the express assertion of ch. iv. 32. In order,  
however, rightly to understand this   
community, we may remark:   
  
(1) *it is only  
Sound in the church at Jerusalem*. No  
trace of its existence is discoverable any  
where else: on the contrary, St. Paul  
speaks constantly of the rich and the poor,  
see 1 Tim. vi. 17; Gal. ii. 10; 2 Cor. viii.  
13, 15; ix. 6, 7; 1 Cor, xvi. 2: also St.  
James, ii, 1–5; iv. 18.—And from the  
practice having at first prevailed at   
Jerusalem, we may partly perhaps explain tho  
great and constant poverty of that church,  
Rom. xv. 25, 26; 1 Cor 1–3; 2 Cor.  
viii. also ch, xi. 30; xxiv. 17.—'The   
non-establishment of this *community* elsewhere  
may have arisen from the inconveniences  
which were found to attend it in Jerusalem:  
see ch. vi, 1.   
  
(2) This community  
of goods was not, even in Jerusalem,   
enforced by *rule*, evident from ch. v. 4  
(xii. 12), but, originating in free-will,  
became perhaps an understood custom, still  
however in the power of any individual not  
to comply with,

(3) It was not (as Grotins  
thought) *borrowed from the sect of the  
Essenes*, with whom the Apostles, who  
certainly must have sanctioned this   
community, do not appear historieally to have  
had any connexion.

But (4) it is much  
more probable that it arose from a   
*continuation*, and application to the now  
increased number of disciples, *of the   
community in which our Lord and His   
Apostles had lived* (see John xii, 6; xiii. 29)  
*before*.—The practice probably did not  
long continue even at Jerusalem ; see Rom.  
xv. 26, note.

**45.] possessions** probably  
mean *landed property*, ch. v. 1—**goods**,  
any other possession; *moveables*, as distinguished  
from land.

**parted them**, i.e.  
**their price**; see a similar way of speaking,  
Matt. xxvi. 9.

**46. continuing daily with one accord in the temple]**See Luke  
xxiv. 53. The words need ‘not mean,  
though they *may* mean, that they were  
assembled in Solomon's porch, as in ch. v.  
12—but most probably, that they   
regularly kept the hours of prayer, ch. iii, 1.

**at home]** i.e. privately, as   
contrasted with their public frequenting of  
the temple: not, ‘*from house to house,*’ as  
A V.:—the words *may* bear that meaning  
(seo Luke viii. 1), but no have no trace of  
such a practice, ot’ holding the *agapæ*, or  
love-feasts, successively at different houses,  
—The breaking of bread took place at  
their house of meeting, wherever that was:  
cf. ch. xii, 12.

**did eat their meat]**  
ive. they **partook of food**: viz. in these  
*agapæ*, or breakings of bread.

**singleness of heart]** The word rendered   
**singleness** originally implies *freedom from stones  
or rocks*, and thus *simplicity, evenness,  
purity*.

**47.]** praising God does not  
seem only to refer to *giving thanks at  
their partaking of food*, but to their  
general manner of conversation, including  
the recurrence of special ejaculations and  
songs of praise by the influence of the  
Spirit.

**more that were in the way of  
salvation**: compare the Apostle’s   
command, ver. 40;—**those who were being  
saved**. Nothing is implied by this word,  
to answer one way or the other the   
question, whether all these *were finally saved*.  
It is only asserted, that they were *in the  
way of salvation* when they were added to  
the Christian assembly. Doubtless, some  
of them might have been of the class  
alluded to Heb. x. 26–29: at least there  
is nothing in this word to preclude it.

**CHAP. III. 1–10.]** HEALING OF A LAME  
MAN BY PETER AT THE GATE OF THE