note.   
  
**14. with the women**] viz. those  
spoken of by St. Luke himself, Luke viii.  
2, 3,—where, besides those named, he  
mentions *many others*. Some have proposed   
to render the phrase “*with their  
wives:”* but many of these were certainly  
*not wives of the Apostles* ; and that those  
women who were ‘last at the Cross and  
earliest at the tomb’ should not have been  
assembled with the company now, is very  
improbable.   
  
**and Mary the mother  
of Jesus**] The **and** gives eminence to *one*  
among those previously mentioned. This  
is the last mention of her in the N. T.  
The traditions, which describe her as (1)  
dying at the age of fifty-nine, in the fifth  
year of Claudius, or (2) accompanying St.  
John to Ephesus, and being buried there,  
are untrustworthy. Other accounts, with  
the authorities, may be seen in Butler’s  
Lives of the Saints, Aug. 15. The fable of  
the *Assumption* has *no foundation even in  
tradition*.   
  
**and his brethren**] This  
clearly shews, as does John vii. 5 compared  
with vi. 67, 70, that *none of the brethren  
of our Lord were of the number of the  
Twelve*. When they were converted, is  
quite uncertain. See the whole subject  
discussed in note on Matt. xiii. 55, and in  
the Introduction to the Epistle of James.  
  
**15—26.**] ELECTION OF A TWELFTH  
APOSTLE TO FILL THE ROOM OF JUDAS  
ISCARIOT.   
  
**15. in those days**] In the  
days between the Ascension and Pentecost :  
during which it appears that the number of  
the assembly had increased, not probably  
by fresh conversions, but by the gathering  
round the Apostles of those who had previously   
been disciples.   
  
**the number of  
names**] that is, of persons: but the term  
would hardly be used except where the  
number is small. See Rev. iii. 4, and note.  
  
  
**an hundred and twenty**] De  
Wette asks, ‘ where were the 500 brethren  
of 1 Cor. xv. 6?’ We surely may answer,  
‘not in Jerusalem.’   
  
**16.**] We may  
enquire, by what change in mind and  
power Peter was able, *before the descent of  
the Spirit*, thus authoritatively to speak of  
Scripture and the divine purposes? The  
answer will be found in the peculiar gift of  
the Spirit to the Apostles, John xx. 21, 23 ;  
where see note. — The pre-eminency of  
Peter here is‘ the commencement of the  
fulfilment of Matt. xvi. 18, 19 (see note  
there).   
  
**17.**] **Because** gives the  
reason of the previous assertion, viz. that  
Judas held, and had betrayed, that place  
of high trust of which the prophecy spoke.  
Thus it has reference to the *substance of  
the prophecy*, already in Peter’s mind, and  
serves to explain the words “*his habitation*,”   
and “*his bishoprick*,” which occur  
in the prophecy.   
  
**had obtained the  
lot**] not literally, but inasmuch as the *lot*  
of every man is regarded as being cast and  
appointed by God.   
  
**18.**] This verse  
*cannot be regarded as inserted by St.  
Luke*; for, 1. the place of its insertion  
would be most unnatural for an historical  
notice: 2. the form of its introduction in  
the original forbids the supposition: 3. the  
whole style of the verse is rhetorical, and  
not narrative, e.g. “*this man*,” “*the reward   
of iniquity*.”—The statement, that  
he *bought a field*, does not appear to agree  
with the account in Matt. xxvii, 6—8;  
nor, consistently with common honesty,  
can they be reconciled, *unless we knew  
more of the facts than we do*. If we