I think these words may be interpreted two  
ways: 1. that Judas *deserted this our*  
**place**, our office and ministry, *to go to his  
own* **place**, that part which he had chosen  
for himself, viz. the office and character of  
a traitor and enemy of God; 2. regarding  
the former word **place** as being selected to  
correspond to the more proper and dreadful  
use of the word *here*, that Judas *deserted*  
his appointed place, here among us, that he  
might go to *his own appointed place elsewhere*,   
viz. *among the dead in the place of  
torment*. Of these two interpretations, I  
very much prefer the second, on all accounts;   
as being more according to the  
likely usage of the word, and as more befitting   
the solemnity of such a prayer. At  
the same time, no *absolute sentence* is   
pronounced on the traitor, but that dark surmise   
expressed by the phrase **his own place**,  
which none can help feeling with regard  
to him. To understand “he” of Judas’s  
successor,—*that he* (the new Apostle) *might  
enter on his own place of dignity destined  
for him by God*, (1) is contrary to the form  
of the sentence in the original ; (2) is inconsistent   
with the words, which are unexampled   
in this sense; (3) would divest  
a sentence, evidently solemn and pregnant,  
of all point and meaning, and reduce it to  
a mere tautology. It appears to have been  
very early understood as above; for Clement   
of Rome says of Peter, “ Thus having  
borne a martyr’s testimony, he went to his  
appointed place of glory,” an expression  
evidently borrowed from our text. Lightfoot   
quotes from a Rabbinical work on  
Numb. xxv. 25, “*Balaam went to his  
own place*,” i.e. “*to hell*.”   
  
**26. they  
cast lots for them**] These lots were probably   
tablets, with the names of the persons   
written on them, and shaken in a  
vessel, or in the lap of a robe (Prov. xvi.  
33); he whose lot first leaped out being  
the person designated.   
  
**was voted in  
amongst the eleven apostles**] The *lot*  
being regarded as the divine choice, the  
suffrages of the assembly were unanimously  
given (not in *form*, but by cheerful acquiescence)   
to the candidate thus chosen,  
and he ‘voted in’ among the eleven  
Apostles, i.e. as a *twelfth*. That St. Luke  
does not absolutely *say so*, aud never afterwards   
speaks of the *twelve* Apostles, is  
**surely no safe** ground en which to doubt  
this. — Stier was disposed to question  
whether this step of electing a twelfth  
Apostle was altogether suitable to the then  
waiting position of the Church, and whether  
Paul was not in reality the twelfth, chosen  
by the Lord Himself. But I do not see  
that any of his seven queries touch the  
matter. We have the precedent, of all  
others most applicable, of the twelve tribes,  
to shew that the number, though ever  
*nominally kept*, was *really exceeded*. And  
this incident would not occupy a prominent  
place in a book where St. Paul himself has  
so conspicuous a part, unless it were by  
himself considered as being what it professed   
to be, the filling up of the vacant  
Apostleship.  
  
  
**CHAP. II. 1—4.**] THE OUTPOURING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ON THE DISCIPLES.  
  
**1.**] **while the day of Pentecost was being  
fulfilled**: “during the progress of that  
particular day :” necessitated by the pres.  
tense. In *sense*, it amounts to ‘*when the  
day of Pentecost was fully come*,’ as A.V.  
  
  
**the day of Pentecost**] The *fiftieth*  
*day* (inclusive) after the sixteenth of Nisan,  
the second day of the Passover (Levit. xxiii.  
16),—called in Exodus xxiii. 16, ‘*the feast  
of harvest*,’—in Deut. xvi. 10, ‘*the feast  
of weeks:* ’—one of the three great feasts,  
when all the males were required to appear  
at Jerusalem, Deut. xvi. 16. At this time,  
it was simply regarded as the feast of  
harvest: among the later Jews, it was  
considered as the anniversary of the giving  
of the law from Sinai. This inference was  
apparently grounded on a comparison of  
Exod. xii. 2 and xix. 1. Josephus and  
Philo know nothing of it, and it is at the  
best very uncertain. Chrysostom’s reason  
for the event happening when it did is  
probably the true one: “It was fitting  
that this should take place on the recurrence   
of a feast: that they who had been  
present at the cross of Christ might see  
this also.” The question, *on what day of  
the week* this day of Pentecost was, is beset  
with the difficulties attending the question  
of our Lord’s last passover; see notes on  
Matt. xxvi. 17, and John xviii. 28. It  
appears probable however that it was on  
the Sabbath, —i.e. if we reckon from  
*Saturday, the* 16*th of Nisan*. Wieseler  
supposes that the Western Church altered  
the celebration of it to the first day of the