds.—
ἐληφθέν (see parl.) describes a situation
which “has seized” and holds one in its
grasp (pf.).—ἀνθρώπινος connotes both
quam hominibus solit (Cv.) and hominis
superabilis (Bg.), such as man can bear
(K.V.).
Some give an objective turn to the adj.,
reading the clause as one of further
warning: “It is only trial from men
that has overtaken you” (so, with vari-
ations, Chr., Est., Gr., Bg.—opponentur
tentatio demonica). But the sequel im-
plies a temptation measured by the
strength of the tempted; moreover, as
El. says, P. would have written οὕτω
παθῆναι, rather than οὕτω ἐληφθέν, if fore-
boding worse trial in store; nor did he
conceive the actual trials of the Cor., any
more than those of the Thess. or Asian
Churches (τ Thess. iii. 5, Eph. vi. 10 ff.),
as without diabolical elements (see 20 ff.,
vii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 14).—ἐληφθέν is attached
to ἀνθρώπινος alone: lit. “temptation has not seized you, except a human
(temptation)”—i.e., “otherwise than hu-
man.”—προσθέσοι δὲ Θεὸς contrasts the
human and Divine; for the natural trial
a supernatural Providence guarantees
sufficient aid (see parl.). έκθεσία is
(cf. 2 Cor. i. 18): “God is faithful in
that (or so that) He etc.” Paul ascribes
to God not the origination, but the con-
xxii. 31 f., James i. 12 ff.): the πειρασμός
is inevitable, lying in the conditions of
human nature; God limits it, and supplies
along with it the εἰλθήσατε. —For the
eclipse in ἐτίθησατ, cf. ill. 2.—The
art. in τὸ πειρασμός, τὴν ἐκβάσιν, is indi-
vidualising: “the temptation” and “the
egress” match each other; hence καὶ, “also,”
indivulso nero (Bg.). Issue is a sense of
ἐπαφήμα in later Gr.; in cl. Gr. disem-
barkation, then exit, escape. In τὸ
δύναμαι ὑπενεγκεῖν (for gen. inf. of
purpose, see Wr., p. 408) the subject is not
expressed; as coming under God’s general
dealing with men, it is conceived inde-
finitely—“that one may be able to bear”.
Shut into a Cul de sac, a man de-
spairs; but let him see a door open for his
exit, and he will struggle on with his load.
ἐκβάσις signifies getting clear away from
the struggle; υπενεγκέει under it, the latter made possible by the
hope of the former. How different all
this from the Stoic consolation of sui-
cide: “The door stands open!” In
the Cor. “temptation” we must include
both the allurements of idolatry and the
persecution which its abandonment en-
tailed.
Ver. 14 gives the final point to all that
has been urged, from ver. 1 onwards:
the sad fate of the Israelite fathers, the
 correspondence between their trials and
those of the Cor. readers, the possibility
of effectual resistance, and the certain
relief to which the Divine fidelity is
pledged—these considerations combine
to enforce the appeal, Fleel from idolatry;
cf. vi. 18a, and note.—βιώσιμος, as in viii.
13 (see note), points with emphatic finger
along the line of past history; ἀνθρώπι
n
15. As φρονίμους: λέγω κρίνατε ὑμείς δ' φήμι. 16. τὸ καθιστὸν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐστὶν; τὸν δ’ ἄρτον δὲ = κλώμεν, ὑφ’ ἅμα κοινωνία τοῦ Προς κορίνθιον Α. 

Ver. 15. As φρονίμους λέγω κρίνατε ὑμείς δ’ φήμι: "As to men of sense I speak; be yourselves the judges of what I affirm." With this prefatory appeal to the intelligence of the readers cf the introductory phrases of Rom. vi. 19, Gal. iii. 15; the ground of admonition in this § lies entirely within the judgment of the Cor., as that of the last § did not (1). The Cor. are φρόνιμοι, intellectually clever and shrewd, not σοφοί (as some of them thought themselves to be, iii. 18); this compliment is consistent with the censure of iii. 1 ff.; see parl., also Trench Syn., § lxv. "The new conception of the πνευματικός caused the word φρόνιμος to sink to a much lower level in the N.T. than it occupied in Plato or Aristotle." (Ed.). Philo disparages φρόνιμοι, defining it as μάθημα τεντωρυγίας κ.μ.πρ. (Quod Deus immut., § 33); he says, σοφία μὲν γὰρ πρὸς θεραπείαν θεοῦ, φρόνιμοι δὲ πρὸς ανθρώπων βιοτήτων διοικήσιν (De pram. et gen. § 14).—On φήμι (again in 19), cf. vii. 29, and note. For like appeals, see Luke xii. 25, Acts iv. 19. The questions that follow, the readers will easily answer from their knowledge of religious custom and feeling.

Ver. 16. κοινωνία is the key-word of this passage (see parl.); the Lord’s Supper constitutes a “communion” centering in Christ, as the Jewish festal rites centered in “the altar” (18), and as the “demons,” the unseen objects of idolatrous worship, supply their basis of communion in idolatrous feasts (21 f.). Such fellowship involves (1) the ground of communion, the sacred object celebrated in common; (2) the association established amongst the celebrants, separating them from all others: “The word communion denotes the fellowship of persons with persons in one and the same object” (Ev.). These two ideas take expression in vv. 16, 17 in turn; their joint force lies behind the protest of vv. 20 ff.—Appealing to the Eucharist—or Eulogia, as it was also called—P. begins with “the cup” (cf. the order of Luke xxii. 17 ff., and Didaché ix. 2 f.), the prominent object in the sacrificial meal (21), containing, as one may say, the essence of the feast (cf. Ps. xxxii. 5). τ. εὐλογίας is attributable gen. (like “cup of salvation” in Ps. cxxvii. 13; see other parl., for both words); so Cν., “destinatus ad mysticam eulogiam,” and Ηn. (see his note). Christ blessed this cup, making it thus for ever a “cup of blessing”; cf. the early sacramental phrases, οἱ τῆς εὐλογίας ἱππού άρτοι in Or. on Matt. x. 25, and τὰς εὐλογίας τ. Χριστοῦ ἱδοναί from the Catacombs (X. Kraus, Roma sotteranea, 217), cited by Ηn. On this view, δ’ εὐλογούμεν is no repetition of τῆς εὐλογίας, but is antithetical to it in the manner of Eph. i. 3: sc. “the cup which gives blessing, for which we give blessing to God.” The prevalent interpretation of τ. ποτήρ. τ. εὐλογίας makes the phrase a rendering of kαὶ θανάτου τοῦ ποτῆρος τ. Πασχα, the third cup of the Passover meal, over which a specific blessing was pronounced (often identified with that of the Eucharist); or, as Ed. thinks (referring to Luke xxii. 20), the fourth, which closed the meal and was attended with the singing of the
Hallel. Such a technical Hebrewism would scarcely be obvious to the Cor., and the gen. so construed is artificial in point of Gr. idiom; whereas the former construction is natural, and gives a sense in keeping with the reader's experience.—τὸ ποτήριον, τὸν ἄρτον are acc. by inverse relative attraction, a constr. not unknown, though rare, in cl. Gr. (see Wr., p. 204). Hf. thinks that, with the merging of these nouns in the rel. clause, the act of blessing the cup and breaking the bread becomes the real subject of κοινωνία in each instance—as though P. wrote, “when we bless the cup, break the bread, is it not a communion, etc.? ” In any case, the “communion” looks beyond the bare σώματος του Χριστού εστίν; 17. ότι είς άρτος, καρτίον, κλώς, μεταδίδεται the sacred action, the usus pocii, of which they form the centre. “The bread” is “blessed” equally with “the cup,” but in its case the prominent symbolic act is that of breaking (see parls.), which connotes the distribution to “many” of the “one loaf.” Thus “the sacramental bread came to be known as the κλασμός: so Did., S 9 “(F.d.).—On the pl. ἐλεόσυνην, κλάματι, Mr. observes: “Whose was it to officiate in this consecration? At this date, when the order of public worship in the Church was far from being settled, any Christian man was competent. By the time of Justin (Apol. i.65) the function was reserved for the προεστώς, but on the understanding that he represented the community and acted in communion with it (see Ritschl, Altkath. Kirche, 2 pp. 365 f.). The pls. of our passage speak out of the consciousness of the Christian fellowship, in which it is matter of indifference who may be, in this instance or that, its administrative organ.”—οὐχὶ κοινωνία του αἵματος, του σώματος, του Χριστοῦ; “Is it not a communion of (or in) the blood, the body, of Christ?” (cf., for the gen. after κοινωνία, note on i. 9)—Justin (Apol. ii. 53) draws the conclusion that it was necessary to develop the idea of κοινωνία in ver. 16, showing how vital to the Church is the fellowship of the Lord’s Table, that was being violated by attendance at idol feasts.—The elliptical οὐκ ἐσμεν is often construed as a continued dependent clause under the regimen of οὐκ: either (a) “Since we, who are many, are one bread (loaf), one body” (A.V., R.V. txt., with several ancient Verss., Est., Al., Sm.); or (b) “Since there is one bread, and we, the many, are one body” (D.W., Mr.)—these renderings making the twain with this a double reason for the κοινωνία of ver. 16, instead of seeing in the είς σώμα an evidence of the εν σώμα. But (a) confuses two distinct figures, and identifies unsuitably “the bread” with the Church itself. (b) escapes this error by reading into the first clause the δύναμιν required to match δύναμιν in the second; but the copulative “and” is
metéchomen. 18. 'blépete tov 'Iσραήλ 'katá 'sárka, oých 1 εσθίοντες τάς θυσίας 'κοινωνί τοῦ 'θυσιαστηρίου εἰσιν; 19. 'tò 1δην 2 μὴ φημι; ὁτι 1 'εἰδώλου 2 τί ἐστιν, ὡς ὁτι 'εἰδωλοθυτόν 2 τί ἐστιν; 20. ἀλλ' ὁτι 1 ὑμεῖς 2 τί τα ἐθνη; 4 'εἰδωλοθυτόν 2 τί εστιν; 3ο. ἀλλ' ὁτι 'θυεῖ τα 4 ἐθνη, "δαιμονίοις" θυεῖ καὶ οὐ Θεός.

17-20. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α


οὐ Θεός, B and Syrians, so W. H. marg.

εἰδωλοθυτόν ... εἰδώλου (in this order): NAAC**DPR τοῦ, 46, 73, latt. Vg. sah. cop., A8, AUG., AMBRST. διένειν to the words.

Paul's appeal to the meaning of the Lord's Supper is leading up to a prohibition of attendance at the idol-feasts. Against this veto the men of "knowledge" will argue that idolatry is illusion (viii. 4 ff.), its rites having no such ground in reality as belongs to Christian observances; the festival has no religious meaning to them, and does not touch their conscience (contrast viii. 7); if friendship or social feeling invites their presence, why should they not go? Paul admits the non-reality of the idol in itself; but he discerns other terrible presences behind the image—"demons" are virtually worshipped at the idol-feast, and with these the celebrants are brought into contact. "What then do I affirm (the φημί of 15 resumed) ! that an idol sacrifice is anything (has reality) or that an idol is anything? (to say this would be to contradict viii. 4). No, but that (ἀλλ' ὅτι) what the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons, and not to God; and I would not that you should be communicants of the demons!" How could the Cor., as "men of sense, judge" of a situation like this? The riot and debauch attending heathen festivals showed that foul spirits of evil presided over them: cf. vv. 6 ff., referring to the worship of Baal-Peor, with which the allusion here made to Deut. xxxii. 7 (cf. Ps. cvii. 37 f.) is in keeping. "That the worship of heathen cults was offered quaod intentionem—not indeed quaod intentionem—but devils was, consistently with their strict monotheism, the general view of later Jews" (Mr.). Heathenism P. regarded as the domain of Satan (2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12; cf. Luke iv. 6, 1 John v. 19), under whose rule the demons serve as the angels under that of God (2 Cor. xii. 7, 1 Tim. iv. 1; cf. Matt. xii. 24, xxv. 41, etc.); idolatry was, above everything, inspired by Satan. Βαλμόν (=Βαλμα, of which it is neut. adj.) was primarily synom. with θεῖον—"Βαλμα is related to θεῖος as ρυθμος to persona divina" (Cr.); τὸ Βαλμονὸς οὐδείς ἐστιν άλλ' ή θεῖος ή θεοῦ εργον (Arist., Rhet., ii, 23. 8); hence Socrates...
called the mysterious guiding voice within him δαιμόνιόν τι. Ed. observes a tendency, beginning with Eurip. and Plato and accentuated in the Stoics, "to use the word in a depreciatory sense"; already in Homer it often suggested the uncanny, the supernatural as an object of dread. The word was ready to hand for the LXX translators, who used it to render various Heb. epithets for heathen gods. Later Judaism, which peopled the unseen with good and evil spirits, made δαιμόνια a general term for the latter, apart from any specific refer. to idols (see, already, Tob. iii. 8, etc.); hence its prominence in the Gospels, and the origin of the word demoniac (δαιμονιζόμενος); on the whole subject, see Cr. ii., also Everling's Paulinische Daimonologie. For κοινωνία δαιμονίων, cf. Isa. xlv. 11, where the "fellows" of the idol signify a kind of religious guild, brought into mystic union with their god through the sacrificial meal (see Cheyne ad loc.); also Isa. lv. 21. Ver. 20 c is calculated to bring home to the Cor. the fearful danger of trifling with idolatry.

Vv. 21, 22. This lively apostrophe sets in the strongest light the inconsistency of Cor. Christians who conform to idolatry, the heathenism of their position. "You cannot drink the Lord's cup and the cup of demons"—the two together! "You cannot partake of the Lord's table and the table of demons!" Cf. the τίς μετοχή, κοινωνία, κ.τ.λ.; cf. 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff., and other parl. The nouns forming the obj. are anathema as being qualitative, the impossibility lying in the kind of the two cups; cf. note on ii. 5. "The Lord's cup" is that received at His direction and signifying allegiance to Him; in ver. 16, "the cup of (His) blessing."—Possibly, P. alludes here to Mal. i. 7, 12, where "the table" signifies "the altar of Jehovah"; but the expression is borrowed without this identification. In this context table and altar are essentially distinguished; the altar supplies the table (cf. Heb. xiii. 10). "S. Coena convivium, non sacrificium; in mensa, non in altari" (Bg.). The τραπέζη includes the ποτήριον and δρόμος of ver. 16 together. This passage gives its name of "the Lord's Table" to the Eucharist.—"Or (is it that) we provoke the Lord to jealousy?"—is this what we mean by eating at both tables? Paul includes himself in this question; such conduct is conceivable in his case, since he had no scruple against the idololathy on their own account (see viii., ix. 1). Deut. xxxii. 21 (neighbouring the previous allusion of 20) sufficiently indicates the result of such insolence: see other O.T. parl. For this argumentative ή in Paul's questions, cf. vi. 9, etc., ix. 6.—If the Cor. are daring Christ's sovereign displeasure by coquetting with idolatry, they must suppose themselves "stronger than He!" As sensible and prudent men they must see the absurdity, as well as the awful peril, of such double-dealing; cf. Deut. xxxii. 6, 28 f. Ισχυρός (i. 25) implies inherent, personal strength. Of the δύναμις τ. κυρ. Ιησού Ρ. had given a solemn impression in ch. v. 4 f.; cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 3.

§ 34. Liberty and its Limits, x. 23-xi. 1. The maxim "All things are lawful" was pleaded in defence of the use of the idololathy, as of other Cor. laxities; so the Ap. has to discuss it a second time (cf. vi. 12). In ch. vi. he bade his readers guard the application of this principle for their own sake, now for the sake of others; there in the interests of purity, here of charity (23 f.). When buying meat in the market, or when dining at an unbeliever's table, the Christian need not enquire whether the flesh offered him is sacrificial or not; but if the fact is pointedly brought to his notice, he should abstain, to avoid giving scandal (25-30). Above all such regulations stands the supreme and comprehensive rule of doing everything to God's glory (31). Let the Cor. follow Paul as he himself follows Christ, in living for the highest good of others (32-xi. 1).

Ver. 23. On πάντα έξεστιν κ.τ.λ., see notes to vi. 12. The form of that ver. seems to be purposely repeated here (ομοίως only omitted), with the effect of bringing out the altruistic as complementary to the self-regarding side of Christian ex-
23. *Πάντα μοι 1 'έξεστιν, άλλ' οδ τάντα 'συμφέρει: τάντα ε See vi. 12. μοι 1 'έξεστιν, άλλ' οδ τάντα 'οικοδομεί. 24. μηδείς το 'έκατον δέ λέοντος 1 πωλούμενον έσθίετε, μηδείς 
λέοντος δέ την τον 'εκατόν. 25. πάν τον και μακελλάριον τους έτερον έκαστος. 26. τού γαρ Κύριου ή γη και τον πληρώμα αυτής. 27. ει δέ 4 

1 Om. μος (supplied from vi. 12) all pre-Syrian uncc.
2 Om. έκαστος pre-Syrian uncc. and verss.
3 του Κύριου γαρ (in this order): all uncc. but AHKL.P.
4 Om. 6 pre-Syrian uncc. and verss.

pediency. On Paul's dialectical use of the words of opponents, cf. viii. 1 ff. and notes. Closing his discussion about the sacrificial meats, P. returns to the point from which he set out in ch. viii., viz., the supremacy of love in Church life—there commended as superior to knowledge, here as supplying the guard of liberty; in both passages, it is the principle of edification. The tacit obj. of οικοδομεί (see viii. 1, iii. 9-17) is "the Church of God" (32). Edification, in its proper meaning, is always relative to the community; P. is safe-guarding not the particular interests of "the weak brother" so much as the welfare of the Church, when he says, "Not all things edify".

Ver. 24. With μηδείς τ. έκατον κ.τ.λ. cf. xiii. 5, Rom. xiv. 7, xv. 2, Gal. vi. 2, Phi. ii. 1 ff. After άλλ' understand έκαστος, from the previous μηδείς: cf. that on οικοδομεί, note below. "Not one of you, the other," the pl. else-where in such connexion (cf. Matt. xxii. 21). For δ έκαστος (= δ πλησίον, Rom. xvii. 2), wider than δ άδελφος (viii. 17; cf. 27 f.)—"the other" in contrast with oneself—see parls.; Gr. idiom prefers "the other" where we say "others."—το έκατον, το του έτερου, implies some definite good—"his own, the other's interest": a N.T. k. l.; the pl. elsewhere in such connexion (cf. Matt. xxii. 21).

Vv. 25, 26. The above rule is now applied in the concrete, τον τον και μακελλάριον πωλούμενον κ.τ.λ.: "Anything that is on sale in the meat-market eat, not asking any question of conscience." μακελλάριον is a term of late Gr., borrowed from Latin (macellum): possibly a local word, introduced by the colonia; for the anarthrous τον μακελλάριον, cf. note on ον σταθερά (ix. 24).—μηδείς έκαστος δεία τον συνιδέσημον might mean "for conscience' sake (to avoid embarrassment of conscience) making no enquiry" (Cm., Er., Hf., El., Holsten), as though addressed to men of weak conscience—Bq. however, "propter conscientiam alienam" (referring to 29); or, "because of your (sc. strong) conscience making no enquiry"—since you are not troubled with scruples (Est., Mr., Ed.); or, "making no enquiry on the ground of conscience," the adv. phrase simply defining the kind of question deprecated (so Bz., Hn., Bt., Gd., Ev.); the last interpretation best suits the generality of the terms, and the connexion with ver. 26. For έκαστος, see ii. 14, iv. 3, ix. 3, and notes; it signifies enquiry with a view to judgment at the bar of conscience.

ERGE, acc. of definition, as in Acts x. 20, xi. 12; Sm. baldly renders it as transitive obj., "examining nothing"—kein Fleischstück untersuchend! For μη in plpl. clause, see Wr., p. 606. The citation from Ps. xxv. 1, recalling the argument of viii. 4 ff., quiets the buyer's conscience: consecration to an idol cannot deprive the Lord of anything that belongs to "the earth and its fulness," and which His providence supplies for His servants' need; cf. Rom. xiv. 6, εζ. p. 24. πλήρωμα, in its primary sense, id quo res impletur (cf. Lt., Colossians, pp. 257 ff.): "terra si arboribus, herbis, animalibus etc., careret, esset tanquam domus supellectile et omnibus instrumentis vacua" (Cv.).

Ver. 27: a case parl. to that of vv. 25 f., attached therefore asyndetically; cf. the two clauses of ver. 16. When one buys for himself, the question arises at the shop; when he is the guest of another, it arises at the table. "If some one invites you, of the unbelievers, and you determine to go."—τον άντιτέρον is emphatic by position: in a non-Christian house sacrificial meat was likely to be used, and here the Christian's conduct
ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α
Χ.
Μt. xxii. 3 ff.; Lk. vii. 39, xiv. 7 ff.; Jo. ii. 2; Exh. v. 12; See vi. 6.

See vi. 6.

Lk. x. 8; Mk. viii. 14; Acts xvi. 34; Gen. xliii. 31 ff.

Luke x. 8; John vii. 39, xiv. 7 ff.; Acts i. 2.

1 See vi. 6.

Lk. χ. 8; Ε, γάρ κυρίου, ἕκαστο πλήρωμα αὐτής, "λέγω οὐχίν, εαυτοῦ, "αλλά την τοῦ ἑτέρου. "ινα τιγάρη Αcts xvi. 34, Gen. xliii. 31 ff.

would be narrowly watched.—ὁλείτε in N.T., as in cl. Gr. (see Lidd., under βούλομαι, as against Gm. under θέλω: cf. note on xii. 11), signifies will, active purpose, not mere wish ("are disposed to go," E.V.); the invited make up their mind to go, are bemi on it (P. "non valde probat," Bg.; "a hint that it would be wise to keep away," El.); the next clause discovers them there, with the viands before them. P. assumes social intercourse of Christians with heathen—not with false Christians (ν. το f.); there can be no question, after νν. 2o ff., of attending an idol-feast or κατακείσθαι εν ειδωλίω (viii. 1ο).—τ. παρατιθέμενον re places τ. πωλούμενον of ver. 25; the rest is a repetition: no more need to raise the question of conscience in the one case than in the other.

Vv. 28, 29a. εάν δε . . . είπη, "But if any one say to you "—a probable contingency, as ει τις καλεί κ.τ.λ. (27) was an assumed fact; see Bn. on the forms of the Condit. Sentence, §§ 242 ff. —§ 28 confronts this contingency with both the situations described in vv. 25 and 27. The information, "This is sacrificial meat," might be volunteered to the Christian purchaser in the market (by the salesman, or a by-stander), or to the Christian guest at the unbeliever's table (by the host, or by a fellow-guest), the communication being prompted by civility and the wish to spare the supposed susceptibilities of the Christian, or by the desire to embarrass him; whatever its occasion or motive, it alters the situation. The genuine reading, λεπόβοιν (slain-as-sacred, i.e., in sacrifice), takes the statement as from the mouth of unbelievers; a Jew or Christian would presumably say ειδωλόθυτον, as above and here in T.R.: Reuss and El. suppose the informant to be "a Christian converted from heathenism " using the inoffensive term "at the table of a heathen host"; but τ. ἀπίστων suggests heathen company, and μηνύω private information. "Forbear eating (μή εσθίετε, revoking the permission of 25 ff.) for the sake of him that informed you, and for conscience' sake." —Μηνύω (see parts.), to disclose what does not appear on the surface or is imparted secretly. The informant expects the Christian to be shocked; with his συνήθεια τ. ειδώλου (viii. 7), he looks on the flesh of the sacrifice as having acquired a religious character (it is ιερόθυτον); by saying Τούτο λεπόβοιν, he calls conscience into play—those conscience the next clause shows.—διά τον μηνύσαντα και την συνείδησιν form one idea, being governed by the same prp., και adding an explanation; from regard to the conscience of the μηνύσας—not his possible contempt or ill-will—the Christian should decline the offered flesh or stop eating it.—συνείδησιν δε λέγω, οδ την αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ., "Conscience however I mean, not one's own, but that of the other."—Ver. 29a explains the διά τ. συνείδησιν of ver. 28, and reconciles its instruction with that of vv. 25, 27, while it brings the matter under the governing rule laid down in vv. 23 f. By contrast with "the other," the 2nd pl. of ver. 28 becomes 2nd sing. reflexive.

Vv. 29b, 30 justify, in two rhetorical questions, the Christian's deference to
the conscience of another: (a) ήνα τι γίνεσθε, τοίον κατά Αυτούς; "For to what purpose is my liberty judged by another conscience?"
i.e. "What good end will be served by my eating under these circumstances, and exposing my freedom to the censure of an unsympathetic conscience?" cf. ii. 15, Matt. vii. 6. ήνα τι (γίνεσθαι), ut quid? (Vg.), signifies purpose, not ground as Mr. and others take it; there is nothing to be gained by the exercise of liberty in this case. For κρίνω in adverse sense, see par. For the previous συνείδησις του άλλου (alterius), άλλης (aliena) συνειδήσεως is substituted (cf. xv. 29, 2 Cor. xi. 4), indicating a distinction not merely in the persons but in the consciences generally possessed. The Ap. says here of Liberty what he says of Faith in Rom. xiv. 22: κατά σεαυτόν έχε ενώπιον του Θεού.—Question (b) intimates that, instead of any benefit resulting from the assertion of liberty in face of conscientious condemnation, positive harm ensues—thanksgiving leads to blasphemy! "If I with thanks (or by grace) partake, why am I blasphemed over that for which I give thanks?" The τι is prospective, as in xv. 29 f. = εις τι or έν τι. The bare χάριν can scarcely mean here "by the grace of God" —esp. in view of ευχαριστώ; cf. Rom. xiv. 6 and 16 (for βλασφημοίμαι). Men of heathen conscience, seeing the Christian give thanks knowingly over food devoted to the idol, will regard his act as one of sacrilegious indulgence and denounce it accordingly; it seems to them a revolting hypocrisy; "Quelle religion est celle-là? devaient dire les païens." (Gd.)—a grievous πρόσκομα both to Jews and Greeks (32); cf. Rom. ii. 24.—ετέρου αυτού absorbs the dem. pron. governed by the same prp.; cf. vii. 39, 2 Cor. ii. 3. The repeated emphatic εγώ points to the Christian as devout on his own part, yet incurring the scandal of gross irreverence.—Vv. 31, 32 conclude the matter with two solemn, comprehensive rules, introduced by the collective έν (cf. Rom. v. 9, xi. 22), relating to God's glory and to man's salvation. The supreme maxim of duty, πάντα εις δόξαν Θεού ποιείτε, applies to all that Christians "eat or drink" (including the idolothyta),—indeed to whatever they "do"; cf. Rom. xiv. 20 ff., Col. iii. 17.—A second general rule emerges from the discussion: "Offenceless prove yourselves, both to Jews and to Greeks and to the church of God." άπροσκόποι here act., as in Sir. xxxv. 21, not causing to stumble; elsewhere pass. in sense. For γίνεσθε, see note on vii. 23. The three classes named make up Paul's world of men: "Jews" and "Greeks" embrace all outside the Church (i. 22, ix. 20 f.); Christian believers alone form "the Church of God" (cf. i. 2, and note; also Gal. vi. 16). This text and xii. 28 afford the first ex. in P. of the comprehensive use of έκκλησία, as transcending local ref. "The church of God" is bound up with His glory (31); its sacredness supplies a new deterrent from self-indulgence. It contains "the weak" who are liable to injury (viii. 9, ix. 22).
moderate oneself to, not give enjoyment to (cf. Rom. xvi. 3)—no need to speak of a "conative present," resembling ἐπανειλημμένος. Paul's universal compliance is qualified by its purpose, ἐπανειλημμένος, in the light of which the verbal contradiction with Gal. i. 10, Thess. ii. 4, is removed; there is nothing in his power that P. will not do for any man, to help his salvation (cf. ix. 22b).—Between the ἐρωτεύω and its purpose lies the ἀρέσκω clause, in which the Ap. professes for himself the rule commended to the Cor. in ver. 27. The "self-advantage" which P. sets aside, touches his highest welfare (cf. Rom. ix. 3); P. sacrificed what seemed to be his spiritual as well as material gain—spending, e.g., weary hours in tent-making that might have been given to pious study—to secure spiritual gain for others; thus "losing himself," he "found himself unto life eternal." "The many," in contrast with the single self; cf. ver. 17, Rom. v. 15 ff.—Through his own pattern P. points to that of his Master and theirs: "Show yourselves (γίνεσθε, see 32, vii. 23) imitators of me, as I also (am) of Christ." P. does not point his readers back to the historical model ("of Jesus," or "Jesus Christ," as in Eph. iv. 21), but upward to the actual "Christ," whose existence is evermore devoted to God (Rom. vi. 10 f.) and to men His brethren (Rom. viii. 34 f., i. 30), "in whom the Cor. believers are" (i. 2, 30). Paul's imitation Christi turns on the great acts of Christ's redeeming work (Eph. v. 2, Phil. ii. 5-11), rather than on the incidents of His earthly course.

Division IV. Disorders in Worship and Church Life, xi.-xiv. The Ap. returns to the internal affairs of the Church, which occupied him in Div. I., dealing however not as at the outset with the relations of the Cor. Church to its ministry, but with the mutual relations and behaviour of its members within the society. The questions arising under this head are bound up with the moral and social problems of Divs. II. and III., and several leading topics of former chaps. reappear in a new connexion—e.g., the Christian relationship of the sexes (common to vi., vii., and xii.), the Lord's Supper (x. and xi.), the supremacy of Love to Knowledge (viii. and xiii.). The matters treated in these chaps. are well defined: (1) the unveiling of the head by women in public worship, xi. 2-16; (2) profanation of the Lord's Table, 17-34; (3) the exercise of spiritual gifts, xii. 1-11 and xiv.—a subject which leads the Ap. into two digressions: (a) on the corporate nature of the Church, xii. 12-31; (b) on the supremacy of love, xiii.

As in the earlier parts of the letter, the train of thought is objectively dictated; the matters taken up arise from the faulty state of the Cor. Church, and were supplied to the writer partly, as in chh. vii.-x., by the Church Letter, and partly by information conveyed in other ways (see xi. 18, and Introd., chap. ii.), which indicated the existence of disorders and scandals within the community of the gravity of which it was unaware.

§ 35. The Woman's Veil, xi. 2-6. P. is glad to believe that the Church at Cor. is loyal to his instructions (2); he interrupts his censures by a word of praise. This commendation, however, he proceeds to qualify. First, in respect of a matter whose underlying principles his readers had not grasped: he hears that some women speak in Church-meetings, and that bareheaded! For a woman to discard the veil means to cast off masculine authority, which is a fixed part of the Divine order, like man's subordination to Christ (3 f). She who so acts disgraces her own head, and only needs to go a step further to rank herself with the degraded of her sex (5 f).
καθὼς ἔπαρθε ὡς ἵνα τάς παραδόσεις κατέχετε. 3. ἔλημεν ὅτι ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλή ὁ Ἱησοῦς ἕτοι, κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ἡ ἀνὴρ, κεφαλὴ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ὁ θεός. 4. πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἡ προφητεία, κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων, ὕπιστεύετε. 5. ἐκ τῆς ἐνημέρωσες ὑμᾶς ὅτι παρέδωκας παραδόσεις κατέχετε.

3. θέλω δὲ υμάς εἰδέναι (= οὐθέν καὶ σ. x. i. above). For such adoption by P. of the words of his readers, see notes on viii. 1 ff. Self-esteem characterised this Church (iv. 8 ff., v. 2); the declaration was sincere, and contained a measure of truth; P. accepts it for what it is worth.—δια, introducing the new topic, marks also the connexion between vv. 1 and 2: "I bid you imitate me—but I am glad to know (from your letter) that you do".—πάντα, acc. of definition (not obj.), as in ix. 33; the vb. regularly governs a gen. in N.T.: μεμνημόνευτος, like memini, a pf. pres.—παρά-δοσις, a "giving over" (without the associations of our tradition), applies to historical fact, teaching, or rules of practice delivered, through whatever means, to the keeping of others: for reference to fact and usage, see ver. 23; to fact and doctrine, x. 1; to the three combined, as here, 2 Thess. ii. 15; for its currency in Jewish Schools, Matt. x. 19 ff., etc.—κατέχετε, as in x. 2 = κρατείτε, 2 Thess. ii. 15. καθὼς κ.τ.λ. implies maintenance in form as well as substance, observance of the τύπος διὰ συγχέων (Rom. vi. 17).

Ver. 3. ἔλημεν ὅτι ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι ( = οὐ θέλω κ.τ.λ. of x. i.; see note).: "But I would have you know"—the previous commendation throws into relief the coming censure. The indecorum in question offends against a foundation principle, viz., that of subordination under the Divine government; this the Cor., with all their knowledge, cannot "know," or they would not have allowed their women to throw off the ἐξουσία επί τῆς κεφαλῆς (10). The violated principle is thus stated: "Of every man the Christ is the head, while the man is head of the woman, and God is head of Christ". As to the wording of this sentence: παντὸς ἀνδρὸς bears emphasis in the 1st clause asserting, like the parl. and clause, a universal truth which holds of the man (vir) as such; the predicate of the 1st clause is distinguished by the def. art.—"Christ is the (proper, essential) head," etc. (cf. η εἰρήνη, Eph. ii. 14, and see Bm., pp. 124 f.); ὁ Ἱησοῦς, in 1st and 3rd clauses, means "the Christ" in the wide scope of His offices (cf. x. 4, xii. 12, xv. 22); for anarthrous κεφαλὴ γυναικός, cf. note on ii. 5. That Christ is "every man's" true head is an application of the revealed truth that He is the one Lord of created nature (viii. 6; Col. i. 15 f.), combined with the palpable fact that the ἀνὴρ has no (intervening) lord in creation (cf. 9); he stands forth in worship, amidst his family, with no visible superior, holding headship direct from his Maker, and brought by his manhood into direct responsibility to Him "through whom are all things". Ed., following Cm. and Mr. (not Hn.), limits this manly subordination to the Christian order of life; "the man is head of the woman in virtue of the marriage union, Christ of the man in virtue of union with Him through faith": but faith is common to the sexes, on this footing οὐκ ἐνί ἄρσεν καὶ ἀρσεν (Gal. iii. 28); on the other hand, in Pauline theology, the law of marriage and the social order are grounded in Christ. Paul's argument has no force unless the parl. assertions rest on a common basis. The question is one that touches the fundamental proprieties of life (8-15); and the three headships enumerated belong to the hierarchy of nature.—"The Christ" of the 3rd clause is "the Christ" of the 1st, without distinction made of natures or states; He who is "every man's head," the Lord of nature, presents the pattern of loyalty in His perfect obedience to the Father (xv. 28, Gal. iv. 4; Heb. v. 5, 8, etc.); cf. iii. 22 f., where
ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

ΧΙ. 1. εἰ, ταῖσχυνεῖ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. 5. πάσα δὲ γυνὴ προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα ἀκατακαλύπτω τῇ κεφαλῇ, κατασκεύαζε τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς. 1· ἐν γὰρ ἑστὶ καὶ τῷ ἀτόμῳ τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ. 6. εἰ γὰρ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται γυνὴ, καὶ κυριάσθη. εἰ δὲ αἰσχρῶν γυναίκα νυμφὴ τὸ κείρασθαι ἢ ἐξυρήσθαι, κατακαλύπτεσθαι.

with the same δὲ. . . . δὲ a chain of subordinate possession is drawn out, corresponding to this subordination of rule. Submission in office, whether of woman to man or Christ to God, consists with equality of nature.

Vv. 4, 5: the high doctrine just asserted applied to the matter of feminine attire. Since man qua man has no head but Christ, before whom they worship in common, while woman has man to own for her head, he must not and she must be veiled. The regulation is not limited to those of either sex who "pray or prophesy"; but such activity called attention to the apparel, and doubtless it was amongst the more demonstrative women that the impropriety occurred; in the excitement of public speaking the shawl might unconsciously be thrown back. προσευχόμενοι κ.τ.λ., "when he (she) prays or prophesies,"—in the act of so doing,—κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων, "wear down from the head (a veil:" κάλυμμα understood), the practice being for the woman in going out of the house to throw the upper fold or lappet of her robe over her head so as to cover the brow: see Peplos in the Dict. of Antiq. ἀκατακαλ. τ. κεφαλῆς, "with the head uncovered," dat. of manner, as χάριτι in x. 30.—Is it the literal or figurative "head" that is meant as obj. to καταισχύνει; Ver. 3 requires the latter sense, while the sequel suggests the former; Al. and Ed. think both are intended at once. Hf. is probably right in abiding by the reading αὐτῆς (see txtl. note); he supposes that the Ap. purposely broke off the parallelism at the end of ver. 5, thus sharpening his reproof: the man who wears a veil "puts to shame his head"—i.e. Christ, whose lordship he represents (7); the woman who discards it "puts to shame her own head"—the dishonour done to the dominant sex falls upon herself. That the shame comes home to her is shown by the supporting sentence: ἐν γὰρ ἑστὶ καὶ τῷ ἀτόμῳ (cf. iii. 8) τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ, "for she is one and the same thing with her that is shaven" (Mr., Ev., Bt., Ed., El.); "It is one and the same thing," etc. (E.V.), would require τῇ ἐξυρήσθαι. Amongst Greeks only the hetaira, so numerous in Cor., went about unveiled; slave-women wore the shaven head—also a punishment of the adulteress (see Wetstein in loc., and cf. Num. ν. 18); with these the Christian woman who emancipates herself from becoming restraints of dress, is in effect identified. To shave the head is to carry out thoroughly its unveiling, to remove nature's as well as fashion's covering (15).

Ver. 6, with a second γάρ, presses the above identity; the Ap. bids the woman who discards the veil carry her defiance a step further: "For if a woman is not veiled, let her also crop (her head); but if it is a disgrace for a woman to crop (it) or to keep (it) shaven, let her retain the veil" (καλυπτέσθω, pr. impv., continuous). P. uses the modus tollens of the hypothetical syllogism: "If a woman prefers a bare head, she should remove her hair; womanly feeling forbids the latter, then it should forbid the former, for the like shame attaches to both." The argument appeals to Gr. and Eastern sentiment: "physical barefacedness led to the inference of moral, in a city like Corinth" (Ev.). κειράσθαι and κείρασθαι, aor. mid., denote a single act on the woman's part; "to cut off her locks"; ἐξυράσθαι, pres. mid.—a shaven condition; the single art. comprises the infs. in one view.—Paul's directions do not agree precisely with current practice. Jewish men covered their heads at prayers with the Tallith (cf. the allusion of 2 Cor. iii. 14 fl.)—this custom, retained probably by some Jews at Christian meetings (4), P. corrects without censure; women were both veiled and kept behind a screen. Amongst the Greeks,
both sexes worshipped with uncovered head, although women covered their heads at other times (see Hermann, *Gottesdienstl. Alterthümer*, § 36, 18 f.; Plato, *Phadò*, 89B, C), while Roman men and women alike covered their heads during religious rites (Servius ad *Æn.*, iii., 407). The usage here prescribed seems to be an adaptation of Gr. custom to Christian conceptions. With us the diff. of sex is more strongly marked in the general attire than with the ancients; but the draped head has still its appropriateness, and the distinction laid down in this passage has been universally observed.—The woman is recognised by the side of the man as "praying" and "prophesying" (see *note on* xii. 10); there is no ground in the text for limiting the ref. in her case to the exercise of these gifts in domestic and private circles (thus Hf., Bt., and some others); on the contradiction with xiv. 34, see note *ad loc.* Under the Old Covenant women were at times signally endued with supernatural powers, and the prophetess occasionally played a leading public part (e.g. Deborah and Huldah); in the Christian dispensation, from Acts i. 14 onwards, they receive a more equal share in the powers of the Spirit (see *note on* xii. 26). But in the point of εξουσία there lies an ineffaceable distinction.

§ 36. MAN AND WOMAN IN THE LORD, xi. 7-16. The *Ap.* has insisted on the woman's retaining the veil in token of the Divine order pervading the universe, which Christ exhibits in His subordination to the Father. But he has some further observations to make on the relative position of the sexes. In the first place, he bases what he has said of the headship of man on the story of creation, exhibiting man as the direct reflexion of God, woman as derived and auxiliary (7-9); in this connexion the ref. to "the angels" must be understood (10). At the same time, man and woman are necessary each to the other and derive alike from God (11 f.). Having thus grounded the matter upon Christian principle, P. appeals in confirmation to natural feeling (13-15), and finally to the unbroken custom of the Church (16).

Ver. 7. ἀνήρ (not ἄνδρος) μεν γάρ "For man indeed (being man) ought not to have his head veiled" (καλύπτεσθαι, pr. inf. of custom), in contrast with woman who *ought* (5, το) this is as wrong on his part as it is right on hers; οὐκ negatives the whole sentence, as in ver. 1. οφείλει, like δε (19), denotes moral or rational necessity, the former vb. in a more personal, the latter in a more abstract way. For him to veil his head would be to veil the "image and glory of God"; Christ, the image of God, became ἄνθρωπος as ἀνήρ.—υπάρχων (see parls.), "being constituted" so. To accompany ἐκόνων, P. substitutes for the ομοίωσις (d'muth) of Gen. the more expressive δόξα—by which the LXX renders the synonymous t'munah of Ps. xvii. 15—God's "glory" being His likeness in visible splendour; cf. Heb. i. 3. P. conceives Gen. i. 26 to apply to Adam as ἄνδρος primarily, although in ver. 27 it stands, "God created man in His own image . . . male and female created He them".—ἡ γυνὴ δὲ κ.τ.λ. presents a shortened antithesis to the μεν clause; logically completed it reads, "But the woman (ought to have her head veiled, for she) is the glory of the man"—δοξά ἄνδρος—not of the race (ἄνθρωπον), but of the stronger sex. Paul omits ἐκόνων, which does not hold here; she is not man's reflexion, but his counterpart—not "like to like, but like in difference," wedded as "perfect music unto noble words"; she partakes, through him, in the ἐκόνων Θεοῦ (Gen. i. 27). That which in our common nature is most admirable—faith, purity, beauty—man sees more excellently and proportionately shown in hers. It follows that he who degrades a woman sullies his manhood, and is the worst enemy of his race; the respect shown to women is the measure and safeguard of human dignity.
in accordance with Jewish belief, they appear as agents of the Lawgiving in Gal. iii. 19 (Acts vii. 53), and in Heb. i. 7 are identified with the forces of nature. The same line of thought connects the angels here with the maintenance of the laws and limits imposed at Creation (cf. Job. xxviii. 7), reverence for which P. expresses in his own style by this allusion; see Hn., Ed., and Gd. in loc. With this general view the interpretation is consistent which regards the angels as present in Divine worship and offended by irreverence and misconduct (see 1 Tim. v. 21), as (possibly) edified too by good behaviour (see Eph. iii. 10): cf. the ancient words of the Liturgy, “Therefore with Angels and Archangels, etc.” A familiar thought with the Fr.; thus Cm. ad loc., “Open the eyes of faith, and thou shalt behold a multitude of angels; if the air is filled with angels, much more the Church”; and Thp., τοῖς ἄγγελοις ἀδιστάμενοι. Similarly Hooker, “The house of prayer is a Court beautified with the presence of Celestial powers; there we stand, we sing, we sound forth hymns to God, having His angels intermingled as our associates; with reference hereunto the Ap. doth require so great care to be taken of decency for the Angels’ sake” (Excl. Poi., iii. 5). R. cannot mean evil angels subject to sensual temptation, as many, after Tert., have read the passage, basing it on a precarious interpretation of Gen. vi. 4 (see Everling, Die paul. Angelologie u.s.w., pp. 32 ff.)—an explanation far-fetched and grossly improbable. Others have seen in these ἄγγελοι pious men, prophets, Church-officers, even match-makers! Others have proposed emendations of the text, substituting διά τοὺς ἄγγελους or τὰς ἄγγελας, or διὰ τῆς ἄγγελου (during the preaching!). Baur, Sm., and others would relieve the troublesome words as a primitive gloss.

Vv. 11, 12. τῇ γεν. κτ.λ. modifies and guards the foregoing; this conj. lies
between δε and ἄλλα in its force—but besides, ὀμορφία. What has been said in νν. 10 must not be overpressed: woman is subordinate, not inferior; the sexes are alike, and inseparably necessary to the Christian order (11); and if man is the fountain, woman is the channel of the race's life (12). ούτε γυνὴ... ούτε ἄνηρ κ.τ.λ.: "Neither is there woman apart from man, nor man apart from woman in the Lord." Here Tennyson is the best commentator: "Either sex alone is half itself... each fulfils defect in each, and always thought in thought, purpose in purpose, will in will, they grow... the two-celled heartbeat ing, with one full stroke, life". έν Κυρίω (cf. νν. 39, etc.), i.e. under the rule of Christ, where woman's rights are realised as nowhere in heathenism (cf. Gal. iii. 28, Eph. v. 28; also the wording of vii. 3 f. above). For the contrast of ἐκ and διά, see viii. 6; "the woman has an equivalent in the Divine order of nature, that as man is the initial cause of being to the woman, so woman is the instrumental cause of being to the man" (Ev.). But the ἄνηρ is only a relative source; God is absolute Father—ἐν τῷ Θεῷ (cf. νν. 6, 1. 30 and note, Rom. xi. 36). To Him man and woman owe one reverence.

Ver. 13. There is a constitutional feeling which supports the above inference in favour of the woman's veil; it was implied already in the κατακλυσμόν and αἰσχρόν of νν. 5 f., and is now explicitly stated: "Amongst yourselves (inter rather than intra vos ipsos) judge ye; is it seemly for a woman unveiled to be engaged in prayer (pr. inf.) to God?"—an appeal to social sentiment (cf. Rom. ii. 15, μετέξετο ἄλλοις), recalling the κρίνατε ἄνωθεν of x. 15. πρέπον (neut. ptp.: see parls.), as distinguished from ὑπόθεσιν of δε (7. 19), denotes beseemness, suita-

bility to nature or character. τῷ Θεῷ lends solemnity to προσεύχεσθαι.

Vv. 14, 15. The question οὐδε ἡ φύσις αὐτή κ.τ.λ. summons personal instinct to the aid of social sentiment: "Does not even nature of herself teach you that, etc.?" For η φύσις, see Rom. ii. 14; in this connexion it points to man's moral constitution rather than to external regulations; Hf. and El. however, taking φύσις in the latter sense, reverse the order of thought in νν. 13 f., seeing in the former ver. individual instinct (they render ἐν ναυτώι within yourselves), and in this ver. social rule.—Hf. and Hn., by a strained constr. of διδάσκει, render έτι "because," and draw the obj. of "teach" from ver. 13, seeing in διά k.τ.λ. the ground of the affirmative answer tacitly given to both questions: "Does not nature of herself teach (this)" (Yes), for if a man have long hair, etc." The common rendering is preferable; the teaching of nature is expressed in a double sentence, which gathers the consensus gentium on the subject: "that in a man's case, if he wear long hair (σιν οὖν ημα νυτυθμ, Vg.), it is a dishonour to him, but in a woman's, if she wear long hair, it is a glory to her". άνήρ, γυνὴ stand in conspicuous antithesis preceding the conj.: what is discredit able in the one is delightful in the other. Homer's warriors, it is true, wore long hair (καρποκομοοντες Αχιλλοι), a fashion retained at Sparta; but the Athenian youth cropped his head at 18, and it was a mark of folly or effeminacy (a legal ατιμία), except for the aristocratic Knights, to let the hair afterwards grow long. This feeling prevailed in ancient as it does in modern manners (cf. the case of Absalom). In the rule of the Nazirites natural instinct was set aside by an exceptional religious vocation. The woman's κόμη is not merely
Τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων ὁποῖον εὐπρεπῶς ὅποιον εἶτα υπό εὑρέμων ὁπεδ ἐκλήσειά τοῦ Θεοῦ.

νο αἵμα, but a positive δύο; herself the δύο ἄνδρος, her beauty has in this its crown and ensign. And this "glory" is grounded upon her humility: "because her hair to serve as a hood (ἀντί περιβολαίου) has been given her"—not as a substitute for head-dress (this would be to stultify Paul's contention), but in the nature of a covering, thus to match the veil (ἐν γεύσει de voile, Gd.); cf. χαρὰ ἀντὶ χάριτος, John i. 16; ἀντὶ κατανόησιν ζώνοι...τέτευκται, Odys. viii. 456. δέδοται (pf. pass.) connotes a permanent boon (see 2 Cor. viii. ττ, ττJohn iii. 1, etc.). περιβολαίον (from περιβάλλω), a torax βερ, mantle, is here exceptionally used of head-gear.

Ver. 16 closes the discussion sharply, with its appeal to established Christian rule. If, after all that the Ap. has advanced in maintenance of the modest distinction between the sexes, any one is still minded to debate, he must be put down by authority—that of P. himself and his colleagues (ἡμεῖς), supported by universal Christendom; cf. xiv. 33, 37 ff.—δικαίος φιλόνεικος εἶναι, not "seems," but "thinks (presumes; see parls.) to be contentious"; εἶτα τις and the case supposed (as in x. 27), and too likely in quarrelsome Cor. φιλόνεικος, not amans victoria (Est.) as if from νίκη, but avidus litium (from νικος),—a disputa for disputa tion's sake.—ἡμεῖς, in contrast with αἱ ἐκκλησίαι, means not "I and those like minded" (Mr.), but "I and my fellow-ministers" or "I and the Apostles generally" (cf. iv. 6-13, xv. 11, 2 Cor. i. 19, iv. 13, etc.).—τοιαύτην συνήθειαν, the custom described in vv. 4 f. above, which gave rise to the whole discussion; not, as many understand it, the custom of being contentious (in temp. matter, rather than as a custom): no one could think of the ἄρρι (ἡμεῖς) indulging such a habit! The advocates of feminine emancipation may have supposed that P., the champion of liberty, was himself on their side, and that the rejection of the veil was in vogue elsewhere; he denies both. For συνήθεια, Lat. con-suctudo, see viii. 7: for αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ττ, ττthe pl. conveying the idea of unanimity amongst many. Those who explain "such a custom" as that of "being contentious," usually link this ver. with vv. 17 ff. It is true that the σχίσματα of the sequel, like the ἔριδες of i. ττ, tended to φιλονεικία, in truth the disputatiousness of the Cor. ran into everything—a woman's shawl, or the merits of the Arch-apostles!

§ 37. THE CHURCH MEETING FOR THE WORSE, xi. 17-22. The Cor. Church had written self-complacently, expecting the Apostle's commendation upon its report (2). In reply P. has just pointed out one serious irregularity, which might indeed be put down to ignorance (3, ττ). No such excuse is possible in regard to the disorders he has now to speak of, which are reported to him on evidence that he cannot discredit (ττ). In νν. 3 ff. P. rectified an error, now he must censure a glaring fault; "le ton devient celui du blame positif" (Gd.); νν. 3 and ττ both detract, in different degrees, from the "praise" of ver. 2. τοῦτο παραγγέλλων has to wait long for its explanation; P. lingers over his preliminary rehearsal of
the founding of the Lord's Supper, and
the "charge" is held in suspense; its gist becomes evident in νν. 20 f. Neither
the feminine indecorum censured in the last § (to which τούτο is referred by Μr.,
Bt., Gd., El., etc.), nor the contentiousness glanced at in ver. 16 (by which Εν. and
Εd. explain it), has been, strictly speaking, matter of a charge, moreover, the back
ward ref. of τούτο involves the awkwardness of associating επαινώ and its
introductory ptp. with disconnected objects; these interpretations better fit the
other reading, παραγγέλλω .. . επαινών.
With certain specific and solemn injunctions respecting the Εucharist in view,
Ρ. says, "I do not praise (you), in that not for the better but for the worse you
come together''.-ότι, with the like broad sense as in i. 5, ix. 10, gives at once the
content and ground of dispraise. Τhe general profitlessness of the Church as
assemblies reached its climax in the de
secration of the Lord's Supper, their
hallowing bond (χ. 16 f.).
Ver. 18. Τhe severer reproach, εις το
ήσσον συνέρχεσθε, is justified by νν.
τ8-22, which lead round to the intended
παραγγελία. —πρώτον μὲν requires an
έκτητα ἔδ, that is not forthcoming (cf.
Rom. i. 8) : the complement appears to
lie in xii.-xiv.—viz., the abuse of spiritual
gifts, a further and prominent ground of
disapproval (Mr., Hn., El.). Bt. and Ed.
find the antithesis in τά λοιπά, ver. 34β.
Hf. renders πρώτον "chiefly," dispensing
with any complement, but μὲν sup-
poses a mental ἔδ. Ver. 20 gives no
contrasted ground of censure, it stands
upon the same ground.—συνερχόμενοι
ὁμώς εἰς ἐκκλήσια (not τῇ ἐκκ., in the
Church): "as often as you come together
in assembly"—ptp. pr. of repeated occur-
rence; the σχίσματα in Church meetings
were chronic. For ἄκοινος σχίσματα, see
i. 10 f.; the pr. "I am hearing" suggests
(in contrast with ἀκούειν above) con-
tinued information from various quarters
(cf. v. 1, ἀκούωτα): hence the qualifying
μέρος τί (acc. of definition) πιστεύω,
wanting in ch. i.; Ρ. does not "believe"
everything reported to him, but so much
as is stated he does credit.—σχίσματα,
see i. το f.; the pr. "I am hearing' suggests
(in contrast with ἀκούω above) con-
tinued information from various quarters
(cf. v. 1, ἀκούωτα): hence the qualifying
μέρος τί (acc. of definition) πιστεύω,
wanting in ch. i.; Ρ. does not "believe"
everything reported to him, but so much
as is stated he does credit.—σχίσματα,
see i. το f.; the pr. "I am hearing'
suggests
(in contrast with ἀκούω above) con-
tinued information from various quarters
(cf. v. 1, ἀκούωτα): hence the qualifying
μέρος τί (acc. of definition) πιστεύω,
wanting in ch. i.; Ρ. does not "believe"
everything reported to him, but so much
as is stated he does credit.—σχίσματα,
see i. το f.; the pr. "I am hearing'
suggests
(in contrast with ἀκούω above) con-
tinued information from various quarters
(cf. v. 1, ἀκούωτα): hence the qualifying
μέρος τί (acc. of definition) πιστεύω,
wanting in ch. i.; Ρ. does not "believe"
everything reported to him, but so much
as is stated he does credit.—σχίσματα,
see i. το f.; the pr. "I am hearing'
suggests
(in contrast with ἀκούω above) con-
tinued information from various quarters
(cf. v. 1, ἀκούωτα): hence the qualifying
μέρος τί (acc. of definition) πιστεύω,
wanting in ch. i.; Ρ. does not "believe"
everything reported to him, but so much
as is stated he does credit.—σχίσματα,
see i. το f.; the pr. "I am hearing'
suggests
(in contrast with ἀκούω above) con-
tinued information from various quarters
(cf. v. 1, ἀκούωτα): hence the qualifying
μέρος τί (acc. of definition) πιστεύω,
wanting in ch. i.; Ρ. does not "believe"
everything reported to him, but so much
as is stated he does credit.—σχίσματα,
see i. το f.; the pr. "I am hearing'
suggests
(in contrast with ἀκούω above) con-
tinued information from various quarters
(cf. v. 1, ἀκούωτα): hence the qualifying
μέρος τί (acc. of definition) πιστεύω,
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ο Rom. ii. 4: 1 Τim. iv.12, vi.2 : Ηeb. xii.2 , 2 Ρet. ii.το ; thrice 

1 See νεr. 2. 

φ Lk. iii.Ι , xxii.36. 

προ and προς often confused in comp. vbs. 

applied; also Rom. v. 4. η άποκριτή κατεργάζεται δοκίμως, 1 Peter i.7; also Tert., De Prascr. Heret., 4, "ut fides habendo tentationem habet etiam probationem". For δόκιμας, accepted on proof, see parl., esp. ix. 27; those approved with God thus "become manifest" to men; "l'effet est de manifester au grand jour les membres de l'église sérieux et de bon aloi" (Gd.), "Dominus talibus experimentis probat constantiam suorum. Pulchra consolatio!'' (Cν.). 

Vv. 20, 21 resume with emphasis the circumstantial clause of ver. 18 and draw out, by ούν, the disastrous issue of the σχίσματα: they produce a visible separati 

on the ground of enlightenment; the αιρέσεις sloped down toward κραιπάλη και μέθη.-επί το αυτό," to the same (spot)." —ουκ έστιν κ.τ.λ. can hardly mean, "it is not to eat the Lord's Supper" (so ΑL. and others)—for the Cor. intended this, but by unworthy behaviour (26 f.) neutralised their purpose: P. says either "it (sr. your feast) is not an eating of the Lord's Supper" (A.V., Bz., Est., D.W., Bt., Hn., El., Gd.: "ce n'est pas là manger, etc."); or, "it is not (possible) to eat the Lord's Supper." (R.V., Bg., Mr., Hf., Ed., Ev.)—such eating is out of the question. Ver. 21 bears out the last interpretation, since it describes a state of things not merely nullifying but repugnant to any true κυριακόν δείπνον; ουκ έστιν carries this strong sense, negative 

the idea as well as fact, in Heb. ix. 5, and often in cl. Gr.—The adj. κυριακόν (=του Κυρίου) stands in emphatic contrast with ίδιον, the termina 

κος signifying kind or nature: "It is impossible to eat a supper of the Lord, for each man is in haste to get (προλαμβάνει-praroccupat, Βz.) his own 

supper when he eats,"—or "during the meal" (Εν.; εν τώ φαγείν, in cdendo, Βz. ; not ad manducandum, as in Vg.). Instead of waiting for one another (33), the Cor., as they entered the assembly-room bringing their provisions, sat down at once to consume each his own supply, like private diners at a restaurant; προ- suggests, in view of ver. 22, that the rich even hurried to do this, so as to avoid sharing with slaves and low people at a common dish (22). —The κυρ. δείπνον was a kind of club-supper, with which the evening meeting of the Church commen 

ched after (184, 204), taking place at least once a week on the Lord's Day (cf. Acts xx. 7 ff.). This Church-supper, afterwards called the Agapé (see Dic 

of Christian Antiq. s.v.; also Ed. ad loc.) was analogous to the συσσίτια and ἔρανοι held by the guilds and friendly societies then rife amongst the Greeks. Originating as a kind of enlarged family meal in the Church of Jerus. (Αcts ii. 46), the practice of the common supper accorded so well with social custom that it was universal amongst Christians in the first century (see Weizsäcker's Apost. Age, vol. ii., pp. 279-286). Gradually the Eucharist was separated from the Agapé for greater decorum, and the latter degenerated and became ex-
23. Εγώ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου δὲ καὶ τοῦ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἤγγισεν εἰς τὴν μυκὴν τοῦ παρεδίδοτον ἵνα ἐλάβεσθαί ·
24. καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλάσε καὶ εἶπε, "Λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτο Μου ἐστίν τὸ υπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον"·

The table was provisioned at Cor. not from a general fund (as was usual in the ἐρανοὶ or collegia), but by each guest bringing his contribution in kind, a practice not uncommon in private parties, which had the disadvantage of accentuating social differences. While the poor brought little or nothing to the feast and might be ashamed to show his fare, the rich man exhibited a loaded basket out of which he could feed to repletion. All κοινωνία was destroyed; such vulgarity would have disgraced a heathen guild-feast. The Lord, the common Ηοστ, was forgotten at His table. Ος μὲν πεινά—sc. the poor man, whose small store was insufficient, or who arriving late (for his time was not his own) found the table cleared (cf. τρολαμβάνει). δὲ δὲ μεθύει, "but another is drunk!" or in the lighter sense suggested by πεινά, πίους σατισ βιβλί (Gr., Ηπ.), "drinks to the full" (cf. John ii. 16). The scene of sensual greed and pride might well culminate in drunkenness. Of all imaginable schisms the most shocking: hunger and intoxication side by side, at what is supposed to be the Table of the Lord! This is indeed meeting for the worse. —For the demonstrative use of the rel. pron. with μνὲ and δέ, see Wr., p. 130.

Ver. 22. μὴ γὰρ οἰκεῖος οὐκ ἔχετε κτ.λ.; "For is it that you have not houses to eat and drink in?" See ver. 34, and note. The γὰρ brings in an ironical excuse: "For I suppose you act thus because you are houseless, and must satisfy your appetite at church!" cf. πῶς γάρ, Acts viii. 31.—If this voracity cannot be excused by a physical need which the offenders had no other means of supplying—if, that is to say, their action is deliberate—they must intend to pour scorn on the Church and to insult their humbler brethren: "Or do you despise the Church of God, and cast shame on those that are without means?"

For ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, an expression of awful dignity, see i. 2, x. 32. τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας, "the have-nots" (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 12)—οἱ ἔχοντας in cl. Gr. signifies "the men of property"; μὴ (of the point of οἰκεῖο) rather than οὐ (of the fact), for the poor with their beggarly rations are shamed by the full-fed on this very account. What could show coarser contempt for the Church assembly?—P. shows a fine self-restraint in the litotes of the last sentence: τί εἶπον ημῖν κτ.λ.: "What am I to say to you? Should I praise (you)? In this matter I praise you not"...επαινέσω, deliberative aor. subj., like εἶπον, for the question refers not to the future, but to the situation depicted (see Wr., p. 356). ἐν τούτῳ has great point and emphasis when attached to the following οὐκ ἔπαινώ (so R.V. marg., after early Verss., Βz., Εst., Μr., Ηn., Gd., Βt., Εl., Εd.); thus also ἔπαινέω better matches εἶπον, and the last clause prepares for the important ἔγω δὲ παρέλαβον of the ensuing ver.

§ 38. Unworthy Participants of the Lord's Bread and Cup, xi. 23-34. The behaviour of the wealthier Cor. at the Church Supper is scandalous in itself; viewed in the light of the institution and meaning of the Eucharistic ordinance, their culpability is extreme (23-27). The sense of this should set the readers on self-examination (28 f.). The sickness and mortality rife amongst them are a sign of the Lord's displeasure in this very matter, and a loud call to amendment (30-32). Two practical directions are finally given: that the members of the
Church should wait until all are gathered before commencing supper; and that where hunger forbids delay, food should first be taken at home (33 f.).

Amongst the things the Ap. had "delivered" to his readers, that they professed to be "holding fast" (2), was the story of the Last Supper of the Lord Jesus, which the Church perpetuates in its communion-feast.—εγώ, antithetical to υμίν: Ε the imparter, you the receivers, of these solemn facts.—από neither excludes, nor suggests (cf. i. 3ο, χίν.36, etc.) as παρά might have done (Gal. i. τ2, τ Τhess. ii.13), independent impartation to Ρ.; "it marks the whence of the communication, in a wide and general sense" (Εl.); the Ap. vouches for it that what he related came authentically from the Lord. παραλαμβάνω de notes "receiving a deposit or trust" (Εd.). "The Lord Jesus," see i. 8. -The allusion to "the night in which Ηe was betrayed" (graphic impf., "while the betrayal went on"), is no mere note of time; it throws into relief the fidelity of Jesus in the covenant (25) thus made with His people, and enhances the holy pathos of the recollection; behind the Saviour lurks the Traitor. Incidentally, it shows how detailed and matter-of-fact was the account of the Passion given to Paul's converts. For the irreg. impf., παρεδίδετο, see Wr., p. 95, note 3.—"took a loaf" (einΒrod: cf. the ειςάρτος of x. τ7)—one of the flat and brittle unleavened cakes of the Passover Table.—καὶ συχροιτήσας ἐκλάσεις κ.τ.λ., "and after pronouncing the blessing, broke it and said, etc." This συχροιτία was apparently the blessing inaugurating the meal, which was followed by the symbolic bread-breaking, whereas "the cup" was administered μετά το δειπνήσαι (25); cf. Luke xxii. 17 ff. (see notes ad loc. in vol. i.), whose account is nearly the same as Paul's, differing in some important particulars from that of Matt. and Mark. Luke, however, introduces a preparatory cup of renunciation on the part of Jesus, "prolusion cena" (Bg.). The fratio panis, the sign of the commencement of a household or social meal (Luke xxiv. 30; Acts ii. 42), is prominent in each narrative; this act supplied another name for the Sacrament.—Regarding the words pronounced over the broken loaf, we bear in mind (1) that Jesus said of the bread "This is my body," Himself sitting there in His visible person, when the identification of substance could not occur to any one; (2) that the parl. saying concerning "the cup" expounds by the word "covenant" (covenant in my blood, in Luke and P.; my blood of the covenant, in Matt. and Mark) the connexion of symbol and thing symbolised, linking the cup and blood, and by analogy the loaf and body, as one not by confusion of substance but by correspondence of relation: what the blood effects, the cup sets forth and seals. The bread, standing for the body, "is the body" representatively; broken for Christ's disciples, it serves materially in the Supper the part which His slain body is about to serve spiritually for the life of the world." Our Lord thus puts into an acted parable the doctrine taught by figurative speech in John vi. 48 ff. "ἐστίν is here the copula of symbolic being: otherwise the identity of subject and predicate would form a conception equally impossible to Speaker and hearers" (Μr.).—το υπέρ υμών (κλώμενον an early gloss), "that is for you"—in all its relations subsisting for men; for our advantage He wore the σώμα σαρκός (2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 7, Heb. ii. 14 ff., etc.). The τούτο τούτεις clause is peculiar to Luke and Paul: their witness is good evidence that the words are από του Κυρίου (23). The sacrificialsense put on ποιείτε by many "Catholic" exegetes (as though syn. with the Homeric βέζειν, and 'asah of Exod., xxix. 39, etc.) is without lexical warrant, and "plane praetermentem Scripturae" as the R.C. Estius honestly says; see also El. ad loc.—εἰς τήν εμήν (cf. Ωμετέραν,
"eis thên emn' éamýmnon". 26. Ὑσάκης γὰρ ἀνὶ ἑσθίητα τὸν ἀρτὸν τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνετε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἧ ἀρχίς ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ. 27. οὐτὲ ὃς ἑσθίη τὸν ἀρτὸν τοῦτον ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἄναξίως, ἐνοχὸς καὶ το ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἠνοχὸς τούτο ἠκάτῃ τοῦ Ἱσαάκου. Πρὸς Κορινθίους, ἦν ἐν ἐμῆν ἀνάμνησιν. "

Ver. 25. Ὑσάκης καὶ τὸ ποτήριον: "In the same fashion also (He gave) the cup." The two ritual actions correspond, and form one covenant.—μετὰ τῇ δειπνησθησθῇ (as in Luke)—"postquam coenaverunt" (Cv.), or better "cœnatum est" (Rom. Liturgy)—is studiously added to "emphasise the distinction between the Lord's Supper and an, ordinary evening meal; cf. vv. 20 f.—The eating of the bread originally formed part of the common meal (consider Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, εὐθύνων αὐτῶν), and may still have so continued, but the cup was certainly afterwards" (El.)—a solemn close to the κύριακὸν δείπνον.—"This cup is (see note 24: εστίν wanting in Luke) the new covenant, in my blood"; cf. notes on x. 16 f. for τὴν ποτ., and the relation of διαθήκη to κοινωνία. The cup, given by the Lord's hand and tasted by each disciple in turn, is a virtual covenant for all concerned; in His blood it becomes so (ἐν Τῇ αἷμα is made by its position a further predicate, not a mere adjunct of διαθ.: cf. Rom. iii. 25), since that is the ground on which God grants and man accepts the covenant. For διαθήκη, see Cr., s.v.; this term, in distinction from συνθήκη, indicates the initiative of God as Disposer in the great agreement. For P.'s interpretation of ἐν τῇ αἷμα, see Rom. iii. 23 ff., Eph. i. 7., ii. 13 ff., Col. i. 20; also parls. in Ep. to Heb., Rev. i. 5, Ἐφ. i. 7, Ἐφ. i. 18 f. For "new covenant," see parls.: κανών, new in nature, contents, as securing complete forgiveness and spiritual renovation (Jer. xxxi. 31 ff., etc.).—"This do... for the commemoration of Me"; see ver. 24 b; τοῦτο includes, beside the act, the accompanying words, without which the ἀνάμνησις is imperfect. Ὑσάκης δὲν (late Gr. for ἀνʼ) πίνετα: "so many times as (quotiescunque) you drink (it)"—the cup of the context; not "so often as you drink" (Hf.), sc. at any table where Christians meet. Our Lord prescribed no set times; P. assumes that celebration will be frequent, for he directs that, however frequent, it must be guided by the Lord's instructions, so as to keep the remembrance of Him unimpaired.

Ver. 26. Familiarity helped to blunt in the Cor. their reverence for the Eucharist; hence the repeated Ὑσάκης δὲν: "for so many times as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you are proclaiming the Lord's death, until He come". γὰρ has its proper explicative force: Christ bade His disciples thus perpetually commemorate Him (24 f.: ποιεῖτε,"go on to do"—sustained action), "for it is thus that you publish His death, and in this form the testimony will continue until He comes again." καταγγέλλετε (see parls.), on this view ind., is the active expression of ἀνάμνησις: "Christus de beneficio mortis suæ nos admonet, et nos coram hominibus id recognovimus" (Cv.). The ordinance is a verbum visibile, a "preaching" of the entire Church in silent ministry: "Christi sanguis scripturarum omnium sacramento ac testimonia effusus praedicatur" (Cyprian, quoted by Ed.). ἔχει ὑμῖν ἀληθᾷ states the terminus ad quem given in the words of Jesus at the Table, Luke xxii. 18, Matt. xxvi. 29. The rite looks forward as well as backward; a renewal of the Passion Supper, a foreshadow of the Marriage Supper of the Lamb. Paul thus "associates with the καταγγέλλειν of the celebrants the fear and trembling that belong to the Maranatha of xvi. 22" (Mr.). The pathos and the glory of the Table of the Lord were alike lost on the Corinthians.
Ver. 27 draws the practical consequence of vv. 20-26, stating the judgement upon Cor. behaviour at the Supper that a right estimate of the covenant-cup and bread demands: "So then, whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily, will be held guilty (ένοχος έσται; reus tenetur, Βz.; rather, tenebitur) of the body and blood of the Lord''; it is this that he ignores or insults; cf. ver. 29. On έστα, with ind., see note to iii. 7. What "unworthily" means is patent from vv. 20 ff.—The or, for and, between τρίβω and πίνω supplies the single text adducible for the R.C. practice of lay communion in one kind: "non levierat, Αp., si non sentiret unam speciem sine alteras uymi posse"). But and appeared in just the same connexion in ver. 26, and reappears in vv. 28 f.; "or" replaces "and" when one is thinking of the parl. acts distinctly, and the same communicant might behave unworthily in-either act, esp. as the breaking of the bread and taking of the cup at this time came in probably at the beginning and end respectively of the Church Supper, and were separated by an interval of time, see notes on ευχαριστήσας and μετά τ. δείπν.(24ff.).ένοχος (from εν-έχω, to hold in some liability) acquires in late Gr., like αίτιος, a gen. of person against whom offence is committed; see Ed. in loc. To outrage the emblem is to outrage its original—as if one should mock at the Queen's picture or at his country's flag. Except άφες, the vbs. throughout this passage are pr. in tense, relating to habit.

Ver. 28. "But (in contrast with the guilt described, and in order to escape it) let a man put himself to proof, and so from the bread let him eat and from the cup let him drink." άφρωνως, replacing δε (27), is qualitative, "containing the ideas of infirmity and responsibility" (Gd.); cf. iii. 4, x. 13. On δοκιμάζω, see iii. 13, and parl.; it signifies not judicial examination (άνακρίνω, iv. 3, etc.), nor discriminative estimate (διακρίνω, 31), but self-probing (probet se ipsum, Vg.; not exploret se, Bz.) with a view to fit partaking; any serious attempt at this would make the scene of vv. 20 ff. impossible: the impv. is pr., enjoining a practice; the communicant must test himself habitually by the great realities with which he is confronted, asking himself, e.g., whether he "discerns the Lord's body" (29).—και ούτως: scarcely sì demum (Βg.), but hoc cum animo, cf. Phil. iv. 1. δοκιμάζω, και... πινέτω—a solemn fulness of expression, in keeping with the temper of mind required; the prp. implies participation with others (cf. ix. 7, 13, x. 17).

Ver. 29. Participation in the bread and cup is itself a δοκιμάζω: "For he that eats and drinks, a judgment for himself (sentence on himself) he eats and drinks". The single art. of ο εσθίων και πίνων, combining the acts, negatives the R.C. inference from the ή of ver. 27 (see note). Contact with Christ in this ordinance probes each man to the depths (cf. John xii.48). His attitude toward the Lord at His table revealed with shocking evidence the spiritual condition of many a Cor. Christian—his carnality and blindness as one "not distinguishing the body".—The two senses given by interpreters to διακρίνω are, as Hn. says, somewhat blended here ("Beruht jedes Urtheilen auf Entscheiden und Unterscheiden"), as in διιδικάζω (Vg.); one "discerns (judges clearly and rightly of) the (Lord's) body" in the sacrament, and therein "discriminates"
the rite from all other eating and drinking—precisely what the Cor. failed to do (20 ff.). They did not discern the signified in the sign, the Incarnate and Crucified in His memorial loaf and cup, and their Supper became a mere vulgar matter of meat and drink. This ordinance exposed them for what they were—σαρκικοί (iii.3).—τὸ σῶμα (cf. 24 ff.)—a reverent ἀφοσίωσις, resembling η ἡμέρα in iii. 13 (see note); the explanation of some Lutherans, that τὸ σῶμα means "the substance" underlying the material element, is foreign to the context and to Apostolic times. On "the serious doctrinal question" as to what the unfaithful receive in the sacrament, see El. ad loc. Distinguish ἄρρωστος (unhappily rendered " damnation" in A.V.), a judicial sentence of any kind, from κατάκρισις, the final κατάκριμα, the final condemnation of the sinner (32; Rom. ν. 16).

Ver. 30. In evidence of the "judgment" which profanation of the Lord's Table entails, the Ap. points to the sad fact that "amongst you many are sick and weakly, and not a few are sleeping"—ἀσθενεῖς and ἀρρωστοὶ to cases of debility and continued ill-health—ἀγροτείς, the Christian syn. for ἀντοφθησίους (Bz.). The added κοιμῶνται (the Christian syn. for ἀνοσοῦσκοντος) shows that P. is speaking not figuratively of spiritual conditions, but literally of physical infictions which he knows to be their consequence (διὰ τοῦτο). We must be careful not to generalise from this single instance (see John ix. 3). The mere coincidence of such afflictions with the desecration of the Eucharist could not have justified P. in making this statement; he must have been conscious of some specific revelation to this effect. For ἱκανοί (a sufficient number—something like our "plenty of you"), see parls.; "something less than ἄρρωστοι, though sufficiently numerous to arouse serious attention" (El.). The "sleepers" had died in the Lord, or this term would not have been used of them; it does not appear that this visitation had singled out the profaners of the Sacrament; the community is suffering, for widely-spread offence. Both in the removal and infliction of physical evil, the inauguration of the New Covenant, as of the Old, was marked by displays of supernatural power.

Vv. 31, 32. Such chastisements may be averted; when they come, it is for our salvation: "If however we discerned (or discriminated: διειδικασμός, Vg.) ourselves, we should not be judged".—διακρίνω is taken up from ver. 29 (see note); it is distinguished from κρίνω, which in turn is contrasted with κατακρίνω (32).—τῷ κόσμῳ in the sequel explains the bearing of διακρίνω here: it expresses a discriminating judgment, by which the Christian rightly appreciates his own status and calling, and realises his distinctive character, even as the διακρίνοντα of ver. 29 realises the diff. between the κυριακὸν δείπνον and a common δείπνον. The alliterative play on κρίνω and its compounds is untranslatable; cf. ii. 13 ff., iv. 3 ff. For the form of hypothesis, see ii. 8; for the pers. of εαυτού, vi. 7.—κρίμονοι δὲ assumes, from ver. 30, as a fact the consequence hypothetically denied in the last sentence: "But under judgment as we are, we are being chastised by the Lord, in order that we may not with the world be condenmed" (κατακρίσις, judged-against, to our ruin). Thus hope is extracted from a sorrowful situation; cf. Heb. xii. 6 f., Rev. iii. 19; νοεθείας μᾶλλον ἢ καταδίκης τῷ γινόμενον (Cm.). On παιδεύω, to treat as a boy, see Trench, Syn., § 32. Plato describes παιδεία as δύναμις ἄφθονη τῇ φυσί; cf. the proverb, παθήματα μαθήματα. Ch. v. 5 is the
extreme case of such "chastening" unto salvation; cf. Ps. cxix. 67, etc.—κατακριθώμεν (aor.), a definitive pronouncement; cf. Acts xvii. 31, etc. P. associates himself, by 1st pers. pl., with the readers, sharing his Churches' troubles (2 Cor. xi. 28 f.).

Ver. 33, 34a. The "charge" (17) proceeds from inward to outward, from self-examination (28) to mutual accommodation respecting the Lord's Supper. Religious decorum depends on two conditions,—a becoming spirit associated with fitting external arrangements, such as good sense and reverence dictate: "And so, my brothers, when you meet for the meal, wait for one another".—αδελφοί μου adds a touch of affection to what has been severely said.—συνερχόμενοι carries us back to vv. 17, 20; the same train of admonition throughout.—το φαγεῖν embraces the entire Church Supper: see notes on vv. 20 f.; the order αλλήλους εκδέχεσθε (invicem spectate, Vg;) forbids the hasty and schismatic το ίδιον δείπνον προλαβεῖν (21); no one must begin supper till the Church is gathered, so that all may commence together and share alike. Το τυα for others presumes το τυαίνει to feast τυίθεντο with them.—κατακριθώμεν never means excipio (receive: so Hf., and a few others), but always expecto in the N.T.; with the former sense in cl. Gr., it signifies to receive (a person) from some particular quarter. Some might object that hunger is pressing, and they cannot wait; to these Paul says, "If any one is hungry, let him eat at home"—staying his appetite before he comes to the meeting; cf. vv. 21, 22a. The Church Supper is for good-fellowship, not for bodily need; to eat there like a famished man, absorbed in one's food—if nothing worse happen—is to exclude Christian and religious thoughts.—συνερχόμενοι, not συνερχόμενοι (18: note the absence of the art.)—"Coming together εἰς κρήμα" (for a judgment) defines the "coming together εἰς ταύτα" of ver. 17 in terms of vv. 29-32.
nature (31, xiii. 8, 13, xiv. 12). For the moment, Paul's object is twofold: first, to lay down a general criterion of the presence of Christ's Spirit (3), and then to show the wide manifoldness of His working in the community of believers (4-11).

Ver. 1. For the heading of the new topic, which runs on to the end of ch. xiv., see note on vii. i. τῶν πνευματικῶν is neut.—"concerning spiritual things (gifts, powers)," as in xiv. 1 (cf. πνευματικῶν, 12) and viii. i; not "spiritual persons" (xiv. 37, ii. 15), as Hf. and some others would have it: not the status of the persons spiritually endowed, but the operations of the Spirit who endows them are in question. "As is transitional, with a shade of antithesis to τὰ λοιπὰ . . . Βασίλειαμα: "Whatever subject I postpone I must not delay to explain the nature of spiritual gifts." (Ed.). On οὐ δεῖ άγνοεῖν, cf. note to x. 1; the Ap. has something to explain not quite obvious and highly important.

Ver. 2. On the critical reading, οὐδὲ δι' άυτὸ τὴν ἡμέραν ἤτε . . . ὡς δὲ τῶν πνευμάτων, there are two plausible constructions: (a) that of Bg., Bn. (pp. 383 f.), Ed., who regard ὡς as a resumption of the δι', after the parenthetical δι' clause, and thus translate: "You know that, when you were Gentiles,—how you were always led to those voiceless idols, being carried away." There are two reasons against this construction—(1) the improbability of δι' being forgotten after so short an interruption; (2) the inversion of the proper relation between ὡς δὲ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ἀναγκασμένοι, the former of which is naturally construed as subordinate and adverbial to the latter, the "leading to idols" supplying the condition under which the "carrying off" took place. (b) We are driven back upon the alternative construction, adopted by Est., Mr., Hn., Ev., Bt., Gd., El. (see his note, and Krüger's Sprachl., § 371, a, Anm. 1 f., for similar instances), who regard ἀναγκασμένοι as chief predicate after οὖν, and complete the ptp. by τετέθη, which is mentally taken up from the interposed temporal clause: "You know that once (οὐτί ποτέ) you were Gentiles, carried off to those voiceless idols, however you might be led, (you were) carried away." Since ὡς with ptp. complement occurs but once besides in N.T. (2 Cor. xii. 2, and there with acc. ptp., not nom. as here), the confusion between the ptp. construction and the δι' construction after οὖν, by which Mr. accounts for the grammatical irregularity, is not very probable. The emendation of W.H. (see txtl. note) is most tempting, in view of Eph. ii. 11; it wholly obviates the difficulty of grammar: "You know that once (δι' τοῦτο) you were Gentiles, carried off to those dumb idols, howsoever you might be led".—The Cor. now belonging to the λαός Θεοῦ, distinguish themselves from the ἐθνῆ (see v. 1, x. 20); to be "led away to the (worship of the) idols" is the characteristic of Gentiles (viii. 7). ἀναγκασμός implies force rather than charm in the ἀναγκασμόν; P. is not thinking of any earlier truth from which the heathen were enticed, but of the overwhelming current by which they were "carried off" (abreptos, Bz.), cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4, 2
k N.T. h.l.: εἰπείν Κύριον Ιησούν εἰ μὴ ἐν ὁ Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. 4. Ἰεροθείους καὶ μεταλλάζοντας εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα. 5. καὶ διαμερίζεται διακοινοῦσα εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος. 6. καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσίν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἄγων. 7. θέσος ὁ ἑργών ὑπὸ τὰ πάντα ἐν ὁ πάνω.

Ver. 1. See i. 7.

1 Pl. only in this ch. Rom. xi. 29. ii. 6. m Pl. h.l.: xvi. 15. 2 Cor. passim. eight times more in P.; Heb. i. 14. Rev. ii. 19. 8 times in Acts; also I K. x. 40. a H.L. o 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 12; Rom. vii. 9; Gal. ii. 8, iii. 5, v. 6; 8 times more in P.; also Jas. v. 16; Mt. xiv. 2; Mk. vi. 14. p See viii. 6. q xx. 26; Eph. i. 23; Col. iii. 11.

1 Κυριος Ιησους: ΝΑΒC, τ7, 46, 67**, 73, νg. syrsch.

Κυριον Ιησουν: DGΚLP, etc. See note below.

καὶ ο αὐτὸς (2): ΒC, 37, 46; W. H. 

καὶ ο αὐτος : DG

See note below.

ο δε αυτος : SSΑΚLP, νg. Αdd after αυτος Νς ΚL, etc.: after ενεργων, Β.

Τίμ. ii. 26, Matt. xii. 29. With this agrees the qualifying ὡς ἐν γεγος (not ἀνήγος, as Hf. and Hn. read; this gives an irrelevant sense— "led up," "led in sacrifice"), indicating the uncertainty and caprice of the directing powers— "pro nutu ducentium" (Est.). For the right sort of ἀνήγεσις, see Rom. viii. 14, Gal. v. 18.— On the ἀνθεμα, cf. vii. 4; the voicelessness of the idol is part of its nothingness (cf. Ps. cxv. 4-7, etc.): the Pagans were led by no intelligent, conscious guidance, but by an occult power behind the idol (x. 19 ff.).

Ver. 3. Their old experience of the spells of heathenism had not prepared the Cor. to understand the workings of God's Spirit and the notes of His presence. On this subject they had asked (1), and P. now gives instruction: "Wherefore I inform you." They knew how men could be " carried away " by supernatural influences; they wanted a criterion for distinguishing those truly Divine. The test P. supplies is that of loyalty to Jesus Christ. " No one speaking in the Spirit of God says ἁναθήμα Θεοῦ, and no one can say Κυριος Θεος except in the Holy Spirit." Jesus is anathema, Jesus is Lord, are the battle cries of the spirits of error and of truth contending at Cor. The second watchword is obvious, its inclusiveness is the point of interest, it certificates all true Christians, with whatever διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων (4 ft.), as possessors of the Holy Spirit, since He inspires the confession of their Master's name which makes them such (see i. 2, Rom. x. 9, Phil. ii. II, etc.). Not a mystical "tongue," but the clear intelligent confession "Jesus is Lord" marks out the genuine πνευματικὸς; cf. the parl. cry ᾿Αββα ὁ πατὴρ, of Gal. iv. 6. " He shall glorify Me," said Jesus (John xvi. 14) of the coming Spirit: this is the infallible proof of His indwelling.—But who were those who might say at Cor., " Jesus is anathema?" Faciebant gentes, says Βg., sed magis 3 μδια. ἁναθήμα (see parls.) is Ιεβραιστικὸς in Biblical use, denoting that which is εκ τῆς λέγεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑπὸ τοῦ θερινοῦ καταστασιμοῦ στήριγμα, ὡς ἐν εἰρήνῃ. So the Pagans were led by no intelligent, conscious guidance, but by an occult power behind the idol (x. 19 ff.). Such frenzied shouts, heard in moments of devotion, affected susceptible natures as with the presence of an unearthly power; hence the contrast which Παύλου draws. This watchword of hostile Jews would be taken up by the Gentile mobs which they roused against the Nazarenes, see Acts xiv. 45, xvi. 6, where βλασφημοῦντες may well include λέγοντες ἁναθήμα Ἰησοῦν. Gd., ad loc., and W. F. Slater (Faith and Life of the Early Church, pp. 348 f) suppose both cries to originate in the Church; they ascribe the anathema to heresies resembling Cerinthus and the Ophites, who separated Jesus from Christ (cf. i John ii. 18 ff., iv. 1-6); but this identification is foreign to the situation and context, and is surely an anachronism.—The distinction between λαλέω and λέγω is well
exemplified here: λαλεῖν ἐν is "to speak in the element and sphere of, under the influence of" the Holy Spirit.

Vv. 4-6. "But," while the Spirit prompts in all Christians the simultaneous confession Jesus is Lord, this unity of faith bears multiform fruit in "divisions of grace-gifts, services, workings". These are not separate classes of πνευματικά, but varied designations of the πνευματικά collectively - a trinity of blessing associating its possessors in turn with the Spirit, the Lord, and God the fountain of all. What is a χάρισμα (see i. 7) in respect of its quality and ground, is a διακονία in view of its usefulness (see 21-25), and an ενέργημα in virtue of the power operative therein.

Ver. 7. Εκάστῳ δὲ κ.τ.λ.—distributive in contrast with the collective τ. πάντιν of ver. 6; cf. Eph. iv. 6 f., and the emphatic Κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος of iii. 5-13: "But to each there is being given the manifestation of the Spirit with a view to profiting"; cf. Eph. iv. 7-16, where the διακονία is similarly portioned out amongst the members of Christ, for manifold and reciprocal service to His body. The thought of mutual benefit, there amply expressed, is here slightly indicated by προς τὸ συμφέρον (ad utilitatem, Vg.): see vii. 12, 23, 33, on this word.

δίδοται, datur (not datum est), indicates continuous bestowment, so in vv. 8 ff.: these charisms, blossoming out in rich, changeful variety, disclose the potencies of the Spirit ever dwelling in the Church.
the colourless ω μέν (for the rel. pr. in this use, cf. xi. 21); but in continuation ἄλλῳ δὲ (to another) is varied with ἄλλῳ (to some one else); the latter seems to mark a more specific, qualitative difference: cf. the interchange in xv. 39 ff., also in 2 Cor. xi. 4, and ἄριστος in xiv. 21, Rom. vii. 23; ἄριστος moreover dispenses with the contrastive δι', as conveying its own antithesis (Hn. however, against Mr., takes the pron. to be used indifferently). Accordingly, the third (faith) and eighth (tongues) in the chain of gifts indicate points of transition, in the writer's thought, from one sort of endowment to another; and the nine thus fall into three divisions, of two, five, and two members respectively, with λόγος, πίστις, γλώσσαι for their titles, the first of which exhibits the Πνεῦμα working through the νοῦς, the second in distinction from the νοῦς, and the third in supersession of the νοῦς: for this basis of discrimination, cf. xiv. 14-20; also xiii. 8, where the like threefold distinction appears in another order. The above arrangement is that of Mr.; Ed. gives a more elaborate and somewhat diff. analysis.—(a) λόγος σοφίας and γνώσεως were the charisms most abounding at Cor.: see i. 5, and the relevant notes on i. 17, 30, ii. 1, 4. "Wisdom" is the larger acquisition,—the truth of God wrought into the man; "knowledge" is that truth intellectually apprehended and objectified: see Ed. ad loc., who says, "The παρέκβασις οf σοφία is mysticism, of γνώσεως is rationalism". Expressed in λόγος, both gifts serve the Church πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον (7); they are the qualifications of pastor and teacher respectively. "The Spirit" is the channel (διά) conveying Wisdom; "the same Spirit" is the standard (κατὰ) regulating Knowledge.—(b) πίστις impresses its character on the whole second series; standing alone, with emphasis, it implies an energy and demonstrativeness of faith (cf. παρά πίστις, xiii. 2), ein Glaubenskristos (Mr.): λόγαρα and δυνάμεις are operations of such faith in the material sphere, by way of miracle; προφητεία and διάκρισις πνευμάτων, in the purely spiritual sphere, by way of revelation. Faith however may be exhibited in conspicuous degree apart from these particular demonstrations (cf. Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21, Mark xvi. 17 f.). The first two of the five are imparted "in (i.e., grounded upon, exercised in the sphere of) the same Spirit"; what is said of these is understood of the other three (cf. ἐν in ver. 3): "in the same Spirit" dwell the endowments of a fruitful understanding and of a potent faith; "in the one Spirit"—in His power and bestowment alone—all "gifts of healings" lie (cf. Mark iii. 28 ff.). The λόγαρα (acts of healing; see parl.) are χαρίσματα by eminence—gracious acts (cf. Luke vii. 21, ἄλλος (παρά διά κατὰ κατὰ): the δυνάμεις (powers, see parl.) display strength rather than grace, e.g., in the sentence of v. 5 above, or that contemplated in 2 Cor. xii. 2 ff., 10; they are "acts of energy".—Προφητεία, as an edifying gift of speech, is akin to the λόγος graces of (a); it is contrasted with γλώσσαι (c) in xiv., as being an intelligent exercise. But prophecy, while employing the νοῦς, has a deeper seat; it is no branch of σοφία or γνώσις as though coming by rational insight, but an ἀποκάλυψις of hidden things of God realised through a peculiar clearness and intensity of faith (2 Cor. iv. 13 f.; Heb. xi. 1, 13; Luke x. 21 f., etc.), and is in line therefore with the miraculous powers preceding; hence "the prophet" is regularly distinguished from "the teacher".—"Discernment of spirits" is the counterpart and safeguard of "prophesying."
demanding the like super-rational penetration; the true critic may not have originative faculty, but his mind moves in the same region with that of the originator and tracks his steps. 

The spirit, pl., for this gift had many and various occasions of exercise; see pass., also for 

διακρίσεις, vi. 5, etc.; as to the power itself and the need for its exercise, cf. 

I Thess. v. 20 ff., 2 Thess. ii. 2, 9 ff., 1 John ii. 18 ff., iv. 1-6, Matt. xxiv. 11 f. 

P. exhibits this διακρίσις admirably in ver. 3 above; it displays itself in Acts xiii. 8 ff., along with the ένεργημα δυνάμεως; cf. Acts v. 1-11.—(c) The "kinds of tongues," with their attendant "interpretation," constitute the third order of specific charisms; in this exercise the intelligence of the speaker is suspended. 

The γλώσσαι, ranked first by the Cor. because of their sensational character, Ρ. enumerates last in regard of "profiting" (7), ch. xiv. will justify this relative depreciation. The "tongues" of this Ep. cannot have signified the power to speak strange languages in missionary preaching, as many have inferred from the terms used in the account of the manifestation of the Day of Pentecost; see notes on Acts ii. 4-11. γένη implies that this ecstatic phenomenon was far from uniform; the "new tongues" of Mark xvi. 17, together with the indications of ch. xiii. 1 and xiv. of this Ep., point to the breaking out of an exalted and mystical utterance differing from all recognised human speech; this utterance varied at diff. times and places in its mode and attendant conditions, and in the impression it produced on the hearers; it is regularly spoken of in the pl. The necessity of έρμηνεία for the extraction of any benefit to the Church from the Tongues will be shown in ch. xiv.; sometimes the possessor of the Tongue became interpreter also (xiv. 13). On the γλώσσαι generally, see Ed., ad loc.; also H. 

Ver. 11 sums up the last par. (4-10), impressing on the Cor. with redoubled emphasis the variety in unity of the "gifts," and vindicating the sanctity of each: "But all these things worketh the one and the same Spirit" (cf. 9). In the qualifying clause, "dividing separately (seorsim) as He wills," διαιρεῖ αυτὸ το Πνεύμα is assumed from ver. 7; ίδια adds the thought that the Spirit deals with each recipient by himself, individually and appropriately (cf. vii. 7, iii. 8, xv. 23); while καθώς 

βούλεται signifies that He acts in the distribution upon His choice and judgment, where lies the hidden reason for the giving or withholding of each particular gift.—For 

βούλεται, see parls.; and for its difference from εθέλω, cf. ver. 18; also iv. 19, 21, and parls. Ευριπ., Ηιππ., I. 329 f., supplies a good example of the distinction, οὐδεὶς απαντάν βούλεται προθυμία τή τού θέλοντος, αλλ' 

άφιστάμεθ' αεί: "None of us likes to cross the purpose of one that is bent on anything, but we always stand aside." No predicate could more strongly imply personality than does 

βούλεται. 

§ 40. The One Body, of Many Members, xii. 12-20. The manifold graces, ministries, workings (4 ff.), that proceed from the action of the Holy Spirit in the Christian community, stand not only in common dependence upon Him (§ 39), but are mutually bound to each other. The Church of Christ is "the body" for the Spirit of God; and these operations are its correlated functional activities (12 f.). Differentiation is of the essence of bodily life. The unity of the Church is not that of inorganic nature,—a monotonous aggregation of similars, as in a pool of water or a heap of stones; it is the oneness of a living organism, no member of which exercises the same faculty as another. Without "many members," contrasted as foot with hand or sight with smell (14-17), there would be no body at all, but only a single monstrous limb (19). In God's creative plan, it is the integration and
The one Spirit, the leading thought of § 39, suggests the similitude of “the body” for the Church (called in ch. iii. the tillage, building, temple of God), since this is the seat of His multifarious energies. In the Eph. and Col. Epp. τὸ σῶμα becomes a fixed title for the Christian community, setting forth its relation both to the inhabiting Spirit and to the sovereign Head; as yet it remains a plastic figure. Aristotle had applied this image to the State, the body politic, and the idea was a Gr. common place. The Ap. is still insisting on the breadth of the Holy Spirit’s working, as against Cor. partisanship and predilection for miraculous endowments; hence the reiterated εν and πολλά, also the emphatic πάντα of the second clause: “but all the members of the body, many as they are (πολλά όντα), are one body.” In applying the comparison, Paul writes not as one expects, οὕτως ή εκκλησία or οὕτως ημείς, but with heightened solemnity οὕτως και ο Χριστός, “so also is the Christ!” “Christ stands by metonymy for the community united through Him and grounded in Him” (Hn.). This substitution shows how realistic was P.’s conception of believers as subsisting “in Christ,” and raises the idea of Church-unity to its highest point; “all the members are instinct with one personality” (Ed.): cf. Gal. ii. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 3, 5, for this identification in the case of the individual Christian. The later representation of Christ and the Church as Head and Body is implicit in this phrase. For Χριστός with art., cf. i. 12, x. 4, etc.; also Eph. v. 23 ff.

Ver. 13. καὶ γὰρ ἐν εἷς Πνεύματι κ.τ.λ.: “For indeed in one Spirit we all into one body were baptized—whether Jews or Greeks, whether bondmen or freemen—and we all of one Spirit were made to drink,”—were drenched (Εν.). An appeal to experience (cf. Gal. iii. 2 ff., iv. 6; also Acts xix. 2-6): at their baptism the Cor. believers, differing in race and rank, were consciously made one; one Spirit flooded their souls with the love and joy of a common faith in Christ.—For βαπτίζω εν and εἰς, see pars.: εν defines the element and ruling influence of the baptism, εἰς the relationship to which it introduces. P. refers to actual Christian baptism, the essence of which lay in the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit (John iii. 5 ff., Tit. iii. 5 f.); baptism represents the entire process of personal salvation which it seals and attests (Eph. i. 13, Gal. iii. 26 ff., Rom. vi. 2 ff.), as the Queen’s coronation imports her whole investiture with royalty. That Jews and Greeks, slaves and freemen, had received at the outset an identical Spirit, shows that they were intended to form a single body, and that this body was designed to have a wide variety of members (11 f.).—ισοτιθεμένων (see pars.) has been referred by Cm., Aug., Cv., Est., and latterly by Hn., to the ποτήριον of the Lord’s Supper (x. 16, xi. 25), as though καὶ coupled the two consecutive Sacraments (cf. x. 2 f., and notes); but the tense, parl. to ἐβαπτίσθημεν (otherwise in x. 16, etc.), points to a past event, not a repeated act; and it is “the blood of Christ,” not the Holy Spirit, that fills (symbolically) the Eucharistic cup. The two aors. describe the same primary experience under opposite figures (the former of which is acted in baptism), as an outward affusion and an inward absorption; the Cor. were at once immersed in (cf. συνετάφημεν, Rom. vi. 4) and saturated with the Spirit; the
Paul addressed the Corinthians about the diversity of spiritual gifts and how each member of the Church contributes uniquely to the unity and body. He explained that although the foot and ear do not have the powers of the hand and eyes, they are indispensable parts of the body. He warned against members feeling inferior or dissatisfied with their roles, emphasizing the importance of each member's unique contribution to the Church's function. Paul concluded that it is God's will to appoint the members of the Church in their respective places and offices, and we should not feel inferior or dissatisfied with our roles.
19. eι δέ ἦν τὰ πάντα ἐν μέλος, τοῦ τὸ σῶμα; 20. νῦν δὲ
πολλὰ μὲν ἐμὴ, ἐν δὲ σῶμα.

21. Οἱ δύναται δὲ οὖθαλμος εἰπεῖν τῇ χειρί, ὡς Ἱερεῖν σου οὐκ ἐξ ἐμῆς ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῖς ποιήσῃ, ὡς Ἱερεῖν ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐχόμεν.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

Ε" ομ. τὰ (7) ΒΓ, 17; Lach., Tr., W.H. bracket.
νῦν, GP; see ver. 18.

Ομ. μεν (?) BD, 73, Aug. So W.H. tnt.; Lachm., Tr. brackets.

Ομ. δε ACGP, 17, 37, syrach. cop. (Alex. and late Western); ΝΒDΚL, vg. retain.

For τίθημι in mid. voice, cf. ver. 28 and other parts.; the tense refers the Divine appointment constituting the body to past time generally—"has set," rather than "set." The prefixed εν singles out the individual for the Divine regard, distributed by τιθήμην; each limb by itself has its part assigned by God.—ἐθέλησεν signifies determining will, as βούλεται (II, note) discriminating choice.

Vv. 19, 20 rehearse the doctrine of vv. 12-14, now vividly illustrated by vv. 15 ff., p35, that a manifold variety of organs is indispensable for the existence of the Church. First the principle is suggested by a rhetorical question, in the strain of ver. 17: "But if all were one member, where (were) the body!" Secondly, it is affirmed, with grave conclusiveness: "But as the case stands (νῦν δὲ)—Many members, yet one body."—Πολλὰ μέλη, ἐν δὲ σῶμα sums up the whole exposition in a concise epigram, which was perhaps already proverbial (cf. ix. 24).—ἄτινων hardly needs to be supplied. Cf., for the thought, x. 17, and notes on vv. 12, 14 above.

§ 41. The Mutual Dependence of the Body's Members, xii. 21-31a. Mutiliformity, it has been shown, is of the essence of organic life. But the variously endowed members, being needful to the body, are consequently necessary to each other—those that seem "weaker" sometimes the more so (21 f.), while the less honoured have a dignity of their own; thus all the members cherish mutual respect and fellow-feeling (23-26). This holds good of the Church, with its numerous grades of personal calling and endowment (27 f.). No one charism belongs to all Christians (29 f.). There is choice and purpose in God's distributive appointments, which leave, moreover, room for man's personal effort. We should desire the best of His gifts (31).

Ver. 21 personifies again the physical members, in the fashion of vv. 15 f.: there the inferior disparated itself as though it were no part of the body at all; here the superior disparages its fellow, affecting independence. "The eye (might wish to say but) cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee! or the head in turn to the feet, I have no need of you!" The eye and head are imagined looking superciliously on their contemporaries; in vv. 15 f. the ear and foot effect the part of discontented rivals.—οὐ οὖν—a moral and practical impossibility (cf. x. 21): at every turn the eye wants the hand, or the head calls on the foot, in order to reach its ends; the keen eye and scheming head of the paralytic—what a picture of impotence! The famous Roman fable of the Belly and the Members is recalled by the Apostle's apologue. There is no such thing in the physical, nor in the social, fabric as independence.—πάλιν (cf. iii. 20, 2 Cor. x. 7, Rom. xv. 10, vicissim (Hn.)), rather than iterum (Vg.) or rursum (Bz.), aduces another instance of the same kind as the former.

Vv. 22-24a. "On the contrary" (αλλ'α), instead of the more powerful and dignified (23) bodily parts dispensing with the humbler (21), it is "much more" the case that these latter—"the weaker" or "less honourable as they may seem to be" (τὰ δοκοῦτα ἡμῶν ὑπάρχειν)—"are necessary" in themselves (22), and treated with "more abundant honour" in our care of the body. By πολλὰ μάλλον (cf. Plato, Phaedo, 8o E, ἄλλα πολλὰ μάλλον), molto potius
PROS KORINThIOUS Ἄ

19—26.

See i. 27.


See ii. 7.


See iii. 25.

See ii. 7.

See ii. 7.

See i. 7.

See vii. 32.

With ὑπερ, N. T. h., Ps. xxxvii. 18.

For τιμή., Rom. ix. 21, xii. το, xiii. 7; Ι Τim. ν. 17, vi. 1: 2 Τim. ii. 20 f.: Ι Ρet. iii. 7. 

-σις, 1 Ρet. iii. 3. 

For τιμη., Rom. ν. 32. 

-Rom. i. 27; Rev. -ον, see vii. 35; -ονως, xi. 40. ο Ηeb. vi. 2. 

See i. 7. g See i. 10. f See vii. 32. With ὑπερ, N. T. h., Ps. xxxvii. 18. s See iii. 22.

1 νοτεροιντι, Ν*DGKL, etc.—Western and Syrian.

2 οχιματια, Ν*DGL, above 30 minusc.—Western. So Tisch.6, Treg. marg.; other edd. οχιμα: cf. i, 10, xi. 18.

3 αιτι (?) BG, some latt. vg. (et si quid), Ambrst. (Western). So Lachm., Treg. Favoured by its dissidence from the parl. αιτι. A omits altogether.

(Bz.) or a fortoiri (Ev.), the position of ver. 21 is more than negative; the inferior members are not merely shielded from contempt, but guarded with exceptional respect. By the "weaker" and "ignobler" parts P. cannot mean the hands or feet spoken of in ver. 21, for these are strong and usually uncovered (see περιτίθεμεν, 23); but members in appearance quite subordinate and actually feeble—viz., the more delicate vital organs. Amongst these the ἀσχήμονα signify definitely τα αἴηδα, que inhonestas sunt (Vg.); cf. Rev. xvi. 15, την ἀσχημοσύνην.—The διαθέτερα and ατιμετέρα, the "comparatively weak" and "feeble" (comparativus nullius, Bg.), wide categories applicable to the same members from different points of view. Weakness, in the case, e.g., of the heart, is compensated by needfulness; ignobility, as in the viscera, by careful tendance shown in ample clothing—"we put about them (clothe them with) a more abundant honour" (for the use of τιμή, cf. ἱερουργία in xi. 10). The unseemliness (indecency) attaching to certain organs, always guarded from sight, "brings with it (ἔχει, cf. Heb. x. 35) a more abundant seemliness." Against most comment. (Gd., e.g., thinks only of "les soins de la toilette"!), Ed. maintains that ἐσχημοσύνη (23) has a moral sense, looking beyond the honour of apparel; "the greater comeliness relates rather to function". Is any office more responsible than that of parenthood, anything more sacred than the mother's womb and mother's breast? (cf. Luke xi. 27; also Heb. xiii. 4).—τα δὲ ἐσχήμονα κτλ.: "But our seemly parts"—head and face, e.g. (the human face divine)—"have no need," their distinction being conspicuous; see xi. 7a, where this visible, but also moral, ευσχημοσύνη is raised to its highest grade. From this text Bg. inferred the impiety of patches!—On ὑπάρχειν, see note to xi. 7; δοκεῖ has in vv. 22 f. its two meanings—non-personal and personal—of seem and suppose; like methinks and I think, Germ. dunken and denken.

Vv. 24b, 25. "But God compounded (συνεκέρασεν, mixed together; Vg. contemptivit) the body." The assertion of God's workmanship in the structure of the physical organs (cf. 18) was necessary, when many think the evil of matter and regarded physical appetites as degrading (cf. 1 Tim. iv. 3, Col. ii. 23; also vi. 13, 18 ff. above). This accounts for the adversative ἀλλά—"Nay but": P. tacitly contradicts those who saw nothing but ατιμία and ἀσχημοσύνη in vital bodily functions. For ὁ Θεός συνιέται, cf. Ps. cxxxix. 13-16 (where the womb is "God's laboratory," Deitzsch), Eccl. xi. 5, Job x. 8-11. Ed. reads the assertion as directed against philosophy; "where Aristotle says 'nature,' P. says 'God'."—τα ὑπάρχοντα περισσοτέραν δοῦν τιμήν, "to the part which suffers lack (opus habenti, Cv.: cf. note, i. 7) having assigned more abundant honour"; so that the human instinct respecting the ignobler organs of the body (ver. 23) is the reflex of a Divine ordinance: cf. xi. 14 f., to the like effect.—"That there may not be division (ὁχιμα:
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ΧΙΙ.

υπ.

συμπάσχει πάντα τα μέλη. "είτε δοξάζεται εν μέλος, συγχαίρει πάντα τα μέλη. 27. υμείς δέ "σώμα "Χριστού, και "είτε δοξάζεται εν μέλος, συγχαίρει πάντα τα μέλη. 27. υμείς δέ έστε σώμα "Χριστού, και μέλη εκ μέρους. 28. και ούς μεν θεός εν τῇ Εκκλησίᾳ "χαίρει πάντα τα μέλη, εκκλησία που επιτελούσα τροποι, προφήτας τριτον και διδασκάλους, μέλη εκ μέρους. 28. και ούς μεν Θεός εν τῇ Εκκλησίᾳ συμπάσχει πάντα τα μέλη, εκκλησία που επιτελούσα τροποι, προφήτας τριτον και διδασκάλους, μέλη εκ μέρους. 28. και ούς μεν Θεός εν τῇ Εκκλησίᾳ συμπάσχει πάντα τα μέλη, εκκλησία που επιτελούσα τροποι, προφήτας τριτον και διδασκάλους, μέλη εκ μέρους.

1 Om. εν Μ*ΑΒ, Thdr. So the crit. edd.

μελος, D*, latt. vg. (membra de membro), syrΡ., and many Ff. (ουκ ειπεν μελη εκ μελων, αλλα μελη πολλα εκ μελους ενος μελος γαρ η κεφαλη του ολου σωματος: Severian, in Calchua). A characteristic Western variant.

εκκλησία, all unce. but KL. DG, Hil., Amb. omit.

see pars.) in the body"—the manifestation of the jealousy or scorn depicted in vv. 16 and 21, which have their counterpart at present in the Cor. Church (i. 10 ff., iv. 6, etc.).—The opposite state of things (άλλα), so desirable in the spiritual organism, is realised by Divine art in the natural: "God tempered the body together" in this way, "that... the members might have the same solicitude for one another." The physical members are obliged, by the structure of the frame, to care for one another; the hand is as anxious to guard the eye or the stomach, to help the mouth or the foot, as to serve itself; the eye is watchman for every other organ; each feels its own usefulness and cherishes its fellows; all "have the same care," since they have the same interest—that of "the one body." This societas membrorum makes the physical order both a parable of and a basis for the spiritual. For το αυτό, cf. i. 10, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Phil. ii. 2, etc.—μεριμνώσιν (see esp. vii. 32 ff., for this shade of meaning) is in pr. sbj., of habitual feeling: in pl., despite neut. subject, since the μελή have been individually personified (15 f., 21).

Ver. 26 illustrates the unselfish solicitude of the bodily organs: the nervous connexion makes it a veritable συμπάθεια (συμπάσχει). Plato applies the same analogy to the State in a striking passage in his Politicus, 462C; see also Cm., ad loc.—δοξάζεται (glorificatur, Cv.; not gloriatur, Vg.) goes beyond nervous sympathy: "δόξα is more than ευεξία" (Ed.): for δοξάζω, applied to the body, cf. xv. 40 ff., Phil. iii. 21. Cm. says finely, "When the head is crowned, the whole man feels itself glorified; when the mouth speaks, the eyes laugh and are filled with gladness".

Ver. 27. The figure of the body, developed from ver. 14 to 26 with deliberation and completeness, is now applied in detail to the Church, where the same solidarity of manifold parts and powers obtains (4 ft.): "Now you are (υμείς δέ έστε) a body of (in relation to) Christ, and members severally"—scarcely "the body of Christ ' specifically (ΕΙ.), as if R. might have written το σώμα του Χριστού (as in Εph. ίν.12, etc.); this has not yet become the recognised title of the Church (see note on 12 above) : nor is the anarthrous σώμα to be read distributively, as though the Cor. Church were thought of as one amongst many σώματα. R. is interpreting his parable: the Cor. are, in their relation to Christ, what the body is to the man.—Χριστού is anarthrous by correlation (cf. note on Θεού σοφίαν, ii.7).—εκ μέρους signifies the partial by contrast, not as in xiii.g with the perfect, but with the τω whole (body)—particularum (Bz.): έκ of the point of view—"from (and so according to) the part (allotted to each)"; see ver. 11; cf. also μεριμναί in vii. 17, etc.; similarly, έκ μέτρου in John iii. 34. έκ λοιπὸντος in 2 Cor. viii. 13.

Ver. 28 expands the μέλη εκ μέρους, ούς μεν (cf. 8 ff.) should be followed by ούς δέ; but πρώτον intervening suggests δεύτερον, τρίτον in the sequel—"instead of a mere enumeration P. prefers an ar-
...
these "powers" are in vv. 28 and 8 ff. so decidedly separated from the teaching and associated with the healing gifts, that δυνάμεις appears to look forward, and to be obj. (prospectively) to ἡχονον along with χαρίσματα λαμποντα: "do all possess powers? all grace-gifts of healings?" (so Bz., Mr., Ed.). For δυνάμεις see, Rev. iii. 8; also Acts ix. 1, Acts i. 8, Matt. xiv. 2.

Ver. 3α shows the difference which an indolent nature or weak judgment might draw from vv. 29 f., supposing that God's sovereign ordinations supercedes man's effort. Our striving has a part to play, along with God's bestowment, in spiritual acquisitions; hence the contrast εδέ. "But (for all that) be zealous after the greater gifts." A man must not, e.g., be content to "speak with tongues" when he might "prophecy" (xiv. 1 ff.), nor to work miracles when beside that he might teach in the "word of wisdom."—ζηλούω (see parl.) implies in its good sense an ardent, in its bad sense (xiii. 4) an emulous pursuit.

The greater (μείζονα) gifts are those in intrinsically greater, or more beneficial (xv. 5)—conditions usually coincident.

§ 42. THE WAY TO CHRISTIAN EMINENCE, xii. 31b-xiii. 3. Carefully and luminously Paul has set forth the manifoldness of the Holy Spirit's gifts that contribute to common life of the Church. All are necessary, all honourable in their proper use, but some are more conspicuous and desirable than others. But if these "greater gifts" be sought in selfish emulation (as the θλοιντα of ver. 31α, taken by itself, might suggest), their true purpose and blessing will be missed; gifts of grace (χαρισματα) are not for men actuated by the οθαλος of party spirit and ambition (cf. 4 f., iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 20, Gal. v. 20). While encouraging the Cor. to seek larger spiritual powers, the Ap. must "besides point out" the "way" to this end (31b), the way to escape the perils besetting their progress (4 ff.) and to win the goal of the Christian life (8-13). Love is the path to power in the Church; all loveless abilities, endowments, sacrifices are, from the Christian point of view, simply good for nothing (1-3).
of the climax: "aye, and of angels!"

describes this mystic utterance at its highest (c.f. λαλεῖ Θεῷ, xiv. 2)—a mode of expression above this world. Possibly P. associated the supernatural γλῶσσαι, by which he was himself distinguished (xv. 18), with the ἀρρητά ρήματα heard by him "in paradise" (2 Cor. xii. 4); c.f. the "song" (Rev. xiv. 2 f.) which only "those redeemed out of the earth" understand. The Rabbis held Hebræus to be the language of the angels.—χαλκός denotes any instrument of brass; κύμβαλον, the particular loud and shrill instrument which the sound of the tongues "resembled.

Ver. 2. Prophecy in its widest range, and faith at its utmost stretch—in those lacking love, both amount to "nothing!" (ἐὰν εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα κ.τ.λ.), "If I know all the mysteries (of revelation) and all the knowledge (relating thereto)," explains κατὰ λόγων της προφητείας by stating the source, or resources, from which "prophecy" is drawn: τὰς κατὰ τ. μυστ., posits a mental grasp of the contents of revelation added to the supernatural insight which discovers them (see notes on λόγων γνώσεως and προφητείας, xiii. 8 ff.), as e.g. in the case of Isaiah. Hn. supplies ήξων, instead of the nearer εἰδῶ, before τ. γνώσεως and προφητείας, xii. 10, reading "as if I have all knowledge" as a second, distinct assumption following on "if I know all mysteries," on account of the incongruity of Prophecy and Knowledge; but the point of P.'s extreme supposition lies in this unusual combination—the intellect of a philosopher joined to the inspiration of a seer. —For μυστήρια, see note on ii. 1.—πιστίν (see note on xii. 9) ὥστε μεθιστάνειν ὀρή—an allusion to the hyperbolical sayings of Jesus ad rem (Matt. xvii. 20, xx. 21; see notes in vol. i.); in the pr. (continuous) inf.—"to remove mountain after mountain!" (Ed.). Whatever God may be pleased to accomplish through such a man (c.f. iii. 9), he is personally worthless. On the form οὐθέν, see Wm., p. 48; for the thought, c.f. iii. 18, 2 Cor. xii. 11, Gal. vi. 3.

Ver. 3. The suppositions of these three vv. cover three principal forms of activity in the Church—the spheres, vis., of supernatural manifestation, of spiritual influence, of material aid (3); loveless men who show conspicuous power in these several respects, in the first in-

Vol. II.
ΧΙΙΙ. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ

and activity in good. In the negative movement, the first half-lines set forth Love's attitude—free from jealousy, arrogance (cf. iv. 6b), avarice, grudge-bearing; while the second member in each case sets forth her temper—modest, refined in feeling, pliable, having her joy in goodness. The third movement reverts to the opening note, on which it descants.—For the individual words: μακροθυμέω is to be long-tempered (longanimis est, Er.)—a characteristic of God (Rom. ii. 4, etc.)—patient towards injurious or provoking persons; this includes οὐ παροξυσμονται; ου λογιζεται το κακον, παντα στεγει; whereas υπομενει, closing the list, signifies patience in respect of adverse and afflicting circumstances; the two unite in Col. i. 11: see Trench, Syn., § lii.: χρηστευται—a vb. perhaps of Paul's coining—plays the part of a χρηστος (benignus), one who renders gracious, well-disposed service to others (Trench, Syn., § lxiii): P. associates μακροθυμεω and ηροτισται repeatedly (see pars.).—ου αδικια and αληθεια are similarly contrasted in 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12.—The four παντα clauses form a chiasmus: the first and fourth relating to the bearing of ill, the second and third to expectation of good in others; the first pair belong to the present, the last to the future. For στεγει, see pars.; Bz. and a few others render the clause "omnia tegit," in accordance with the radical sense of the vb.; but suffert (Vg.) is its Pauline, and also prevalent cl. sense.—Πίστις appears
r Cf. xii. 27. Cf. "καταργηθησεται": 9. ἵνα μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν καὶ ἵνα μέρους προφητεύομεν. 10. ἔτων δὲ Πέλαγος ἔν τοῦ προφετεύομεν, τότε τὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ προφετεύομεν.
11. οὕτως ἠμῖν "νήπιος, ὡς "νήπιος ἡ προφητεία, ὡς "νήπιος ἡ Γάλανος, ὡς "νήπιος ἡ ἐφόρονος, ὡς "νήπιος ἡ ἀλοιφήνος 2. ὡς "νήπιος ἡ καταργήσεται, ὡς "νήπιος ἡ καταργήσε...
9. - ΙΟΙ
ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ
γαρ "αρτι" ἐσοπτρον εν αἰνίγματι, τότε δε πρόσωπον πρός
καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην. 13. νῦν δε μένει πιστις, ὁπις, ἀγάπη,
tὰ τρία ταῦτα. μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη.

below. c N.T. h.l.; Num. xii. 8; Sir. xxxix. 3.
3 Jo. 14; Num. xii. 8; also 2 Cor. iii. 18.
many times in Syn. GG. and Acts. For the antith., εἰ. viii. 2 f.; Gal. iv. 9.
For compar. with παντων, xν. 19, Mt. xiii. 32, Lk. ix. 46.
See xii. 3 Ι.
N.Τ. h.l.; Num. xii. 8; Sir. xxxix. 3.
See note d Ν.Τ. h.l.; Gen. xxxii. 30. Cf. 2 Jo. τα;
Ν.Τ. h.l.; Num. xii. 8; Sir. xxxix. 3.
See xii. τ8.
Ver. 12 figures in another way the contrast between the present partial and the coming perfect Christian state, in respect particularly of knowledge: it is the diff. between discernment by broken reflexion and by immediate intuition.
"For we see now through a mirror, in (the fashion of) a riddle, but then face to face."—βλέπω, as distinguished from οράω, points to the fact and manner of seeing rather than the object seen (see parls.). On ἀρτι see note to iv. i1; it fastens on the immediate present.—δι’ ἐσοπτρον, "by means of a mirror": ancient mirrors made of burnished metal—a specialty of Cor.—were poor reflectors: the art of silvering glass was discovered in the 13th century.—έσοπτρον = κάτοπτρον (2 Cor. iii. 18), or ἐνοπτρον (cl. Gr.); not διόπτρα, speculare, the semi-transparent window of talc (the lapis specularis of the ancients), as some have explained the term. Cf. Philo, De Decal., § 21, "As by a mirror, the reason discerns images of God acting and making the world and administering the universe"; also Plato’s celebrated representation (Republic, vii., 514) of the world of sense as a train of shadows imaging the real. Mr., Hf., Gd., Al., El. adopt the local sense of δια, "through a mirror," in allusion to the appearance of the imaged object as behind the reflector: but it is the dimness, not the displacement, of the image that P. is thinking of. —Such a sight of the Divine realities, in blurred reflexions, presents them ἐν αἰνίγματι, enigmatically—"in (the shape of) a riddle" rather than a full intelligible view. Divine revelation opens up fresh mysteries; advanced knowledge raises vaster problems. With our defective earthly powers, this is inevitable.—πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, Heb. πανίμ 'el'panim (see parls.), with a reminiscence of Num. xii. 8, οτάμα κατὰ στόμα ... καὶ οὐ δι’ αἰνίγματων (referring to the converse of God with Moses): the "face" to which ours will be turned, is God’s. God is the tacit obj. of ver. 12b, which interprets the above figure: "Now I know (γινώσκω, a learner’s knowledge: see i. 21, etc.; contrast οράω, 2 above and ii. ι1) partially; but then I shall know-well (ἐπιγνώσομαι), as also I was well-known ".
God has formed a perfect apprehension of the believing soul (viii. 3); He possesses an immediate, full, and interested discernment of its conditions (Rom. viii. 27, etc.); its future knowledge will match, in some sense, His present knowledge of it, the searching effect of which it has realised (Gal. iv. 9, etc.).
Ver. 13. νῦν δε μένει κ.τ.λ.—final conclusion of the matter, μένει being antithetical to πίπτει κ.τ.λ. of the foregoing: "But as it is (nunc autem), there abides faith, hope, love—these three!" they stay; the others pass (8 ff.). Faith and Hope are elements of the perfect and permanent state; new objects of trust and desire will come into sight in the widening visions of the life eternal. But Love, both now and then, surpasses its companions, being the character of God (viii. 3, 1 John iv. 8, 16); in Love is the fruition of Faith’s efforts (Gal. v. 6) and Hope’s anticipations; it alone gives worth to every human power (1-3). The popular interpretation, since Cm., has read νῦν as temporal instead of logical, identifying it with the ἀρτι of ver. 12, as though the Ap. meant that for the present Faith and Hope "abide" with Love, but Love alone "abides" for ever. But P. puts the three on the same footing in respect of enduriness—"these three" in comparison with the other three of ver. 8—pointedly adding Faith and Hope to share and support the "abiding" of Love; "love is greater among these," not more lasting.—For μείζων with partitive gen., cf. Matt. xxiii. 11, and see Wr., p. 303. For the pregnant, absolute μένει, cf. iii. 14, 1 John ii. 6, 2 John 2.

sun vir. Hiems non affert ver; sed ver pellit hiemem: sic est in anima et ecclieasia" (Bhg.).—γίγοναι and κατήργηκαν, in pf. of abiding result; for καταργέω, cf. i. 28 and parls.
Ver. 12 figures in another way the contrast between the present partial and the coming perfect Christian state, in respect particularly of knowledge: it is the diff. between discernment by broken reflexion and by immediate intuition.
"For we see now through a mirror, in (the fashion of) a riddle, but then face to face."—βλέπω, as distinguished from οράω, pointsto the fact and manner of seeing rather than the object seen (see parls.). On ἀρτι see note to iv. i1; it fastens on the immediate present.—δι’ ἐσοπτρον, "by means of a mirror": ancient mirrors made of burnished metal—a specialty of Cor.—were poor reflectors: the art of silvering glass was discovered in the 13th century.—έσοπτρον = κάτοπτρον (2 Cor. iii. 18), or ἐνοπτρον (cl. Gr.); not διόπτρα, speculare, the semi-transparent window of talc (the lapis specularis of the ancients), as some have explained the term. Cf. Philo, De Decal., S 2π, "As by a mirror, the reason discerns images of God acting and making the world and administering the universe"; also Plato’s celebrated representation (Republic, vii., 514) of the world of sense as a train of shadows imaging the real. Mr., Hf., Gd., Al., El. adopt the localsense of διά, "through a mirror," in allusion to the appearance of the imaged object as behind thereflector: but it is the dimness, not the displacement, of the image that P. is thinking of. —Such a sight of the Divine realities, in blurred reflexions, presents them ἐν αἰνίγματι, enigmatically—"in (the shape of) a riddle" rather than a full intelligible view. Divine revelation opens up fresh mysteries; advanced knowledge raises vaster problems. With our defective earthly powers, this is inevitable.—πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, Heb. πανίμ 'el'panim (see parls.), with a reminiscence of Num. xii. 8, οτάμα κατὰ στόμα ... καὶ οὐ δι’ αἰνίγματων (referring to the converse of God with Moses): the "face" to which ours will be turned, is God’s. God is the tacit obj. of ver. 12b, which interprets the above figure: "Now I know (γινώσκω, a learner’s knowledge: see i. 21, etc.; contrast οράω, 2 above and ii. ι1) partially; but then I shall know-well (ἐπιγνώσομαι), as also I was well-known ".
God has formed a perfect apprehension of the believing soul (viii. 3); He possesses an immediate, full, and interested discernment of its conditions (Rom. viii. 27, etc.); its future knowledge will match, in some sense, His present knowledge of it, the searching effect of which it has realised (Gal. iv. 9, etc.).
Ver. 13. νῦν δε μένει κ.τ.λ.—final conclusion of the matter, μένει being antithetical to πίπτει κ.τ.λ. of the foregoing: "But as it is (nunc autem), there abides faith, hope, love—these three!" they stay; the others pass (8 ff.). Faith and Hope are elements of the perfect and permanent state; new objects of trust and desire will come into sight in the widening visions of the life eternal. But Love, both now and then, surpasses its companions, being the character of God (viii. 3, 1 John iv. 8, 16); in Love is the fruition of Faith’s efforts (Gal. v. 6) and Hope’s anticipations; it alone gives worth to every human power (1-3). The popular interpretation, since Cm., has read νῦν as temporal instead of logical, identifying it with the ἀρτι of ver. 12, as though the Ap. meant that for the present Faith and Hope "abide" with Love, but Love alone "abides" for ever. But P. puts the three on the same footing in respect of enduriness—"these three" in comparison with the other three of ver. 8—pointedly adding Faith and Hope to share and support the "abiding" of Love; "love is greater among these," not more lasting.—For μείζων with partitive gen., cf. Matt. xxiii. 11, and see Wr., p. 303. For the pregnant, absolute μένει, cf. iii. 14, 1 John ii. 6, 2 John 2.
§ 44. The Gifts of Tongues and of Prophecy, xiv. 1-6. The digression upon ἡ διάστημα has not diverted us from the subject of this Div.; Love has shown the way (xii. 31b) in which all τὰ πνευματικά (xii. 1, xiv. 1) are to be sought, the animating principle and ulterior aim that should govern their exercise. But the principle of Love supplies, further, a criterion by which the charisms are to be relatively estimated—their use in edification (3 ff., xii. 19, 29). Thus P. at length answers the question addressed to him from Cor. as to the worth of the several "spiritual powers," and in particular as to the relative value of Tongues and Prophesying. He has led up to this answer by his exposition of the general Christian truths bearing upon the matter—viz. the office of the Holy Spirit as the distributor of God's gifts (xii. 3-11), the organic nature of the Church (12-31), and the sovereignty of love in the Christian life (xiii.).

Ver. 1. "Pursue love"—follow intently this καθ᾽ ὑπερβολήν ὁδόν (xii. 31b: see note): διώκω (see parl.: pr. impr.) signifies to prosecute to its goal (xiii. 13) a course on which one has entered. ἢ λούστε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, "but (continue to) covet the spiritual (gifts)"": P. resumes xii. 31 (see note, also on xii. 1). Love is exalted in the interest of the charisms, not to their disparagement; it is not to be pursued by forgetting everything else, but opens the true way to everything else: "Sectamini charitatem, affectate spiritualia" (Cv.).—"But rather (in preference to other gifts) that you may prophesy": this is chief amongst "the greater charisms" of xii. 31. Perhaps the Cor. had asked specifically which of the two, Tongues or Prophecy, was to be preferred. ἢν προφητεύῃς (cf. δέλω ... μάλλον ἢν, 5) differs from τὸ προφητεύειν by making the object distinctively an aim: in striving after the charisms, Prophecy is to be set highest and to control the rest. For the use of ἢν, cf. note on 1. 10, also Bm., pp. 235 ff.

Vv. 2, 3. The reason for preferring Prophecy, on the principles laid down, is that one's fellows receive no benefit from the Tongues: except God, "no one hears" the latter—i.e. hears understandingly (cf. Eph. i. 13, iv. 29, etc.). There was sound enough in the glossolalia (xiii. 1), but no sense (23). πνεύματι δὲ λαλεί ν.τ.κ., "but in spirit he is speaking mysteries"; δὲ points a contrast to the οὐδεὶς . . . ἀκούει: there is something worth hearing—deep things muttered by those quivering lips, that should be rationally spoken. For μυστήριον, see note on ii. 7, and Cr. s. v.: mystery in Scripture is the correlate of revelation; here it stops short of disclosure, tantalizing the Church, which hears and hears not. πνεύματι, dat. of manner or instr.,—"with the spirit," but without the "understanding" (νοῦς: 14 ff.; cf. note to xii. 8).—"But he who prophesies does speak to men—edification and exhortation and comfort." παρακλήσις and παραμυθία are distinct from οἰκοδομή: prophetic speech serves for (a) "the further upbuilding of the Christian life, (b) the stimulation of the Christian will, (c) the strengthening of the Christian spirit" (Hf.). Παρακλήσις has ref. to sorrow or fear (see parl.); παρακλήσις (far commoner) to duty; οἰκοδομή, in the widest sense, to knowledge and character and the progress of the Church: this last stands alone in the sequel.

Ver. 4. "He that speaks with a tongue edifies himself, but he that prophesies edifies a church (assembly)"—not one but many persons, not himself but a whole community. The impression made on the γλωσσολαλὸς by his utterance, since it was delivered in a rapture and without clear conception (12 ff.), must have been vague: but it powerfully confirmed his faith, since it left an abiding sense of possession by the Spirit of God (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 1-10). Our deepest feelings frequently enter the mind below the surface consciousness.

Ver. 5. Notwithstanding the above drawback, the Tongues are a real and desirable charism; the better is preferred...
to the good: “Yet I would have you all speak with tongues,—but rather that you might prophesy.” μᾶλλον ἡνα προφητεύσει is repeated from ver. 1: what the Ap. bids his readers prefer, he prefers for them—not to the exclusion of the Tongues, for the two gifts might be held at once (6, τ8), but as looking beyond them.—θέλω ἵνα occurs several times in the Gospels without any marked telic force (Matt. vii.12, Mark vi.25, ix.30, John xvii.24), but only here in P.: its substitution for the inf. (λαλεῖν) of the coordinate clause is significant.—“More over he who prophesies is greater than he who speaks with tongues”—attached by the part. δὲ where one expected γὰρ (T.R.); P. is not justifying his own preference just stated, but giving a further reason why the Cor. should covet Prophecy more than Tongues: the main reason lies in the eminent usefulness of this charism (2-4); besides that (δὲ), its possessor is a “greater” person (μείζων: cf. xii.31) “than the speaker with tongues—except in the case that he interprets (his ecstatic utterance), that the Church may get edification.” Τhe power to interpret superadded to the glossolalia (see 13, 26 ft., xii.10) puts the mystic speaker on a level with the prophet: first “uttering mysteries” (2) and then making them plain to his hearers, he accomplishes in two acts what the prophet does in one. ἐκτὸς ἐλ μὴ is a Pauline pleonasm (see parl.), consisting of ἐκτὸς ἐλ (except if) and ἐλ μὴ (unless) run together; “with this exception,—unless he interpret” (Wright, p. 756). For ἐλ with sbj., in distinction from ἐὰν, see W.R., p. 368; it “represents that the event will decide the point” (El.). To supply τὸ with διερμην., supposing another interpreter meant, is ungrammatical; the identity of speaker and interpreter is the essential point. He interprets with the express intention that the Church may be edified (ἐνα...οἰκοδομην λάβη).

Ver. 6. What the Ap. has said touching the criterion of edification, he applies to his own approaching visit (iv. 18 ff., xvi. 5 ff.): “But at the present time, brothers,”—νῦν δὲ, temporal, as in v. 11, etc.; not logical, as in vii. 14, xiii. 13, etc. (see Hf., against most interpreters). It is the situation at Cor. which gives point to this ref.: what help could the Ap. bring to his readers in their troubled state, if he were to offer them nothing but confused mutterings and ravings? (cf. 7-11)—an appeal to common sense. —The hypotheses are parl. (expressing by ἐὰν actual possibility, cf. 18; not mere conceivability)—the second the negative of the first: “if I should come to you speaking with tongues, wherein shall I profit you—if I do not speak in (the way of) revelation or knowledge, or prophesying or teaching?” In the four ἡ clauses, the second pair matches the first: revelation comes through the prophet, knowledge through the teacher (cf. xii. 8, 10, 28, etc.). For ἐκκομαμ with ptp. of the character or capacity in which one comes—“a (mere) speaker with tongues,” unable to interpret (see 5)
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Luke xiii. 7.

§ 45. Utterance Useless without Clear Sense, xiv. 7-13. P. has just asked what the Cor. would think of him, if in their present need he came exhibiting his power as a speaker with Tongues, but without a word of prophetic inspiration or wise teaching to offer. Such speech would be a mockery to the hearers. This holds good of sound universally, when considered as a means of communication—in the case, e.g., of lifeless instruments, the flute and lyre with their modulated notes, or the military trumpet with its varied signals (7 f.); so with articulate speech, in its numberless dialects. To the instructed ear every syllable carries a meaning; to the foreigner it is gibberish (10 f.). Just as useless are the Tongues in the Church without interpretation (9, 12 f.).

Ver. 7. "Ομως τα άψυχα " Quin et inanima " (Cν.); as in Gal. iii. 15, the part. emphasizes the word immediately following, not φωνήν διδόντα ("though giving sound") in contrast to διαστολήν . . . μη δώ (so however Wt., Gr., Mr., Sm.: "yet unless they give a distinction, etc."). The argument is a minori ad majus, from dead instruments to living speech: "Yet even in the case of lifeless things (τα άψυχα, generic art.) when they give sound, unless they give a distinction in their notes" (so Ηf., Ed., El.).-φθόγγος denotes a measured, harmonious sound, whether of voice (Rom. x. 18) or instrument: see Plato, Tim. 80.-διαστολή is referred by Lidd., and by Ev. ad loc., to the pause between notes; by most others (after Plato, Philob., 17C.; cf. Oec. ad loc.) to the interval (= διάστημα) or distinction of pitch; possibly (so Cv., El.) it includes both in untechnical fashion—whatever in fact distinguishes the φθόγγος.—τοις γνωσθείσαι κ.τ.λ.: "How will that which is being piped or harped be discerned?"—how will the air be made out, if the notes run confusedly into one another? The double art., το αυλ. . . . το κιθαρ., separates the two sorts of music. This comparison used applies to inarticulate γλωσσολαλία, not to foreign languages.

Ver. 8. To the pipe and harp, adornments of peace, P. adds for further illustration (και γάρ) the warlike trumpet. This ruder instrument furnishes a stronger example: varied signals can be given by its simple note, provided there is an understanding between trumpeter and hearers; "unius tubae cantus alius ad alia vocat milites" (Bγ.). Without such agreement, or with a wavering, indistinct sound, the loudest blast utters nothing to purpose: "For if the trumpet also gives an uncertain voice, who will prepare for battle?" How disastrous, at the critical moment, to doubt whether the trumpet sounds Advance or Retreat!

Ver. 9 enforces the twofold illustration of vv. 7 f.: "So also in your case (ουτως και υμεις), if through the tongue you do not give a word of clear signification (ευςημον λόγον), how will that which is spoken be discerned?"—ευςημός (from ευ and σήμα, a sign) implies a meaning in the word, and a meaning good to make out; cf. Sophocles, Antig., 1004, 1027—τοις γνωσθείσαι κ.τ.λ.; is an echo from ver. 7; and "the tongue" (δια της γλώςης: cf. iii. 5, vi. 4, vii. 17), as the means of living speech, is thrust before the αυλ. in emphatic contrast to "the lifeless" pipe, etc. P. does not therefore refer in this sentence (as Est., Gd., Ed. would have it) to the supernatural Tongue
10.  τοσαύτα, το. τοσαύτα, "ει " τύχοι, "γένων εστιν " εν κόσμω και ουδέν " Υ 37χοι, " γενη μίας τον εάν ούν μη είδω τήν δύναμιν τής φωνῆς, έσομαι τῶ λαλοῦντες μερίδες καὶ τὸ λαλῶν "έμοι 8 βάρβαρος, καὶ ο λαλῶν "έμοι 8 βάρβαρος.

12.  οὐτώ καὶ ὅμει, ἐπεὶ ἦλθαν εἰς τε πνευμάτων, πρὸς τήν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς.

11.  εάν οὐν " ει " τύχοι, "γένων εστιν " εν κόσμω και ουδέν " Υ 37χοι, " γενη μίας τον εάν ούν μη είδω τήν δύναμιν τής φωνῆς, έσομαι τῶ λαλοῦντες μερίδες καὶ τὸ λαλῶν "έμοι 8 βάρβαρος, καὶ ο λαλῶν "έμοι 8 βάρβαρος.
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1. εἰς τοῦτο: all unce. but KL.
2. ὁταν all pre-Syrian unce.
3. ὁταν, by itacism, AD*L, τα σαλ την, G, γινωσκω.

(elsewhere, moreover, expressed by the anarthrous γλῶσσα: otherwise here), for it is precisely his objection to this charism that it gives an άσημον instead of a εύσημον λόγον (16, 19, 23); he means to say: "As inanimate instruments by due modulation, and by the fixed meaning attached to their notes, become expressive, so it is in a higher degree with the human tongue; its vocables convey a meaning just in so far as they are ordered, articulate, and conformed to usage". Now this is what the Cor. Glossolalia was not: "for you will be (otherwise) speaking into the air"—the issue of uninterpreted Tongue-speaking (cf. 2, 17, etc.).—ἐις ἄφων, a proverbial expression (cf. ix. 26) for ineffectual speech, like our "talking to the wind"; in Philo, ἀρμοθεῖα.

Ver. 10. Speaking of vocal utterance, the Ap. is reminded of the multitude of human dialects; this suggests a further proof of his contention, that there must be a settled and well-observed connexion between sound and sense. "Ever so many kinds of voices, it may chance, exist in the world."—On ἐν τῷ χώρῳ (if it should hap = τυχόν, xvi. 6), which removes all known limit from the τοσαύτα, see note of El. For the anarthrous ἐν κόσμω, cf. 2 Cor. v. 19; "in the world"—a sphere so wide.—καὶ οὐδὲν (ο. τ. γενών) ἄφωνον, "and none (of them) voiceless": not tautologous, but asserting for every "kind of voice" the real nature of a voice, viz., that it means something to somebody: "nullum genus vocum vocis expersc" (Est.); "aunique language n'est une non-lange"; the Greeks love these paradoxical expressions—cf. Βίος ἀληθῶς, χάρις ἀληθῆς (Gd., Hn.). The Vg. and Bz. miss the point in rendering, "nihil est mutum".

Ver. 11. "If then I know not the meaning of the voice" (τήν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς, vim or virtutem vocis)—for every voice has a meaning (10b); on this very possible hypothesis, "I shall be a barbarian to the speaker, and the speaker a barbarian in relation to me" (δὲ ἐμοί, cf. Matt. xxi. 42, and perhaps ii. 6 above), or "in my ear". By this illustration of the futility of the uninterpreted Tongues, Paul implicitly distinguishes them from natural foreign languages; there is a μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος in the comparison, just as in the previous comparison with harp and trumpet; one does not compare things identical. The second figure goes beyond the first; since the foreign speech, like the mysterious γλῶσσα (2), may hide a precious meaning, and is the more provoking on that account, as the repeated βάρβαρος intimates.

Ver. 12. οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς is parl. to ver. 9; but the application is now turned into an exhortation. P. leaves the last comparison to speak for itself, and hastens to enforce his lesson: "So also with yourselves; since you are coveters of spirits (ζηλωταί εστίν πνευμάτων), seek that you may abound (in them) with a view to the edifying of the church" or "for the edifying of the church seek (them), that you may abound (therein)". The latter rendering, preferred by Cv., Mr., Al., Hf., Sm., is true to the order of the words, and reproduces the emphasis of τῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐκκλησίας. ἦλθεν has its object supplied beforehand in the previous clause, and Ενα (περιστέρετη) bears its ordinary sense as conj. of purpose. Spiritual powers are indeed to be sought (cf. 1, xii. 31), provided that they be sought for the religious profiting of others, with a view to abound in service to the Church. The Ενα clause is thus parl. to πρὸς τ. εἰκοδομην (cf. xvi. 35, 2 Tim. iii. 16); cf. John x. 10, and other parl. for περιστέρετη. ἦλθεν, seedots, enthusiasm after spirits (Ev.),—used perhaps with a touch of irony (Hn.). The Cor. have already the eagerness that P. recommends in ver. 1;
but it is not prompted by the best motives, nor directed to the most useful end: this word was common amongst Greeks as describing the ardent votaries of a school or party, or those jealous for the honour of some particular master (cf. Gal. i. 14).—πνεύματα differs somewhat from τὰ πνευματικά (1), signifying not "the (proper) spiritual" powers, but unseen forces generally (see xii. 10, διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, i John iv. 1, and the warning of xii. 3; cf. the note); "the Cor. sought supernatural endowments, no matter what their nature might be" (Ed.)—at any rate, they thought too little of the true source and use of the charisms, but too much and too emulously of their outward impression and prestige (see πνευμάτων, 32).—Everling (Die paul. Angel. u. Daimonologie, pp. 40 ff.) infers from this passage, along with Rev. xxii. 6, the conception of a number of Divine "spirits" that may possess men; but he overpresses the turn of a single phrase (see xii. 3; cf. the note); "the one and the self-same Spirit" as from God (xii. 11).—Ver. 13. "Wherefore (since thus only can the γλώσσας λαλών edify the church) let him who speaks with a tongue pray that he may interpret": cf. ver. 5. It appears that the speaker with Tongues in some instances could recall, on recovery, what he had uttered in his trance-ecstasy, so as to render it into rational speech. The three vbs. are pr., regulating current procedure.—The ίνα clause, after προσευχέσθω, gives the purport of the prayer, as in Phil. i. 9; cf. i. 10 above, xvi. 12; Luke ix. 40, etc. Mr., El., and others, prefer to borrow γλώσσῃ from the next ver., and render thus: "Let him that speaks (with a tongue) pray (therewith), in order that he may interpret"; but this strains the construction, and γλώσση appears to be added in ver. 14 just because the vb. προσεύχομαι had not been so understood before.

§ 46. THE ΝΟΥΣ ΤΗΕ ΝΕΕΔΛY ΑLLY OF THE ΠΙΝΕΥΜΑ, xiv. 14-20. In § 44 the Ap. has insisted on edification as the end and mark of God's gifts to His Church, and in § 45 on intelligibility as a condition necessary thereto. Now the faculty of intelligence is the νούς; and we are thus brought to see that for a profitable conduct of worship, and for a sane and sound Church life (πά, ἢ, 23), the understanding must be in exercise: it is a vehicle indispensable (14 f.) to the energies of the spirit. On this point P. is at one with the men of Gnosis at Cor.; he discountenances all assumptions made in the name of the Spirit" that offend against sober judgment (20).—This passage, in a sense, counterbalances i. τ8-ii.5: it shows how far the Ap. is from approving a blind fanaticism or irrational mysticism, when he exalts the Gospel at the expense of the wisdom of the world.

Ver. 14. The Tongue has been marked out as an inferior charism, because it does not edify others; it is less desirable also because it does not turn to account the man's own intelligence: "If I pray with a tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding (νοοῦ) is unfruitful". The introductory γαρ (see txtl. note) seems hardly needed; if genuine, it attaches this ver. to ver. 13, as giving a further reason why the γλωσσολαλόν should desire to interpret—viz., that his own mind may partake fruitfully in his prayers. In any case, the consideration here
ψαλώ δὲ ἐὰν καὶ τῷ νοτ.: 16. ἐπει δὲν εὐλογήσης τῷ τρῖτον τὸν καὶ εὐλογήσης τῷ τρῖτον τῷ τῷ μήν ἐν τῇ καὶ εὐχαριστῆς, ἐπειδὴ τῇ λέγεις (2) περὶ τῆς εὐχαριστῆς, ἐπειδὴ λέγεις οὐκ οἴδε; 17. οὐ μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς, ἀλλ' ἐπειδή τῷ αμήν επί τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, επειδή λέγεις οὐκ οἴδε, τῇ σή εὐχαριστίαν; 18. εὐχαριστῆς τῷ Θεῷ μου, πάντων ὑμῶν ἐλαλῶς ἐλαλῶσιν.

in this sense, Sir. xii. 12; cf. Lk. xvi. 9 f. note below. k 2 Cor. i 19. m 12 times in P.; Acts xxiv. 3; Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12; -τος, Col. iii. 15; -τεω, passim in P.

in this sense, Sir. xii. 12; cf. Lk. xvi. 9 f. note below. k 2 Cor. i 19. m 12 times in P.; Acts xxiv. 3; Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12; -τος, Col. iii. 15; -τεω, passim in P.

The fruit of the speaker is found in the profit of the hearer" (Thd.).—"The νοῦς is here, as distinguished from the πνεῦμα, the reflective and so-called discursive faculty, παρά εἰκοτικά, the human πνεῦμα quaternus cogitât et intellegit" (El.); see Beck's Bibl. Psychology, or Laidlaw's Bibl. Doctrine of Man, s. v.; and cf. notes on i. 10, ii. 16 above; also on Rom. viii. 23, 25. Religious feelings and activities—prayer in chief (Phil. iii. 3, Rom. i. 9, etc.)—take their rise in the spirit; normally, they pass upward into conception and expression through the intellect.

Ver. 15. It is the part of nous to share in and aid the exercises of πνεῦμα: "What is (the case) then? I will pray with the spirit; but I will also pray with the understanding: I will sing with the spirit; but I will also sing with the understanding".—τί οὖν εστίν; "How then stands the matter?" (Quid ergo est? Vg.): one of the lively phrases of Greek dialogue; it "calls attention, with some little alacrity, to the upshot of what has just been said" (El.).—ψαλῶς denoted, first, playing on strings, then singing to such accompaniment; Eph. v. 19 distinguishes this vb. from θάλ. Ed. thinks that instrumentation is implied; unless forbidden, Gr. Christians would be sure to grace their songs with music. Through its LXX use, esp. in the title Ψαλμοι, "hymn" (Heb.), the word came to signify the singing of praise to God; but the connexion indicates a larger ref. than to the singing of the O.T. Psalms; it included the "improvised psalms which were sung in the Glossolalia, and could only be made intelligible by interpretation" (Mr.). Ecstatic utterance commonly falls into a kind of chant or rhapsody, without articulate words.

Ver. 16. "Since if thou bless (God) in spirit": πνευματι, anarthrous—"in spirit" only, without understanding; cf. οικοδομεῖται. Ver. 17. "And in spirit": πνευματικα, all uncc. but GKL.

εὐλογεῖται, all uncc. but GKL.

εὐλογεῖται, all uncc. but GKL.

εὐλογεῖται, all uncc. but GKL.

εὐλογεῖται, all uncc. but GKL.

εὐλογεῖται, all uncc. but GKL.

εὐλογεῖται, all uncc. but GKL.

εὐλογεῖται, all uncc. but GKL.
being an ἰδιώτης γλώσση (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 6): Thd. rightly paraphrases by ἀκινήτος, uninitiated. In cl. Gr., ἰδιώτης means a private person in distinction from the State and its officers, thus ἰδιώτης as distinguished from the expert or professional man. The ptp. ἀκατηχεύω, filling up (see parls.), represents the ἰδιώτης as a necessary complement of the γλώσσαι ἐκκλησίας (xii. 39). Hn. and others insist on the literal (local) sense of τότος, as equivalent to ἑδρα not τάξις, supposing that the ἰδιώτης occupied a separate part of the assembly room; but this is surely to pre-date later usage.—The united “Amen” seals the thanksgiving pronounced by a single voice, making it the act of the Church— the Amen,” since this was the familiar formula taken over from Synagogue worship; cf. 2 Cor. i. 18 ff. On its ecclesiastical use, see El. ad loc., and Dict. of Christian Antiq. s.v.—ἐν εἰκόνωι τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ = ὁ θεοῦ ἐκποίησας of ver. 2. El. observes, “From this ver. it would seem to follow that at least some portions of early Christian worship were extempore”: indeed, it is plain that extempore utterance prevailed in the Cor. Church (cf. f. 14 f.).

Ver. 17. “For thou indeed giveth thanks well”—admirably, finely (καλώς; cf. Luke xx. 39, James i. 18):”unlike ironiques (fr.).—ἐκκριβωτικός = ἐκκριβοτικός (16: see note, also on i. 4).—διερευνών, i.e., the ἰδιώτης of ver. 16 signifies, as in iv. 6, x. 29: the pron. a distinct or even opposite person. P. estimates the devotions of the Church by a spiritually utilitarian standard; the abstractly beautiful is subordinated to the practically edifying: the like test is applied to a different matter in x. 23, 33.

Vv. 18, 19. Again (cf. 6, iv. 6, ix.) the Ap. uses himself for an instance in point. Even at Cor., where this charism was supernatural, no one “speaks with tongues” (mark the pl. γλώσσαις) so largely as P. does on occasion; far from thinking lightly of the gift, he “thanks God” that he excels in it. 2 Cor. v. 13 and xii. 1-4 show that P. was rich in ecstatic experiences; cf. Gal. ii. 2, Acts ix. 12, xvi. 9, xxii. 23 f., etc.—The omission of ότι after ευχαριστώ is exceptional, but scarcely irregular; it belongs to conversationally, and occurs occasionally after a number of the verb declarandi in cl. Gr.: cf. note on δοκεῖ κ.τ.λ., iv. 9; and see Wr., p. 653. The Vg., omitting μάλλον, reads omnium vestrum linguam loquor, making P. thank God that he could speak in every tongue used at Cor.; Jerome, in his Notes, refers the μάλλον to the other App., as though P. exulted in being a better linguist than any of the Twelve!—μάλλον ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κ.τ.λ.: “but in church-assembly (cf. note on ver. 4) I would (rather) utter five words with my understanding, that I might indeed instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue!”—μάλλον contradicts the seeming implication of ver. 18—“but for all that”: one might have supposed that P. would make much of a power in which he excels; on the contrary, he puts it aside and prefers to use every-day speech, as being the more serviceable, cf. for the sentiment, ix. 19-23, 2 Cor. i. 24, iv. 5, 12, 15, x. 7, xiii. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 6 ff. With his tongue P might speak in solitude, “to himself and to God” (2, 28, 2 Cor. v. 13): amongst his brethren, his one thought is, how best to help and benefit them.—For νοῦς in contrast with πνεῦμα, see note on ver. 14; for its declension, cf. i. 10.—κατηχεύω (see parls.) differs from διδάσκει as it connotes, usually at least, oral impartation (“ut alios voce instituam,” Bz.), including here prophecy or doctrine (6). On ἀλλά . . . ἐκκριβωτικός, see parls.; malim . . . quam, Bz. For the rhetorical μυρίους, cf. iv. 15 ff.

Ver. 20. P. has argued the superiority of intelligible speech, as a man of practical sense; he finally appeals to the good sense of his readers: “Brethren, be not
21. "Εν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται, "Οτι εν ἑτερογλώσσοις 1 καὶ εν ἑτεροις 2 λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, καὶ κατά εἰς κατούστρα μου, λέγει Κύριος". 22. "Ωστε οἱ γλώσσαι εἰς τούς πιστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ απίστοις καταλέγεται τοις ἄδελφοις, ἢ δὲ

---

1 ετερογλώσσοις: G latt. vg. (in aliiis linguis et labiis aliiis) and Latt. Ff.

2 ετεροίς: cf. Acts ii. 4; Exod. xxx. 9. For gen. ετερων, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 8.

children in mind" (see parls.)—"in judgment" (Ed.), "the reasoning power on its reflective and discriminative side" (El.); φρένα differs from νούς much as φρόνιμος from σοφός (see notes to iv. 10, x. 15). Emulation and love of display were betraying this Church into a childishness the very opposite of that broad intelligence and enlightenment on which it plumed itself (i. 5, iv. 10, viii. 1, x. 15, etc.). "It is characteristic of the child to prefer the amusing to the useful, the shining to the solid" (Gd.). This is a keen reproof, softened, however, by the kindly αδελφοί ("suavem vim habet," Βg.).—γίνεσθε, "be in effect," "show yourselves"; cf. xi. 1, etc. "In malice, however, be babes (act the babe); but in mind show yourselves full-grown (men)".

—For the force of the ending in νηπιάζω, cf. τυρπ-άζω, to redden, Matt. xvi. 2; the vb. is based on νήπιος, a kind of superlative to παιδίον—"be (not boyish, but actually) childish" (Ed.), or "infantile, in malice". For the antithesis of τελείως (= ἄνευ) and νηπιάζου, see ii. 6, xiii. 9 ff., and parls. For κακία, cf. note on v. 8: P. desiderates the affliction of the little child (see Eph. iv. 32 f., for the qualities opp. to κακία), as Jesus (in Matt. xviii. 2 ff.) its simplicity and humbleness. Gd. excellently paraphrases this ver.: "Si vous voulez être des enfants, à la bonne heure, pourvu que ce soit quant à la malice; mais, quant à l'intelligence, avancez de plus en plus vers la maturité complète".

§ 47. THE STRANGE TONGUES AN OCCASION OF UNBELIEF, xiv. 21-25. The Ap. has striven to wean the Cor. from their childish admiration of the Tongues by showing how unedifying they are in comparison with Prophecy. The Scripture quoted to confirm his argument (21) ascribes to this kind of manifestation a punitive character. Through an alien voice the Lord speaks to those refusing to hear, by way of "sign to the unbelieving" (22). These abnormal utterances neither instruct the Church nor convert the world. The unconverted see in them the symptoms of madness (23). Prophecy has an effect far different; it searches every heart, and compels the most prejudiced to acknowledge the presence of God in the Christian assembly (24 et al.).

Ver. 21. This O.T. citation is added not by way of Scriptural proof, but in solemn asseveration of what P. has intimated, to his readers' surprise, respecting the inferiority of the Glossolalia; cf. the manner of quotation in i. 19, ii. 9, iii. 19. The passage of Isaiah reveals a principle applying to all such modes of speech on God's part. The title ο νόμος Jewish usage extended to Scripture at large; see Rom. iii. 19, John x. 34. P. shows here his independence of the LXX: the first clause, Ο adviser, follows the Heb., only turning the prophet's third person ("He will speak") into the first, thus appropriating the words to God (λέγει Κύριος; Origen's Hexapla and Aquila's Gr. Version run in almost the same terms (El.) Paul's second clause, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονται, is based on the latter clause of ver. 12 (translated precisely in the LXX, καὶ οὐκ ἐξῆλθαν ἑκούσων), but with a new turn of meaning drawn from the general context: he omits as irrelevant the former part of ver. 12. The original is therefore condensed, and somewhat adapted. Hf. and Ed. discuss at length the Pauline application of Isaiah's thought. According to the true interpretation of Isa. xxviii. 9 ff. (see Cheyne, Delitzsch, or Dillmann ad loc.), the drunken Israelites are mocking in their cups the teaching of God through His prophet, as though it were only fit for an infant school; in anger therefore He threatens to give His lessons through
the lips of foreign conquerors (11), in whose speech the despisers of the mild, plain teaching of His servants (12) shall painfully spell out their ruin. The δι (ki) is part of the citation: “For in men of alien tongue and in lips of aliens I will speak to this people; and not even thus will they hearken to me, saith the Lord”. God spoke to Israel through the strange Assyrian tongue in retribution, not to confirm their faith but to consummate their unbelief. The Glossolalia may serve a similar melancholy purpose in the Church. This analogy does not support, any more than that of νν. το f. (see notes), the notion that the Tongues of Corinth were foreign languages.—εἰσακούω, to hear with attention, εἰς effect, shares the meaning of ὑπακούω (obedi) in the LXX and in cl. Gr.

Ver. 22. The real point of the above citation from Isaiah comes out in ώστε αἱ γλώσσαι εἰς σημεῖόν κ.τ.λ., “And so the tongues are for a sign not to the believing, but to the unbelievers”—sc. to those who will not hear of who having rejected other modes of instruction find their unbelief confirmed, and even justified (23b), by this phenomenon. This interpretation (cf. Matt. xvi. 4; and for εἷς θημέων in the judicial sense, Is. vii. 18) is dictated by the logical connexion of vv. 21, 22, which forbids the thought of a convincing and saving sign, read into this passage by Cm. and many others. P. desires to quench rather than stimulate the Cor. ardour for Tongues.—ἡ δὲ προφητεία κ.τ.λ., “while prophecy on the other hand” (δὲ) serves the opposite purpose—i.e. (is for a sign) not to the unbelievers, but to the believing”. ὀλ πυτεύοντες implies the act continued into a habit (cf. i. 21); ὁ ἄπιστος, the determinate character. For δοτε with ind., see note on iii. 7.

Ver. 23 shows the disastrous impression which the exercise of the Tongues, carried to its full extent, must make upon men outside—a result that follows (σὺν) from the aforesaid intention of the gift (22): “If then the entire Church should assemble together and all should be speaking with tongues, but there should enter uninstructed persons or unbelievers, will they not say that you are mad!?” If the Tongues are, as many Cor. think, the highest manifestation of the Spirit, then to have the whole Church simultaneously so speaking would be the πέφλους ἐπί τοῦ Κυρίου of spiritual power; but, in fact, the Church would then resemble nothing so much as a congregation of lunatics! A reducitur ad absurdum for the fanatical coveters of Tongues.—The ἄπιστος (here unqualified: otherwise in 16; cf. note) is persons unacquainted with Christianity (altogether uninstructed) and receiving their first impression of it in this way, whereas the ἄπιστοι are rejectors of the faith. The impression made upon either party will be the same. The effect here imagined is altogether different from that of the Day of Pentecost, when the “other tongues” spoke intelligibly to those religiously susceptible amongst non-believers (Acts ii. 21 f.). The imputation of madness from men of the world P. earnestly deprecates (Acts xxvi. 24 f.).—Ed. renders ἄπιστοι “separatists”—unattached Christians; but this interpretation wants lexical support, and is out of keeping with ver. 16: did any such class of Christians then exist?

Vv. 24, 25. How diff. (δέ) and how blessed the result, “if all should be prophesying and there should enter some unbeliever or stranger to Christianity (ideographic: see previous note), he is convicted by all, he is searched by all, the secret things of his heart become manifest; and so he will fall on his face and worship God, reporting that verily God is among you!” This brings out two further notes of eminence in the charism of
Prophecy when compared with Tongues: (1) The former edifies the Church (3 ff.); (2) it employs a man’s rational powers (14-19); (3) it can be exercised safely by the whole Church, and (4) to the conversion of sinners. That “all” should “prophesy” is a part of the Messianic ideal, the earnest of which was given in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost: see Num. xi.23-29, Joel ii.28, Acts ii.4, 15 ff.; the speaking of Pentecost Peter identifies with prophesying, whereas P. emphatically distinguishes the Cor. Glossolalia therefrom. Prophecy is an inspired utterance proceeding from a supernatural intuition, which penetrates “the things of the man,” “the secrets of his heart,” no less than “the things of God” (ii.10 ff.); the light of heart-searching knowledge and speech, proceeding from every believer, is concentrated on the unconverted man as he enters the assembly. His conscience is probed on all sides; he is pierced and overwhelmed with the sense of his sin (cf. John iv.29, also i.48, viii.9, Acts viii.18 ff., xxiv.25). This form of Prophecy abides in the Church, as the normal instrument for “convincing the world of sin” (John xvi.8 ff.); it belongs potentially to “all” Christians, and is in fact the reaction of the Spirit of Christ in them upon the unregenerate (cf. John xx.22 f.); διάκονη is the precise word of John xvi.8.—

Prophecy when compared with Tongues: (1) The former edifies the Church (3 ff.); (2) it employs a man’s rational powers (14-19); (3) it can be exercised safely by the whole Church, and (4) to the conversion of sinners. That “all” should “prophesy” is a part of the Messianic ideal, the earnest of which was given in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost: see Num. xi.23-29, Joel ii.28, Acts ii.4, 15 ff.; the speaking of Pentecost Peter identifies with prophesying, whereas P. emphatically distinguishes the Cor. Glossolalia therefrom. Prophecy is an inspired utterance proceeding from a supernatural intuition, which penetrates “the things of the man,” “the secrets of his heart,” no less than “the things of God” (ii.10 ff.); the light of heart-searching knowledge and speech, proceeding from every believer, is concentrated on the unconverted man as he enters the assembly. His conscience is probed on all sides; he is pierced and overwhelmed with the sense of his sin (cf. John iv.29, also i.48, viii.9, Acts viii.18 ff., xxiv.25). This form of Prophecy abides in the Church, as the normal instrument for “convincing the world of sin” (John xvi.8 ff.); it belongs potentially to “all” Christians, and is in fact the reaction of the Spirit of Christ in them upon the unregenerate (cf. John xx.22 f.); διάκονη is the precise word of John xvi.8.—

Prophecy when compared with Tongues: (1) The former edifies the Church (3 ff.); (2) it employs a man’s rational powers (14-19); (3) it can be exercised safely by the whole Church, and (4) to the conversion of sinners. That “all” should “prophesy” is a part of the Messianic ideal, the earnest of which was given in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost: see Num. xi.23-29, Joel ii.28, Acts ii.4, 15 ff.; the speaking of Pentecost Peter identifies with prophesying, whereas P. emphatically distinguishes the Cor. Glossolalia therefrom. Prophecy is an inspired utterance proceeding from a supernatural intuition, which penetrates “the things of the man,” “the secrets of his heart,” no less than “the things of God” (ii.10 ff.); the light of heart-searching knowledge and speech, proceeding from every believer, is concentrated on the unconverted man as he enters the assembly. His conscience is probed on all sides; he is pierced and overwhelmed with the sense of his sin (cf. John iv.29, also i.48, viii.9, Acts viii.18 ff., xxiv.25). This form of Prophecy abides in the Church, as the normal instrument for “convincing the world of sin” (John xvi.8 ff.); it belongs potentially to “all” Christians, and is in fact the reaction of the Spirit of Christ in them upon the unregenerate (cf. John xx.22 f.); διάκονη is the precise word of John xvi.8.—
tion must once more be insisted on as the true aim of them all.—διαν εκ τινων ἐρμηνεύτων: "whenever you assemble" (cf. xi. 18 ff.): here pr.; the aor. of ver. 23 referred to particular occasions.—"Each has a psalm (to sing)—a teaching, a revelation (to impart)—a tongue, an interpretation (to give)." The succession of the objects of ἔχει perhaps reflects the order commonly pursued in the Church meetings. For έκαστος, cf. i. 12, etc.: every Cor. Christian has his faculty; there is no lack of gifts for utterance or readiness to use them; cf. i. 5, also iv. 6 ff. This exuberance made the difficulty; all wanted to speak at once—women as well as men (34); ἐξελεγμένοις εἰς τὸν πλῆθος πάντων—The ψαλμός might be an original song (though not chanted unintelligibly, ἐν γλώσσῃ the latter is enumerated distinctly: see note on ψαλίδω, 15), or an O.T. Psalm Christianly interpreted (see parls.); similarly Philo, De Vita Cont., § 10, describing the Therapeutæ, ὁ ἀναστάς υμών ὑμῶν ἔβαλε εἰς τ. Θεον, ἡ καίνων αὐτοῦ πεποιηκών, ἡ ἀρχαία ἡ τῶν πάλαι ψυχῶν. For N.T. psalms, see Luke i., ii., Rev. iv. 11, v. 9 f., 12 f., xv. 3 f.—διδαχὴ and ἀποκάλυψις (see 6 above; xii. 28 f.), the two leading forms of Christian edification. Beside the ψαλμός is set the complementary ἀρχαία, by which it is utilised for the Church: cf. xii. 10, 30; and vv. 1-19 passim.—πάντα πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν γινώσκει (pr. impv.), "Let everything be carried on with a view to edification".

Vv. 27, 28. The maxim πρὸς τ. οἰκοδομῆν κ.τ.λ. is applied to Tongues and Prophecy, as the two main competing gifts: "Whether any one speaks with a tongue (let them speak: sc. λαλῶν τῶν) to the number of two (κατὰ δύο), or at the most three" (at one meeting)—"siat per binos, aut ad plurimum ternos" (Bz.);—καὶ ἀνά μέρος, "and in turn," idque vicissim (Cv.)—not all confusedly speaking at once. Ed. ingeniously renders the κατὰ and ἀνά clauses "by two, or at most three together, and in turns" (antiphonally), as though the Tongues could be combined in a duet—"the beginning of Church music and antiphonal singing amongst Christians": but this does not comport with the ecstatic nature of the Glossolalia; moreover, the sense thus given to the second clause would be properly expressed by ἐν μέρει, not ἀνά μέρος (Hn.).—"And let one person interpret": whether one of the ψαλμοσιολογοι (13), or someone else present (Ελλης, xii. 10); the use of several interpreters at the same meeting might occasion delay or confusion. "If however there be no interpreter (present), let him (the speaker with the Tongue) keep silence in the Church, but let him talk to himself and to God": unless his utterance can be translated, he must refrain in public, and be content to enjoy his charism in solitude and in secret converse with God (cf. 2 fi.); the instruction to "speak in his heart, noiselessly" (so Cm., Est., Hf.) would be contrary to λαλεῖν, and indeed to the nature of a tongue. ή for cl.παρῆ, sit for adsit, of Lk. ν. τ7; Ἰλιαδικ. 688" (Ed.).

Vv. 29, 30. προφήται δὲ δύο ή τρεῖς κ.τ.λ.: "But in the case of prophets, let two or three speak, and let the others discern" (diudiscerent, Vg.). In form this sentence varies from the parl. clause respecting the Tongues (27); see Wr., p. 709, on the frequency of oratio variata in P., due to his vivacity and conversational freedom; the anarthrous προφήται is quasi-hypothetical, in contrast with γλώσση τῆς λαλεῖ—"not the prophets," but "supposing they (the speakers) be prophets, let them speak, etc." The
number to prophesy at any meeting is limited to “two or three,” like that of the Tongue-speakers; the condition ανά μέρος (27) is self-evident, where edification is consciously intended (3, etc.). “The others” are the other prophets present, who were competent to speak (31); these silent prophets may employ themselves in the necessary “discernment of spirits” (see xii. to)—diakrinēτωσαν, acting as critics of the revelations given through their brethren. The powers of προφητεία and διάκρισις appear to have been frequently combined, like those of artist and art-critic. It is noticed that in the Didaché a contrary instruction to this (and to Ι Τhess. ν. 2ο f) is given: πάντα προφήτην λαλούντα εν πνεύματι ουτε διακρίνεται. The above regulation implies pre-arrangement amongst the speakers; but this must not hinder the free movement of the Spirit; if a communication be made εκ τοῦ μισθοῦ to a silent prophet, the speaker should give way to him: “But if anything be revealed to another seated” (the prophesier stood, as in Synagogue reading and exhortation: Luke ν. 1, Αctς xiii. 16), “let the first be silent.” σιγάτω does not command (as σιγησάτω might) an instant cessation; “some token would probably be given, by motion or gesture, that an ἀποκάλυψις had been vouchsafed to another of the προφήται; this would be a sign to the speaker to close his address, and to let the newly illumined succeed to him” (El.). Even inspired prophets might speak too long and require to be stopped! "For you can (in this way) all prophesy one by one (καθ’ένα: singulatim, Cv.), in order that all may learn and all may be encouraged." Stress lies on the repeated πάντες (cf. xii. 12 f.): let every prophet get his turn, and every hearer will receive benefit (cf. 26b); even if the Church members were all prophets, as Paul imagined in ver. 24, and thinks desirable (1-5), by due arrangement, and self-suppression on the part of the eloquent, all might be heard. Ver. 32. The maxim πνεύματα προφήτων ὑποτάσσεται, is coupled by και to ver. 31 under the regimen of γάρ, it gives the subjective, as ver. 31 the main objective, reason why the prophets should submit to regulation. “How can I prophesy to order”’ one of them might ask; “how restrain the Spirit’s course in me?” The Ap. replies: “(for) also the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets”; this Divine gift is put under the control and responsibility of the possessor’s will, that it may be exercised with discretion and brotherly love, for its appointed ends. An unruly prophet is therefore no genuine prophet; he lacks one of the necessary marks of the Holy Spirit’s indwelling (see 33, 37). This kind of subjection could hardly be ascribed to the ecstatic Glossolalia. On the pl. πνεύματα, signifying manifold forms or distributions (xii. 4, τΙ) of the Spirit’s power, see note on xii. το. υποτάσσεται is the pr. of a general truth: “a Gnomic Present” (Βn., 8 τg); cf. iii. 13, 2 Cor. ix. 7.

Ver. 33. The apophthegm of ver. 32 exemplifies the universal principle of order in God’s works; cf. the deduction drawn in xi. 3. God’s gift of the Spirit submits itself to the receiver’s will, through whose direction its exercise is brought into regulated and edifying use: “For God is not (a God) of disorder (or seditionis, Cv.), but of peace”. To suppose that God inspires His prophets...
to speak two or three at a time, to make a tumult in the Church and refuse control, would be to suppose Him the author of confusion, of chaos instead of cosmos. —ἀκαταστασία (seeparls.) isa word of the LΧΧ and later Gr., denoting civil disorder or mutiny, it recalls the σχίσματα and έριδες of i. το f., xi. τ8 f, to which emulation in the display of spiritual powers seems to have contributed.—" As it is in all the Churches of the saints": in evidence of the "peace" which God confers on human society, P. can point to the conduct of Church meetings in all other Christian communities—a feature proper to "assemblies of the saints". Here is a final and solemn reason why the prophets of Cor. should practise self-control and mutual deference: cf. xi. 16; also i. 2b, and note; xvi. Ι. On the connexion of the ώς clause, see Ed. or El. W. H. attach it to ver. 31, regarding vv. 32, 32a as a parenthesis; but this breaks the continuity of vv. 33, 32; nor does it appear that "all the churches" had the superabundance of prophets that necessitated the restrictions imposed in vv. 29-31. Other leading editors (Tisch., Mr., Hn., Hf., Bt., Gd.) link this qualification to the following context; but it comes in clumsily before the impv. of ver. 34, and the repetition of ου ταίς ἐκκλησίαις is particularly awkward. On the other hand, the ref. to the example of the other Churches appropriately concludes the Apostle's appeals on the weighty subject, of universal interest, which has occupied him throughout this chapter.

§ 49. Final Instructions on Church Order, xiv. 34-40. In vv. 34 ff. P. turns to the matter which he first touched upon in reproving the disorderly Church life at Cor. vις., the irregular behaviour of certain Christian women (xi. 2-10): there it was their dress, now it is their tongue that he briefly reproves. Vv. 37 f, glancing over the injunctions of Div. IV. at large, commend their recognition as a test of the high pretensions to spiritual insight made at Cor. Ver. 39 recapitulates Paul's deliverance on the vexed question of Tongues versus Prophecy. Ver. 40 adds the final maxim of propriety and order,—a rule of administration as comprehensive and important as the πάντα προς οικοδομήν of ver. 26.

Ver. 34. Αι γυναίκες εν ταις εκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν: "Let women (Gr. generic art.) keep silence in the church assemblies, for it is not allowed them to speak"; cf. Ι Τim. ii.12, where the "speaking" of this passage is defined as "teaching, or using authority over a man". The contradiction between this veto and the language of xi.5, which assumes that women "pray" and "prophesy" in gatherings of Christians and forbidstheir doing so "with uncovered head," is relieved by supposing (α) that in xi.5 Ρ. refersto pνίταtegatherings (so Cν., Βg., Μr., Βt., Εν., Εl.), or means specifically at home (Ηf.), while here speaking εν εκκλησία is forbidden (35); but there is nothing in ch. xi. to indicate this distinction, which ex hyp. is vital to the matter; moreover, at this early date, the distinction between public and private Christian meetings—in church or house—was very imperfectly developed. Or (β), the instances admitted in xi. 5 were exceptional, "ou la femme se sentait
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ο νόμος λέγει ἐν εἰς τιμαθεῖν 'θέλουσιν ἐν οίκω τούτου: ἐπερωτάτωσαν ἀνδρὸς 'αίσχρον γάρ έστιν γυναῖκι τίμια, ἐν εἴς ἑαυτῶν ἑαυτοὺς θεοῦ 'ἐξ ὑμῶν ο λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ εξήλθεν κατήντησεν είναι 'πνευματικός 'επιγινωσκέτω α γράφω υμίν τρόπον εκκλησίας.

η αφ' υμών ο λόγος του Θεοῦ εξήλθεν, κατήντησεν είναι η πνευματικός 'επιγινωσκέτω α γράφω υμίν 'ότι του'

14: Col. i. 25; 1 Th. ii. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 9; Tit. ii. 5; occasional in other Epp.; freq. in Syn. GG. and Acts. k See x. ii. 11; See ii. 18. m See xii. 38; sing. thus, Acts xxi. 10; Tit. ii. 12 (n). n See ii. 15. o ουυυυυυ μαθείν: δScBDGΚL, etc. μαθειν: δScBDGΚL, etc. So all edd. except W.Η., who put μαθανεῖν (!) in txt., following δS"Α", τ7, and a few other minn. with Greg. Nyss., and μαθ. in marg. γυναίκι: ΝΑΒ, Τ7, 73, νγ., cop. basm. Αλλ' εν εκκλησία ἡ πποφήτης εἴναι 'πνευματικός 'επιγινωσκέτω α γράφω υμίν εκκλησίας. Ομ. τού all but a few minn.; cf. vii. 19.

pressée de donner essor à un élan extraordinaire de l'Esprit" (Gd.): but πώς γυναίκα (xi. 5) suggests frequent occurrence. (c) Hn. supposes participation in the ecstatic manifestations forbidden, as though γυναίκα were understood with λαλεῖν. (d) Ed. thinks the tact permission of xi. 5 here withdrawn, on maturier consideration. But (c), in view of the words that follow, "but let them be subject" and "if they want to learn" (contrasted with λαλεῖν by δέ), and on comparison with the more explicit language of 1 Tim. ii. 12, in view moreover of the principle affirmed in ch. xi. 3 ff., it appears probable that P. is thinking of Church-teaching and authoritative direction as a rôle unft for women.—παρακαλῶσαν is the key-note of Paul's doctrine on the subject (cf. also Eph. v. 22 ff., etc.). This command cannot fairly be set aside as a temporary regulation due to the state of ancient society. If the Αp. was right, there is a παρακαλεῖσθαι which lies in the nature of the sexes and the plan of creation, but this must be understood with the recollection of what Christian subjection is (see Gal. ν. 13b, Eph. ν. 22 ff.; also note on xi. 3 above).—What "the law says" was evidently in Paul's mind when he ground his doctrine in ch. xi. on the O.T. story of the creation of Man and Woman. For Jewish sentiment in the matter, see Wetstein ad loc., Vitringa, Synag., p. 724; Schöttgen, Hor., p. 658. For Gr. feeling cf. Soph., Ajaq, 293, γυναῖκα κοινός κε ὑπὸ φράσεως (Ed.); for Early Church rule, Const. Apost., iii. 6, Conc. Carthag., iv. 90 (quoted by El.).

Ver. 35. εἰ δέ τι θελοῦν μαθανεῖν: "But if they want to learn something" —if this is the motive that prompts them to speak. This plea furnishes an excuse, consistent with the submission enjoined, for women raising their voices in the Church meetings; but even so P. deprecates the liberty. As between μαθανεῖν and μαθείν after θέλω and the like, El. thus distinguishes: "when attention is directed to the procedure of the action specified, the pr. is commonly used; when simply to the action itself, the aor." —In bidding the Cor. women of enquiring minds "to ask at home of their own husbands," P. is laying down a general rule, not disposing of all cases that might arise; since the impv. of ver. 35 admits of exceptions, so may that of ver. 34: the utterances of Pentecost (Acts ii. 4) proceeded from "all," both men and women (cf. 18 f); there is also the notable instance of Philip's "four daughters which did prophesy" (Acts. xxii. 9). At Cor. there was a disposition to put men and women on an equal footing in public speaking and Church leadership, this is stigmatized as αισχρόν (τερβερον, cf. xi. 6, 13 ft.); it shocks moral feeling. For εν εκκλησίαι, see xi. 18.

Ver. 36. The Αp. adds the authority of Christian usage to that of natural instinct (cf. the connexion of xi. 14 and 16), in a tone of indignant protest: "Or (is it) from you (that) the word of God went out? or to you only did it reach?" —i.e., "Neque primi, neque soli estis Christiani" (Est.). The Cor. acted without thinking of any but themselves, as though they were the one Church in the world, or might set the fashion to all the rest (see note on i. 28; also 33 above, and xi. 16). For the self-sufficiency of this
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38. ει δε τις "αγνοεί," αγνοείτω." Ε.
39. Ωστε, αδελφοί,""ζηλούτε προφητεύειν, και το "λαλείν"
Ε. γλώσσαις""μή "κωλύετε."4ο. πάντα" "ευσχημόνωςκαι κατά
ii. 16. τάξιν γινέσθω.

q Cor. vii.

1 εστίν εντολή: ΝΑΒ, 17, cop., Aug. (Νει, εστ. Δο). D*G, 14, Or., Hil.,
Ambrst., εστιν simply (Western); so Tisch. εστιν εντολαι: Syrian emendation.

2 αγνοειται (?) : ΝΑΒ*D*G, Or., latt. vg., Amb., Ambrst., Hil.; so Lachm.,

3 αγνοειτω (2): δScΑ"ΒDbc, etc., retained by Τr.txt., R.V. txt., W.Η. marg: See
note below.

4 α δελ φοι μου: ΝΑΒ*, 67**, syrr. cop. Om. μου Western and Syrian.

5 τα λαλείν μη καλείτε γλώσσαις (in this order): ΝΑΒΡ, τ7, 73-con
formed by Western and Syrian edd. to usual order.

6 πάντα 8ε: all uncc. but KL.

church, cf. iv. 6 ff., v. 2. On καταντάω
eis, see x. 11.—4 links this ver. with the
foregoing, "Or (if what I have said is
not sufficient), etc." Vv. 37, 38. Α γράφατε ὑμῖν,
in the apodosis, includes, beside the last particular
(34 ff.), the other instructions of this Ep.; προφήτης and πνευματικός in
the protasis recall esp. the directions of chh. xii.-xiv.:
cf. xi. 4, xiv. 1, xiv. 1.-

δοκεῖ, as in iii. 18 (see note), is putat,
sibi videtur (not videtur alone, Vg.),
de-noting self-estimation. The term πνευ
ματικός includes every one endowed with
a special gift of the Spirit; cf. the pl.
πνευματά, ver. 12. Ηf. and Ηn. think
here of the "speakers with tongues," the disjunctive ἕ narrows the ref. of "spiritual," by contrast with
"prophet," to the sense of "speaker with tongues"; but this is a needless infer-
ence from the part.; the Ap. means "a
prophet, or a man of the Spirit (in any
sense)". The adj. πνευματικός (in masc. :
see parls.) refers not to spiritual powers
(τὰ πνευματικά, xii. 1, etc.), but to
spiritual character (= ὡς κατὰ πνεῦμα, ἐν
πνευματικῶς, Rom. viii.), which gives in-
sight in matters of revelation (cf. John
vii. 17, vii. 31 f.). While the true "pro-
phet," having a kindred inspiration (cf.
20), will "know well of the things" the
Ap. "writes, that they are a commandment of the Lord" (Κυρίου εστίν ἐντολή, " are
what the Lord commands"; cf. ii. 10-16,
vi. 40, and notes, 2 Cor. xiii. 3), this ability belongs to "the spiritual" gener-
ally, who "judge all things" (ii. 15);
being "of God," they hear His voice in
others (cf. John viii. 42 f., etc.; x John ii.
20, iv. 6). The "Lord" is Christ, the
Head of the Church, who "gives com-
mandment to His Apostles" (cf. vii. 20,
25, xii. 3, xiv. 1, xiv. 3, etc.; Matt.
xxviii. 20, etc.). —For ἐπι-γινωσκέτω, cf. xii. 12—"judi-
cet atque agnoscat" (Est.); the pr. impv.
asks for a continued acknowledgment of
Christ's authority in His Apostle.—But if
any one is ignorant (of this), he is ignored
(αγνοείται)—a retribution in kind. The
professor of Divine knowledge who does
not discern Paul's inspiration, proves his
ignorance; his character as "prophet"
or "spiritual" is not recognised, since
he does not recognise the Apostle's char-
20, for this criterion as laid down by
Christ; the Ap. John assumes it in i iv.
6.—αγοείται, is pr. in tense, ignoratur
(not ignorabitur, Vg.), affirming an actual
rejection—sc. by the Lord, who says to
such despisers of His servants, "I know
you not" (cf. viii. 3: 2 Τim. ii. 19; John
v. 42, etc.); but by His Apostle too, who
cannot acknowledge for fellow-servants
men who repudiate the Lord's authority
in him (cf. 3 John 9 f.). Christ foretold
that He would have to disown "many
who had prophesied" in His name (Matt.
vi. 22 f.). If αγνοειτω be read (still pre-
ferred by Mr., Bt., Ev., Gd., with R.V.
txt.), the impv. is permissive, as in vii.
15: "sibi susque ignorantiae relinquent-
ΧV. Ι-2.
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ΧV. Ι. "Γνωρίζωδε υμίν, αδελφοί, το ευαγγέλιον δεσιμα-εξ: μην υμίν, "δ και παρελάβετε, "εν ου και σώζεσθε τιν λόγον ευηγγελισάμην υμίν, ει f κατέγετε, "εκτός dos esse censeo" (Est.) — a counsel of despair; contrast 2 Tim. ii. 24 ff.

Vv. 39, 40 restate the advice of ver. 1 in the light of the subsequent discussion, moderating the Church’s zeal for demonstrative charisms by insisting on the seemliness and good order which had been violated by their unrestrained exercise (26-33). "And so, my brothers, covet to prophesy": διατάξειν, cf. xii. 31; το προφητεύειν replaces by the regular inf. the telic ἤν προφητεύητε of ver. 1 (see note).—καὶ τὸ λαλεῖν μὴ κυλιντεῖ γλώσσαις, "and the speaking with tongues do not hinder"; this is to be alloτυcd in the Church, but not encouraged like Prophecy, of course with the proviso that the Tongue has its interpreter (13, 28). For ἡστε with impv., see iv. 5, etc.—πάντα δὲ γινεῖσθαι: "But let all things be carried on, etc.": the δὲ attaches this caution specially to ver. 39; zeal for Prophecy and permission of Glossolalia must be guarded by the observance at all points of decorum and discipline.—ἐστηδίμωνες (see parl., and note on vii. 35), honeste (Vg.) or decenter; North. Eng. mensely (cf. Eph. iv. 1, v. 4, and 33 above)—a sort of "ethical enhancement of the more mechanical κατά τάξιν" (El.). On the latter expression, opp. of ἐτάξιον, 2 Thess. iii. 6 f., also xi. 34b above: the Cor. would interpret it by P.’s previous instructions—his παραδόθει, ἐστολαι, δόλον ἐν Χριστῷ —and those given in this Ep.—ἐστιθημόνων demands a right Christian taste and deportment, κατά τάξιν a strict Christian method and rule of procedure.

DIVISION V.: THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, CHAP. XV. Some members of the Cor. Church denied the resurrection of the dead (12), compelling the Ap. to enter on a systematic defence and exposition of this Christian doctrine. The question was not raised in the Church Letter; nor does Paul indicate the source of his information; the opinion of the τινές was openly expressed, and was doubtless matter of common report (cf. v. 1). Their position was incompatible with Christianity; it contravened, in-
flesh and the world of matter.—Paul's argument is in two parts: (A) vv. 1-34, concerning the certainty; (B) vv. 35-57, concerning the nature of the Resurrection.

To establish its certainty (A), P. begins by (a) rehearsing the historical evidence of Christ's bodily resurrection, which had been preached by himself εν πρώτοις and so received by the readers (τινίτι γάρ υμίν); (b) he shows that to deny the resurrection of the dead is to deny Christ's resurrection, and so to declare the Gospel witness false and its salvation illusive (12-19); and further, (c) that the risen Christ is the first-fruit of a great harvest, whose in-gathering is essential to the fulfilment of the kingdom of God (20-28); (d) he closes this part of the case by pointing to the practical results of faith or unbelief in a future resurrection (29-34). (B) The nature of the resurrection body is (α) illustrated by the difference between the seed and the perfect plant; also by the endless variety of material forms, in stanced in animal organisms and in the heavenly bodies, which helps us to understand how there may be a future body of a higher order than the present human frame (35-43). (β) This difference between the σώμα τερατωτικόν and the σώμα ψυχικόν being premised, it is argued that our investiture with the former is as necessary a consequence of our relation to Christ as our investiture with the latter is a consequence of our relation to Adam (44-49). (c) Only by this transformation, by the victory over death and sin thus achieved, can the promise of God in Scripture be fulfilled, His redeeming purpose effected, and the work of His servants made secure (51-58).—This is the earliest Christian doctrinal essay; in method and argumentative character it is akin to the Ep. to the Romans. Hn. ably defends its integrity against the attempts of Clemen and the Dutch School to make out interpolations and contradictions.

§ 50. The Facts Concerning Christ's Resurrection, xv. 1-11. The doubt which the Ap. combats strikes at the fundamental, probative fact of his Gospel. He must therefore go back to the beginning, and reassert the "first things" he had taught at Cor. (1-4); to establish the resurrection of Jesus Christ is logically to destroy the theorem, "There is no resurrection of the dead." (12). Six successive appearances of the Risen One are enumerated—the first made to Kephas, and the last to Paul himself—(5-9); the list is not intended as exhaustive, but includes the names most prominent in the Church, the witnesses whose testimony would be best known and most accessible. The Ap. dwells on the astonishing mercy that was in this way vouchsafed to himself (9 f.), insisting finally, on the unbroken agreement of the Apostolic preaching and of the Church's faith in regard to this supremely important event (11).

Vv. 1, 2. "Now I give you to know, brothers" (cf. xii. 3, for γνωρίζω): Paul writes, with a touch of blame, as though informing the Cor. of what the staple of his message had been, that on which their whole Christianity is built (εν γνώσει); to establish this supremely important event (11).

Ver. 1. "I make known the good news which, on the one hand, I proclaimed to you, which also, on the other hand, you received, through which also you are being saved". Ver. τίνι λόγῳ ευηγγελισάμην υμίν: is difficult to seize. The two interpretations of the R.V., text. and marg. (also A.V.), are those commonly adapted: (a) making the τίνι λόγῳ dependent on γνωρίζω, as appositive to το ευαγγελίον κ.τ.λ., "I make known the good news..." (so Bg., Hn., Ed.); (b) prefixing the clause, with an inversion of the normal order, to the hypothetical εἰκατέχετε, which states the condition of σώζεσθε, "(you are saved), if you hold fast by what word I preached" (Bz., Mr., Ev.)
There are convincing objections to both views, advanced by Mr. and El. against (a), and by Ed. and Hn. against (b): beside the harsh inversion it requires, (b) leaves the interrog. τίνι (the instances of τίς for δς, with ἐχω, adduced in Bm.'s Grammar are not really parl.), and the substitution of λόγος for ευαγγέλιον, unexplained. Preferring therefore construction (a), one feels that at this distance the τίνι λόγῳ clause practically detaches itself from γνωρίζω (Hf.); the Ap. restates το ευαγγέλιον in the altered shape of a challenge to the memory and faith of his readers—an interrogation prompted by the misgiving expressed directly afterwards in ει κατέχετε: "In what word (I ask) did I preach (it) to you?—(you will remember) if you are holding (it) fast!—unless you believed idly!" The λόγος is "the word of the gospel" (Acts xv. 7; cf. Eph. i. 13, Col. i. 5), "the story of the cross," etc. (i. 17), as told by P.—quo sermone (Vg.); not qua ratione (Er., Cv.). Can it be that the Cor. have let this slip or did they believe it εική—not frustra, in vain (so Vg., and most others, as in Gal. iii. 4), but in the common cl. sense of εἰκή, temere (cf. Rom. xiii. 4, Col. ii. 18), heedlessly, at random, without serious apprehension, without realising the facts involved. The self-contradiction of the τινές (τί) shows levity of belief. For εκτός εἰμι, see χίν. 5.

Vv. 3, 4 answer the question put in ver. 2, reinforcing the readers: "For I delivered to you amongst the first things, that which I also received".—καὶ emphases the identity of the παραδοθέν and παραλημφθέν, involved in the character of a "faithful steward" (iv. 1 f., cf. John xvii. 8, etc.). How these matters had been received—whether by direct revelation (Gal. i. 12) or through other contributory channels (cf. note on xi. 23 above)—is irrelevant.—ἐν πρώτοις, in primis, in chief (cf. i. Tim. i. 15 f.). The things thus delivered are "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He has been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." Amongst the three πρώτα, the first and third are πρώτα (cf. 2 Cor. v. 14 f., Rom. iv. 25, 1 Thess. iv. 14, etc.); the second is the link between them, signalising at once the completeness of the death and the reality of the resurrection (cf. Rom. vi. 4, x. 7): ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται is a more vivid and circumstantial expression for ὅτι ἐγήγερται εκ νεκρών (12, etc.).—The two chiefest facts P. and the other Apostolic preachers (ττ) were accustomed to verify, both separately and jointly, from the Old Testament, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς (Acts xiii. 32 ff., xvii. 3, xxvi. 22 f., Rom. i. 2 ff.), after the manner of Jesus (Luke xxii. 37, xxiv. 25 ff., John iii. 14). But it was the facts that opened their eyes to the meaning of the Scriptures concerned (cf. John ii. 22, xx. 9). The death and burial are affirmed in the aor. as historical events; the resurrection is put with emphasis into the pf. tense, as an abiding power (cf. προς, τί, 2ο = εγερθείς. . . ουκέτι αποθνήσκει (Rom. vi. 9; cf. Heb. vii. 25).—"For our sins," see pars.—"quia nos nostris abolendis" (Bg.).—"P. could not have said ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν if Christ's death were only an example of self-denial, not because ὑπὲρ must be rendered "instead of" (in loco), but because the ref. to sin involves with ὑπὲρ the notion of expiation" (Ed.); cf. the excellent note of Mr.; see the exposition of the relation of Christ's death to man's sin in 2 Cor. v. 18 ff., Rom. iii. 23 ff., v. 6-11, Gal. iii. 10 ff., with notes in this Comm. ad locc.; also ver. 36 below, and note. The definition on the third day indicates that "in His case restoration to life ensued, instead of the corruption of the corpse that sets in otherwise after this interval" (Hf.). Jesus appears to have seen a Scriptural necessity in the "third day" (Luke xxiv. 46).
states as having been formally delivered to the Cor. along with the facts attested; for these two clauses are under the regimen of παρέδωκα (ver. 3). The manifold testimony was detailed with more or less fulness at diff. times; but P. seems always to have related ἑπρίμης the witness of Κεφας and the Twelve, beside the revelation to himself (8). The Lord's manifestation to Peter (on the form Κεφας, see i. τ2) preceded that given to the body of the Απόστολος (Luke xxviii. 34). Peter's evidence, as the witness of Pentecost and ἀπόστολοι τ. Παντοκράτορ, was of palmary importance, ἐκκλησίας ἑλατρικῶν ἐν τ. Αποστολος (Thd.), esp. in view of the consensum to be asserted in ver. 11 (cf. i. 12).—ἐπέβαινες with dat., appeared (pass. aor., in reflexive sense: see Bm., pp. 52, 187), is used of exceptional, supernatural appearances (see parli.). "The twelve," the college of the App., without exact regard to number: actually ten, wanting Judas Iscariot, and Thomas absent on the first meeting. Luke speaks on this occasion of "the eleven" (the Western reading here) and those with them, xxvii. 33; Paul cites the official witnesses.

Ver. 6 carries forward ἑπέβαινες into a new sentence, independent of παρέδωκα ... ἕτως: the four remaining manifestations P. recites without indicating whether or not they formed a part of his original communication.—ἐπέβαινες (cf. 23, 46, xii. 28) ἑπέβαινες κ.τ.λ.: "After that (τοῦτο) He appeared to above (ἐπάνω, cf. Mark xiv. 5) five hundred brethren once for all" (σεμελί, Bz.). Nowhere else has ἑπέβαινες the meaning simul, at once (so Vg., and most interpreters, in violation of usage). This was the culminating manifestation of the risen Jesus, made at the general gathering to which His brethren were invited by Him in a body, as it is related in Matt. xxviii. 7, 10, Mark xvi. 7; the appearance to "the eleven" described in Matt. xxviii. 16 ff. is recorded as the sequel to this summons, and implies the presence of a larger assembly (see esp. the words οἱ ἐπάνω in ver. 17), such as P. alludes to; the great charge of Matt. xxviii. 18 ff., closing the First Gospel, corresponds by its importance to this ἑπέβαινες.—P. writes a quarter of a century after the event; the followers of Jesus were mostly young in age for "the majority" (οἱ πλείονες) to have been still alive. On ἑπέβαινες, see iv. 13.

Ver. 7. "After that, He appeared to James"—sc. James, the brother of the Lord, as elsewhere in P. (Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 12), included in the ἑπέβαινες τ. Κυρίου (ver. 5 above (see note); associated with P. in Acts xv. 13, xxi. 18 (see notes). The manifestation to James—only mentioned here—the chief of our Lord's formerly unbelieving brothers (John vii. 5), explains the presence of "His brothers" amongst the 120 disciples at Jerus. (Acts i. 14) and James' subsequent leadership in the mother Church. His high position at the time of writing accounts for his citation in this place. Paul made acquaintance with James as well as Peter on his first visit to the Jerus. Church (Gal. i. 18 f.). The well-known story about the meeting of Jesus with James told by Jerome (De viris illustr., 2) implies an earlier date for this than Paul's narrative admits of, since ἑπέβαινες signifies succession in time; succession of rank cannot be intended.—"After that, to all the
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6-10.

προσ Κορινθίους Α ἐκτρώματι, ὦφθη καμοί 9. εγὼ γὰρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἄνωτέρων, διὸ εἰμὶ ἵκανος καλεῖσθαι ἀνώτερος, διότι δὴ ἐκτρώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 10. καὶ ἵκανος καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ήχάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰμι, καὶ η ἕκαστος αὐτοῦ ή ἔχει ὡς κενὴν ἐγενήθη, ἀλλὰ περισσότερον πάντων ἐκποίσα. διὸ εἴδω δὲ ἀλλὰ ἕκαστος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ συν.

above. g 2 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 2 and Mt. iii. 11 (with inf.); Ex. iv. 10. b Gal. i. 13, 23, iv. 29; Phil. iii. 6; Acts ix. 4, xxii. 4, 7, xxvi. 11, 14 f.; Rev. xii. 13; Mt. v. 10 ff. etc. c See i. 4. i 1 Pet. i. 10; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 8; Rom. v. 15. m 1 Th. ii. i, iii. 5 (εἰς κενόν). For κενόν, see ver. 14. n Adv., Mk. vii. 36; Heb. vii. 17, viii. 15. For comp. adj., see xii. 23. o Rom. xvi. 6, 12; Ph. ii. 16; Acts xx. 35; Mt. vi. 28; Ps. cxvii. 1. For κενόν, see iii. 8.

1 Om. η DG, latt. verss. and Fl.—gratia ejus in me.

apostles": in this formal enumeration, ἀνώτερος bears its strictest sense, and could hardly include James (see Acts i. 13 f.; he is not certainly so styled in Gal. i. 19). Paul was, presumably, aware of the absence of Thomas on the occasion of ver. 5, and his consequent scepticism (John xx. 24 ff.). He therefore says distinctly that all participated in this latter sight, which coincides in point of time with Acts i. 6-12, not John xx. 26. The witness of the First App. to the resurrection was complete and unqualified.

Ver. 8. ἄσχατον δὲ πάντων, ὦτερα τῷ ἐκτρώματι: "But last of all, as it were to the abortion (a creature so unfit and so repulsive), He appeared also to me":—ἄσχατον (adv.) πάντων marks the conclusion of a long series; cf. iv. 9, also Mark xii. 22.—στερεῖ, a frequent cl. conjunction, "nonnihil mitigat—ut si [or quasi]: docet non debere hoc nimium premit. Articulam videt habet (τῷ ἐκτρώματι). Quod inter liberos est abortus, inquit, id ego sum in apostolis. . . . Ut abortus non est dignus humano nomine, sic apostolus negat se dignum apostoli appellatione" (Βg.; similarly Est., Mr., Al., Ed., Sm.). ἐκτρώματα need not be pressed beyond this figurative and descriptive meaning. However, Cv., Gr., Bt., Gd., and many find in the phrase an indication of the suddeness and violence of Paul's birth into Christ; Hn. and El. see pictured in it, more appropriately, the unripe birth of one who was changed at a stroke from the persecutor into the Apostle, instead of maturing normally for his work.—"P. describes himself thus in contrast with those who, when Jesus appeared to them, were already brothers or apostles, already born as God's children into the life of faith in Christ" (Hf.). Sm. aptly suggests that τῷ ἐκτρώματι was one of the insulting epithets flung at Paul by the Judaists; in their eyes he was a veritable Missgeburt. He adopts the title—"the abortion, as they call me"—and gives it a deeper meaning. His low stature may have suggested the taunt: cf. 2 Cor. κ.το, and Acts Pauli εί Στεφάνου, 3. An abortion is a living, genuine offspring.

Ver. 9. ὁ ἐλάχιστος corresponds to ἄσχατον πάντων (8); "the least" properly comes "last": cf. Eph. iii. 8, which enhances this expression; also 1 Tim. i. 15.—ὁ εἰμι ἵκανος καλείσθαι κ.τ.λ., "who am not fit to bear the name of apostle".—ἵκανος (lit. reaching up to, hinreichend), as distinguished from ἀξίον (worthy: xvi. 4), denotes adequacy, competence for office or work (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 5); the words are interchangeable "where the capacity to act consists in a certain moral condition of mind and heart" (Ed.: cf. Matt. iii. 11, and John i. 27).—διότι (propter quod, Bz.) έκτρώμα κ.τ.λ., "because I persecuted the Church of God"—a remorse which never left the Ap. (cf. Gal. i. 13, 1 Tim. i. 13 ff., Acts xxvi. 9 ff.); the prominence of this fact in Luke's narrative is a sign of Paul's hand. The Church of Jerusalem, whatever opposition to himself might proceed from it, was always to Paul "the church of God" (Gal. i. 13, 22): on this phrase, see note to i. 2. For καλόμενον, in this sense, cf. Rom. ix. 25 f., Heb. ii. 11.

This ver. explains how P. is "the abortion" among the App.; in respect of his dwarfishness, and the unripeness of his birth into Apostleship.

Ver. 10. "God's grace," which makes Paul what he is (see x. 1 f.; the double εἰμι is firmly assertive—"I am what I verily am"), is the favour, utterly undeserved, that summoned Saul of Tarsus
from the foremost rank of the persecutors to the foremost rank amongst the servants of the Lord Jesus: cf. i Tim. i. 14, Eph. iii. 8, ii. 7, Gal. i. 13 ff. The grace of Apostleship implies the antecedent grace of forgiveness and adoption.—καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐμὲ ἐδωκε κ.τ.λ., “and His grace that was extended unto me, has not proved vain”: cf. the emphatic ἐμοί of Eph. iii. 8; the repeated art. marks me as the signal object of this grace; for χάρις ἐμὲ, cf. 1 Peter i. 10.—κανὴ (cf. 14) means not void of result (that is ματαία, τοῦ), but υπὸ of reality: Paul's Apostleship was no titular office, no mere benevolence towards an unworthy man; the favour brought with it a labour quite as extraordinary—"nay, but (ἀλλὰ) more abundantly than they all did I labour".—κοπιάω connotes ερήμωσιν, painful or exhausting toil, see note on κόπος, iii. 8. So that, if last and least at the outset, and conspicuously unfit for Apostleship, in execution P. took the premier place: see 2 Cor. x. 13-15, xi. 23, xii. 11 ff., Rom. xv. 15-21.—αιτῶν πάντων, presumably, more than all the rest together: by his single labours P. had extended the kingdom of Christ over a region wider than all the Twelve had advanced up to this date.—From the depth of Paul's self-abasement a new pride is ready to spring, which is corrected instantly by the words, όπο αὐτὸ ἢ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ συν ἐμέ: "not I, however, but the grace of God (working) with me"—this really wrought the work; I was its instrument. See iii. 7 ff., xii. 6, Phil. ii. 12 f., Eph. iii. 20, Col. i. 29; and for the turn of expression, Gal. ii. 20.

Ver. 11 breaks off the comparison between himself and the other App., into which Paul was being drawn, to sum up the statement of fact and evidence concerning Christ's resurrection: "Whether then it were I (8 f.) or they (Kephas, the Twelve, the first disciples, James: 5 ff.), so we proclaim (3 f.), and so you believed (2)". For εἰτέ, εἰτέ, giving alternatives indifferent from the point of view assumed, cf. iii. 22, x. 31, etc.—οὔτως is emphatic: in the essential matters of vv. 1-4 and the crucial point of the resurrection of Jesus, there is not the least variation in the authoritative testimony; Peter, James, Paul—Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth—are in perfect accord, preaching, believing, with one mind and one mouth, that the crucified Jesus rose from the dead.—On κηρύσσω, see note to i. 23.—This closes the case on the ground of testimony.

§ 51. If Christ is not Risen? xv. 12-19. Paul has intrenched his own position; he advances to demolish that of his opponents. His negative demonstration, taking the form of a destructive hypothetical syllogism, has two branches: he deduces (a), in vv. 13-15, from the (supposed) non-existence of the fact of resurrection, the falsity of the faith (κενὴ ἡ πίστις) accorded to it, and of the witnesses attesting it; (b), in vv. 17-19, from the non-existence of the effect, the unreality of the effects derived from it (ματαία ἡ πίστις). Are the sceptics at Corinth prepared to affirm that the App. are liars and that the new life and hopes of their fellow-Christians are an illusion! In arguing these two points, P. presses on the impugners twice over (13, 16), that their general denial logically and in principle excludes Christ's resurrection.

Ver. 12. οὐ contrasts with the affirmation of all Christians (11) the contradictory dogma of τινες ἐν ὑμῖν. For their sake P. made the rehearsal of vv. 1 f. "But if Christ is preached, (to wit) that He is raised from the dead"—not "it is preached that Christ, etc.": the preaching of Christ is the preaching of His resurrection; ἐγγεγραμμένος and ἐσταυρωμένος (see i. 23 f., ii. 2) are, both of them, predicates inseparable from Χριστὸς (cf. Rom. iv. 24 f., viii. 34, x. 9, 2 Cor. v. 15;
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13. εἰ δὲ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἐστιν, ἦν τί τινὲς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγείρονται. 14. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγείρη γείρεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγείρονται. 15. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν εὑρίσκεται καὶ ὑμῶν, ἐκείνη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐμὴ πίστις ὑμῶν: οὐκ ἦγειρεν ἐκείνη δὲ νεκρὸς ὑμῶν:

See note I above.

Acts xvii. 18, 1 Peter iii. 18, 21, etc.). For the πρ. ἐγείρθη, see ver. 4.—If this is so, “how (is it that) amongst you some say?”—a crying contradiction, that Christ is preached as risen and is so believed by the readers, and yet some of them say, ‘Ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἐστιν, “There is no (such thing as a) resurrection of dead (men)!’’ (cf. the modern dogma, ‘MIRACLES NEVER HAPPEN’),—a sweeping denial of anything of the kind. The doctrine of the Sadducees (Acts xxiii. 8); cf., for the Greeks, out of countless parts., Ἀσχύλος, Εὐμέν., 639, ἐγέρσθαι ἑνότοις ὡς ἀνάστασις.

The deniers are some (not many), quidam, quos nominare nolo (Μτ.: cf. 2 Cor. χ. 2, etc.),—how, when they were the few wise men of i. 26! (Ed.). Their maxim belonged to the current “wisdom of this age” (i. 20, iii. 19 f.). —τοις, of surprised expostulation, as in Gal. ii. 14; for the emphasis on τινὲς, cf. John xiv. 9, τοίς οὖν λόγοις;

Ver. 13 opposes (8) the thesis of the τινὲς by a syllogism in the modus tollens—sublatum generis, tollitur et species (Gr.): if bodily resurrection is per se impossible, then there is no risen Christ (so Βg., Μτ., Al., Bt., Ed., El., etc.); the abstract universal negative of the deniers ver. 16 will restate in the concrete. Ηn. and Gd. (somewhat similarly Κm., Κv.) hold, on the other hand, that P. is making out the essential connexion between Christ’s rising and that of the Christian dead—in which case he should have written ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν; he speaks of “the dead in Christ” first in ver. 18. Ηn. and Gd. justly observe that the τινὲς might have allowed Christ’s resurrection as an exception, but the point of Paul’s argument is that this is logically impossible, that the absolute philosophical denial of bodily resurrection precludes the raising up of Jesus Christ; on the other hand, if Ηe is risen, the axiom ἀνάστασις οὐκ ἐστὶν is disproved, the spell of death is broken, and Christ’s rising carries with it that of those who are “in Christ” (Θεοῦ; cf. John iii. 36, Ηeβ. ii. 15).

Ver. 14, 15. The implicit affirmative conclusion just intimated P. will develop afterwards. He has first to push the opposing axiom to further consequences: (1) if the fact is untrue, the testimony is untrue—‘But if Christ is not raised, vain therefore is our proclamation, vain also your faith’—κενὸς (see note on οὐ κενῆ, io; and cf. κενός, i. 17, etc.) signifies void, unsubstantial (inanis, Vg.); a holow witness, a hollow belief, while μαρτυρία (17; see parls.) is “vain” as ineffectual, frustrate. For κενομεν, see note on i. 21; on its distinction from λόγος (2), see ii. 4: οὐκ ὁμοιότατος includes P. and his colleagues (11). For ἄρα, see v. 10.—If “the message is empty,” declaring a thing that is not, “the faith is also
empty," building on the thing that is not; preaching and faith have no genuine content; the Gospel is evacuated of all reality.—For the character of P. and his fellow-witnesses this conclusion has a serious aspect: "We are found over (to be) false witnesses of God"—men who have given lying testimony, and that about God, "the worst sort of impostors" (Gd.)! τοῦ Θεοῦ is objective gen., as the next clause shows; it is always "God" to whom P. imputes the raising of Christ, who by this act gave His verdict concerning Jesus (Rom. i.4, Gal. i. 1, Eph. i. 20; Acts ii. 36, xiii. 30-39, xvii. 31).—διά καὶ calls emphatic attention to another and contrasted side of the matter in hand.—εὑρίσκομαι approaches the sense of ἔλεγχομαι or ἀλλισκομαι (see parl.)—"discovered" in a false and guilty position.—Nothing can be stronger evidence than this passage to the objective reality, in Paul's experience, of the risen form of Jesus. The suspicion of hallucination, on his own part or that of the other witnesses, was foreign to his mind; the matter stood on the plain footing of testimony, given by a large number of intelligent, sober, and responsible witnesses to a sensible, concrete, circumstantial fact: "Either He rose from the grave, or we lied in affirming it"—the dilemma admits of no escape.—καὶ οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἀπώλοντο. "Then also those that were laid to sleep in Christ perished!"—perished (ptp. and vb. both aor.) when we laid them to rest, and with the
ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α.

Χριστός ἡ αἰώνιος ζῶος. Εἰ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ μονόν, ἡ ἀληθινὴ παύντων ἀβρααμίων ἡμῶν.

20. Νῦν δὲ ἐκ Χριστοῦ ἡ ἐγνώσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἡ ἀπαρχή τῶν ἁπλικότες εσμέν.

"perishing" which befalls those "yet in their sins" (cf. i. 18, viii. 11, Rom. ii. 12, vi. 23, etc., also John vii. 21, 24). They were "put to sleep in Christ" (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 14), as the sense of His presence and the promises of His gospel turned their death into sleep (John xi. 11, etc.). The μαθαιότης of being lulled to sleep when falling into utter ruin! They thought "the sting of death" drawn (56), and lay down to rest untroubled: cruelly deceived! For the unclassical position of άρα, see Wr., p. 699.

Ver. 19 expresses the infinite bitterness of such a deception. In the right order of words (see txtl. note), μόνον is attached to ἀληθικότες (cf. Luke xxiv. 21): "If in this life we have only had hope in Christ"—no present deliverance from sin, no future inheritance in heaven—"we are more than all men to be pitied".

For a hope without legitimate basis or ultimate fruition, Christians have sacrificed all material good! (cf. 30 ff., iv. 11 ff.; Heb. x. 32-46, Luke xviii. 22, etc.). ἀληθικότες εσμέν = ἁλλάκται (1 Tim. iv. 10), with stress laid on the actual condition of those who have formed this futile hope. οὐκ οὖν Χριστοῦ points to Christ as the ground of Christian hope (cf. Phil. ii. 10). οὐκ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ brings to mind all that the Christian forfeits here and now—losing "this life" for the vain promise of another, letting earth go in grasping at a fancied heaven; no wonder the world pities us!—Ed. ad loc. answers well the censure passed on the Ap., as though he made the worth of goodness depend on its future reward: (1) P. does not say "we are more worthless"—a good man may very "pitiable," and all the more because of his worth; (2) on Paul's hypothesis (17), moral character is undermined, while future happiness is destroyed, by denial of the Resurrection.


Paul has proved the absolute and historic reality of Christ's personal resurrection by the abundant and truthful testimony to the fact (5-15), and by the experimental realization of its effects (17). In ver. 20a he therefore affirms it unconditionally, having overthrown the contrary assertion that "there is no resurrection of the dead." But Christ never stands alone; He forms "a body" with "many members" (xii. 12); He is "firstborn among many brothers" (Rom. viii. 29, Col. i. 18, John xv. 5, etc.). His rising shows that bodily resurrection is possible; nay, it is inevitable for those who are in Him (18, 20b, 23). In truth, the universal redemption of Christ's people from the grave is indispensable for the realisation of human destiny and for the assured triumph of God's kingdom (24-28). The Ap. thus advances from the experimental (§ 51) to the theological proof of his theorem, much as in Rom. v. 1-11, 12-21.

Ver. 20. Νῦν δὲ (cf. xii. 18) marks the logical point P. has reached by the reductio ad impossibile of the negative proposition attacked in ver. 12. Christ has been raised; therefore there is a resurrection of the dead (12-18): "now" the ground is cleared and the foundation laid for the declaration that the Christian dead shall rise in Him—"Christ has been raised from the dead, a firstfruit of them that have fallen asleep"; He has risen in this character and purpose, "not to remain alone in His estate of glory" (Gd.).—ἀπαρχή τῶν κεκοιμημένων (Col. i. 6, Rev. i. 5).—Cm. and Bg. are surely right in seeing here an allusion to the first harvest-sheaf (ἀπαρχή του φερμοῦ άμών, Lev. xxvii. 10: cf. in this connexion Matt. xiii. 39 ff. with John v. 28 f. and Rev. xiv. 14 f.) of the Passover, which was presented in the Sanctuary on the 16th Nisan, probably the day of the resurrection of Jesus; this allusion is in the Easter strain of v. 6 ff. (see notes). The first ripe sheaf is an earnest and sample of the harvest, consecrated to God and laid up with Him (cf. Rom. vi. 10 f.) in anticipation of the rest. The Resurrection has begun.

Vv. 21, 22 explain the identification of
the risen Christ with those sleeping in death, which was assumed by the word απαρχή. It rests on the fact that Christ is the antitype of Adam, the medium of life to the race as Adam was of death. This parl. is resumed in vv. 46 ff., where it is applied to the nature of the resurrection body, as here to the universality of the resurrection. These two passages form the complement of Rom. v. 12-21; the antithesis of Adam and Christ—who represent flesh, trespass, death and spirit, righteousness, life respectively—is thus extended over the entire career of the race viewed as a history of sin and redemption. "For since through man (there is) death, through man also (there is) a resurrection of the dead": δι' ανθρώπου, "through human means or mediation. For επειδή, quidem (Cν.), see i. 21 f.: the first fact necessitated and shaped the second: man was the channel conveying death to his kind (Rom. v. 12), through the same channel the counter current must flow (Rom. v. 15, etc.). This goes deeper than απαρχή, Christ is the αρχή, the principle and root of resurrection-life (Col. i. 18)."—"Through man" implies that Death is not, as philosophy supposed, a law of finite being or a necessity of fate; it is an event of history, a calamity brought by man upon himself and capable of removal by the like means. —διώτερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἄδαμ κ.τ.λ.: "For just as in the Adam all die, so also in the Christ all will be made alive". The foregoing double δι' ανθρώπου opens out into "the (representative) Adam and Christ"—the natural and spiritual, earthly and heavenly counterparts (45 ff.), the two types and founders of humanity, paralleled by διώτερ ... καὶ οὕτως (cf. Rom. v. 12 ff.).—The stress of the comparison does not lie on ζωοποίησον, as though the Ap. meant to say that "all (men)" will rise in Christ as certainly as they die in Adam (so, with variations, Or., Cm., Cv., Mr., Gd., Sm., El., referring to John v. 28 f., Acts xxiv. 15): as Bt. says, the absence of ανθρώπου tells against such ref. to the race (contrast Rom. v. 12, 18), also, the use of ζωοποίησον (see below). The point is that as death in all cases is grounded in Adam, so life in all cases is grounded in Christ (cf. John vi. 53, xii. 25)—no death without the one, no life without the other (Aug., Bg., Hf., Ed., Hn., Bt.). πάντες = οι πολλοί (Rom. v. 18 f.), as set in contrast with ο άνθρωπος.—Ζωοποίησον is narrower in extension than ἐγείρω (2ο), since the latter applies to every one raised from the grave (15 f., 35); wider in intension, as it imports not the mere raising of the body, but restoration to "life" in the full sense of the term (Hf.; cf. 45, Rom. vi. 8, viii. 11; John v. 21, vi. 63),—ανάστασιν ζωής (John v. 29). A firm and broad basis is now shown to exist for the solidarity between Christ and the holy dead (οι κεκοιμημένοι) affirmed in ver. 20. Ver. 23. But απαρχή implies difference in agreement, distinction in order along with unity in nature and determining principle. Hence the added qualification, έκάστος δὲ εν τῷ ιδίῳ τάγματι, κ.τ.λ.: "But each in his proper rank—Christ (as) firstfruit; thereafter, at His coming, the (people) of Christ". τάγμα signifies a military division (cf. xiv. 40). There are two τάγματα (cf. Matt. xiii. 8) of the resurrection host; the Captain (ο αρχηγός, Heb. ii. 10; cf. απαρχή above), in His solitary glory; and the rest of the army now sleeping, to rise at His trumpet's sound (52, Ι Τhess. iv. 16).—It is incongruous to make a third τάγμα out of το τέλος (ver. 24) as Bg. and Mr. would do, paraphrasing this as "the last act (of the resurrection)",—viz., the resurrection of non-Christians. Their introduction is irrelevant: P. has proved the resurrection of Christ, and is now making out that the resurrection of His sleeping ones is bound up with His own. Christ and Christians are the participants in the resurrection of life. έκκοιμητα, opp. of κρύων (cf. 46) implied
The noun freq. with this ref. Cf. xvi. 17. 

Ver. 24. είτα το τέλος: "Then (is) the end "—sc., "at His coming". Christ's advent, attended with the resurrection of His redeemed to eternal life, concludes the world's history; then "the harvest" which is "the end of the world" (Luke xxi. 39 f., 49; cf. Rev. xiv. 15 f.), "the end of all things" (1 Pet. iv. 7), the dénouement of the drama of sin and redemption in which "the Adam" and "the Christ" have played out their respective parts, the limit of the human horizon. —As εἰσέρχεται was defined by εν τῇ παρουσίᾳ, so είτα by the two ὅταν clauses: "when He yields up the kingdom to His God and Father, when He has abolished every rule and every authority and power ", the two vbs. denote distinct, but connected and complementary acts. παρὰδεδομένη (the reading παραδοτός is sbj., not opt.: Ec., p. 40) is pr. sbj., signifying a proceeding, contingent in its date and manner of occurrence, but concurrent with είτα, which again rests upon εν τῇ παρουσίᾳ. The aor. sbj. κατάργηση (Lat. futurum exactum) signals an event lying behind the παράδοσις and by its nature antecedent thereto, —"when He shall have done away, etc." —every opposing force has been destroyed, then Christ lays at the Father's feet His kingdom. "Cum tradat (not tradiderit: so Vg., reading παραδοτός) regnum, etc., cum evaucerit omnen princi-
Ver. 25 sustains the representation of the τέλος just given by prophetic words of Scripture (cf. 3 f.): "For He must needs reign, until He has put all the enemies underneath His feet". Not till every enemy of God is vanquished can Christ’s existing kingdom reach its end. P. is thinking of the culmination, not the cessation, of Christ’s kingship (see note on τερατικόν, 24). — τέλος is added to the text of the Psalmist, as if to say: "Every one of the foes proscribed in the Messiah’s charter must submit, before He can present to His Father a perfect kingdom"; see par., for other applications of this cardinal Ο.Τ. dictum.—On δεί, see note to viii. 2.—ἀχρίς ού—radically "up to," rather than "until" (the time at which)—in later Gr. takes sbj. of future contingency dispensing with ἀν (Wt., p. 371)—The words of Ps. cx. are freely adapted: θή gets its subject from αὐτόν, viz. Christ—not God, as imported by Est., Bz., Gf., Ηf., Gd., to suit the R.; it is parl. in tense-construction to καταργήσῃ (24, see note).

Ver. 26. ἐσχάτος ἐχθρός καταργεῖται ὁ δάσατος: "(As) last enemy death is abolished"—in other words, "is abolished last among these enemies"—ἐσχάτος is the emphatic part of the predicate; and καταργεῖται (see i. 28) is in pr. tense, of what is true now in God’s determination, in the fixed succession of things (cf. iii. 13). Death personified, as in ver. 55, Ισα.xxv. 8, Rev. xx. 14. If all enemies must be subdued, and death is last to fall, then "the end" (24) cannot be until Christ has delivered His own from its power and thus broken Death’s sceptre.—This ver. should close with a full stop. Καταργεῖται ὁ δάσατος is the Christian counter-position to the ἀνατάσεις τῶν τοῦ θανάτου of Cor. philosophy; the τετελεσμένον of ver. 12 say, "There is no resurrection"; P. replies, "There is to be no death". The dogma of unbelief has been confuted in fact by Christ’s bodily resurrection (13 ff.); in experience, by the saving effect thereof in Christians (17); and now finally in principle, by its contrariety to the purpose and scope of redemption (21-26), which finds its goal in the death of Death. Hofmann makes το τέλος in ver. 24 adverbial to ver. 26 ("at last," cf. 1 Peter iii. 8), with the δεί clauses as its definitions and the γαρ clause parenthetical:"then finally, when etc., when etc. (for etc.), as last enemy death is abolished". His construction is too artificial to be sustained; but he sees rightly that this ver. is the climax of the Apostle’s argument.

Vv. 27, 28 are a supplement to vv. 20-26. They reaffirm, in new words of Scripture, the unlimited dominion assigned to Christ (25-27a), in order to reassert more impressively the truth that only through His absolute victory can the kingdom of God be consummated (24α, 28b). The opening γαρ adduces, by way of comment, a prophecy parl. to that cited in ver. 25 and specifically applied in ver. 26. Psalm viii. promised to man complete rule over his domain (cf. Heb. ii. 5 ff.); as man Christ here stands forth the counter-type of Adam (21 f.) who forfeited our estate, winning for Himself and His own the deliverance from death (Heb. ii. 9, 14 f.) which seals His conquest and sets "all things under His feet". But (86 . . . 86) this subjection of all things to Christ is no infringement of God’s sovereignty nor alienation of His rights; on the contrary, it is the means to their perfect realisation. Such is the purport of the two δεί sentences, the second of which repeats in another way, after the interpolated δήλον δεί clause, what the first has announced, τοῖς αὐτοῖς...
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"ότι εκτός του ὑποτάξευσις αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε καὶ αὗτος ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξευσις αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ὑπὸ πάντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Πάσων.

ο Col. iii. 11; Herod., iii., 157, πάντα ἐν τοῖς Βαβυλώνιοις Ζωνταρ. (Al.)

"οταν . . . παντα omd.by δS", and a few others, skipping from τ. παντα of ver. 27.

1 Om. καιΒDG, τ7,67**,latt.νg. Lachm. and W.Η. bracket;Τr.omits.

2 Οm. τα ΑΒD", τ7.

3 Cf. νι.18, and xiν.5. See xii.6.
on αυτος υποταγησται (so most comm.-t:) or on τα υποταξατι (so Hf., and some others). This solemn conclusion most fitly attaches to the princ. vb.; it expresses the loyal purpose of the Son in His self-subjection, whose submission exhibits the unity of the Godhead (cf. John x. 30-36, xvii. 23), and constitutes itself the focus and uniting bond of a universe in which God's will is everywhere reignant and His being everywhere immanent.—ταυτω neuter, like παντα.

§ 53. THE EFFECT OF UNBELIEF IN THE RESURRECTION, xv. 29-34. To clinch the argument for the truth and the necessity of the Christian resurrection and to bring it home to the readers, the Ap. points out how futile Christian devotion must be, such as it is witnessed in "those baptised for the dead" and in his own daily hazards, if death ends all (29-31); present enjoyment would then appear the highest good (32). The effect of unbelief in the future life is already painfully apparent in the relaxed moral tone of a certain part of the Cor. Church (33 f.).

Vv. 29, 30. There are certain conditions of interpretation bearing on the sense of the much discussed expression οι βαπτιζομενοι υπερ των νεκρων which bar out a large number of attempted explanations: (a) οι βαπτιζομενοι, unless otherwise defined, can only mean the recipients of Christian baptism, in its well-understood sense as the rite of initiation into the Christian state administered upon confession of faith (i. 13 ff., xii. 13, Rom. vi. 3 f., Gal. iii. 27, etc.). (b) υπερ των νεκρων (not υπερ νεκρων, "on behalf of dead persons" as such: cf. 12, etc.) points to a specific class of "the dead" interested in the baptism of the living—presumably to "the (Christian) dead" of the last §, and probably to those amongst them who were connected with "the baptised" in question. (c) In following up ver. 29 with the words of ver. 30 (τι καλ ημεις καυνυκευσαν;) P. associates himself with the action of "those baptised for the dead," indicating that they and he are engaged on the same behalf (for καλ ημεις associating "we" with persons aforementioned, cf. 2 Cor. iv. 13, Gal. ii. 16, iv. 3, Eph. ii. 3, etc.). This last consideration excludes the interpretation, at present widely adopted (Ambrst., Anselm, Grot., Mr., Holsten, Al., Hn., Bt., El., Sm.), that P. alludes to a practice then (it is conjectured) in vogue at Cor., which existed much later amongst the heretical Cerinthians and Marcionites (see Cm. ad loc. in Cramer's Catena; Tert., De Resurr. Carnis, 48, adv. Marc., v. 10; Epiph., Her., xxviii. 6), viz., that of the vicarious baptism of living Christians as proxies for relatives or friends dying unbaptised. With such a proceeding P. could not have identified himself, even supposing that it existed at this time in the Church (of which there is no evidence), and that he had used it by way of argumentum ad hominem. An appeal to such a superstitious opus operaturn would have laid the Ap. open to a damaging retort, Gd. justly asks, "Αγου ειτε σεξηρεστω "{uninterpretable text}"This objection tells less forcibly against the view, lately suggested, that P. alludes to some practice of substitutionary baptism observed in the Pagan mysteries, finding thus a witness to the Resurrection in the heathen conscience, και ημεις adding thereto the Christian practical testimony; but condition (a) forbids this solution. As El. admits, condition (b) also bears strongly against the prevalent exposition. (6) moreover negates the idea of Cm. and the Gr. Fl., maintained by Est. and Ev. (see the ingenious Addit. Note of the latter), that υπερ των νεκρων means, as Thp. puts it, υπερ αναστασεως, και ημεις αναστησαμεν: if P. meant this, why did he not say it? The fol-
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31. "καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκω, τῷ τῶν ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκων ἑαυτῷ νήμα τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. "καθ' ἡμέραν πάντα πάντα ἐγὼ εἰς Χριστόν ἤπειρον. 32. εἰ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἦμα, εἰς τὸν κατὰ Χριστόν ἔχω ἐν Χριστώ Ιησούτω Κυρίω ημών.

Acts; Mt. xxvi. 55. y N.T. k.l.; Gen. chii. 13 f. ο. = obj. gen., Rom. xi. 31; so νημα. Rom. xv. 4. See note below. a Rom. xv. 17. For the noun, Rom. iii. 27; 6 exx. in 2 Cor.; 1 Th. ii. 19; Jas. iv. 16. -ημετ., see ημα, see ν. 6; -αομαι, see ν. 29. b See iii. 3, and note below.

For τί ποιήσουσιν; (see LXX parls.) indicates that the hope on which these baptisms rest will be stultified, without a resurrection; it will betray them (Rom. ν. 5). -ει όλως νεκροί κ.τ.λ., "If absolutely (οmnino, Vg.; see note, ν. 10) dead men are not raised" (the axiom of the unbelievers, πz, π5, Ει unfolds the assumption involved in τι κατά άνθρωπον ημα, which repeats, with emphasis on the pronoun, the former question—"Why indeed are they baptised for them?"

how can they be interested in the baptism of survivors, if they have perished (18)? On this assumption, converts would have been gained upon false hopes (cf. 19), as well as upon false testimony (15).—"Why also do we run hazard every hour!"—further consequent of ει νεκροί ουκ εγείρονται: "our case (that of the App. and other missionaries, braving death unceasingly: see τI; iv. 9 ff., 2 Cor. iv. 10 ff., xi. 23 ff.; John xv. 18-xvi. 22) is parl. to theirs; as they, in love for the dead whom they hope to meet again, take up the cross of Christian profession, so we in the same hope face hourly peril".

Vv. 31, 32a. In no slight jeopardy do P. and his comrades stand; for his part he declares, "Daily I am dying; my life at Ephesus has been that of a combatant with wild beasts in the arena—for what end, if there is no resurrection?" With καθ' ημέραν ἀποθνῄσκω cf. 2 Cor. iv. 10, xi. 23, Rom. viii. 36; referring to his present "affliction in Asia," P. writes in 2 Cor. i. 8 f., "We have had the sentence of death in ourselves". Ed. softens the expression into "self-denial, dying to self and the world": better Cv., "obsideoe assiduis mortibus quotidie"; and Gd., "Not a day, nor an hour of the day, when they might not expect to be seized and led out to execution".—P. had not been in this extreme peril at

lowing οὗτος αὐτῶν indicates that by οὗτος τῶν νεκρῶν definite (dead) persons are meant. Ed. notices with approval the rendering of John Edwards (Camb., 1692), who supposed these "baptized" to be men converted to Christianity by the heroism of the martyrs; somewhat similarly, Gd. This points in the right direction, but misses the force of οὕτως (on behalf of; not έπεί, on account of), and narrows the ref. of τῶν νεκρῶν (cf. 18, 20, 23); there is no indication in the ep. of martyrdoms at Cor. (see, on the contrary, iv. 9 f.). P. is referring rather to a much commoner, indeed a normal experience, that the death of Christians leads to the conversion of survivors, who in the first instance "for the sake of the dead" (their beloved dead), and in the hope of reunion, turn to Christ—e.g., when a dying mother wins her son by the appeal, "Meet me in heaven!" Such appeals, and their frequent salutary effect, give strong and touching evidence of faith in the resurrection; some recent example of the kind may have suggested this ref. Paul designates such converts "baptised for the dead," since Baptism seals the new believer and commits him to the Christian life (see note, xii. 13) with all its losses and hazards (cf. 30). The hope of future blessedness, alloying itself with family affections and friendship, was one of the most powerful factors in the early spread of Christianity. Mr. objects to this view (expounded by Köster) that τ. νεκρῶν needs definition by συγγενών και φίλων, or the like, to bear such meaning; but to each of these βαπτιζόμενοι those who had thus influenced him would be "the dead". The obscure passage has, upon this explanation, a large, abiding import suitable to the solemn and elevated context in which it stands; the words reveal a communion in Christ between the living and departed (cf. Rom. xiv. 9), to which the hope of the resurrection gives validity and worth (cf. 1 Thess. v. 10, 2 Thess. ii. 1).
Cor. (see Acts xviii. 9 f.), and his readers might think the description overdrawn; so he exclaims, "νή τ. υμετέραν καύχησιν κ.τ.λ.: "Yea, by the glorying over you, brothers, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord!" cf. the protests of 2 Cor. i. 18, 23, xi. 10 f., 31, Rom. ix. 16. He protests by this καύχησις as by that which is dearest to him: cf. i. 4 ff., iv. 14, 2 Cor. vii. 1, 14 ff.; similarly in 1 Thess. ii. 19 f., 2 Thess. i. 4, Phil. iv. 1, etc. For this rare use of the pron., cf. xi. 24, τ. ζωήν ανάμνησαν (and note), 2 Cor. ix. 3. νή (= ναί) with acc. of adjuration, a cl. idiom.—Paul's "glorying" he "holds in Christ Jesus our Lord" (cf. i. 7); it is laid up with Christ as a καύχημα ειςημέραν Χ. (Phil. ii. 16; cf. iii. 8, iv. 3 ff. above, 1 Thess. ii. 19, Col. i. 4, etc.).—"If in the manner of men I have fought with wild beasts in Ephesus, what is the profit!" κατά άνθρωπον bears the stress, "humanitus-spe vitae praesentisduntaxat" (Vulg.; cf. iii. 3 f.); seeking the rewards—applause, money, etc.—for which men risk their lives. Instead of these, P. earns poverty and infamy (iv. 9 ff., Phil. iii. 7 f.); if there is no "day of Christ" when his "glorying" will be realised, he has been fooled (cf. i. 19 and note, Phil. iii. 14, 2 Tim iv. 8; Matt. xix. 27 ff., Luke xiv. 14, xxii. 28 ff.).—διπλως (from διπλαι, to increase; nearly syn. with μισθός, iii. 8, etc.; or κέρδος, Phil. i. 21) signifies the consequent advantage accruing to P. from his fight; that it brings present moral benefit is obvious, but this is not the point (cf. iv. 4-27; see Ed. ad loc.), touching the diff. of pagan and Christian morality.)—θηριομάχος is probably figurative, though Gd., Weizsäcker (Apost. Zeitalter, pp. 325 f.), McGiffert (Christianity in the Apost. Age, pp. 280 f.), with some older expositors, take it that P. had been actually a θηριομάχος in the Ephesian amphitheatre, despite his Roman citizenship. But no such experience is recorded in the list of his woes in 2 Cor. xii.; moreover it appears from Acts xix. 31-40 that P. had friends in high quarters at Eph., who would have prevented this outrage attempted. Ignatius (ad Rom., iv.) applies the figure to his guards, borrowing it probably from this place. The metaphor is in the strain of iv. 9 (see note); cf. also Ps. xxi. 12, 16, etc., and the use of όφελος in the Rev.—In view of this last parl. and of 2 Tim. iv. 17, Krenkel in his Beiträge, V., finds the "wild beast" of Paul's struggle in the Imperial Power, which K. thinks was already so designated "in the secret language of Christians" (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 5 f.). But nothing in Acts xix. indicates conflict on P.'s part with the magistrates of Eph. (and Lk. habitually traces with care his relations with Roman authorities); it was the θηριομάχος, instigated by the shrine-makers, which attacked him; before the riot he had been probably in danger of assassination from this quarter, as well as from "the Asian Jews," who set upon him afterwards in Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 27 ff.).

Vv. 32b states in words of Scripture the desperation that ensues upon loss of faith in a future life: "If (the) dead are not raised (the Sadducean dogma repeated a sixth time), 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!'" ει νεκροί κ.τ.λ. is rightly attached by the early Gr. and most modern commentt. to the following clause. Paul is not drawing his own conclusion in these words, nor suggesting that the resurrection supplies the only motive against a sensual life; but he points out (cf. 33 f.) the patent fruit of the unbelief in question. This is just what men were saying on all sides; the words quoted voice the moral recklessness bred by loss of hope beyond death. Gr. and Rom. literature teem with examples of this spirit (see Wisd. ii. 6; Herod., ii., 78, Thuc., iii., 53, and other reff. furnished by Ed. ad loc.); indeed Paul's O.T. citation might have served for the axiom of popular Epicureanism. Hn. describes ancient drinking-cups, recently discovered, ornamented with skeleton figures wreathed in roses and named after famous philosophers, poets, and gourmands, with mottoes at attached such as these: το τέλος ηδονή, τέρπε ζών σεαυτόν, σκηνή βίος, τούτον μετάλαβε το γάρ αύριον έστιν. Cf. our own miserable adage, "A short life and a merry one!"

Vv. 33, 34 deliver Paul's judgment
33. "μη πλανάσθε." “χρηστάνθην κυρίως άμαρτάντες, ορθά ὑμιν λέγω."

34. εκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μη αμαρτάνετε," αγνωσίαν γαρ έχουσι προς έντροπην υμιν λέγω."

35. "Αλλ' ερεί τις, "Πώς εγείρονται οι νεκροί; ποίω δέ ευομαι,xiii.4; -οτης,2 Cor.vi.6,and eight times besides in Ρ. 1 Ν.Τ. h.l., Gen. ix. 24: 1 Κi.xxν.37ί,Joiel.5,ανανηφω.

upon the situation: the disbelief in the Resurrection declared in the Cor. Church is of a piece with its low ethics (iii. 1 ff., iv. 18-v. 2) and its heathen intimacies (v. 3-11; vi. 1-13; vii. 1-24); it springs from αγνωσία Θεού, from a feeble religious consciousness.—μη πλανάσθε (see parls.), “Be not misled (seduced)”; the seduction lay in the specious philosophy under which sceptical tenets were advanced, concealing their demoralising tendency. The line the Ap. quotes (an ordinary senarius of the dialogue in the Attic drama: κρηστά, so τυritten in the best copies, was probably χρήσθ', Τr., Ηn.) is attributed to Μenander (322 Β.С.), of the Νew Comedy and an Εpicurean, by Τert. and Ηier., followed by most others. But this was a proverbial gnôme, and probably current long before Μenander. εκνήψατε δικαίως κ.τ.λ. (cf. 32b, xi. 2 τ; and parls. for εκνήφω): "Rouse up to soberness in righteous fashion, and ceaseto sin" (thefirstimpν. is aor.,of a single action; the second φν., of a course of action)—a startling call, to men fallen as if into a drunken sleep under the seductions of sensualism and heathen society and the fumes of intellectual pride. δικαίως signifiesthe manner of the awaking; it is right the Cor. should rouse themselves from self delusion; Ρ. assails their conscience. αγνωσίαν γαρ έχουσι (cf. 12) έχουσιν,

§ 54. The MANNER OF THE RESURRECTION, xv. 35-42a. We enter on the second part of the Apostle’s argument touching the Resurrection: see the analysis, Intro. to Div. V. He has established the truth of the doctrine and the certainty of the event, and proceeds consequently to set forth the manner of its occurrence and the nature of the new body to be assumed. P. has still in view the unbelieving "some," and pursues the dialectical and apologetic vein of the foregoing context. The deniers found in the inconceivability of the process (35) a further and, in their eyes, decisive objection against the reality of the fact. In vindicating his doctrine upon this side, Ρ. therefore confirms its truth, he traces its analogies in nature, and its harmony with the order of Divine revelation; and the first half of his grand argument culminates in the second. See Edwards’ subtle analysis of νν. 35-44.

Ver. 35. 'Αλλα 'δρει τις: this form of interlocution belongs to Jewish dialectic (see parls.); cf. ver. 12, also 'δρεις μοι, Rom. ix. 19, and the familiar Pauline challenge, 'τι σου δρομένην;—"How are the dead raised up? With what sort of (woίς δέ) body moreover do they come?"—two distinct questions. δέ might indeed introduce the same question in an altered form (Μr., Βt., Εl., Sm.), but the vbs. and the interr. prons. are both different. The first (cf. Luke i. 34, John iii. 9, vi. 52, Heb. ii. 3, 1 John iii. 17)
intimates the impossibility of the thing, and is answered in ver. 36; the latter, the inconceivability of the manner, answered in vv. 37 ff. (so Cm., Cv., D.W., Hf. Ed.). The sceptics advance their second question to justify the first: they say, "The resurrection P. preaches is absurd; how can any one imagine a new body rising out of the perished corpse—a body suitable to the deathless spirit?"

The lbs. are logical pr., as concerned with general truths (cf. 26); "actio rei declaratur absque significatione temporis" (Er.).—ἐγείρονται (cf. John v. 29; 1 Thess. iv. 14, δ Θεός ἀξεῖ) graphically represents the difficulty of the objectors: "In what bodily form do we picture the dead coming on the scene?"

Ver. 36. ἄφρων (opposite of φρόνιμοι, iv. 10, x. 15) taxes the propounder of these questions not with moral obliquity, but with mental stupidity (see parls.). Wanting the art. (cf. Luke xii. 20), the word is an assertion rather than an exclamation: "Insensitive que tu es, toi qui te crois si sage!" (Gd.). Some attach συ as subject to ἄφρων, but this weakens the adj., and the pron. is required to give due emphasis to δ σπείρεις following. With a little care the questioner might answer himself; every time he sows his garden-plot, he assumes the principle denied in regard to man's material form, ισι., that death is the transition to α μελέτη of the life in the seed, and the Resurrection is an evolution, not a reinstatement. Our Lord uses the same figure with the like implication, but another application, in John xii. 23 f.

Vv. 37, 38 make answer to the second branch of the question of ver. 35, by the aid of the same profound analogy.—καὶ δ σπείρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις, "And what thou sowest—not the body that will come to be dost thou sow." It is the object of the sower to realise a new σώμα in his seed. If any one interrupted him with the question, "What sort of a body can the grain take that you drop in the earth to τον!" the sower would dismiss him as a fool; he has seen in this case "the body that is to be." Now the actuality of the lower resurrection vindicates the conceivability of the higher.—τὸ γενησόμενον states not merely a future certainty (quod futurum sit, Vg.), but a normal process (oriturum, Bz.: quod nasciendum, Cw., Bg.).—αλλὰ γυμνὸν κόκκον, "but a naked grain"—unclothed with any body, wanting the appearance and furnishing of life (cf. 2 Cor. v. 3, ἐνδυσάμενοι, οὐ γυμνοί).—For εἰ τύχοι ("if it should chance, of wheat"), see note on xiv. 10: the kind of grain is indifferent—"or of any of the rest (of the seeds)". The grain of wheat gives to the eye no more promise of the body to spring from it than a grain of sand.—ο δὲ Θεός stands in opposition to συ δ σπείρεις—God the life-giver responding to the sower's trustful act. "But God gives it a body, according as He willed" (ἡθέλησεν)—not "as He wills" (according to His choice or liking), but in accordance with His past decree in creation, by which the propagation of life on the earth was determined from the beginning (Gen. i. 11 f.; for the vb., cf. note on xii. 18). To allege an impossibility in the case is to impugn the power and resources of the Creator (cf. Acts xxvi. 8), manifested in this very way every spring-time. The Divine will is the efficient nexus between seed and plant (cf. xii. 6).—"And (He gives) to each of the seeds a body of its own
36—40. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

και ἐκείνω τῶν στερμάτων τὸ γίον σώμα. 39. οὗ πάσα σάρξ ἡ αυτὴ σάρξ· ἄλλα ἄλλη μὲν σάρξ ἀνθρώπων, ἄλλη δὲ σάρξ.

κτήνων, ἄλλη δὲ ἵππων, ἄλλη δὲ ἰχθυών. 40. καὶ σώματα ἐπουράνια, καὶ σώματα ἐπίγεια. ἄλλα ἄλλα μὲν ἢ

20. ii. 16; Acts xxviii. 10; Jo. x. 12. d Phrase, N.T. hi. e Lk. x. 34; Acts xxviii. 24; Rev. xviii. 13; Num. xx. 4, etc. f N.T. hi.; Job v. 7. Prose for σειριον (Rom. i. 23, etc.), which is poetical in cl. Gr. g Freq. in G.; h. in Eph. h The antith. in Phil. ii. 10 and jo. iii. 12. eποουρανωμενον, νυν. 48 f; five times in Eph.; a Tim. iv. 18; six times in Heb.; M. xviii. 35. Κ. Eph. i. 10; Mt. vi. 9, etc. i 2 Cor. v. 1; Phil. iii. 19; Jas. iii. 15. Cf. το εν τοις γης, Eph. i. 10, etc.

This added clause meets the finer point of the second question of ver. 35; God will find a fit body for man's redeemed nature, as He does for each of the numberless seeds vivified in the soil. "How unintelligent to think, as the Pharisees did, that the same body that was buried must be restored, if there is to be a resurrection! Every wheat-stalk contradicts thee!" (Mr.)

Ver. 39. The rest of the § goes to sustain ver. 38b, showing the inexhaustible variety of organic forms in the Divine economy of nature and the fitness of each for the life it clothes. This is manifested, to use the varied types of animal life: οὐ πάσα σάρξ ἡ αυτὴ σάρξ. "All flesh is not the same flesh"—in the zoological realm there is no uniformity, but endless differentiation. (Ed. makes πάσα σάρξ predicate—"the same flesh is not all flesh," i.e., physiological assimilation means differentiation—getting out of the sentence a physiological idea obscure in itself and not very relevant to the context). Instead of men, cattle, birds, fishes, with their heterogeneous natures, being lodged in the same kind of corporeity, their frame and organs vary with their inner constitution and needs. If God can find a body for beast and fish, in the lower range, no less than for man, why not, in the higher range, for man immortal no less than for man mortal?—κτήνος (from κτάομαι), denoting cattle as beasts of purchase in the first instance, is applied to four-footed beasts at large: cf. Gen. i. 25 ff., ii. 20.

Ver. 40. The possibility of a future body unimaginably diff. from the present is indicated in the contrast suggested by the diff. regions of the two: "Bodies also heavenly there are, and bodies earthly". The σάρξ of ver. 39 is now dropped, for it belongs only to the σώμα ἐπουράνιον. What does Ρ. mean by his σώματα επουράνια! The previous context and the tenor of the argument lead us to think of bodies for celestial inhabitants, sc. the angels (Luke xx. 36, Matt. xxviii. 2, etc.), as suitable to their condition as the σώματα επίγεια are for the forms of terrestrial life just enumerated (so Mr., D.W., Al., El., Sm.); moreover σώμα is never used elsewhere in Bib. Gr., and rarely in cl. Gr., of inorganic bodies. On the other hand, ver. 41 in connexion with ver. 40b strongly suggests the sun, moon, etc., as the "heavenly bodies" in Paul's mind (so Bg., Hf., Hn., Ed., Bt., Gd., and most moderns). The former considerations preponderate, esp. when we find P. in vv. 47 ff. (see notes) resuming the same contrast in the antithesis between "the earthly man" and "the heavenly". Paul is thinking of the risen Christ whom he had seen, more than of the angels, as supplying the type of the σώμα ἐπουράνιον; cf. Phil. iii. 20 f. Gm., Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Everling (Die paul. Engelologie u.s.w., pp. 46 ff.) combine the above interpretations by attributing to P. the belief of Philo and the Jewish mystics that the stars are animated, and are to be identified with the O.T. "angels," as by the heathen with their gods. This
Thus in 2 Cor. iii. 18: Lk. 1: 18 = "λίθον, και ἄλλη "σελήνης, καὶ ἄλλη "δόξα "αστέρων. /* "άλλη γὰρ "αστέρος διαφέρει εν "δόξῃ. 42a. οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἀνεπιτύπτηται στασίς τῶν νεκρῶν. m Acts ii. 20; Mt. xxiv. 59; Lk. xxvi. 44 in Rev. x Jude 13 (RGT); Mt, ii. four times, xxiv. 59; 14 exx. in Rev. in this use, Gal. iv. 1; Dan. vii. 3 (Theod.). cf. Rom. ii. 16, etc.; also iv. 7 above. p See ver. 12. q ver. 36; see note below. r ver. 50; Rom. viii. 21; Gal. vi. 8; Col. ii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 4, ii. 12; 19; Jonah ii. 7; s See vi. 14. t Rom. ii. 7; Eph. vi. 24; 2 Tim. i. 10; Tit. ii. 23, vi. 18 f. u See xi. 14. v see. ii. 3; and for antith., 2 Cor. xii. 6, xiii. 4 f., Heb. xi. 34.

The notion is wanting in Biblical support. P. asserts that there are "bodies" for heavenly beings, just as there are for earthly (cf. 49); the adj. ἐπουράνιον supplies the ποιότης desired in ver. 35. The heavenly and earthly bodies, alike as being "bodies," are far different in "glory". —αλλὰ ἐπιείρεται κ.τ.λ. traverses the mistaken inference as to the identity of nature in the two kinds of organism, which might be hastily drawn from ver. 39b: "But the glory of the heavens is indeed one (glory), and the (glory) of the earth is another".—ἐπιείρεται (cf. note on xii. 8 ff.) implies a diff. wider, or at least more salient, than that connoted by the ἄλλη of vv. 39 and 41; where the two are distinguished in cl. Gr., ἄλλος marks a generic, ἐτέρος a specific diff. How utterly diff. was the glory of the risen Lord, who appeared to P. (Acts xxvi. 23), from that of any earthly Potentate!

Ver. 41. Even amongst the οὐρανός ίπτωμα there are varieties, just as amongst the ἐπιείρα (39), such as are indicated by the diff. of aspect in the visible celestial objects: "There is one glory of sun, and another glory of moon, and another glory of stars—for star differs from star in glory". While these luminous orbs are not to be identified with the "heavenly bodies" of ver. 40 (see note), they serve to symbolise the diversity of glory amongst them; all are glorious, but in degrees.—ἄλλη as in ver. 39 (contrast 40), indicates diff. within the same order. The frequent symbolic association of sun and stars with God, the angels, the righteous, and with the glorified Jesus, may account for the asyndetic transition from ver. 40b (signifying persons) to 41. From the distinctions manifest amidst the common glory of the visible heavens we may conjecture corresponding distinctions in the heavenly Intelligences and in the bodies appropriate to them.

Ver. 42a sums up what has been advanced in vv. 36-41, and presents it in six words: οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἀνεπιτύπτηται στασις τῶν νεκρῶν. "So indeed is the resurrection of the dead". It is as possible as that plants of wholly diff. form should shoot from the seed sown by your own hand; and the form of each risen body will be determined by God, who finds a suitable organism for every type of earthly life, and can do so equally for every type and grade of heavenly life, in a region where, as sun, moon, and stars nightly show, the universal splendour is graduated and varied infinitely.

§ 55. The First Adam and the Last. Ver. 42b-49. The Ap. has now removed a priori objections, and brought his theory of bodily resurrection within the lines of natural analogy and probability of reason. He has at the same time largely expounded it, intimating (1) that the present is, in some sense, the seed of the future body, and (2) that the two will differ as the heavenly must differ from the earthly. He goes on to show that this diff. has its basis and pattern in the diff. between the primitive Adam and the glorified Christ, who are contrasted in condition (42b, 43), in nature (44 ff.), and in origin (47 ff.).

Vv. 42b, 43. Σπείρεται εν φθορά ... εν ατιμία ... εν ασθενεία: "The sowing is in corruption (perishableness) ... in dishonour ... in weakness". It is better, with Cn., Wr. (p. 656), and Hn., to regard σπείρεται and εγείρεται as impersonal, since no subject is supplied; the vbs., thrice repeated with emphasis, are contrasted in idea; the antithesis lies between two opp. stages of being (cf., for the mode of expression, Luke xii. 48). σπείρεται recalls, and applies in the most general way, the δ σπείρεις and σπέρματα of vv. 36 ff. To interpret this vb. as figuring the act of burial ("verbum amennissimum pro sepultura," Bg.; so Cm., Gr., Mr., Bt., El, and many others) confuses the analogy (the "sowing" is expressly distinguished from the "dying")
41-45. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

"εγείρεται" εν "δυνάμει 44." σπείρεται σώμα "ψυχικόν, εγείρεται σώμα "πνευματικόν, και "έστι" σώμα "πνευματικόν, και "έστι" έστιν σώμα "πνευματικόν, και "ήσωσαν." "Εγένετο δ' τρώγος άνθρωπος 44. "Αδάμ "εις ψυχήν ζωοποίησεν." Ω δ’ εσχάτος έσχατος "Αδάμ πρώτος άνθρωπος Αδάμ "εις ψυχήν ζωοποίησεν."

---

1. "έστιν": all pre-Syriancodd., and all ancient verss. exc. syrr.

2. "και": all uncc. but KL.

3. "σώμα": pre-Syriancodd.

4. BK, and several minn., om. ανθρωπος.

5. of the seed, 36), and jars with ανθρωπίνα (a sick man, not a corpse, is called weak), and with ψυχικόν in ver. 44; cf. also vv. 50-54, where α φθορά, το φθάρτόν, τον ψυχικόν τούτο are identified with the living ψυχή. Our present life is the seedtime (Gal. vi. 7 ff.), and our "mortal bodies" (Rom. viii. 10 f.) are in the germinial state, concluding with death (36), out of which a wholly diff. organism will spring. The attributes φθορά (cf. Σολωμων η. φθοράς, Romans viii. 21), δύναμις (cf. Phil. iii. 21), φυτεύω (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 4)—summed up in the ψυχικόν τωτον of Romans viii. 11 and μόρφη δούλου of Phil. ii. 7—are those that P. is wont to ascribe to man's actual physique, in contrast with the αφθαρσία, δόξα, δύναμις of the post-resurrection state: see 2 Cor. iv. 7, 10, 16. v. i, 4, Rom. i. 4, viii. 18-23. Thus, with variety in detail, Est. ("moritur corpus multis ante mortem misericet sed editavitibus suscitabitur eodem corpus omni ex partegloriosum"), Cv., Hf., Hn., Ed. Gd. refers the threefold σπείρεται to the three moments of burial, mortal life, and birth respectively; van Hengel identifies it with procreation, quite unsuitably.

6. "Ver. 44. "There is sown a psychic body; there is raised a spiritual body." This dictum grounds the antithesis unfolded in vv. 42 f. upon its proper basis; the diff. is not a matter of condition merely, but of constitution. Corruption, dishonour, feebleness are, in great part, penal inflictions (Rom. v. 12 ff.), signifying not a natural defect, but a positive subjection to the power of sin (53-56); man, however, is essentially ψυχή under the present order (45), and his body therefore is essentially ψυχικόν as determined by that order (cf. vi. 13, and note; Col. ii. 20 ff., Matt. xxii. 30, etc.), being fitted to and expressive of the "soul" wherein his earthly being centres; see the note on ψυχικόν, ii. 14. Though inadequate, "natural" is the best available rendering of this adj.; it indicates the moulding of man's body by its environment and its adaptation to existing functions; the same body is χοίρον in respect of its material (47).—ψυχικόν is only relatively a term of disparagement; the "psychic body" has in it the making of the "spiritual"; its adaptation for the present service of the soul is the sowing of it, that is the initial step in its adaptation for the future uses of the spirit. An organism fitted to be the seat of mind, to express emotion, to carry out the bequests of will, is in process of being adapted for a still nobler ministry (Ed.); "he that sows to the Spirit (in the natural body), will reap of the Spirit (in the spiritual body)," Gal. vi. 8.—"If there is a psychic body, there is also a spiritual": a frame suited to man's earthly life argues a frame suited to his heavenly life, according to the principle of ver. 38 (cf. the argument from lower to higher in Matt. vi. 30); and the σώμα πν. lies, in some way, germinally hidden in the σώμα ψ., to be unfolded from it under "the universal law of progress" (Ed.).—σπείρεται to the three moments of burial, mortal life, and birth respectively; van Hengel identifies it with procreation, quite unsuitably.

7. "έστιν (εαίστιτ)" bears emphasis in each clause; from the fact of sense P. argues to the fact of faith. Observe txtl. notes 1-3.

8. Ver. 45 puts into words of Scripture the law of development affirmed, thereby showing its agreement with the plan of creation and its realisation in the two successive heads of the race. Into his citation of Gen. ii. 7 (LXX) P. introduces πρώτος and duplicates άνθρωπος by 'Αδάμ (ha'addm), to prepare for his antithetical addition ο έσχατος Άδάμ εις πνεύμα ζωοποιούν. On the principle of ver. 44b, the Adam created as ψυχή was the crude beginning of humanity (the pred. ψυχή ζωούσα is shared by A. with the animals, Gen. i. 20, 24)—a "first" requiring a "last" as his complement and explanation. The two types differ here not as the sin-committing and sin-abolishing (Rom. v. 12 ff.), but as the rudimentary and finished man respectively, with their physique to match.—
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46. ἂν νομε "πνεύμαν τῶν πνευματικῶν ἀλλὰ τὸ "ψυχικόν, ἐκτικά οἱ τῶν πνευματικῶν. 47. ὁ πρῶτος ἅρματος ὁ πνεύματος "ψυχικόν τοῦ Κύριος. 48. ἂν ο Κύριος ἔσχατος άνθρωπος, ο Κύριος εἰς πνεύμα, εἰς πνεύμαν καὶ ἄνθρωπος Αδάμ, are not to be found here. For (a) Philo's first is Paul's last; (b) both Paul's Adams are equally concrete; (c) the resurrection of Christ distinguishes their respective periods, a crisis the conception of which is foreign to Philo's theology; (d) moreover, Gen. i. 26 is referred in xi. 7 above to the historical, not the ideal, First Man.

Ver. 46 might have been expressly aimed at the Philonian exegesis; it affirms a development from lower to higher, from the dispensation of ψυχή to that of πνεύμα, the precise opp. of that extracted from Gen. i., ii. by Philo. (ἄλλ' οὐ) "Nay, but not first is the spiritual, but the psychic—after that (έπειτα: cf. 23) the spiritual". P. states a general law (σώμα is not to be understood with the adjs.): the ψυχικόν as such demands the πνευματικόν to follow (44); they succeed in this order, not the reverse. "The Ap. does not share the notion, long regarded as orthodox, that humanity was created in a state of moral and physical perfection... In independently of the Fall, there must have been progress from an inferior state, the psychic, which he postis as man's point of departure, to a superior state, the spiritual, foreseen and determined as man's goal from the first" (Gd. ad loc.: see the whole passage).

Vv. 47-49 draw another contrast between the two "men," types of the two eras of humanity, which is suggested by the words χούν από τῆς γῆς (ἀπόθεν mina'adam) of Gen. ii. 7. The first is ἐκ γῆς, χοϊκός (terrenus, Vg.; more literally, puleereus, Βz.); the second is εξ ουρανού (ἐκλόγη, Βz.; not δείκτη, Vg.) has led to the identifying of the δεύτερος ἁμαρτωλός, with the incarnate Christ (see Ed.), to the confusion of
46—50.
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...ος ουρανου. 48. ωσος ο χοικος, τοιοτω και οι ιχοικοι και... 49. και καθως εφορεσαμεν την εικονα των ιχοικων, εφορεσομεν και την εικονα Εω Ε.

Τοτε δε φημι, αδελφοι, οτι Μk. ix. 3. g See νεr. 4ο. i See xi. 7. k See vii. 29. m See vi. 9 (with κληρονομ.).

...η δυναται, for the compound subj. and sing. νb., cf. Μt. ν. 18; there o,p See ver. 42. W.Η. retain-ωμεν inmarg., R.V. and Weiss intxt., referring-ωμεν to marg.; other crit. edd.,-ωμεν.

Paul's argument (cf. note on 45). This phrase is suggested by the antithetical Ιε γη: the form of existence in which the risen Jesus appeared was super-terrestrial and pneumatic (cf. 2 Cor. v. 2); it possessed a life and attributes imparted "from heaven"—by an immediate and sovereign act of God (Rom. i. 4, vi. 4, 2 Cor. xiii. 4, Eph. i. 19 f., 1 Peter i. 21, etc.). This transformation of the body of Jesus was foreshadowed by His Transfiguration, and consummated in His Ascension; P. realised it with the most powerful effect in the revelation to himself of the risen Christ "from heaven". The glorious change attested, indeed, the origin of Christ's personality, but it should not be confused with that origin (Rom. i. 4; cf. Matt. xvii. 5). From His resurrection onwards, Christ became to human faith the άνθρωπος επουράνιος (Rom. vi. 9 f., Rev. i. 17 ff.), etc. The above χοικος and επουράνιος have severally their copies in χοϊκοί and επουράνιοι (48). Is this a purely physiological distinction, between pre- and post-resurrection states of the same men (cf. 44)? or is there a moral connotation implied, as Ηf and Εd. suggest! The latter seems likely, esp. on comparison of Phil. iii. 18 ff., Col. iii. 1-4, Rom. vi. 4, and in transition to the exhortation of ver. 49. Those who are to be "heavenly" in body hereafter already "sit in heavenly places" (Εph. ii. 6), while those are "earthly" in every sense "whose flesh hath soul to suit," οι τα επιγεια φρονουντες.

Admitting the larger scope of ver. 48, we accept the strongly attested hortatory φορέσωμεν of νεr. 49: "Let us wear also the image of the Heavenly One". The εικων embraces the entire "man"—not the body alone, the σαρξ and σαρκος ανθρωπου (Phil. ii. 7, 2 Cor. iv. 7, 1 Thess. iv. 4)—in Adam and Christ respectively (cf. xi. 7, 2 Cor. iii. 18, Rom. viii. 29, Col. i. 15, iii. 10); and we are exhorted to "put on Christ" (Rom. xiii. 14, Gal. iii. 27), realising that to wear His moral likeness here carries with it the wearing of His bodily likeness hereafter: see vv. 20-23, Rom. viii. 11; 1 John iii. 2 f.

§ 56. VICTORY OVER DEATH, xv. 50-58.

The second part of the argument of this chapter has now reached the same platform as the first (cf. §§ 51 and 54). The Resurrection of the Body, it has been shown, is an essential part of the Divine world-plan and necessary to the fulfilment of God's kingdom through Christ (20-27); and the transformation of the
Ver. 50. Τοῦτο δὲ φημὶ, ἀδελφὲ (see note, vii. 29) introduces, with a pause, an emphatic reassertion of the ruling thought of the previous §—that of the opposition between the psychic body of the First Adam and the spiritual body of the Second; manifestly the former is unfit for God's heavenly kingdom—with the latter, it is assumed (48b; cf. Luke xx. 34 ff., 1 John iii. 2 f.), we must be clothed to enter that diviner realm: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit God's kingdom; nor indeed doth corruption perishableness) inherit incorruption imperishableness." The second assertion explicates the first: σάρξ καὶ αἷμα = φθορὰ (cf. 42, and note), since decay is inherent in our bodily nature; ὁ ἐξω ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται (2 Cor. iv. 16; cf. Rom. viii. 21 f.). "Flesh" is the matter and "blood" the essence and life-vehicle of man's present corporeity. Nature forbids eternal life in this earthly dress (cf. note on 46). "Inherit" points to the kingdom as the right of the sons of God (Rom. viii. 17, etc.; cf. Matt. xxv. 34), but a heritage unrealised during the "bondage of corruption" (see Rom. viii. 21 ff.). Another, but removable, disability of flesh and blood' appears in Matt. xvi. 28. This bodily change, indispensable in view of the incompatibility just affirmed, is the object of a momentous revelation communicated to P., to which he calls our earnest attention: "Lo, I tell you a mystery!" On μυστήριον, see note to ii. 1. P. began by demonstrating the historical fact of Christ's resurrection (1-11); he then reasoned upon it, in its bearings on religion and nature (12-49); now he adds a new specific
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53. "ριπή" οφθαλμού, εν τη εσχάτη "σάλπιγγι " σαλπίσειγάρ, και "Ε,

οι *νεκροί* εγερθήσονται " "άφθαρτοι, και ημείς αλλαγησόμεθα.

Ευρ. Ιρλι. 1 ν., 885 : τιζειν, Jas. 53. "δειγάρ το "φθαρτοντούτο"ενδύσασθαι"αφθαρσίανκαι το...

Άλλοι διδάσκουν και ρέττυμα νεκροι εργαζεται αλλα σαλπιγκτής τωστής αναστησονται, ΑDGP.

νευέλατιον to crown his teaching. In doing so, P. challenges his opponents in the right of his inspiration and authority, hitherto in the background in this chap. Ver. 15 only vindicated his honesty.

In ver. 51b Αλλαγησόμεθα (required by 50 and repeated in 52) bears the stress; to it the first πάντες (reiterated with emphasis) looks forward: ου κοιμηθησόμεθα is parenthetical: "We shall all—not sleep, but—we shall all be changed". Άλλοι are interpreted by ενδύομαι of ver. 53 and μετασχηματίζω of Phil. iii. 21. As much as to say: "Our perishable flesh and blood, whether through death or not, must undergo a change". That such a change is impending for the dead in Christ is evident from the foregoing argument (see esp. 22 f., 36, 42 f.); P. adds to this the declaration that the change will be universal, that it will extend to those living when the Last Trumpet sounds (52), amongst whom he then hoped that many of the present generation would be found: cf. i. 7; also 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff., where the like is affirmed εν λόγω Κύριου. This hope dictates the interjected ου κοιμηθησόμεθα, which disturbs the grammar of the sentence and necessitates the contrastive δι attached to the repeated πάντες (see txtl. note; Wr., p. 695; also El. ad loc.). There is no need to suppose a trajectory of ου (as if for ου πάντες, or ου μεν πάντες κοιμηθησον), nor any diff. between the sense of Αλλαγησόμεθα, in vv. 51 and 52: the certainty of change in all who shall "inhabit incorruption" is declared (51), and the assurance is given that while this change takes place in "the dead" who are "raised incorruptible," at the same time "we" (the assumed living) shall undergo a corresponding change (52; cf. 2 Cor. v. 2 ff.). Thus in "all" believers, whether sleeping or waking when Christ's trumpet sounds, the necessary development will be effected (53 f.).—The critical moment is defined by three vivid phrases: εν
v. 4 as above) unto victory! " Αʹ δια, with its double clause, recalls the double δια of ver. 24 and of vv. 27 f. (see notes), which are parl. to each other and to this, alike marking the great "when," the epoch of the consummation. The destruction of the "last enemy" secures absolute "victory" for Christ and His own. Paul corrects the LXX txt. of Isa. xxv. 8, which makes Death the victor, κατεπόθην θάνατος ισχύσας; he appears to have read the Ηεβ. passively bulla", for Massoretic bulla": Τheodotion's translation is identical with Ρaul's. lanetsach (for ever) is often rendered εις νίκος (later Gr. form of νίκη) by the LXX, according to the Aramaic sense of the noun; its Heb. sense implies a final and unqualified overthrow of the King of Terrors, and therefore admits of P.'s application. "This is the farthest reaching of all O.T. prophecies; it bears allusion to Gen. iii." (Dillmann; see also Delitzsch, on the Ηesianic txt.), and reverses the doom there pronounced.

Vv. 55-57. At this climax P. breaks into a song of triumph over Death, in the strain of Ηosea's rapturous anticipation of Israel's resurrection from national death. [Many interpreters, however, put the opp. sense on Ηos. xiii. 14, as though God were summoning Death and the Grave to play all their forces for Israel's annihilation, and this accords with the prophet's context; but violent alterations of mood are characteristic of Ηosea; see Nowack ad loc. in Handkom. xiv. A.T., also Orelli's Minor Prophets, or Cheyne in C.B.S.] The passage has the Hebraistic lift of Paul's more exalted passages; cf. xiii. 4 ff., and parl. there noted.

"Where, O Death, is thy victory? Where, O Death, is thy sting και θανάτου τούτου κ.τ.λ. G om. the entire double θανάτου clause, skipping from αθανασίαν in ver. 53 to αθανασίαν in ver. 54.

P. freely adapts the words of Ηosea, repeating θάνατου in the second line, where Ηosea writes δι' (LXX άδη), since death is the enemy he pursues throughout (Ed. notes that άδης never occurs in Paul's Εpp.); and he substitutes syn. terms for each of the other nouns to suit his own vein, νίκος being taken up from νείκος in ver. 54, and κέντρον preparing for the thought of ver. 56.—το δε κέντρον κ.τ.λ. throws into an epigram the doctrine of Rom. iv.-viii. and Gal. iii. respecting the inter-relation of Sin, Law, and Death: "Mors aculeum quo pungat non habet nisipeccatum ; et huic aculeo Lex vim mortiferam addit" (Cν.). Sin gives to death, as we mortals know it, its poignancy, its penal character and humiliating form, with the entire "bondage of corruption" that attaches to it: see esp. Rom. v. 12, 17, vi. 10, 23, vii. 24, viii. 10, 20 ff., Heb. ii. 14 f. Apart from sin, our present bodily existence must have terminated in the course of nature (44-46); but the change would have been effected in a far diff. way, without the horror and anguish of dissolution—as indeed it will be for the redeemed who have the happiness to be alive at the Second Advent (see 51 f., and parl.).
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54-58.

δι δύναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ νόµος: 57. τῷ δὲ Θεῷ Χάρις τῷ κ. See x. 30. διδόντι ἡμῖν τὸ νῖκος διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 58. Ωστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί, ἠθανάσιοι γίνεσθε, ἀμετακίνητοι, περισσεύοντες εἰς τῷ ἐργῷ τοῦ Κυρίου πάντοτε, εἰδότες ὅτι οὐκ ἕστιν κάποιος ὁ ἐςτιν κατὰ Κυρίῳ.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

58, 59.

For those who "fall asleep in Christ" (18, 2ο; Ι Τhess. ν. 14), death, while it is still death and naturally feared (ουθέλομαν ἐκθέσασθαι, 2 Cor. ν. 4), is robbed of its "sting" (cf. 1 John iv. 18; also John v. 24, viii. 51 f., xi. 25 f., 2 Tim. i. 10; Rev. xx. 6), viz., the sense of guilt and dread of judgment—"tamesi adhuc nos pungit, non tamen letaliter, quia retusum est ejus acumen, ne in animae vitaliapenetret" (Cν.).—κέντρον is sting (as in Rev. ix. 10), not goad (as in Acts xxvi. 14); Death is personified as a venomous creature, inflicting poisoned and fatal wounds. Here Death reigns through Sin, as in Rom. ν. 17; Rom. ν. 21 pictures Sin reigning in Death: the effect through the cause, the cause in the effect.—While Death gets from Sin its sting, Sin in turn receives from the Law its power. δι δύναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ νόµος condenses into six words Paul's teaching on the relation of Sin to Law (see Rom. iv. 15, ν. 2ο, νί. Ιο, vii.; Gal. ii. 16, iii., iv. 21-v. 4)—the view, based on his experience as a Pharisee, that the law of God, imposing on sinful man impossible yet necessary tasks, promising salvation upon terms he can never fulfil and threatening death upon non-fulfilment, in effect exasperates his sin and involves him in hopeless guilt; δι ἀμαρτία... δια τ. ἐντολής... με ἀπετέχεσαν (Rom. ν. 11).—The exclamation of relief, "Thanks be to God, etc.," is precisely parl. to Rom. ν. 17, viii. 1 f.—The believer's "victory" lies in deliverance through Christ's propitiatory death (Rom. iii. 23 f.; cf. i. 17 f., 30, vii. 11 above) from the condemnation of the Law, and thereby from "the power of Sin," and thereby from the bitterness of Death. Law, Sin, and Death were bound into a firm chain, only dissoluble by "the word of the cross—God's power to the saved" (i. 18; cf. Rom. i. 16 f., viii. 1 ff.). Thus the Ap. finally links his doctrine of the Bodily Resurrection and Transformation of Christians to his fundamental teaching as to Justification and the Forgiveness of Sins; ch. xv. is a part of the λόγος τ. σταυροῦ which alone P. proclaims at Cor. (i. 1 f.).—God "gives to us the victory," won for us by "our Lord Jesus Christ," which otherwise Sin, strengthened (instead of being broken) by the Law, had given to Death. The pr. ptp. τῷ διδόντι τὸ νῖκος asserts the experience of redemption (cf. i. 2, vi. 19; 2 Cor. ν. 21, xiii. 5, Rom. ν. 1 ff., Eph. ν. 7); similarly ὑπερνικώμεν, Rom. ν. 37, declares the continuous triumph of faith; for the sentiment, cf. Rom. ν. 2-11, Ι Thess. ν. 16 ff., Phil. iv. 4, Ι Peter ν. 3-9.

Ver. 56 is set aside by Sm., and Clemen (Die Einheitlichkeit d. paul. Br., ad loc.), after Straatmann and Völter, as a "marginal note" of some early Paulinist, on the ground that it is out of keeping with the lyrical strain of the passage, and with the absence of the anti-legal polemic from this Ep. But the ideas of this ver. fill the contemporary Rom. and Gal. Epp., and are uppermost there in Paul's highest moods (see Rom. ν. 31 ff., 2 Cor. ν. 13-21); they are expressed with an originality and pregnant force unmistakably Pauline, and in a rhythmical, imaginative turn of expression harmonising with the context. In this Ep., which "knows nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified," the Ap. was bound to link his theology of the Resurrection to the doctrine of salvation by the Cross: see νν. 17 f., in proof that the λόγος τῆς ἀναστάσεως is one, in Paul's mind, with the λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ. Ver. 58 briefly directs the previous teaching against the unsettlement caused by Cor. doubts. This unbelief was taxed in νν. 32 ff. with sensualism and ignorance of God; its energizing effect on Christian work is here indicated. For δικαιογία with impv., cf. iii. 21, iv. 5, etc. —ἐθανάσιοι γίνεσθε, "show yourselves steadfast": see note on vii. 23, also x. 32, xi. 1; for the adj., see parls. In Col. i. 23 the combination ἐθανάσιοι, ἀμετακίνητοι ("not-to-be-moved") is almost identically repeated; similarly in Aristotle, Nic. Eth., ΙΙ., iv., 3, το βεβαιὸν καὶ ἀμετακίνητον ἅθλον is specified as a con-
CHAPTER /.
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a Η.Ι.
b See vi. 1.
c Note vii. 17.
d See vii. 17.

See vii. 22.

b See vi. 1, below.

c See vii. 17.

d See vii. 17; for pl. in local use, ver. 19; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Gal i. 2 (r. Gal.), 22; Th. ii. 14; Rev. i. 4.

\[ \text{λογίας} (?): \text{B*or ** and I.} \]

dition of all right and virtuous doing. -περισσεύοντες κ.τ.λ. adds the positive to the foregoing negative side of the injunction; "abounding (overflowing: see parls.) in the work of the Lord always". t. ἐγγον τ. Κυρίου (cf. ix. 1; Col. iii. 23 f., Matt. xxi. 28, Mark xiii. 34) is "the work" which "the Lord" prescribes, while "the work of God" (Rom. xiv. 20; cf. iii. 9 above) is "the work" which "God" does: contrast xii. 5 and 6 above. -κόπος; see note to iii. 8; and on κενός, νερ. 14: the "toil" is "empty" which is spent on illusion; "ce n'est pas là une activité d'apparat, accomplie dans le néant, comme si souvent le travail terrestre, mais un sérieux labeur, accompli dans la sphère de l'éternelle réalité" (Gd.); hence the pr. ἐστίν rather than ἔσται. -ἐν Κυρίω: in the sphere of Christ's authority, wrought under Ηis headship, which supplies the basis of all Christian relations and duties; cf. ver. 36, iv. 17, vii. 22, etc.

DIVISION VI. BUSINESS, NEWS, AND GREETINGS, xvi. The Ap. has delivered his mind to the Cor. upon the questions which prompted this great Ep. He had reserved to the last the profound and solemn problem of the Future Life, in its treatment of which the concept of intellect and the moral levity that spoiled this powerful Greek Church found their most characteristic expression. To the defence and exposition of the Christian hope of the Resurrection of the Body P. has devoted in chap. xv. all his powers of dialectic and of theological construction, bringing his argument to the glorious conclusion with which, in § 56, the thought of the Ep. culminates. He has thus carried his readers far away from the Cor. atmosphere of jealousy and debate, of sensuality and social corruption, infecting their Church, to seat them in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus. There remain a few matters of personal interest, to be disposed of in two or three paragraphs—concerning the collection for Jerusalem (1-4), his own and Timothy's intended visits, and the invitation declined by Apollos (5-12). These are followed by an energetic final exhortation, into which is woven a commendation of Stephanas and other Cor. now with P. (13-18), and by the epistolary salutations which are full and animated, a word of severe warning being attached to his own affectionate greeting and autograph signature (19-24).

§ 57. CONCERNING THE COLLECTION, xvi. 1-4. During his Third Missionary Journey P. was collecting money for the relief of the Christian poor in Jerusalem. Two chap. in the middle of 2 Cor. are devoted to this business, which, as it seems, had moved slowly in the interval between the two Ep. The collection had been set on foot some time ago in Galatia (1); in Macedonia it had been warmly taken up (2 Cor. viii. 1 f.); from Acts xx. 4 we learn that "Asians" also (from Ephesus and the neighbourhood) accompanied P. in the deputation which conveyed the Gentile offering to the mother Church. A little later, in writing to Rome (xv. 25-32), the Ap. refers to the collection, with great satisfaction, as completed. Every province of the Pauline mission appears to have aided in this charity, which, while it relieved a distressing need, was prompted also by Paul's warm love for his people (Rom. ix. 3), and by his desire to knit together the Gentile and Jewish sections of the Church, and to prove to the latter the true faith and brotherhood of the converts from heathenism (2 Cor. ix. 11-14). P. had taken part in a similar relief sent from Antioch many years before (Acts xi. f.); and in the Conference of Jerus., when the direction of the Gentile mission was committed to him, the heads of the Judaean Church laid on him the injunction to "remember the poor" (Gal. ii. 10). Foreign Jews were accustomed, as an act of piety, to replenish the poor funds of the mother city. The Christian community of Jerus. suffered from chronic poverty. With little natural or commercial wealth, the city lived mainly upon its religious character—on the attractions of the Temple and the Feasts.
thronged by Jews from the whole world; and the Nazarenes, while suffering from the intense bigotry of their compatriots in other ways, would find it esp. difficult to participate in employments connected with religion. 1 Thess. ii. 14 intimates that the Judean Churches had recently undergone severe persecution.

Ver. 1. "But about the collection that (is made) for the saints" (της εις τ. διανω). This clause might be construed as subordinate to the following ἀσβεστάζα; it reads more naturally as a detached title to the par.—indicating this, seemingly, as another topic of the Church Letter (cf. vii. 1, viii. 1, xii. 1). The subject is alluded to as one in which the Cor. were already interested (see 2 Cor. ix. 2).—λογία (more correctly spelt λογεία) = cl. Gr. συλλογή, or έσησος (club-contribution); elsewhere in Paul χάρις (2 Cor. ix. 5), ευλογία (2 Cor. ix. 12), κοινωνία (Rom. κν. 26). Till the other day this word counted as a h.l. in Gr. literature; but the Egyptian Gr. papyri furnish instances of its use as a business term, denoting, along with λογεύω (from which it should be derived), the collection of money either in the way of imposts or voluntary assessments: see Deissmann’s Bibelstudien, pp. 40 ff., Hn. in Meyer’s Kommentar ad loc.—The Cor. understand from previous communications who are meant by "the saints" (cf. Rom. xv. 31): Hf. thinks that the Christians of Jerus. are so called by mincense, but such a distinction is un-Pauline (Gal. iii. 28); rather, the fact that the collection is made for the saints commends it to saints (i. 2: cf. 2 Cor. ix. 12 ff.). Such ministry is part of "the work of the Lord" in which the Cor., a moment ago, were bidden to "abound" (xv. 58).

—σαββατόν κ.τ.λ.: "Just as I gave order to the Churches of Galatia, so also do you act". This direction was either given by P. personally on his last visit to Gal. at the outset of the Third Missionary Journey (Acts xviii. 23), more than two years before, or through letter or messengers from Ephesus at a later time. This ref. fairly implies that the arrangement made had been successful in Gal.; the business being completed there some while ago, the Ap. makes no observation upon it in the extant Ep. to the Gal., which was probably contemporary with 1 and 2 Cor. (See Lt., Introd. to Gal.). On the question as to the part of "Galatia" intended, see Introd. to Gal. in this Comm., and notes on the relevant passages in Acts.

Ver. 2 rehearsesthe rule previously laid down for Galatia: "On every first (day) of the week let each of you by himself (= at home) lay up, making a store of it, whatever he may be prospered in".—μίαν σαββάτου—σαββάτος, ουσία κλ. θησαυρίζων, "making a treasure," de scribeseach householder " paulatim cum mulum aliquem faciens" (Gr.), till at the end the accumulated stores should be paid over.—ευοδώται (from ευ and οδός, τοσον one's τυαγ), is pr.sbj., with άν of contingency and ό,τι in acc.of specification: any little superfluity that Providence might throw in a Cor. Christian’s way, he could put into this sacred hoard (cf. 2 Cor. viii. 1). Many in this Church were slaves, without wages or stated income. The Vg. renders, "paucis si bene placuerit," as though reading άνευδοκή, andBg. wrongly, "quod commodum sit".—ίνα μή, όταν ελθώ, τότε κ.τ.λ.: "that there may not be, when I come, collections going on then". P. would avoid the unseemliness and the difficulty of raising the money suddenly, at the last moment; and he wishes when he comes to be free to devote himself to
5. "Ελεύσομαι δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὅταν παρασκευασμένος ἦταν Μακεδονίαν ἡπείρος, "διὰ τὸ γὰρ ἰδρυθείναι "αὐτοὺς ἀπενεχεῖν τὴν χάριν μετὰ τὴν ἱερουσαλήμ. 4. ἐὰν δὲ ἦν εἰς τοὺς καὶ διὸ ποιεῖτε οὕτως, ἐν ὅμοιον τοῦ καὶ πορεύεσθαι, εὐνοεῖν "παραχειμασμοῦ; ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὲ προφήτημα ὑπὲρ τοῦ πορεύσατε.

1 Lachm.s, Tisch., Tr., W.H., R.V. marg., place the comma after ἐπιστολῶν, attaching this adjunct to δοκιμάσετε: see note below.

2 η Καταμενω (2): ΒΜ, 67**. So W.H. and Weiss: παραμ. looks like an assimilation to παραχειμάσω; the stronger καταμενω is intrinsically fitting, by contrast with στοργῇ: see note below.

3 Ὑμᾶς: ΝABCDEIMP. So critt.edd., exc. Tisch.

4 Ομ. καὶ (2) ΒΜ: W.H. txt.—καὶ in marg.

higher matters (cf. Acts vi. 2)—" tunc alia agens" (Bg.).

Vv. 3, 4. The Cor. are to choose delegates to bear their bounty, who will travel to Jerus. with P., if this be deemed fit. Acts xx. 1-4 shows that in the event a large number of representatives of Gentile Churches voyaged with P., doubtless on this common errand. The ἀξιόν may qualify either δοκτε (Βz., Cν., Est., A.V. and R.V. txt., Ed.) or πέμψω (R.V. marg., with Gr. Ff., and most moderns). Being chosen by the Cor., the delegates surely must have credentials from them (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1, and Acts xv., for such letters passing from Church to Church; also Ρ. Clem. ad Corinth.). At the same time, as P. is directing the whole business, he will "send" the deputies and introduce them at Jerus. On δοκιμάσει, see note to iii. 13.—ἐὰν δὲ Αξίων ἐκ τῆς ἡγεμονίας "But if it be worth while that I should journey too, they shall journey with me"—a hint that P. would only take part in presenting the collection if the character of the aid sent made it creditable; otherwise the delegates must go alone; he will not associate himself with a mean charity. The inf. (in gen. case), τοῦ καὶ διδάσκειν, depends on Αξίων—"worthy of my going," "si dignum fuerit ut et ego eam" (Vg.); it can hardly be softened into "if it be right (seemly on any ground): as in 2 Thess. i. 3, where Αξίων is unqualified) that I should go" (Ed.)—as though the Ap. deprecated being obtrusive; he is guarding his self-respect, being scarcely sure of the liberality of the Cor. "Justa estimatio sui non est superbia" (Bg.).

§ 58. VISITS TO CORINTH, xvi. 5-12. The arrangements for the Collection have led P. to speak of his approaching visit to Cor., and he explains more definitely his plans in this respect (5-9). Timothy's coming, though not certain, may be looked for speedily; and the Ap., with some solicitude, asks for him considerate treatment (τού f.). Apollos is not coming at present, as the Cor. seem to have desired and as Paul had urged upon him; he prefers to wait until circumstances are more favourable (12).

Vv. 5, 6. "But I will come to you, when I have gone through Macedonia." The Ap. writes from Ephesus some time before Pentecost (8), probably before Easter (v. 8; see note); he intends to traverse Macedonia on his way (διερχομαι, repeated with emphasis, regularly denotes in the Acts an evangelistic tour: see xiii. 6, xvi. 6, xx. 25, etc.), completing the work of his mission, there so abruptly terminated (Acts xvi. f.). This task will require considerable time (it occupied the months of summer and autumn, during which the Ap. penetrated beyond Mac. into Illyria; Rom. xv. 19), so that P. expects to see Cor. not much before winter (6). He adds therefore in explanation, "For I am going through Macedonia (travelling over the region:
pros korintheous α

7. τὸ θελε γὰρ ὁμας ἵνα παρέδω ἰδικών ἐξιδίκηζον ἵνα λέγων τὸν δὲ εἰπωμιν ἐπὶ ὁμας, ἐὰν οὐ κύριος ἐπιτρέπῃ. 8. ἐπιμείνω δὲ σε Ἔφεσου εἰς τὴν Πεντηκοστήν τοῦ θύρα γὰρ μοι ἀνέργος ἡμέρα καὶ ἐνεργής καὶ αντικείμενον πολλοί. 10. εἶπεν δὲ εἰς Τιμόθεον, "θέλω ἀρτι ἐπαναδίδω τινάς επιμείναι πρὸς σέ, εάν ο Κύριος επιτρέψῃ." δε έν Εφέσω έως τῆς Πεντηκοστής, 

pr., of imminent purpose); but with you haply I will abide (καταμενῶ, as in Acts 1.13, signifies, by contrast to διέρχομαι, keeping to Cor. instead of touring through the province), or [even] spend the winter. Paul will time his visit, if possible, so as to make his winter-quarters in Cor.; in any case, when he arrives, he will give the Cor. the full benefit of his presence. He did so stay for three months (Acts xx. 3). For πρὸς, in converse with, see vv. 7, 10, ii. 3, and parsls.—τυχόν (acc. abs. of neut. ptp.) = el τύχον (see parl.)—another of the cl. idioms confined to this Ep.; it indicates the uncertainty of human plans, and is piously replaced by εάν ο Κύρ. επιτρέψη in ver. 7.—In this plan P. has a further aim, which he mentions to show his dependence on the Cor.: "in order that you may send me forward, wheresoever I may go"—i.e. probably, though not certainly, to Jerus. (4); cf. ver. 11, 2 Cor. i. 16, Rom xv. 24. It would help P., whose infirmities required friendly attentions, to have a good "send off" on his leaving Europe. A generous "collection for the saints" would be a welcome lift (v. 4). Ver. 7. "For I would not see you now, in passing; for (γὰρ) I hope to stay some length of time (χρόνον τινά) with you, if the Lord permit." P. could have crossed by sea and taken Cor. on his way to Mac. (cf. 2 Cor. i. 15 f.); the Cor. had requested his speedy coming, which might have been so arranged. But such a visit could only have been ἐν παράδειγμα (explaining the ἐρετικός, "in the way-by," as the summer must be devoted to Mac.; this flying visit would not be of service; there is much to be done at Cor. (xi. 34, etc.), and when the Ap. does come he means to stay "some time". His recent short visit had been very unsatisfactory (see Introd., chap. ii.).—For ἐπιμείναι, see note on iv. ii.; it is in tacit contrast with the future, as in xiii. 12. For επιμείναι, "to stay on" (in time)—distinguished from καταμενῶ, "to stay fixedly" (in place or condition: 6), see parsls.—εάν ο Κύρ. κ.τ.λ., see parl., also to iv. 19, —pia condition (B.gr.): Paul's plans have been repeatedly overruled (Acts xvi. 6 f.: 1 Thess. ii. 18). He says "if the Lord permit," thinking of his visit as a pleasure; but "if the Lord will," in the parl. clause, iv. 18 f., viewing it as a painful duty. Vv. 8, 9. "But I stay on in Ephesus until the Pentecost," "the fiftieth day" from the 16th Nisan in the Passover Feast (see parl.). This suggests that P. is writing not very long before Whitsuntide; v. 6 ff. indicated a date for the Ep. immediately antecedent to Easter. Ver. 9 explains why the Ap. must remain at Eph. some time longer, although required at Cor.: "for a door is open to me, great and effectual, and (there are) many adversaries". This θύρα is defined in Col. iv. 3 (cf. 2 Cor. i. 12) as a θύρα τοῦ λόγου—a door open to the preacher; in Acts xiv. 27 it is seen from the other side, as θύρα πεποιθευμένοι τοκόλ (cf. xv. 32): an additional reason for not retreating; cf. Phil. i. 28. The terrible riot that shortly
afterwards drove Paul from Eph. verified this statement (Acts xix.). Evangelism flourishes under fierce opposition; "Sæpe bonum et, contra id, malum simul vingent" (Bg.).

"But if Timothy come"—his coming is not certain. He and Erastus have been before this sent to Macedonia (Acts xix. 21 f.) in advance of P., with instructions to go forward to Cor. (iv. 17 above); he might be expected to arrive about the same time as this letter. But local circumstances, or even the report of the unfriendly attitude of the Cor. (Ed.), might detain him in Mac. He is found in Mac. with P. when some months later 2 Cor. is written: there is no explicit ref. in that Ep. to Timothy's presence at Cor. in the interval; but Titus' visit and report are largely in evidence. Ed. says, "in point of fact he (Tim.) did not come" (cf. Lk., Journal of Sac. and Cl. Philology, ii., 198 ff.; also El.). But this assertion is too positive. In iv. 17 above P. announced Titus' coming definitely and laid stress upon it. Tit. shares in the Address of 2 Cor., and the fact that he is associated by the Ap. with himself in the significant "we" of vii. 2 ff. (cf. ii. 5-11) points to his being involved in some way in the "grief" which P. had suffered from Cor. subsequently to the writing of 1 Cor. Very possibly Titus was the διδάσκαλος of 2 Cor. vii. 12, in whose person, seeking as he did to carry out the directions of 1 Cor. iv. 17, Paul had been insulted by some prominent Cor. Christian (ὁ ἄδικησας).—If this actually happened, the apprehensions expressed here about the treatment Tim. might receive, proved only too well-founded: "see (to it) that without fear he may be with you" (or hold converse with you: γένηται προς ὑμᾶς, see ii. 3, and parsi.)... "let no one then set him at naught". These words point to Timothy's diffidence, as well as to his comparative youth: see τιν. iv. 17, and the vein of exhortation in 2 Tim. ii. 1-13 and iii. 10-18. Tim. was P.'s complement, as Melanchthon was Luther's—gentle, affectionate, studious, but not of robust or masculine character. The temper of the Cor. Church would be peculiarly trying and discouraging to him. Paul hopes that regard for him will have some restraining effect upon the Cor.—τὸ γάρ έργον Κυρίου (cf. χν. 58) κ.τ.λ. identifies Titus in the strongest way with P. himself: cf. iv. 17, Phil. ii. 20; similarly respecting Titus, in 2 Cor. viii. 23. For διδασκάλος see parsi.—"But send him forward in pace"—for if Tim. attempts the task indicated in iv. 17, a rupture is very possible, such as we gather from 2 Cor. ii. and vii., actually ensued.—From the following words, "that he may come to me, for I am awaiting him," it appears that P. expects Tim's return before he leaves Eph.: cf., for the νβ., xi. 33.—It is doubtful whether μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν qualifies the subject—"I with the brethren"—those of vv. 12-18, the Cor. brethren now in Eph. and interested in Tim's success at
13. “Gρηγορείτε, στήκετε εν τῇ πίστει: ἀνθρίζεσθε,” κραταιούσθε, ἵνα καὶ ὅμοις κυρίον τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐταξιν εαυτοῦς

Rom. xiv.4; Gal. ν.1; Ρhil.i.27,4iν.1: 1 Τh. iii.8; 2 Τh. ii.12; Jo.viii.44.

z Εph. iii.τ6; Lk. i.8ο,ii.4ο; Νeh. ii.τ8. -αιος,Ι Ρet.ν.6.

b See ix. 15. c See i.το, νεr. 12.

e Ρhil.iv.22; Jo.iv.53; Gen. 1.8.
d See ν.32. 1 See v. 5.

ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΩ ΧΧ. 31 , Ι

Ον the former view, “ the brethren'' of νν. ΙΙ and Ι2 are the same, being the deputies who had brought over the Cor. Church Letter to Ρ., and who are now awaiting Τim's return before they themselves return home. Τhis hints an additional reason why the Cor. should with all speed send Τimothy back to Paul “in peace”.

Ver. Ι2. Τhe manner in which the clause Περί δε Απολλώ του αδελφού is loosely prefixed to the statement of this ver. (“Now about Αpollos the brother”-) suggests that Αpollos’ coming had been mentioned in the Church Letter: cf. ver. τ,vii.Ι, etc. Respecting Αpollos, see notestoi.τ2, and Αcts xviii. 24 ft.-Considering the way in which Αp. had been made a rival to Ρ. in Cor., it shows magnanimity on Ρaul’s sideto desire his return, and a modest delicacy on the side of Αpollos to decline the request: καὶ πάντως οὐκ ήν θέλημα ίνα κ.τ.λ., “And there was no will at all (it was altogether contrary to his will) that he should come now”.—σκαριάνω (see parls.) denotes “to have good opportunity”. The present ferment at Cor. affords no καιρός for Αpollos’ coming. For πάντως, and θέλημα ίνα, see parls.

§ 59. CONCLUDING HOMILY, xvi. 13-18.

According to the Apostle’s wont, at the end of his letter he gathers up the burden of his message into a single concise and stirring exhortation (13 f.). Watchfulness, steadfastness, manly vigour, above all Christian love, were the qualities in which this Church was lacking. Their "love" they would have a particular opportunity of showing to the family of Στεφανας, who had been foremost in works of benevolence (Ι5 f.); for Στ. is now returning home in charge of this Ep. with his two companions, after they had brought the letter of the Church to Ρ. and cheered him by their society. The deputation has done a timely public service in the best spirit; their kind offices must be duly acknowledged (17 f.).
Cor.: the fifth—"All your doings, let them be done (or carried on: γινέσθω) in love"—reiterates the appeal of ch. vii. and xiii. touching the radical fault of this Church; see also iii. 3, iv. 6, vi. 1-8, xi. 21 f., xii. 21, etc.

Vv. 15, 16 urge particular instances of the above by ἀδελφός γινεσθω. The i. clause of ver. 16 is complementary to ταρακαλε (see note on i. 10), and is suspended to make room for the explanatory ὀδηγητε συνεργοῦσιν ἵνα τοὺς ἡμών επιγινώσκετε. The use of ἵνα . . . επιγινώσκετε that the household of Stephanas is the first-fruit of Achaia, and that they set themselves for ministering to the saints"—τὴν οἰκίαν κ.τ.λ., acc. by attraction to ὀδηγητε, according to the well-known Gr. usage with vbs. of this class (Wr., p. 781). There were earlier individual converts in Achaia (see Acts xvii. 34), but with this family the Gospel took root in the province and the earnest appeared of the subsequent ingathering: cf. Rom. xvi. 5; also i. 16 above, and note. The St. family must have been of independent means; for ἀναρρίχητος τούτων (they arrayed or appointed themselves—made this their business) implies a systematic laying out of themselves for service, such as is possible only to those free to dispose, as they choose, of their persons and their time; see this idiom in Plato, Rep., ii., 371C. —"The saints" can hardly be the Jesus saints of ver. 1, since ἐλαχιστον is quite general, and the last words of ver. 16 imply manifold Christian labour; the present commission of St. to Eph. is an instance of "service to the saints".—P. "exhorts" his "brethren . . . that you also (in return for their service to you) submit yourselves to such as these (τούτων, referring to the interpolated ὀδηγητε κ.τ.λ.), and to every one that shares in the work and labours". These persons did not constitute a body of Church officers; we find no traces as yet of an official order in the church of Cor.: the Ap. enjoins spontaneous submission to the direction of those able and disposed to lead in good works. The pp. in συνεργοῦσιν refers not to St. specifically, still less to P., but generally to co-operative labour in the Church, while κοπιώντι implies labour carried to the point of toil or suffering (see note on κόπος, iii. 8; also xv. 58). Loyal and hard work in the cause of Christ earns willing respect and deference in the Church: cf. i. Thess. v. 12 f.

Vv. 17, 18. "But I rejoice at the presence (or coming) of Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus." The stress lying on ταρακαλε explains the introductory δέ: "You must show respect to such men, when they reach home; but I am glad that just now they are here". —Fortunatus (Lat. name, and common) and Achaicus (Gr., and rare) are Stephanas' companions in the deputation; the three will speedily return to Cor. Since P. thus commends them at the end of his Ep., written in reply to the Letter they had brought from Cor., perhaps they were to be its bearers also.—On Stephanas, see i. 16. The two latter names are also h. II. in N.T.; a Fortunatus appears in Clement's list of emissaries from Rom. to Cor. (ad Cor. § 65). Ed. supposes all three to be slaves (Achaicus, at least, resembles a slave-name), and identifies them with оι τ. Χλοής of i. 11; but this does not comport with the position given to Stephanas in vv. 15 f.; see, further, note on i. 11.—"I rejoice at their presence), because the (or my) lack of you these have filled up". ἐπιγινώσκετε.
17-20. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

19. της Ἀσίας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα, σὺν τῇ ἀδελφῇ τοῖς εὐφροσυναυλοῖς· ὀλοκληρώσετε πάντας ἀδελφοίνας ὑμᾶς· ΠΡΩΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α

Epp., exc. 2 Pet., sere. Jude. x See ver. 1. ver. 12. a Rom. xvi. 5; Col. iv. 15; 1 Thess. a. y Rom. xvi. 2 ff.; see vii. 32 above, etc. b Acts ii. 46, v. 42; cf. εν οἰκ. xi. 34 above.

VER. 18b repeats in another form the advice of ver. 16: “Acknowledge (know well) then such men as these”. For τοὺς τοιούτους, see paral., and ver. 16. —προστάσεως (see paral.) denotes strictly access, protection, security; but knowledge of personal qualities implies corresponding regard to and treatment of those who possess such qualities: cf. 1 Thess. v. 12 f.

§ 60. Final Greetings, xvi. 19-24. The Ep. closes with three public salutations from the Christians surrounding P. at Ephesus to their brethren at Cor. (19, 204), followed by a request to the latter, such as appears besides in 1 Thess., 2 Cor., Rom., and Phil., to “salute one another” in token of brotherly union, and of communion with those who now send their greetings (20b). The letter is then sealed with the writer’s personal salutation (21-24) penned by his own hand, and stamped with a characteristic double motto peculiar to this Ep., which expresses the supreme peril and supreme consolation of the Christian calling (22).

Vv. 19, 203. Three successive clauses, headed by ασπάζομαι: “There salute you the Churches of Asia. There saluteth you in the Lord abundantly Ἡφυίλα and Πρίσκιλα, with the assembly (church) at their house. There salute you all the brethren”. The pl. expression, εἰς τῆς Ἀσίας, accords with what appears elsewhere as to the general diffusion of the Gospel in the province of Asia during Paul’s three years’ ministry at Eph. (Acts xix. 10, 26; Col. i. 6, ii. 1, iv. 13, 16), and as to the solidarity of the Asian Churches gathered round Eph., to which collectively the Revelation of John, and probably the (so-called) Ep. to the Ephesians, were addressed. While P. had not personally visited all these communities (Col. ii. 1), he was in touch with them and knew their mind towards their brethren in Greece. Desiring a more catholic feeling in the Cor. Church (see note on i. 2), P. makes the most of these Church greetings.—The second salutation has a note of personal warmth, as the first of catholic breadth: Ἡφυίλα and Πρίσκιλα “send much greeting” (πολλά — in requests and wishes, implies frequency or intensity, or both); and “in the Lord” — not as a matter of ordinary friendship, but in the way of love and service to Christ. This worthy pair entertained the Ap. in Cor. when he first came there (Acts xviii. i ff.); on some occasion (perhaps about this time at Eph.) they risked their lives for his (Rom. xvi. 4). They had now migrated to Eph., where they reappear some years later in 2 Tim. iv. 19; see notes on Rom. xvi. 3 ff., for their further history. Thrice their names figure in the Acts, and thrice in the Epp.— Πρίσκιλα first (“Prisca” only in Acts) four times: see Hort’s Prolegom. to Rom. and Eph., pp. 12 ff., Sand.—Headlam, Romans, pp.
12. Rom. xvi. 15. 
Th. v. 86. 
14. Προς Κορινθίους Α
ε'Ε ασπάσασθε αλλήλους εν 'φιλήματι αγίω.
12; Rom. ήί 'ει τη 'έμή' χειρί, ΠΑΥΛΟΥ
Θ.' ν. 26.; Ι Ρετ. ν. 14. 48, etc.: καταφιλεω, Αcts xx. 37, 5 exx. in GG. 
Μι. xxiii. 7; Lk. i. 29, etc. 
See vii. 9. 
4 τ8 ft., also Rom. ad loc. above, on the 
conjectures associated with this lady's 
name. 
Τhe νb. issing., the two sending 
one greeting.-Τhe "ecclesia at their 
house" can scarcely mean the whole 
Εph. Church, but some neighbouring 
part of it accustomed to gather, more 
or less formally, at Aquila's hospitable 
hearth. If Ρ. lodged with Α. (see txtl. 
ote), as he had done in Cor., the house 
would be a rendezvous for Εphesian 
Christians: cf. Rom. κνί. 5, Col. iv. 15, 
Ρhilem. 2, Αcts xii. 12.-οι αδελφοί πάν 
t8 te comprisethe whole body of Εphesian 
believers, in distinction from the smaller 
circle of Αquila's house, and from the 
mass of the Asian Christians. 
Ver. 2ού. εν φιλήματι αγίω = εν φιλή 
ματι αγάπης (τ Ρeterν. 14). Τhis Ηeb. 
custom of the sacred kiss is retained, at 
Communion, by the Greek and Εastern 
Churches; it died out in the West from 
the 13th cent., after having been the 
subject of many Conciliar limitations, 
occasioned by its abuse in the decline of 
Christian simplicity. αγίω by posi 
tion is predicative—"in a kiss that is 
holy". See Αrt. Кiss in Dict. of Chris 
ίian Antiquities. 
Vν. 21-24. Paul's autograph saluta 
tion, which authenticates the letter (cf. 2 
Τhess. iii. 17), includes the title of the 
greeting (21), the double motto (22), and 
the greeting proper—in two wishes (23f). 
Ver. 2. ος τε έμή χειρί, ΠΑΥΛΟΥ: "the salution, with my own 
hand,—of ΡΑUL".—Παύλου apposed to 
tη έμή, and inscribed with the distinction 
of a personal signature. Up to this 
point, the Ep. was presumably written by 
another hand (cf. Rom. xvi. 22). 
Vv. 22, 23. With pen in hand, Paul 
must needs give expression, in two words, 
to the pent-up feeling under which he has 
written—a fiery seal burnt upon the last 
leaf of the Letter; ch. vi. 12-17 of Gal. 
occupies a like place in that Ep. The 
sentiment, or motto, of the ασπασμός 
forms two clauses: (a) "If any one loves 
not the Lord, let him be anathema".— 
ου (instead of μή) in hypothetical clauses 
may rest upon the vb., constituting it a 
negative term—sc., "hates the Lord" (so Ed.: cf. vii. 9, xi. 6, xv. 13; and Rom. 

vii. 20, where ου θέλω = nolo); but Wr. 
(pp. 599-602) rightly distinguishes such 
instances as this and ix. 2 (cf. note) from 
the above class of combinations, accounting 
for the ου as contradictory to some tacit 
assertion—"if any one does not love the 
Lord" (as he ought, or pretends, to do): 
it is a spuriously love that is accursed—a 
cold, false heart which, knowing the 
Lord, does not really love Him (cf. viii. 
1 f., xiii. 1 f.). 
The use of φιλεω 
φιλέω (only in Tit. iii. 15 elsewhere in 
P.; cf. the interchange in John xxi. 15 
ft.) is noticeable: for the distinction, see 
Gm., s.v. φιλέω; Cr., s.v. φιλέω; 
Trench, Ν.Τ. Syn., § 12.—ου φιλεί 
strikes a deep note of accusation; it is a 
charge of heartlessness—human affection 
to the Master is wanting, to say nothing 
of higher feeling, as with Judas and his 
traitor kiss (see Mt., xxvii. 6, Cant. i. 2. φιλεω in this sense, Μt. xxvi. 
d Col. iv. 18; 2 Τh. iii. 17. The noun besides, 
Mt. xxi. 7; Lk. i. 29, etc. 
See Gal. vi. 11; Psm. 19. 9 1 Σιλ. iii. 10; Μ. xvi. 24; Rev. xiv. 11. 

(b) Τhe second clause of the motto, 
Μαράν αθά, is Αramaic transliterated into 
Gr.; the original cannot be quite certainly 
restored.—Μαράν, it is fairly certain, re 
presents Marām (Syrian) or Marān'ā 
(Αramaic: the final a of the suffixed 
noun having coalesced with the initial 
'a of the vb.), and αθά the pf. Peal of 
'αθά, to conιe. But it is doubtful 
whether 'αθά is strictly past—"our Lord 
hath come" (so Cm. and the ancients, 
with the Syriac Vers.; and Κautzsch in 
his Gramm. d. Βίb.-Αramdischen, pp. 12 
and 174; see also Field's Oιtium Νοτικος, 
iii., pp. 110 f.); or whether the pf. should 
be rendered prophetically—"Our Lord 
cometh," "will come," "is at hand," 
after the manner of Phil. iv. 5, 1 Τhess. 
iv. 14 ff., James v. 7 ff., Rev. i. 7, ΙΙΙ. 11, 
xxi. 20. The latter sense accords with 
the context, with the strain of ch. xv., 
and with the N.T. attitude towards our 
Lord's return: see i. 7, xi. 26, 1 Τhess. i.
21-23, ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α
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