(2) Almost without doubt, this first   
baptism must have been administered, as that  
of the first Gentile converts was (see ch. x.  
47, and note), by *affusion* or *sprinkling*,  
*not by immersion*. The immersion of 3000  
persons, in a city so sparingly furnished  
with water as Jerusalem, is equally   
inconceivable with a procession beyond the walls  
to the Kedron, or to Siloam, for that purpose.

**42–47.]** DESCRIPTION OF THE LIFE  
AND HABITS OF THE FIRST BELIEVERS,  
This description *anticipates*; embracing a  
period extending beyond the next chapter.  
‘This is plain from ver. 43: for the miracle  
related in the next chapter was evidently  
the first which attracted any public   
attention: vv. 44, 45, again, are taken up anew  
at the end of chap. iv., where we have a  
very similar description, evidently applying  
to the same period.

**42.] the apostles’ doctrine**: compare Matt. xxviii  
20.

**and in community]** The living  
together as one family, and having things  
in common. It is no objection to this  
meaning, that the fact is *repeated* below,  
in ver. 45: for so is the *breaking of bread*  
in ver. 46, and the continuing in prayers.  
The meaning given in the A.V., “*in the  
Apostles’ fellowship*,” is not objectionable  
in itself, but still I conceive bears no  
meaning defensible in construction. See  
further in my Greek Test.   
  
**breaking  
of bread]** or, **the breaking of the bread**.  
This has been very variously explained.  
Chrysostom, “In mentioning **bread** here  
he seems to me to signify *fasting*, and  
ascetic life: for they partook, not of  
luxuries, but simply of subsistence” And  
similarly Bengel: “The breaking of bread,  
that is, a frugal diet, common among them  
all.” But on ver. 46 he recognizes a  
covert allusion to the Eucharist.—The   
interpretation of the **breaking of bread** here  
as *the celebration of the Lord's supper* has  
been, both in ancient and modern times,  
the prevalent one. Chrysostom himself, in  
another place, interprets it, or at all events  
the whole phrase, of the Holy Communion.  
And the Romanist interpreters have gone  
so far as to ground an argument on the  
passage for the administration *in one kind  
only*. But,—referring for a fuller   
discussion of the whole matter to the notes on  
1 Cor. x. xi,—barely to render **[the]  
breaking of [the] bread** to mean the  
breaking of bread in the Eucharist, as *now  
understood*, would be to violate historical  
truth. The Holy Communion was at first,  
and for some time, till abuses put an end  
to the practice, *inseparably connected  
with the agapæ*, or *love-feasts*, of the  
Christians, and *unknown as a separate  
ordinance*. To these agapæ, accompanied  
as they were at this time by the celebration  
of the Lord’s supper, the “*breaking of  
[the] bread*” refers,—from the custom of  
the master of the feast breaking bread in  
asking a blessing; see ch. xxvii. 35, where  
the Eucharist is out of the question.

**in prayers] or, in the prayers:—the ap-  
pointed times of prayer**: sce ver. 46. But  
it need not altogether exclude *prayer among  
themselves* as well, provided we do not  
assume any set times or forms of *Christian  
worship*, which certainly did not exist as  
yet. See notes on Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv.  
10.

**43.] every soul**, designating  
generally *the multitude*,—those who were  
not joined to the infant Church, This is.  
evident by the words “*all that believed,*”  
when the church is again the subject, ver.  
44, They were filled with fear, dread,  
reverential astonishment, at the effect   
produced by the outpouring of the Spirit. On  
the anticipatory character of the latter  
part of the verse, see general remarks  
at the beginning of this section.

**44.]** If it surprise us that so large a  
number should be continually assembled  
together (for such is certainly the sense of  
**were together**, not that they were joined  
by brotherly love, as Calvin)—we must  
remember that # large portion of the three  
thousand were persons who had come up to  
Jerusalem for the feast, and would by this  
time have returned to their homes.

**and had all things (in) common]** i.e. *no  
individual property, but one common  
stock:* see ch. iv. 32. That this was   
literally the case with the infant church at  
Jerusalem, is too plainly asserted in these  
passages to admit of a doubt. Some have  
supposed the expressions to indicate merely  
a partial community of goods: contrary to