period of time.” Bengel. “See,” says  
Chrysostom, “how he is always connecting  
God with their ancestors, that he may not  
seem to be introducing any new doctrine.  
Before (ch. ii.) he brought in the   
patriarch David, and now he introduces   
Abraham.”

**glorified]** Not, as A.V., ‘*hath  
glorified*,” implying, by *thus honouring  
His name*: it is the historie past tense,  
**glorified**, viz. by His exaltation through  
death—see John xii. 23; xvii. 10.

Not ‘*His Son*’, but **His Servant**: *servant*,  
however, in that distinct and Messianic sense  
which the same expression bears in Isa.  
xl.–lxvi. The above meaning is adopted  
by all the best modern Commentators.

**in the presence of Pilate**, or, perhaps,  
**to the face of Pilate**. when he was  
determined to let him go: see Luke xxiii.  
20; John xix. 4, 12.

**14. the Holy  
One and the Just]** Not only in the higher  
and divine sense present to St. Peter’s  
mind, but also by Pilate’s *own verdict*, and  
the testimony of the Jews’ consciences.  
‘The sentence is fnll of antitheses: the  
“*Holy One and the Just*” contrasts with  
the *moral* impurity of “a murderer,”—  
“*the* Prince *of life*,” with the destruction  
*of life* implied in “*murderer*,”—while “*ye  
killed*” again stands in remarkable   
opposition to “*the Prince of* life”? This last  
title given to our Lord implics, as the   
Vulgate renders it, “*the Author of life*.”—It  
is *possible*, that the words “*Prince of  
life*” may contain an allusion to the great  
miracle which was the immediate cause  
of the enmity of their rulers to Jesus.  
But of course St. Peter had a higher view  
in the title than *merely* this.

**16.]**  
The A.V. is right; **through**, or better,  
**on account of, faith in his name**. ‘The  
meaning, *for the sake of* (i.e. of awakening  
in you, and in the lame man himself) *faith  
in his name*, though grammatically   
justified, seems against the connexion with the  
Apostle’s profession, “*whereof we are witnesses*,”   
just before. It is evident to my  
mind, that the faith in His name, here  
spoken of, is the faith of these witnesses  
themselves. **His name** (the efficient cause),  
**by means of**, or **on account of** (our) **faith  
in his name** (the medium), &c.

**yea, the faith which is [wrought] by him**—  
not ‘faith *in* Him ;’ which is an   
inadmissible rendering. Peter’s own words (1 Pet.  
i.21) are remarkably parallel with, and the  
best interpreters of, this expression: “*who  
by Him do believe in God that raised Him  
up from the dead and gave Him glory, so  
that your faith and hope are in God.”*  
Some of the Commentators are anxious to  
bring in *the faith of the lame man himself*in this verse. Certainly it is according  
to analogy to suppose that *he had such  
faith*, from and after the words of Peter:—  
but, as certainly, there is *no allusion to it  
in this verse*, and the thread of Peter’s  
discourse would be broken by any such,  
It is the firm belief in His name *on the  
part of us His witnesses*, of which he is  
here speaking, as the medium whereby His  
name (the Power of the great dignity to  
which He has been exalted, the authorship  
of life) had in this case worked.

**17.]**  
**now**, introducing a new consideration:  
see 2 Thess. ii. 6. Here it softens the  
severer charge of ver. 14: sometimes it  
intensifies, as ch. xxii. 16; 1 John ii. 28 :—  
especially with “*behold*,” ch, xiii. 11; xx.  
22. No meaning such as ‘*now* that the  
real Messiahship of Him whom ye have  
slain is come to light’ (Meyer) is   
admissible.   
  
**brethren**, still softening his  
tone, and reminding them of their oneness  
of blood and covenant with the speaker.

**through ignorance]** There need be